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ABSTRACT

Dimensions of Socio-Cultural Sustainability: Perspectives of Hopedale, Nunatsiavut (Labrador)

Janet Kivett Knight

Social and cultural sustainability is increasingly discussed in a variety of disciplines and in the growing body of sustainability literature. However there is a lack of clarity in how the concept is defined and poor understanding as to how it relates to other aspects of sustainability. To address this issue, this research explored current definitions and representations of socio-cultural sustainability in the literature and community perspectives on this topic through a case study in Hopedale, Nunatsiavut, Labrador.

This research identifies gaps in current understandings of this concept, as well as differences between community and academic perspectives. Case study results emphasized the importance of strong social relationships, cultural identity, and connection to place as central elements of socio-cultural sustainability in a northern, Indigenous context. These findings are valuable for policy and decision makers, regarding approaches to community planning and supporting the social and cultural aspects of sustainability.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

While the idea of sustainability is not new, interest in the field has grown considerably since the United Nations World Commission on the Environment and Development (WCED) defined sustainable development in a 1987 report as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED, 1987, p. 13). There is now international consensus that the current trajectory of the human race is unsustainable (e.g. IPCC, 2013). Communities the world over are experiencing broad-scale changes in relation to human activities that have brought about changes in the environment including environmental degradation and loss of biodiversity, and increasingly unpredictable weather events associated with climate change, among others (ACIA, 2004; Hall, 2008; IPCC, 2013; Rogers et al, 2012; Thomalla, 2008). Existing problems, such as resource shortages and an increasing global population, will be compounded by climate change (IPCC, 2013; Rogers et al, 2012). Additionally, it has been argued that these broad changes will serve to exacerbate inequalities in health and livelihoods, especially those between Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations (ACIA, 2004; Ford & Furgal, 2009).

Sustainability has evolved as a field of research which seeks to address these issues; as “a movement to create a symbiotic, mutually supportive relationship among the three domains of environment, society, and economy (Hall, 2008, p .12). The term ‘sustainability’ is used throughout this thesis to refer broadly to the ability of a system (here, a physical community) to remain at a certain level of functioning,
such that its capital (social, cultural, environment, economic, others) is not diminished, and it maintains the ability to respond and cope with both internal and external stressors (such as socio-economic and demographic change, resource development, and climate change). This explanation of the concept is in recognition that communities, much like culture, are dynamic and that sustainability does not assume a static state to be sustained.

1.1 Understandings of Sustainability

Though discussions of sustainability are evolving, there remains a limitation in their current ability to understand relationships between environment, society and economy, and the proportional weight of each ‘realm’ in any one case (Lehtonen, 2004; Partridge, 2005). Due to a host of factors, including the conceptual roots of the term, the contemporary sustainability discourse has largely been focused on economic and environmental elements, with socio-cultural concerns included only peripherally through consideration of poverty, population growth and associated effects on the environment (Lehtonen, 2004; Partridge, 2005; Shirazi, 2011). As such, while the environmental effects of current ways of life and global trends are harshly apparent, the social and cultural impacts and influences are vastly underrepresented in sustainability discussions (Bramley, Dempsey, Power, & Brown, 2006; Colantonio, 2007; Dempsey, Bramley, Power, & Brown, 2011; Gunder, 2006; Omann & Spangenberg, 2002; Rogers et al., 2012).
Current approaches to sustainability are also largely divisive, addressing economic, environmental and social aspects separately or with little understanding of interaction or dependence between these ‘realms’ (Bostrom, 2012; Doubleday, MacKenzie, & Dalby, 2004; Missimer et al., 2010). Critics point to the ‘siloking’ effect of current approaches as detrimental to understandings of sustainability as they neglect, for example, that the economy is inherently a social creation (Lehtonen, 2004). However, there is growing recognition that the social aspects of communities are effectively the ‘connective tissue’ linking environmental concerns with economic issues, and completing a balanced approach to overall ‘sustainability’ of human societies (Becker et al., 1999; Bohannan, Gray, McGrath, & Schultheiss, 2005; Cheney, Nheu, & Vecellio, 2004; Dempsey et al., 2011; Foladori, 2005; Lehtonen, 2004; Magee, Scerri & James, 2012; Mauerhofer, 2011; Udo & Jansson, 2009).

1.2 Socio-Cultural Sustainability

Socio-cultural discussions of sustainability examine social and cultural aspects of human communities as they inform interaction with the natural environment (Berkes, Folke, & Gadgil, 1995), determine their capacity to adapt to change and plan for the future (ACIA, 2004; Berman et al., 2004; Dale et al., 2010; Duxbury & Jeanotte, 2010), and are the basis of many aspects of human well-being (Chandler & Lalonde, 1998; Cooke, 2005; Ribova, 2000).

I use the term ‘social’ to refer to the interactions in human systems, characterizing aspects of relationships between people and functions of human
communities. ‘Cultural’ is used in this thesis to describe the worldviews inherent in human communities; those values, norms and guiding principles that determine how an individual perceives reality. I do so in recognition that culture is also;

- historically adaptive for a particular group
- perpetuated through learning processes among members
- characterized by observable artifacts and behavior, espoused by values, and basic assumptions
- a multi-level construct from individual to global, and
- subject through top-down and bottom-up dynamics (Hall, 2008)

Social and cultural aspects also have intrinsic value, as they support a sense of personal and community well-being, emotional and psychological health (Chiu, 2004; Lalonde, 2006), such as through sense of empowerment, belonging, and social cohesion (Chandler and Lalonde, 1998; Colantonio, 2009).

Social and cultural aspects of sustainability are both representative of the social and cultural structures that support the well-being of individuals and communities (Bramley et al., 2006; Colantonio, 2007), as well as being supportive of sustainability in general. It is within the socio-cultural realm that principles and norms governing human action are developed and reproduced, including relationships with environmental and economic ‘realms’, leading many to see sustainability itself as a social problem (Becker et al., 1999; Cavaye, 2004; Chiu, 2004; Cuthill, 2010; Magee et al, 2012; Magis & Shinn, 2009). In this way, discussions of social and cultural aspects of sustainability are also of direct relevance to economic and environmental sustainability. For any economy to be sustainable, it is argued that it must have a full understanding of the socio-cultural norms, principles and values of the context in which it operates. Socio-cultural
sustainability also has clear implications for environmental sustainability, as human behavior toward the natural environment is largely determined by socially and culturally determined perceptions, values and principles of a population. As such, social and cultural aspects of communities are effectively the ‘connective tissue’ linking environmental and economic issues, and completing a balanced approach to overall ‘sustainability’ of human societies (Becker et al., 1999; Bohannan, Gray, McGrath, & Schultheiss, 2005; Cheney, Nheu, & Vecellio, 2004; Dempsey et al., 2011; Foladori, 2005; Lehtonen, 2004; Magee, Scerri & James, 2012; Mauerhofer, 2011; Udo & Jansson, 2009).

1.3 Existing Challenges

Though socio-cultural sustainability is increasingly discussed in a variety of disciplines and in the growing body of sustainability literature (Magis & Shinn, 2009), there is a severe lack of clarity in how the concept is currently defined and related to other aspects of sustainability (Rogers et al., 2012). Social and cultural aspects of sustainability are seen to be less easily measured (Bostrom, 2012; Lehtonen, 2004). As such, socio-cultural aspects which are important to contextualizing sustainability and thoroughly understanding the systems to be sustained, remain largely neglected as they are difficult to quantify and conceptually complex (Becker, Jahn, & Stiel, 1999; Scerri, 2009).

The community level is recognized as the most appropriate scale for sustainability operationalization, particularly for social and cultural aspects, as it is
at this level that impacts are most felt and interventions are most effectively applied (Baxter & Purcell, 2007; Dale, Ling, & Newman, 2010). However, a proliferation of sustainability projects at various scales continues to consider social and cultural concerns as secondary to economic or environmental goals, rather than essential preconditions for sustainability, or sustainability goals in themselves (Faber et al., 2010; Rogers et al., 2012).

It is essential that planning for the future in any community include appropriate consideration of not only economic and material goals, but also social and cultural ideals and objectives, which are foundational to community sustainability as they determine relationships with the natural environment, influence communities’ capacity to adapt to changes, and also greatly affect quality of human life (Berkes & Folke, 1995; Ford et al, 2007; Slemp, 2012).

1.4 The Northern, Indigenous Context

These issues are of particular importance in northern, Indigenous communities, for several reasons. All cultures of the north “retain a close relationship with the environment and a strong knowledge base of their regional surroundings” (Furgal & Seguin, 2006, p. 1965) but also face large-scale challenges due to climate change, resource development and other forces. Northern regions are “now experiencing some of the most rapid changes in climate on Earth” (Ford & Furgal, 2009, p. 1). In the context of these broad-scale forces, the communities of the
north are becoming ‘proving grounds’ for localized sustainability and climate change adaptation (Crate, 2008).

In particular, Indigenous populations in the north have been identified in climate change discourse as highly vulnerable (ACIA, 2004; IPCC, 2013), as their health and livelihoods are closely linked to environmental conditions (Ford, 2012; Ford & Furgal, 2009). Indigenous communities are more likely to be located in areas of more severe climatic impact, and be already socio-economically marginalized, have low health status and limited access to employment and social services (Furgal & Seguin, 2006; Ribova, 2000). As such, Indigenous populations of the north are uniquely at risk, as they are more sensitive and exposed to the effects of climate change (Ford, 2012).

However, Indigenous communities are also identified as possessing significant adaptive capacity, underpinned by traditional knowledge pertaining to land and resources, cultural identity and strong social networks (Ford, 2012; Furgal & Seguin, 2006; George, Berkes, & Preston, 1996; Searles, Usher & Myers, 2002). Additionally, Indigenous perspectives, based in ways of life closely linked to the natural world, are especially valuable in understanding the processes and impacts of climate change (ACIA, 2004). Interconnectedness between people and place means that Indigenous communities are highly invested in ecological continuity and other sustainability issues. However, our understanding of the socio-cultural dimensions of these broad-scale changes for Indigenous populations is limited (Ford, 2012). As such, this research is particularly relevant and important in northern, Indigenous communities today, as broad-scale changes may manifest in further impacts to
traditional lifestyles, cultural vitality and socio-economic stability (Ford & Furgal, 2009).

With these challenges in mind, and predicated on the understanding that there is significant value in understanding underlying socio-cultural principles in a particular context, as they inform interaction with the natural environment, determine communities’ capacity to adapt to change and plan for the future, and are the basis of so many aspects of human well-being (Berkes & Folke, 1995; Ford et al, 2007; Slemp, 2012), this research addresses the central research question:

*What are the dimensions of socio-cultural sustainability?*
  *What are the existing dimensions as described in the literature?*
  *How do communities themselves identify and describe these dimensions or elements?*

This research seeks to both offer critique of the current academic literature on sustainability, as well as contribute community perspectives to the socio-cultural sustainability discourse. As communities experience palpable change, discussions of sustainability are at the forefront, leading communities to evaluate what is valued, what will be gained or lost, and how to adapt to broad-scale changes. It is critically important to understand sustainability issues as perceived by those living them, and this is an approach lacking in the literature.

**1.5 Structure of Thesis**

This thesis is organized in five Chapters. Chapter 2 describes the research design and methods used to address the research objectives. Following this, in Chapter 3 I present a literature review. This review is presented as a means for
situating the research project within the literature, as well as demonstrating the scope of the discourse around social and cultural aspects of sustainability, and identifying other relevant fields of research. In Chapter 4, I use a case study approach to explore and describe community-level perspectives on social and cultural aspects of sustainability in the community of Hopedale, Nunatsiavut. Finally, in Chapter 5, I discuss the case study in context of the literature, illustrating lessons learned from community perspectives, as well as reflecting on the research process. I also give recommendations both for further research and for action in the community context.
CHAPTER 2
RESEARCH METHODS

2.1 Introduction

In this Chapter, I outline the overall research design, methodology and methods used to complete this research. I begin by situating myself as a researcher within the research project. Following this, I give an overview of the research approach, followed by the overall research design and methods. It is particularly important in qualitative research to ensure that the research is not ‘vague’. As such, I give detailed descriptions of the methods used in both the literature review and the case study, including: data collection, analytical methods and the steps taken to ensure validity of the research results. I conclude the Chapter by discussing my consideration of ethical issues pertaining to the research.

2.2 Positioning the Researcher

Researcher’s Background

Many qualitative research texts emphasize self reflection as necessary to address the research paradigm or worldviews of the researcher (Creswell, 2009; Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Miles and Huberman point out that “any researcher, no matter how unstructured or inductive, comes to fieldwork with some orienting ideas” (1994, p. 17). I feel it is important to acknowledge my own; the personal and professional experiences that have lead me to my thesis work and shaped my research interests, approach, and interpretations throughout.
I come to this work having grown up in the traditional territory of the Anishnaabe (Ojibway). Growing up, many of my classmates were from Curve Lake First Nation, and I spent a good deal of time there. Through these friendships, I had the opportunity to learn from and about Canada’s First Peoples, and be made aware of Indigenous history, culture and politics at an early age. I am still so thankful to have been exposed to different ways of knowing, and I feel this shaped my path forward in post-secondary education.

I have always been interested in the way people interact and how our sense of collective identity holds communities together. During my undergraduate studies at Trent University, I made efforts to explore the human experiences and social effects of development and change, balancing International Development Studies with courses in post-colonial literature. After graduating, I worked for several local non-profit, social support and arts organizations before being offered a position with the federal youth volunteer program Katimavik, facilitating a project in Innu and Inuit communities in the Lake Melville region of Labrador.

It was these experiences that lead me to pursue Masters level studies at Trent University. Living and working in northern, Indigenous communities gave me first-hand experience of the effects of cultural discontinuity, a direct result of a history of colonial policies, but also of a lack of consideration of social and cultural aspects of communities in community planning. I came to realize that there were severe implications of a lack of thorough understanding of socio-cultural landscapes, particularly for Indigenous communities, in which many aspects of culture, identity
and social interaction are still strongly connected to the land. I chose to pursue
graduate work in the Sustainability Studies program, as it offered a multidisciplinary
approach, but also as I saw the socio-cultural aspect of sustainability as a ‘missing
piece’ in the planning that was happening in communities, particularly in the context
of large-scale development and environmental change.

Researcher’s Worldview

As a non-Indigenous researcher working in and with Indigenous communities, I must be cognizant of my own culture. So often, I feel, researchers study ‘culture’ as if they have none of their own. Especially as this research deals with issues of social and cultural norms and perspectives, my own cultural worldview inherently influences my understanding of these issues, and of issues faced by Indigenous communities.

On both my mother’s and father’s sides, I am of mixed European ancestry, mostly Irish and Scottish. As such, I am a part of the socio-cultural ‘settlement’ society, now perceived as the ‘dominant’ culture in Canada. As a non-Indigenous scholar, my education and the cultural environment I have been brought up in are entrenched in a Western, Euro-Canadian paradigm. I acknowledge my role as a partner and beneficiary of the Treaty relationships between Canada and Indigenous peoples, relationships that were secured before my own people arrived on this territory.

I also acknowledge that my interest in Indigenous cultures and communities comes from this recognition, but also a long-seated respect for the Indigenous cultures of the region I call home. Through personal and professional experiences, I
have developed a greater understanding of other ways of knowing and a desire to further this learning. I am thankful that the communities I have lived in and the people I have worked with have allowed me the experiences to learn about Indigenous worldviews, and in this given the chance to rebuild my personal relationships with Creation and human community in a way long lost by my own ancestors.

*Working with Indigenous Communities*

I am greatly concerned at the continuing trend of research done in, ‘for’, or even ‘with’ Indigenous communities that is neither reciprocal nor practical, and instead becomes a point of interesting discussion amongst academics. Academics have a privileged position, and with that privilege comes responsibility. Research should be accessible, purposeful and respectful, as well as having practical implications for the communities of participants. Communities should have the lead role in determining what research is done in, with and about communities, how knowledge is treated and to what ends the research is used. It was my greatest intent that this research was done in a way that was applicable, relevant and useful for the communities I have worked with, and that they feel a sense of control over the work done in their homelands.

*Researcher’s Assumptions*

This project was focused on the perspectives, experiences and priorities of the Inuit community of Hopedale, one of five communities in the Nunatsiavut Inuit
Settlement Region of northern Labrador. As such, the research explores community perspectives that are ‘Inuit’, in that the community itself identifies as such. It is not assumed that the findings are generalizable to all other Inuit or Indigenous communities, but rather that it is important to examine social and cultural issues in context, and at deliberate levels of study. With this in mind, the research aims to demonstrate a process which may be applicable to generating understanding of social and cultural dimensions of sustainability in other communities, be they Inuit or otherwise.

*Theoretical Lens(es)*

Particularly as this research focuses on discussions of community sustainability in an Indigenous context, it is necessary to recognize that the concept of ‘sustainability’ is rooted in Western worldviews, and is not a recognized term in many Indigenous cultures. Rather, ‘sustainability’ is inherent; it is the way relationships with each other and with the natural world should be. A core premise of this research project is that there are complex relationships between and among the ‘realms’ of sustainability (economic, socio-cultural and ecological), and this interconnectedness is central to an Indigenous worldview.

In my work, I attempt to bring greater understanding to the role of social and cultural dimensions of communities in this interconnected concept of sustainability, both in terms of maintaining cultural and social systems over time, and in supporting broader sustainability. I use ‘culture’ to mean both the lenses through which people or groups of people understand and interpret their realities (Rubin &
Rubin, 2005), and the more tangible forms of culture such as traditions, art and language. Cultural lenses are often taken for granted, leading researchers to make cultural assumptions and making reflexivity even more essential (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

2.3 Overview of Research Approach

Research Objective and Purpose

The objectives of this study are to identify and explore dimensions of socio-cultural sustainability, including existing dimensions as described in the literature and understandings of how communities themselves may identify and describe these dimensions or elements.

This project is associated with a regional Inuit government’s current program on community sustainability program. It is part of the Nunatsiavut Government’s Sakkijânginnatuk Nunalik Sustainable Communities Initiative (SCI), a community-based project which seeks to inform best practices for sustainability in the communities of Nunatsiavut, Labrador (see Case Study Description, below). Specifically, this research comprises part of the “Valued Places and Spaces” sub-project within the SCI, which focuses on documenting community's perspectives on places, spaces and activities in the community that are valued by residents seen as important to maintain for the future.
Research Design

This study uses a qualitative exploratory approach. Qualitative methodologies are best able to capture the complexities of research participants’ realities, allowing access to the ‘inner experiences’ of participants, giving insight into the formation of meanings through and in culture (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 12).

This project explored the under-developed understandings of the social and cultural realm\(^1\) of sustainability, following the questions;

\textit{What are the dimensions of socio-cultural sustainability?}
- What are the existing dimensions as described in the literature?
- How do communities themselves identify and describe these dimensions or elements?

To investigate the research questions, two primary means of data collection and analysis were used. First, I conducted an integrative literature review to explore the development of and current discourse on social and cultural dimensions of sustainability. The findings from the literature review were then used to inform a single community case study on this topic. The case study explores community residents’ perspectives on these issues in Hopedale, a coastal community in the Nunatsiavut Inuit Settlement Region of northern Labrador.

2.4 Methods- Literature review

\(^1\) I use “social and cultural realm of sustainability” to refer to both the sustainability of social and...
An integrative literature review (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005) was completed to gain understanding of the development of and current discourse around social and cultural dimensions of sustainability. This project also used the literature as a source to provide questions for further research, to structure analysis of the case study, and for making comparisons between academic and community-based perspectives (Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

**Integrative literature review**

As the field of social sustainability is not as well-defined as its environmental or economic counterparts, an ‘integrative’ literature review was chosen over a systematic approach (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). Integrative reviews allow for bridging between related areas of work (Russell, 2005), particularly valuable in the case of social sustainability. Even more so than ‘sustainability’ social sustainability has multidisciplinary origins, making it a difficult concept to trace the development of, as pertinent literature exists across different subject domains, and often uses unique terminology.

For the purposes of this review, it was necessary for the process to follow an adaptive process, adding new search terms, using purposive sampling and drawing from author’s bibliographies (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). Papaioannou et al (2009) point to the usefulness of supplementary search techniques where concepts and terms are poorly defined, ambiguous, constantly changing, where there is little control over vocabularies, and where variability exists in indexing, as is frequent in some areas of the social sciences. In these situations, “conventional subject
searching may miss significant articles for inclusion in social science systematic reviews” (Papaioannou et al., 2009, p.114). As such, a standard systematic approach to this review of socio-cultural sustainability literature would have been too limiting and likely excluded very relevant fields and as such, an integrative method was employed.

*Identifying and refining search terms*

To begin the review, I developed a list of key words relevant to the topic through familiarity with the research area and sustainability literature. I then arranged these keywords were then arranged into 10 different word combinations, and ran trial searches using online databases of peer-reviewed literature. See Appendix A for a complete list of search terms and databases used.

I developed a spreadsheet to record the results of each search, detailing the total number of results returned and the general topics of the articles. I also made note of which disciplines were represented in the search results, by looking at both the name of the journal and the author's associations. Gaps in disciplinary representation of literature were identified in this process and used to direct further searching to literature in unrepresented fields. Search activities in those fields was then used to identify terms commonly used to discuss social or cultural sustainability and these terms were then included in future searches.

In total, I selected 10 search terms commonly used to discuss the concepts of social or cultural sustainability were used based on their coverage of different disciplines and fields of study (see Appendix A for complete list).
Finding and Harvesting articles

Using the refined list of 10 search terms, I first conducted a systematic search of peer-reviewed literature (Furgal, Garvin, & Jardine, 2010) (see Appendix A for a list of databases searched). I reviewed each of the first 100 search results for inclusion in the study, and harvested PDF files of relevant articles. After review of the first 100 results in a search process, the search was stopped after 25 consecutive search results identified non-relevant sources. Table 2.1 presents inclusion and exclusion criteria used to determine relevance in the search process. Using this process a total of 315 articles were identified and retained from this stage of the search.

After duplicate articles were removed, I reviewed the remaining articles for relatedness to the topics of social and cultural sustainability at the community level. Where an article presented new or divergent information, or an otherwise conceptually interesting discussion of socio-cultural sustainability, I reviewed the bibliography for other pertinent sources. These additional articles were retrieved and reviewed for inclusion in the study.

In total, 234 articles were reviewed. Of these, 187 were identified as containing significant discussion of issues directly relevant to social or cultural sustainability at the community level, and were therefore read in detail. For all articles read, I took comprehensive notes. Notes were summarized in spreadsheet
format and sources were characterized by discipline, topic and components of sustainability identified.

Table 2.1: Inclusion and exclusion criteria for literature review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion Criteria (Harvested)</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• focus of article is human communities</td>
<td>• focus of article is non-human communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• paper based on analysis of the sustainability or social-sustainability literature</td>
<td>• literature deals primarily with implications on non-human species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• article discusses social or cultural indicators, processes, issues or interventions in context of sustainability</td>
<td>• literature deals primarily with purely economic implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• socio-ecological literature (discussing relationships and interaction between human and environmental realm)</td>
<td>• unpublished works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• socio-economic literature (discussing implications of economic policy/practice for human communities)</td>
<td>• articles written in a language other than English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Literature Review Analysis_

In the analysis, I first took a chronological approach, reviewing the development of the field of social sustainability within the larger sustainability discourse. Much of this analysis drew on review papers in the literature. These preview papers, particularly Vallance, Perkins, & Dixon, (2011) and Chiu (2004) were key, as they also identified clear typologies of the literature which were helpful in distinguishing broader discussions of social sustainability.
Using the disciplinary categorization of papers I identified ‘fields of discourse’ in the literature, and the terminology used by these fields in discussing socio-cultural sustainability.

All 187 articles included in the study were then analyzed using a process of thematic content analysis. Thematic content analysis seeks to identify themes, characteristics of themes, relationships and patterns within the data, which then become the categories for analysis (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). In the analysis, I was primarily concerned with the themes and components of socio-cultural sustainability identified, and how these relate to one another. As the review drew on articles discussing topics ranging from very grounded aspects of the concepts and their measurement (e.g. ‘indicators’, ‘measuring’ social sustainability) to more theoretical issues (conceptualization, definition etc.), many themes I identified were referenced directly in the literature, while others were emergent and developed from the grouping of more specific components presented in the sources retained for the literature analysis.

Throughout the literature research process, I undertook article collection, review, and content analysis concurrently. As in other forms of qualitative research, the analysis was an iterative process, involving continual reflection (Creswell, 2009), and as such, I recorded my evolving thoughts, ideas and emergent themes in a separate set of notes for use when writing the analysis.
Concept mapping

Simultaneously with my note-taking and development of spreadsheets, I created, and continued to adapt a concept map of my analysis of the literature using the software program CMaps (Canas et al., 2004). Concept mapping was chosen as a visual means for organizing the data (Creswell, 2009), by way of “mapping out patterns of relationships among identifiable elements, variables, or concepts” (Hall, 2008). This process lends itself well to the field of social sustainability, as a concept which still lacks clarity and acceptance in either a definition or conceptualization of the concept (Creswell, 2009).

In the mapping process, I focused on grouping like concepts and representing emergent themes from the literature. References were first added individually to the map, in ‘concept bubbles’ (see Figure 3.1). Following this, I sorted articles by the component(s) of socio-cultural sustainability they presented and discussed, compiling them accordingly into larger concept bubbles. Once all articles had been included in the map, I arranged components under broader themes.

The CMap program provided many opportunities, however, the two-dimensional nature of the map also presented limitations to representing the complexity of many of the conceptual relationships, as I frequently point to in the Results section of Chapter 3.
2.5 Methods- Case Study

To gain an understanding of socio-cultural dimensions of sustainability in a community context, a case study was undertaken for this thesis. Case studies are useful as a qualitative approach, to “sketch an overall cultural setting” shared by a community, identifying key norms, values, and traditions and how they fit together in a setting (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Case studies seek to generate in-depth holistic understandings (Creswell, 2007). In particular, this case study took an ‘ethnographic interpretive’ approach, with a broad scope and focus on understanding meanings and structures from the participants’ perspectives (Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

Case Study Description

The Inuit of Labrador settled decades-long land-claim negotiations with the governments of Canada and the province of Newfoundland and Labrador in 2005, creating the Nunatsiavut Inuit Settlement Area. Nunatsiavut, which means ‘our beautiful land’ in Inuttitut, is the first Inuit region to achieve semi-autonomous self-government (Nunatsiavut Government, 2009). Although Nunatsiavut remains part of the province of Newfoundland and Labrador, the Nunatsiavut Government (NG) has jurisdiction over such areas as health, education, culture and language, justice and community matters, and operates at both the regional and community level. Inuit Community Governments represent each of the five Nunatsiavut communities (Figure 2.1) and are responsible for local matters.

The case study was conducted in collaboration with the Nunatsiavut Government’s SakKijânginnatuk Nunalik (Sustainable Communities initiative or SCI), and the community of Hopedale. The SCI was developed between the Environment
Division and the Joint Management Committee of the NG, in cooperation with the five coastal communities and researchers at Trent and Memorial universities.

The SCI provides a unique opportunity to explore and generate better understanding of the social and cultural dimensions of community sustainability. It seeks to inform best practices and provide guidance for enhancing community sustainability in Nunatsiavut. My thesis project fit into this larger government initiative well, as the initiative required that community-level research be conducted, exploring community perspectives on sustainability, and particularly those things that are socially and culturally valued.

Data collection involved focus groups and participatory mapping and occurred during July 2013 in the community of Hopedale, Nunatsiavut. I returned to the community in early December 2013 to conduct validation meetings with participants on the qualitative analysis and interpretation, and then to present initial preliminary results of the project to the community.

**Focus Groups**

Focus groups with community members were chosen as the primary method of data collection, as they allow the researcher the opportunity to gather opinions, understand how participants think about a topic, and identify patterns in perception.

---

2 The first phase of the SCI set out to understand opportunities and challenges for community sustainability in Nunatsiavut. The theme of ‘valued places and spaces’ emerged related to community sustainability, along with others such as ‘safe communities’, and ‘infrastructure, housing and community development’. ‘Valued Places and Spaces’ (VPSP) became a sub-project in its own right, seeking to document places, spaces and activities in the community that were valued by residents. The sub-project also aimed to better understand aspects of the community that were seen as important to maintain for the future. My thesis project became a contribution to this sub-project of the regional SCI.
In focus group interviews, researchers engage with 6-8 participants, facilitating group discussion using unstructured and open-ended lines of questioning to elicit views and opinions (Creswell, 2009), in a “permissive, non-threatening environment” (Krueger & Casey, 2009, p. 2). Focus groups also allow for participants to identify areas of importance and priority, which was a central concern in this thesis research and the work done under the SCI as a whole. Focus group texts point out that “subjects [tend] to disclose more about themselves to people who resemble them” (Krueger & Casey, 2009, p. 5). Open-ended questions and the ability to create discussion between participants create much more data dense transcripts (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Additionally, and in line with the ethical considerations of this research, the sharing of experiences within a group may lead to the development of a feeling of empowerment among participants, and partnership in the research process (Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

**Participant Recruitment**

I employed a purposive sampling strategy to recruit focus group participants. The Hopedale Inuit Community Government recommended a community liaison who generated a list of potential participants, given the criteria I supplied. I aimed to have a list of 8-10 potential participants for each focus group, fitting the following criteria:

- over the age of 18
- a Hopedale resident
- willing to participate in the project
Six focus groups were conducted as part of this study. The focus groups were identified and defined based on the interests of this study to include a cross section of community perspectives on the topics of social and cultural aspects of the community that made Hopedale a good place to live and the importance of maintaining these things into the future. The six focus groups were:

- Elder females
- Elder males
- Adult female residents
• Adult male residents
• Youth (18-30 years of age, male and female mixed)
• Community leaders / representatives (representatives from the school, church, community organizations)

The community liaison was given a letter of information about the project, in both English and Inuttitut, to help explain the project to potential participants. Similar information was posted around the community, and communicated through local radio. Potential participants were first approached by the community liaison, and if they showed interest in the study they were then by myself, to explain further the details and intent of the project. Additionally, some ‘snowball sampling’ (Goodman, 1961) was used to identify other potential participants, where initial lists fell short in identifying willing or available participants.

**Focus Group Content and Structure**

Results of the literature review, along with information gathered during preliminary meetings in the five Nunatsiavut communities, were used to inform the questions for community focus groups. The literature review identified several themes and components frequently included in discussions of social and cultural sustainability. Table 2.2, below, illustrates the relation between the thesis research questions, the themes and components identified through the literature review, and the questions posed in the focus group guide.
Focus group discussions revolved around the main question of "what social and cultural things are important to you in the community today, and in the future?" (see Appendix I for full focus group guide). Participants were encouraged to talk about the guiding principles and values they feel are foundational to making their community a healthy place to live and what is needed for the future in this regard.

Throughout the focus group discussions, our community liaison translated participant’s contributions from Inuittitut to English as necessary, to allow participants to express themselves in the language they felt most comfortable, and to allow the researchers to ask follow-up questions in real time.

Each focus group consisted of 2-8 participants, and lasted approximately 3 hours, including breaks. Each discussion was audio-recorded and notes were taken by both myself and a co-facilitator\(^3\). Sessions were semi-structured, in that I prepared a focus group guide with sequenced questions, but the natural flow of conversation often meant that the questions were posed in different order and discussion moved between topics as dictated by participants responses and direction (Creswell, 2007; Krueger & Casey, 2009). Semi-structured interviewing, including focus groups, is particularly good at accessing and generating understanding of the experiences and meanings of participants (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Kvale & Brinkman, 2008).

\(^3\) My colleague from Trent University, Diana Kouril, served as a co-facilitator throughout the case study data collection. As her research was also associated with the NG SCI, a combined research process allowed us to collect data relevant to both thesis projects as well as the Valued Places and Spaces project, while aiming to avoid ‘research fatigue’ in the community.
Table 2.2: Matrix of data collection methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Documents/ Literature</th>
<th>Focus Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) What are the existing dimensions of socio-cultural sustainability, as described in the literature? | Literature (review)  
200+ peer-reviewed articles                                                        | n/a                 |
| 2) How do communities identify and describe these dimensions or elements that are both indicative of their social well-being, resilience and cultural health and also likely to be impacted by processes of change (natural resource development, climate change or community growth)? | Literature review/ concept map identified elements:  
*Satisfaction of Basic Needs*  
a) health  
b) employment  
c) social infrastructure  
d) capabilities  
e) human capital  
*Social Justice and Equity*  
f) engaged, accessible and responsive government  
g) inter- and intra-generational justice  
*Social Cohesion and Social Capital*  
h) participation  
i) sense of identity and belonging  
*Culture*  
j) cultural capital  
k) knowledge generation and transmission  
*Futures Focus* | Focus group guide questions:  
# 3, 4  
# 3, 4  
# 3, 4  
#3, 4  
#3, 4  
# 6  
# 6, 9  
# 5, 6, 8  
# 2, 5, 6, 8  
#7, 8  
#7, 8  
# 9, 10  |
| 3) What key components more accurately identify and assess issues related to social sustainability in these communities? | Elements (a)- (k) from literature review | Data from transcripts |
Focus Group Analysis

Analysis followed the general form of qualitative analysis, as set out by Creswell (2007, 2009), involving stages of data organization and preparation; familiarization with the data; identifying themes and describing the data; coding the data; and presenting the findings. In particular, I carried out a process of thematic content analysis, using a systematic process of coding and identifying themes to interpret data (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). This method is appropriate in contexts where existing theory, research or literature on the phenomenon is limited (Hsieh & Shannon, 2006).

I employed an approach to analysis that utilized both inductive coding (those codes the researcher develops by directly examining the data; Boyatzis, 1998) and pre-determined coding, as drawn from the focus group guide (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The focus group guide itself was based on central themes and components identified in an integrative literature review, and was used as the basis of some pre-determined categories in the analysis (such as ‘participation’ or ‘sense of identity’).

Through this approach to coding I was able to identify and extract information from interviews directly relevant to the research question, while also allowing other themes to emerge from the data. This type of coding also allowed for the findings from focus groups to be compared to the findings from the literature review.

As data analysis in qualitative research is an ongoing and iterative exercise, involving considerable and continual reflection (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Rubin &
Rubin, 2005), I used a separate journal to record my own thoughts, ideas and interpretations throughout the data collection and analysis processes.

**Data Organization and Preparation**

Before starting the formal process of data analysis, all focus group recordings were first transcribed\(^4\). The software program NVivo 8 (QSR International, 2007) was then used to store and organize the data and facilitate the coding process.

**Familiarization with the Data**

To familiarize myself with the data, I read through all focus group transcripts. This was done with the intent of getting a general sense for the data shared by participants, and an impression of the overall depth of information gathered (Creswell, 2009). Throughout the process of familiarization, I made notes on emerging themes, insights or points of interest about the data.

**Descriptive Coding**

After thoroughly reviewing all data, I began the process of coding. Coding was conducted with the assistance of NVivo qualitative analysis software (Krueger & Casey, 2009). In this first phase of analysis, initial groups were created according to sections of the focus group guide, in order to sort responses by the question to which they referred. I then developed descriptive codes (Creswell, 2007) and applied these codes to the data according to content. Descriptive coding summarizes

---

\(^4\)Translation before transcription was not necessary, as the community liaison had performed this function throughout the group discussions.
the topic of a passage of the data in a word or short phase, and is used in beginning stages of analysis to provide basic content to begin forming categories for further analytical work (Saldana, 2009). Codes were then organized into categories, and further grouped as broader categories emerged. I reviewed and summarized categories before beginning interpretation of the data. For the purposes of this study, descriptive coding was important in highlighting significant social and cultural aspects of the community as identified by participants. It also allowed me to make comparisons between the findings of the literature review and grounded, community-based perceptions of aspects of socio-cultural sustainability.

Identification of Themes

As the findings of the literature review were used to develop the focus group guide, many of these same categories were apparent early in the coding process. Throughout the descriptive coding process, I made notes of emerging themes in the data. Once this phase was complete, I re-examined the data for these emergent themes, allowing ideas, relationships and commonalities that cut across descriptive codes to arise. These themes were then coded.

Data Interpretation

I examined common responses to predetermined categories. I then reviewed the code in context of the transcript and payed attention to how the code was used or addressed. Additionally, I looked at the importance given to particular codes (in
terms of repetition or emphasis) in order to generate an understanding of areas of priority.

During this stage, I also examined the codes in relation to the characteristics of the focus group in which they occurred. As focus groups were organized largely by age and gender, but also by role in the community (e.g.: elder residents or those associated with community organizations), this gave interesting insight into how groups perceive certain elements, highlighting commonalities and differences.

Here I developed a deeper understanding of the social and cultural aspects of the community- including how they support community sustainability, how they in turn need support, and how they relate to each other.

Reliability and Validity

To enhance reliability and validity in my data treatment and analysis, intercoder variability comparison was conducted with a second analyst, with no prior experience with the case study (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Additionally, general note-taking was used to document my choices in coding and analysis. This aided in keeping track of important and interesting details, recording my overall thoughts and ideas, and providing transparency.

Validation by Community- ‘Member Checking’

Following my analysis, I returned to the community to present transcripts to focus group participants and permit them to review and edit their contributions. With the aid of the community liaison, participants were presented with their focus
group transcript for review and also asked for permission to use specific quotes that I had identified for the final thesis document or report. During this same trip to the community my initial analysis and interpretation of the data was presented to participants to allow for participant validation or member checking. I held 4 validation sessions to which all 23 focus group participants were invited. In total, 9 of the participants attended these sessions, and 3 more validated the results through email or individual discussion. These sessions were an opportunity for me to discuss my findings with the research participants, and allow them to review, ask for clarification, or suggest alternate interpretations. As a result of these sessions only small clarifications were made to the qualitative results.

*Participatory Mapping*

Following the qualitative discussion of the focus group, I facilitated participatory mapping exercises (Chapin et al., 2005; IFAD, 2009; Tobias, 2000). Participatory mapping was used as a method of gathering data on spatial representations of social and cultural sites, areas, or features in and around the community associated with the narrative provided in the first half of the focus group discussion.

Many Indigenous groups point to the need for recording of cultural information as being more important than ever, and participatory mapping provides a way to do this (Tobias, 2000, p. xii). Participatory maps can provide a visual representation of community perspectives and spatial knowledge, and can include both physical features and resources as in traditional maps, alongside socio-cultural
features (International Fund for Agricultural Development, 2009, p. 4). Community members themselves create the maps, often representing "a socially or culturally distinct understanding of landscape and include information that is excluded from mainstream maps" (IFAD, 2009, p. 7). Participatory mapping can be an effective way to communicate information from participants to decision-makers, as it can use formal cartographic protocols. The process can produce final maps that are geospatially accurate representations of multiple types of data, including portrayals of local knowledge, and accessible to a wider audience (IFAD, 2009, p. 43). This type of mapping differs from traditional approaches to map production and subsequently the way maps are used. Additionally "when properly done, use and occupancy interviews increase the participants' awareness of their connection to territory" (Tobias, 2000, p. 2); a connection participants emphasized in the focus groups as being crucial to the well-being of the community. This process can also:

- contribute to building community cohesion, help stimulate community members to engage in land-related decision-making, raise awareness about pressing land-related issues and ultimately contribute to empowering local communities and their members. (IFAD, 2009, p. 4)

Participatory mapping has shown itself to be a powerful tool, particularly in Indigenous communities, where it is frequently used to demonstrate land use and occupancy and defend traditional territories (Chapin et al., 2005, p. 622). The practice of participatory mapping is concerned with community ownership, control and communication of information (IFAD, 2009, p. 4), in line with the aspirations of communities seeking to have a greater role in planning for the future. Some land use studies have been conducted in the community of Hopedale in the past, and so a number of participants were familiar with the mapping activity used here. As part of
the larger SCI, the NG and HICG were interested in the documentation of this spatial data from participants on these topics for future use in community planning.

*Participatory Mapping Process*

The process used in this study followed closely the steps proposed by Tobias (2000) in his guide *Chief Kerry’s Moose*; training facilitators, developing an approach to the mapping process gaining support from the community in preparation to collect data; collecting the data using appropriately scaled maps and encouraging community participation; processing the data by translating, transcribing and eliminating redundancies; and putting the data into useable forms in databases, map images and final reports. Careful preparation and protocols to ensure consistency in the mapping process supported reliability, validity, accuracy and representativeness of the data (Tobias, 2000, p. 49).

Before beginning, the rationale and procedures for the mapping activity were explained, and participants were provided the opportunity to ask questions. Mapping sessions were also audio-recorded (and later transcribed), and the community liaison provided simultaneous Inuttitut- English translation while mapping took place, as necessary.

I used printed copies of a large- and small- scale satellite image of the community, as base maps, covered with mylar overlays on which participants could draw for the mapping activity. Map boundaries were approximately those of the municipal lands.
During the mapping activity participants were asked to identify places and areas in the community and on the surrounding land that were important to them, particularly for having some social or cultural significance or use. I asked about aspects brought up in the focus group discussion to start. When sites or features were identified and drawn, I then asked specific questions about why the feature was important (how it was used, who used it, etc.).

Each feature (point, line or polygon) was identified with an alphanumeric code identifying its function or use (ex: BP for a berry-picking area) and the sequence in which it was added (ex: BP2 for the second feature added to the map) (Tobias, 2000). The alphanumeric coding system also acted as a verbal anchor, allowing me to verbalize the code identification of the feature being drawn and therefore tying the visual data on the map to the audio-recorded information shared by the participant. This process was continued until participants felt there were no additional features to add. Participants were then asked if there were features of priority (in terms of importance or concern) that they would like to emphasize, and these were noted.

Data Review and Map Digitization

Following the completion of the mapping activities, codes and features were reviewed for clarity, and any required corrections to the Mylar overlays were made. From the transcribed audio recordings, qualitative information pertaining to each code was entered into a database. Information from this descriptive data was used
to assign attributes to the each code, categorizing features as having social or cultural value, or as having specific social or cultural importance.

All overlays were digitized and a trained GIS technician created an ArcGIS (ESRI, 2011) database with the data containing all features and associated characteristics. Preliminary maps were then created from projections of the spatial data, thematically grouped on 3 maps for participant validation.

**Map Validation**

During the time I was in the community validating qualitative data from the focus group discussion, I also held map validation meetings with participants. In these meetings, the preliminary maps presenting composites of all focus group data were presented to participants and reviewed for accuracy and clarity. As well, participants were permitted to add any features they felt had been missed. Several features were added directly to these maps during these sessions. On return to the University these maps were then digitized and additional data was added to the ArcGIS database. Participants also removed redundancies (multiple representations of the same feature). The revised ArcGIS database was then used, with participant consent, to produce 3 final maps and the database was provided to the HICG for use in community planning exercises. Final maps were created based on interpretations of the data relevant to the thesis project; sites and areas of social importance, sites and areas of cultural importance, and sites and areas of both social and cultural importance (see Figures 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 in Chapter 4, Case Study).


### 2.6 Ethical Considerations

During preliminary meetings with the Nunatsiavut Joint Management Committee (JMC) in February of 2012, the SCI gained the support of the AngajukKâks (mayors) of the 5 Nunatsiavut communities. I visited with the community of Hopedale in June of 2012, to introduce the ‘Valued Places and Spaces’ component of the SCI, and gain early support for my own thesis research. Throughout the thesis research, this project conformed to the principles and guidelines of the Trent University Research Ethics Board (REB) and Trent’s Aboriginal Education Council. Additionally, the case study was undertaken with the consent and approval of the Nunatsiavut Government Research Office (NG RO), through the Inuit Research Advisor as well as the community of Hopedale (see Appendices C, D, and E for all research approval documentation). Prior to commencement of any research activity, participants were provided with and verbally guided through the informed consent letters and process and it was only after they had given their consent that focus groups or mapping activities began (see Appendix F for consent letter and forms).

**Relationships**

Prior to collecting data, I spent time in the community in initial meetings related to the SCI. Before beginning focus group sessions, my research partner and I made efforts to spend time familiarizing ourselves with the community, and the community with ourselves. We took opportunities presented to us to visit socially

---

5 See footnote 4
with community members, playing radio bingo and attending community events. A sense of mutual trust amongst the researchers and participants was crucial, both for ethical reasons and to ensure that participants felt comfortable sharing their perspectives in focus groups sessions. Letters of information and overviews of the research project were made available to community members (in both English and Inuttitut) before the research began, with the help of the community liaison. Additionally, the research team made themselves available (by phone, email or in-person when possible) to discuss the research project with community members throughout the research process.

Hopedale community leaders, members and participants were given the opportunity to review the research at several stages of the process, including project proposals and summaries, formulating and refining focus group guides, selecting participants and interpreting results. Hopedale’s AngajukKâk (Mayor), Wayne Piercy, was thoroughly involved in the process, kept up-to-date on daily research activities in the community, and through email and telephone communications when I was not in the community. He was also consulted and asked for advice when determining how results were presented and communicated in the community.

Reciprocity

Particularly as a non-Indigenous researcher working in and with an Inuit community, I am deeply concerned with ensuring that my work is useful to the participating community and contributes to policy and decision-making processes in some way. First and foremost, my commitments were to the community and helping
fulfill their wishes and objectives in the research. It is hoped that the findings from the focus groups, data from the participatory mapping activities and the thesis project, will be used in support of the NG’s SCI, which seeks to inform best practices and provide guidance for enhancing community sustainability in Nunatsiavut. Ultimately, the community will have control over the data, and once approved by the Hopedale Community Council, the community will utilize this information for future planning and research. A final research report and final maps will also be provided to the HICG and the NG as a contribution to the Nunatsiavut SCI.

2.7 Summary

In this Chapter I described the research approach, design and methods employed in this thesis project. I outlined a qualitative research approach to explore social and cultural dimensions of sustainability at the community level. An integrative literature review was presented to first identify the current discourse on socio-cultural sustainability. The findings from this literature review were then used to inform focus group and participatory mapping research in the community of Hopedale, Nunatsiavut (Labrador).

The results of the literature review are presented in Chapter 3. In Chapter 4, the case study findings are provided, illustrating resident perspectives on social and cultural elements that are important to community sustainability.
Chapter 3

Literature review

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the literature review and analysis of the development and contemporary discourse on social sustainability, with a focus toward socio-cultural dimensions in the field. This analysis was then used to inform the discussion guide for focus group sessions which sought to gain community perspectives on social and cultural dimensions of sustainability in the community of Hopedale, Nunatsiavut.

A typology of social ‘sustainabilities’ is introduced, followed by an analysis of the literature by related disciplines, discourses and themes. Key components of community-level sustainability are then identified. Finally, findings from the literature are discussed in terms of their relevance to socio-cultural sustainability in northern, Indigenous communities.

3.2 Results

Much like ‘sustainability’, a concept that “everyone purports to understand intuitively but somehow finds very difficult to operationalize into concrete terms” (Gunder, 2006, p. 211), social sustainability has proved a difficult concept around which to generate consensus. While ‘sustainability’ is often used in reference to a specific context, system or process, there remains little consensus on the dimensions or components of what constitutes ‘social sustainability’ (Rogers et al., 2012).
Additionally, both ‘social’ and ‘cultural’ dimensions are composed of values, norms, customs, social structure, and community lifestyle, and are often considered together (Chiu, 2004). As such, there is often overlap and confusion in distinguishing between ‘social’ and ‘cultural’ dimensions of sustainability as represented in the academic literature.

3.2.1 Concept Map

The concept map (Figure 3.1) represents an organization of the literature in the field of socio-cultural sustainability. The layout of the map, particularly the proximity of certain concept ‘bubbles’ to each other, represents relationships between aspects of the socio-cultural sustainability literature. The bubbles also contain references to important articles on that topic, and brief notes as to the concept itself.

Moving down from the top concept bubble (‘Sustainability and Sustainable Development’), the map shows the most common ‘triple bottom line’ approach, with ‘economic’, ‘social’ and ‘environmental’ ‘pillars’ or ‘realms’, in the first level. As the focus of the literature review is on social sustainability, the remainder of the map deals solely with this ‘realm’.
Figure 3.1: Concept map of socio-cultural sustainability literature.
Using the typology from Vallance (2011), the map identifies three streams in the social sustainability discourse; ‘development’, ‘maintenance’ and ‘bridge’. These make up the second level of the concept map, and are described below.

Loosely corresponding to the 3 'types' of social sustainability, the map shows four fields of discourse related to socio-cultural sustainability, in level three of the concept map. The two dimensional nature of the map presents certain limitations to representations of complexities in the literature, but these can be thought of as overlaying the three-part typology, and also corresponding to the five major themes of the literature.

These five themes, as shown in the fourth level, are: satisfaction of basic needs, social justice and equity, social cohesion, social capital and culture. Flowing from these themes, and making up the fifth level of the map, are key components identified in the literature, often discussed as ‘indicators’.

There is significant conceptual complexity that could not be represented in the map for reasons of visual clarity and organization. Concept bubbles are shown in strongest relation to other concepts, but this map cannot show all linkages and relationships between concepts. However, these complexities are discussed below.

3.2.2 Conceptual roots of ‘sustainability’

The idea of sustainability has origins in the environmental movement of the 1960s and 1970s, referring to ecological sustainability (Partridge, 2005). A growing ‘basic needs agenda’ during the 1970s and 1980s began to include social considerations through the paired discussions of poverty and population growth,
but failed to distinguish between social and ecological issues, including humans as agents of ecological change (Foladori, 2005; Folke, 2006). The most frequently cited definition of sustainability, presented in the WCED report *Our Common Future* (or the ‘Brundtland Report’), actually refers to sustainable development, defining it as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED, 1987, p. 37.). The report represents a turning point in the sustainability discourse, with the inclusion of ‘development’ considerations; basic needs of human populations necessary for economic growth and environmental protection, as well as the key value of intergenerational equity (Foladori, 2005; Magis & Shinn, 2009; Vallance et al., 2011).

However, there are many criticisms of the definition presented in the report; for one, that the identification of ‘needs’ is ambiguous, and says nothing as to how these goals are to be achieved (Castle, 2002). Additionally, the definition still uses an environment- economy binary. Further, it was not until the late 1990s that social issues were taken into account as an important aspect of the sustainability agenda (Colantonio, 2007).

*Sustainable development*

Though ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable development’ are not synonymous, they are often used interchangeably, and both may be seen to serve as “flexible discourses and meeting points for different ideas on how to achieve human betterment” (Crate, 2008, p. 295). Sustainability describes a state of a system, while sustainable development refers to the processes leading to or existing within that
state (Anielski & Winfield, 2002; Colantonio, 2007; Missimer, Robert, Broman, & Sverdrup, 2010; Partridge, 2005). Sustainable development stresses the interaction between realms (Becker et al., 1999; Lehtonen, 2004; Littig & Griessler, 2005; Murphy, 2012), framing sustainability as a ‘moving target’ (Dale et al., 2010).

The concept of sustainable development has been criticized as presupposing continued growth, offering “a smokescreen behind which business can continue its operations essentially unhindered by environmental concerns, while paying lip service to the needs of future generations” (Partridge, 2005, p. 3) and merely endorsing “a different kind of consumerist development” (Dale et al., 2010, p. 18).

Sustainable development is thus a concept suggesting ‘sustaining development’ rather than ‘developing sustainability’ (Doubleday et al, 2004). Even within the sustainable development discourse today, socio-cultural dimensions garner significantly less attention than other pillars of sustainability. It is argued that this is perhaps because they are equated with and represented as socio-economic concerns or simply because they are more difficult to operationalize (Bostrom, 2012; Rhodes, 2004; Vallance et al., 2011).

'Triple Bottom Line’ sustainability

The introduction of ‘triple bottom line’ sustainability marked another shift in the understanding of sustainability (Elkington, 1997). With the addition of the ‘social’ third pillar, sustainability became a more “complex and multi-dimensional field” (Partridge, 2005, p. 5), moving away from a strict environment-economy focus. Sustainability was then seen and presented in the literature as a process of
integrating the three goals (environmental-economy- basic needs) towards the outcome of economic vitality, social health and environmental quality (Bohannan et al, 2005; Littig & Griessler, 2005).

Challenges to the ‘triple bottom line’ approach argue that it is indicative of the pervasiveness of the economic- centered paradigm in that social aspects were added to understandings of sustainability as a separate pillar. Many authors argue that this poses conceptual issues (Lehtonen, 2004); “as if ‘economy’ is not absolutely a social creation” (Partridge, 2005, p. 12). Additionally, the ‘siloing’ of sustainability into pillars neglects the fundamentally different nature of social systems as enmeshed with environmental and economic pillars through social relations, cultural meanings, and practices (Bostrom, 2012; Doubleday et al., 2004; Littig & Griessler, 2005; Missimer et al., 2010). The equality of the three dimensions also poses political questions as to the hierarchical importance of the economy in relation to the social and environmental systems on which it depends (Lehtonen, 2004; Partridge, 2005).

Based largely on a technical approach to sustainability, the current literature reflects the fact that social aspects of sustainability remain largely overlooked (Adger, 1997; Foladori, 2005). As a result, social sustainability remains the ‘weakest pillar’, and there is still little attention paid to the interaction between ‘realms’ (Dale et al., 2010; Partridge, 2005).
3.2.3 Development of Social Sustainability

The literature reflects a growing understanding that it is within the socio-cultural realm that institutions are designed and relations are reproduced, determining human understandings of and interaction with the environment (Becker et al., 1999; Cavaye, 2004; Cuthill, 2010; Magee et al, 2012; Magis & Shinn, 2009). There is also growing recognition of the intrinsic value of social components within the broader sustainability discourse (Magis & Shinn, 2009), and increased recognition of sustainability itself as a social phenomenon (Becker et al., 1999; Bohannan et al., 2005; Cheney, Nheu, & Vecellio, 2004; Dempsey et al., 2011; Foladori, 2005; Lehtonen, 2004; Magee et al., 2012; Mauerhofer, 2011; Partridge, 2005; Udo & Jansson, 2009). However, much of the social sustainability literature is still centered on the “material aspects of sustainability, neglecting its immaterial and cultural aspects” (Shirazi, 2011, p. 1) and continues to address these emergent concerns as secondary to economic or environmental goals.

Socio-cultural sustainability

Alongside growing understanding of the importance of social dimensions in the sustainability discourse, culture has gained recognition as an important factor (Cernea, 1993; Daskon, 2010). The literature reflects a shift from a focus on basic needs and human development goals, towards dimensions more inclusive of cultural concerns (Cernea, 1993; Daskon, 2010; Rhodes, 2004). Colantonio (2009) identifies this shift from ‘traditional’ to ‘emerging’ themes of social sustainability, as summarized in Table 3.1.

There is considerable overlap and confusion between ‘social’ and ‘cultural’
sustainability, as they are often seen as being synonymous, as both refer to values, norms, customs, social structures, relationships and lifestyles (Chiu, 2004; Duxbury & Jeanotte, 2010). Much like social aspects of sustainability, cultural aspects are discussed both as an important part of overall sustainability, but also as having integral value (Chiu, 2004). Cultural aspects of sustainability are often included ‘under’ or ‘within’ social aspects, but require specific attention as they shape the very worldviews which determine the way ‘sustainability’ as a concept is interpreted (Chiu, 2004; DeRiviere, 2010; Jarvela, 2008).

Chiu (2004) identifies social sustainability as being concerned with the well-being of people, and cultural sustainability with the continuation of culture. However, other definitions of social sustainability include aspects such as tolerance and respect, often included as ‘social’ concerns, alongside ‘cultural’ themes of identity and cultural support (Koning, 2002).

**Table 3.1: ‘Traditional’ and ‘emerging’ themes of social sustainability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Traditional</strong></th>
<th><strong>Emerging</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• basic needs, including housing and environmental health</td>
<td>• demographic change (aging, migration and mobility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• education and skills</td>
<td>• social mixing and cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• employment and equity</td>
<td>• identity, sense of place and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• human rights and gender</td>
<td>• empowerment, participation and access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• poverty</td>
<td>• health and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• social justice</td>
<td>• social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• well being, happiness and quality of life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Defining Socio- Cultural Sustainability

Although clear, agreed-upon concept of social sustainability is still missing (Littig & Griessler, 2005), there appear to be benefits to this absence in the literature. An ‘interpretive flexibility’ lends itself to broad appeal in that it “encourages communication among different and disagreeing actors” (Bostrom, 2012, p. 4). In the literature, various authors and disciplines frequently adopt their own definition, according to the perspective with which they approach discussions of sustainability (Colantonio, 2007). Discourse on the concept is “somewhat chaotic and sometimes contradictory or confusing” (Vallance et al., 2011, p. 345) as various prerogatives drive research agendas.

However, the adaptability of the concept also presents a weakness “in that people must constantly elaborate what they actually mean when they address social sustainability” (Bostrom, 2012, p. 4). Current definitions are either discipline-specific, focused on identifying thematic areas, ‘categories’, ‘dimensions’ and ‘indicators’, or explicitly general, a ‘catchall term’ based on the assumed conflict between economic and social development (Colantonio, 2007; Gunder, 2006; Murphy, 2012).

Indicators of Socio- cultural Sustainability

Many articles point to the difficulty in defining and quantifying social aspects of sustainability as leading to limited attention being paid to the concept (Bramley, Dempsey, Power, & Brown, 2006; Colantonio, 2007; Dempsey, Bramley, Power, & Brown, 2011; Gunder, 2006; Omann & Spangenberg, 2002). In comparison with
environmental or economic aspects of sustainability, social dimensions cannot be easily quantified and analyzed (Bostrom, 2012; Lehtonen, 2004). Indicator-based projects that attempt to evaluate issues on qualitative terms have the tendency to reduce complex interactions to technical questions or formulate social dynamics in non-social terms (Becker, Jahn, & Stiel, 1999; Scerri, 2009). Equally as problematic are discussions of social sustainability in the literature that speak solely in terms of social relations, as they run the risk of perpetuating a separation between social and environmental ‘realms’, excluding socio-ecological relationships (Bostrom, 2012). At the core of the problem is the lack of consensus on what constitutes the ‘social’ in the first place. This leads many authors to argue that ‘sustainability’ is often a political question, of ‘what to sustain, and for whom’ (Bostrom, 2012; Davidson, 2009; Lehtonen, 2004). As such, the process of selecting indicators can run the risk of maintaining or exacerbating existing social and environmental ills; injustices and degradation (Gunder, 2006; Lehtonen, 2004; Littig & Griessler, 2005; Murphy, 2012; Omann & Spangenberg, 2002).

3.2.4 Socio-cultural sustainability: main concerns, themes and types

Overall, the discourse on socio-cultural sustainability has two key foci;

- Theoretical and conceptual issues
- Practical issues, such as implementation, measurement, etc. (Bostrom, 2012)

Within these two concerns, the social and cultural sustainability literature can be seen to reflect two main themes;
• A focus on socio-cultural sustainability as supporting broader sustainability

• An understanding of the need to sustain social and cultural structures themselves

Within the latter, much focus is on ‘social equity’ issues (access to services, satisfaction of basic needs, inter- and intra-generational justice) while the former looks at ‘sustainability of community’ (social capital, social resiliency and socio-ecological relationships) (Bramley et al., 2006; Colantonio, 2007).

Loosely corresponding to these broad themes and sub-themes, Vallance et al (2011) present a typology of social sustainability, represented in level two of the map;

• ‘Development sustainability’: addressing basic needs, the creation of social capital, social justice, equity and so on

• ‘Bridge sustainability’: concerning changes in behavior so as to achieve biophysical environmental goals

• ‘Maintenance sustainability’: referring to the preservation – or what can be sustained – of socio-cultural characteristics in the face of change, and the ways in which people actively embrace or resist those changes. (Vallance et al., 2011, p. 342)

These ‘types’ of social sustainability reflect a three-part interpretation; of social sustainability as social constraints or ‘underdevelopment’ limiting sustainability (development-oriented), as social preconditions determining equity between and among generations as well as behaviors towards natural resources (environment-oriented ‘bridge’ sustainability), and social sustainability as concerned with the maintenance and improvement of human well-being, including cultural aspects (‘maintenance’ sustainability) (Chiu, 2004; Vallance et al., 2011).
Their placement on the concept map (Figure 3.1) also represents the relation of the three types to other pillars of sustainability. ‘Development’ social sustainability can be seen as referring to issues that are more economic in nature, ‘bridge’ social sustainability is of interest to those more environmental in nature, and ‘maintenance’ social sustainability is focused more on issues that are primarily social and cultural. As an example of this, a connection is made on Figure 3.1 between ‘bridge’ social sustainability and environmental sustainability, through the field of ‘socio-ecological resilience’.

The three types of social sustainability are discussed more in-depth below.

‘Development’ Social Sustainability

‘Development’ social sustainability is primarily concerned with basic needs, but also social capital and cohesion (Vallance et al., 2011). ‘Development’ sustainability includes both very tangible components, such as provision of social infrastructure, food, housing, and employment, as well as less tangible aspects such as perceptions of equity, distribution of power, justice and security (Foladori, 2005; Vallance et al., 2011).

As such, ‘development’ social sustainability gains much attention across the social science literature in community and urban planning, public policy, health and disaster preparedness and international development. It is also discussed in conjunction with the two other ‘social sustainabilities’ in psychology (Chandler & Lalonde, 1998; Higgins, Phillips, Cowan, & Tikao, 2009; Perkins, Hughey, & Speer, 2002; Rollero & de Piccoli, 2010), planning (Bramley et al., 2006; Cooper, 2006;
Cuthill, 2010; Fercho, 2008; Rogers & Ryan, 2001; Rolfe, 2006), socio-ecology (Galway, Salomon, Takaro, & Allen, 2011; Goodland, 2000; Sakakibara, 2008), and corporate social responsibility (Murphy, 2010).

‘Maintenance’ Social Sustainability

Maintenance social sustainability centers on the understanding that society must be sustained in its own right, and is concerned with the maintenance and improvement of the well-being of human societies (Chiu, 2004; Magis & Shinn, 2009). This type of social sustainability "speaks to the traditions, practices, preferences and places people would like to see maintained (sustained) or improved" (Vallance et al., 2011, p. 344), and thus borders on the core aspects of cultural sustainability in a concern for the maintenance of cultural preferences and characteristics.

Literature on maintenance sustainability stresses these cultural aspects (Abi-Hashem, 2011; Baehler, 2007; Centre of Expertise on Culture and Communities, 2006; Chiu, 2004; Chapel, n.d.; Dalziel, Matunga, & Saunders, 2006; Daskon, 2010; Lee, 2005; T. Marshall & Guilar, 2011; Patterson, 2002; Semken & Brandt, 2010) and often ties them closely to the other types of social sustainability through knowledge generation and transmission (Lalonde, 2002), particularly in the field of socio-ecology (Folke, 2003; Ford et al., 2007; Furgal & Seguin, 2006). The majority of literature on maintenance sustainability originates in the social sciences (Bankoff, 2007), including psychology (Gregory, 2001; Trickett, 1994), with contributions from socio-ecology (Fernandez & Leiserowitz, 2007; Folke, 2003; Grazuleviciute,
2006; Parlee, Berkes, & Council, 2005), and community and urban planning (Bohannan et al., 2005; Slemp et al., 2012).

‘Bridge’ Social Sustainability

Bridge sustainability effectively ‘rounds out’ the social dimensions of sustainability, as social sustainability approaches that conceptualize society ‘without nature’ are “no more appropriate than one which studies the natural world in isolation from the social” (Partridge, 2005, p. 13). Bridge social sustainability recognizes the role of human agency in shaping environmental outcomes and determining social conditions which support broader sustainability (Berkes, Folke, & Gadgil, 1995; Chiu, 2004) including environmental ethics (Vallance et al., 2011). Bridge sustainability diverges from development and maintenance sustainability in that it is not concerned with human capacities and social relations so much as their ecological consequences (Foladori, 2005; Olsson, 2003).

Benefitting from the strong ecological roots of ‘sustainability’, bridge sustainability represents a large portion of the social sustainability discourse, and is represented in a variety of disciplines and fields, all with the intention of building ‘bridges’ or connections between human society and the environment on which it depends (Berman, Nicolson, Kofinas, Tetlichi, & Martin, 2004; Foladori, 2005; Thomalla, 2008; Throsby, 2005). Socio- ecology, particularly those fields concerned with local, traditional and Indigenous knowledges, makes direct connections between bridge and maintenance sustainability, through the inherent cultural connection between people and environment (Berkes & Fast, 1996; Berkes et al.,
Focus on the community

The community level is recognized as the most appropriate scale for sustainability operationalization, particularly for social and cultural aspects, as it is at this level that both impacts are most felt and interventions are most effectively applied (Baxter & Purcell, 2007; Dale et al., 2010). There are some suggestions that aspects of social sustainability, such as levels of economic development and social capital, are more readily measured at the community level (Sherrieb, Norris, & Galea, 2010). ‘Community’ is a multidimensional concept, necessitating definition in itself. Communities are “not only physical settings but also social, economic, political, psychological and cultural settings” (Christakopoulou, Dawson, & Aikaterini, 2001, p. 323), representing groups of individuals who may share a geographic location or common interests, but also culture, sets of norms and values, and relationships (Bajayo, 2010).

Social sustainability discourse, recognizing the importance of contextualizing initiatives, is focused largely on the community scale (Colantonio, 2007; Doubleday et al., 2004). Much of the ‘community sustainability’ work is concerned with monitoring community sustainability through capitals (Anielski & Winfield, 2002; Campbell, 2006; Castle, 2002; Rolfe, 2006; Saunders & Dalziel, 2010). However, there are still issues with incorporating less-tangible social and cultural aspects into community-level planning, as they remain difficult to define, quantify, and are often
'tagged on’ to broader community sustainability planning, seen as having tertiary importance (Duxbury & Jeanotte, 2010). Communities are taking a lead in defining cultural aspects of sustainability through identifying key values, principles and objectives, empowered by processes for indicator development and decision-making processes which are inclusive of community input and in which communities take a leadership role (Bohannan et al., 2005; Duxbury & Jeanotte, 2010; Fercho, 2008; Redefining Progress, 2002).

3.2.5 Disciplinary perspectives on Socio-cultural Sustainability

As many of the perspectives on socio-cultural sustainability are discipline-specific, it is useful to examine the concept from the various disciplinary perspectives from which it originates. Due to issues with visual complexity, these are not represented in the concept map.

Social sciences

Sustainability is a highly relevant field of study for the social sciences, as sustainability is a social concern, requiring greater understanding of the political, cultural and social values determining sustainability (Baehler, 2007; Becker et al., 1999; Christians, 2007). Primarily, the social sciences examine ‘maintenance’ and ‘bridge’ social sustainability (MacKendrick & Parkins, 2004), recognizing the importance of cultural contributions to such things as community resilience (Boyd et al., 2010; Brady, 2011; Chapel, n.d.; Duxbury & Jeanotte, 2010), understanding local context, social structures (Bankoff, 2007; Crate, 2008), and the management of
knowledge and cultural capital (Faber et al, 2010; Lee, 2005; Marshall & Guilar, 2011; Robards & Alessa, 2004).

However, the social sciences have the potential for greater contribution to understandings of social and cultural sustainability than is currently being realized (Becker et al., 1999; Sirgy, Widgery, Lee, & Yu, 2010). Partridge (2005), in particular, argues that the sustainability discourse and the social sciences have long neglected their common ground, and there is both room for social scientists to engage with the sustainability debate, and need for social science to “pay greater attention to the challenges represented by the sustainability agenda” (Partridge, 2005, p.1).

Research in the social sciences may provide help in addressing two central concerns of social sustainability; conceptually, how to measure immaterial aspects which are not easily quantified (Christakopoulou et al., 2001; Doubleday et al., 2004; Martin, 2012; Shirazi, 2011) and practically, how to change behaviors central to sustainability and ensure culturally appropriate processes for sustainability (Luke & Alavosius, 2012; Willis & Edwards, 1999). Multidisciplinary perspectives will aid in incorporating holistic approaches to sustainability.

Corporate social responsibility (CSR)

Corporate entities have begun to consider the social implications their operations. Corporate social responsibility is the focus of a growing body of research, particularly in natural resource development and long-term supply chain issues, and reflects calls for social responsibility as an ‘ethical imperative’ (Paula &
Negrao Cavalcanti, 2000; Pullman, Maloni, & Carter, 2009). This is predominantly in response to a neglect of the ‘social bottom line’ in industry.

Working definitions of social sustainability in CSR reporting refer to provision of equitable opportunities, encouragement of diversity, quality of life considerations, democratic processes and promotion of internal and external connectivity (Glasson & Wood, 2009; Murphy, 2010; Pullman et al., 2009). However, there are issues with the reporting of this progress, as organizations rarely have “a comprehensive strategy for working towards, measuring or reporting on the social dimensions of their activities” (Partridge, 2005, p. 6).

The difficulty in quantifying social sustainability in indicators, particularly in an economic environment, has lead to calls for ‘social footprint’ accounting (McElroy, Jorna, & Engelen, 2008; Omann & Spangenberg, 2002) and approaches such as The Natural Step (Missimer et al., 2010). Still, social sustainability efforts are also often construed as charitable acts, performed in the name of public relations rather than having real merit (Dillard, Dujon, & King, 2009). CSR literature also refers to the need for operations to be socially and culturally acceptable (Rhodes, 2004; Thaman, 2002). Understandings of cultural context help to identify opportunities for intervention, to build community-level cooperation, and to fit initiatives to local goals and norms (Ford et al., 2007).

_Urban and community planning_

The planning disciplines recognize that community is more than a physical place, and that physical places have social, cultural and psychological implications
Both the urban and community planning literatures make strong links between traditional considerations of ‘sustainable communities’ and emergent socio-cultural dimensions, emphasizing ‘development’ and ‘maintenance’ social sustainability (Bramley et al., 2006; Cooper, 2006). Evaluations of community ‘livability’, ‘well-being’, and satisfaction with living environments make connections with mental health, social justice and equity, capabilities, and social cohesion (Cooper, 2006; Cuthill, 2003, 2010; Maloutas, 2003).

Community planning literature emphasizes the role of community capital (natural, built, social, political) in determining community-level sustainability (Bajayo, 2010; Campbell, 2006; Castle, 2002; Rolfe, 2006; Saunders & Dalziel, 2010). Particularly, this literature identifies the need for community involvement in sustainability indicator selection and decision-making processes, allowing for the incorporation of local values, norms and objectives (Bohannan et al., 2005; Castle, 2002; Fercho, 2008; Redefining Progress, 2002).

Public policy

Social sustainability in the public policy discourse covers ‘basic needs’ considerations of education, employment and social infrastructure (McHardy & O'Sullivan, 2004), alongside broader issues of disaster preparedness (Rivera & Settembrino, 2010) and community resilience to climate-change (Ranjan & Prasad, 2012). Much like community planning, public policy discusses the social and cultural dimensions of sustainability with an emphasis on ‘community well-being’ (Graham,
2010; Jarvela, 2008; Penney, O'Sullivan & Senecal, 2012; Ribova, 2000; Senecal, Penney, & O'Sullivan, 2008). The discussion of community well-being has grown from a discussion of ‘composite social indicators’ in the 1970s, which attempted to capture aspects of quality of life and well-being not covered by evaluations based in Gross Domestic Product (Cooke, 2005).

Public policy receives much criticism as the arena in which "efforts towards sustainability and sustainable development have most often become empty clichés of governments and policy makers" (Crate, 2008, p. 295). There are criticisms of under-consideration of issues of gender equity, of issues that are more difficult to quantify or have little data available, and in general policy has the tendency to include cultural aspects under ‘social’ considerations (Jarvela, 2008; Lehtonen, 2004).

**Social ecology**

Owing much to its roots in the natural sciences illustrated by the use of ecological concepts such as ‘resilience’ to enhance understandings of social systems (Adger, Kelly, Huy, & Locke, 2002; Berkes, 2007; Cote & Nightingale, 2012; Folke, 2006; Galway et al., 2011; Thomalla, 2008), socio-ecological studies offer much to the social sustainability discourse. Though there are criticisms of the applicability of resilience thinking to social systems (Cote & Nightingale, 2012; Marshall & Marshall, 2007), socio-ecological literature demonstrates early recognition of human behavior as strongly determinant of environmental outcomes (Berkes et al., 1995; Faber et al., 2010; Olsson, 2003).
Though ‘bridge’ type social sustainability is the obvious focus of social-ecology, there are connections to maintenance and development social sustainability evident in the literature as well. The literature emphasizes that the state of communities, their cultural health and the types of values that are being proliferated have significant influence on human interactions with the environment (Dale & Newman, 2006; Folke, 2003; Throsby, 2005). As such, some fields of socio-ecological studies emphasize the need for cultural preservation, particularly in Indigenous communities, which hold a wealth of traditional knowledge (Berkes & Fast, 1996; Berkes et al., 1995; Boyd et al., 2010; Crane, 2010; Ford et al., 2007; Grazuleviciute, 2006; Sakakibara, 2008). Socio-ecology also includes many calls for the development of indicators to take into account cultural context and community perceptions, through bottom-up participatory approaches (Gahin, Veleva, & Hart, 2003; Magee & Scerri, 2012; Mulligan & Nadarajah, 2008; Panagiotarakau & Mulrennan, 2002).

**Psychology**

Some of the most conceptually interesting discussions of socio-cultural sustainability come from the field of psychology. This literature connects directly with both ‘development’ and ‘maintenance’ sustainability, looking at individual and collective health and well-being, as well as cultural issues.

There is growing recognition in psychology of the role of the inherent value of cultural and social considerations to overall sustainability through issues of identity, place attachment and perceived social well-being (Higgins et al., 2009; Rollero & de Piccoli, 2010; Sani, Bowe, & Herrera, 2008). In particular, research in
this field points to cultural continuity as protection against social ills, such as suicide, violence and substance abuse (Chandler & Lalonde, 1998). There is role for community psychology in addressing socio-cultural sustainability within the large-scale contexts of social, political and environmental change (Gregory, 2001).

*Indigenous Scholarship and Perspectives*

There are clear limitations to this kind of literature review, in that Indigenous voices or perspectives are still limited in the peer-reviewed literature. Inclusion of ‘gray literature’, and non-written sources would have likely yielded a greater representation of Indigenous perspectives. The search terms used may also have prevented the capturing of Indigenous perspectives on social sustainability, as the notion of sustainability itself is embedded in Indigenous worldviews and as such would not necessarily be discussed as a concept separately in itself. While use of terms such as ‘well-being’ and ‘health’ yield results reflective of multi-dimensional understandings, Indigenous authors are still marginalized in the social sustainability literature.

3.2.6 Related Fields of Discourse

Bringing together perspectives from multiple disciplines, it becomes clear that there are overlapping understandings of social and cultural aspects of sustainability. Four major fields of discourse arise in the literature; ‘social well-being’, comprising aspects of overall community well-being and quality of life; ‘social resilience’ covering issues of social justice and equity, social cohesion and social
capital, 'cultural sustainability' looking at culture, cultural processes and capitals; and 'sustainability of community', examining the actual viability of human communities. These are shown on the concept map (Figure 3.1) in level three, as corresponding to both the 'types' of social sustainability (level two), and to the emergent themes from the literature (level four). In the current visual representation and organization presented in Figure 3.1, these related fields of discourse are not shown as 'overlapping' with both the themes and the types, as is recognized and described in the text here.

Social well-being

The discourse of social well-being brings together concerns of general collective human well-being and quality of life, including satisfaction of basic needs, social justice and equity and social coherence (DeRiviere, 2010; Littig & Griessler, 2005; Magis & Shinn, 2009). This field also includes consideration of individual and public health, economic vitality, educational provisions, public safety and security, and access to governance and decision-making processes (Campbell, 2006; McHardy & O'Sullivan, 2004: Redefining Progress, 2002). As such, 'social well-being' relates strongly to 'development' social sustainability, with some connections to 'maintenance', and is positioned accordingly in Figure 3.1.

The social well-being discourse can be broken down into three major foci:

- objective well being (capabilities measurements like education and income)
- subjective well-being (indicators of happiness and satisfaction such as identity, sense of equity and quality of social relations)
• comprehensive well-being (a combination of the physical, practical aspects of survival with the physiological sense of well-being and enjoyment of the 'better things' in life such as sleep, leisure and play) (Rogers et al., 2012)

'Social well-being' as a concept is also called many different things, by various disciplines; 'healthy communities' (community planning), 'community well-being' (social sciences), 'safe communities' (public policy) and 'sustainable communities' (urban planning). While these various concepts cover a variety of interests, they have many commonalities and show little conflict in principles, frameworks and general objectives (Magis & Shinn, 2009). They all recognize the very real social, cultural and psychological needs of human beings alongside basic physical requirements (Ribova, 2000; VanLente et al., 2012).

Additionally, 'well-being' and terms like 'quality of life' may be hard to define, are often used interchangeably and are necessarily subjective, though they all provide useful means for focusing on the qualitative 'human' dimension of social sustainability (Murphy, 2010; Partridge, 2005). However, current assessments of well-being largely emphasize the mainstream notion of socio-economic status as determinant of well-being (McHardy & O'Sullivan, 2004; Penney et al., 2012).

Social resilience

The concept of resilience, borrowed by the sustainability literature from the natural sciences, is used to describe non-linear dynamics of a system (Galway et al., 2011). Applied to social systems, resilience refers to the ability of to respond to external factors (such as political or environmental upheaval), as well as capabilities
for self-organization and capacity for learning, renewal and adaptation through processes involving interactions with social and ecological environments (Abi-Hashem, 2011; Adger et al., 2002; Cote & Nightingale, 2012; Galway et al., 2011; Parlee et al., 2005; Rolfe, 2006; Thomalla, 2008). In the socio-cultural sustainability literature, ‘social resilience’ includes considerations of equity, social mobility, social cohesion, participation, empowerment and cultural identity (Adger, 1997, 2000; Koning, 2002), and is thus strongly related to ‘maintenance’ social sustainability, as represented in Figure 3.1.

The resilience discourse is fertile ground for the inclusion of social and cultural dimensions of sustainability (Abi-Hashem, 2011; Cote & Nightingale, 2012), as it recognizes the importance of local cultural context, traditional knowledges and social perspectives (Folke, 2006; Goodland, 2000; Lehtonen, 2004; Magis, 2007; Partridge, 2005; Perkins et al., 2002).

However, there are few definitions of resiliency pertaining to social and cultural sustainability, other than generally linking capacities to adaptation, with a focus on outcomes (Abi-Hashem, 2011; Bajayo, 2010; Mauerhofer, 2011). As such, the resilience discourse refers mainly to ‘bridge’ sustainability, with ‘development’ and ‘maintenance’ sustainability as secondary concerns. There remains work to be done in tying resilience to social sustainability through greater discussion of the role of cultural systems (Crane, 2010; Rolfe, 2006).
Cultural sustainability

Much like social sustainability, cultural sustainability discourse has two main strands of interest; the sustainability of interactions between culture and the environment, and sustaining cultural capital (Abi-Hashem, 2011; Chiu, 2004; Throsby, 2005). In Figure 3.1, ‘cultural sustainability’ straddles ‘maintenance’ and ‘bridge’ types of social sustainability, as it relates to both. Cultural sustainability is also represented in a differently shaded concept bubble, as it is an important field in and of itself, and the representation of it within social sustainability is problematic for some authors, who would consider it as equal to social sustainability (Chiu, 2004; Jarvela, 2008).

Cultural sustainability literature identifies a need to balance externally imposed change with continuity and development of internal social structures (Vallance et al., 2011) as well as the need to balance respect for tradition with the opportunities of innovation (Koning, 2002).

Cultural traditions and heritage have been repeatedly recognized as ‘a basic need’ in and of themselves, central to human well-being (Baxter & Purcell, 2007; Duxbury & Jeanotte, 2010). Culture is recognized at the international and national level in conventions, resolutions and declarations as something to be ‘protected’, ‘preserved’ and ‘safeguarded’. However, there are a lack of guidelines as to how to handle the cultural ‘pillar’ of sustainability, and incorporation of this dimension through a ‘cultural capital’ approach runs the risk of commodifying culture, undermining its important role in determining human behaviors (Shirazi, 2011). As such, there is a ‘cultural gap’ in the sustainability discourse.
Sustainability of community

A fourth discourse, sustainability of community, covers practical issues of community viability. This field recognizes the community as the scale at which many problems are best addressed and prevented (Rogers & Ryan, 2001). In comparison to broader ‘community sustainability’ or ‘sustainable communities’ discourse, ‘sustainability of community’ focuses on tangible aspects of community-level sustainability, covering components such as the built environment and housing, natural resource management, and maintenance of physical infrastructure, on which the community depends to reproduce itself and sustain an acceptable level of functioning (Dempsey et al., 2011).

Disciplines concerned with sustainability of community have traditionally been urban and community planning, architecture and the natural sciences, all taking a technical approach to targeting sustainability issues at the community level (Anielski & Winfield, 2002; Luke & Alavosius, 2012). However, the discourse shows consideration of sustainability that is both increasingly specific, looking at community-level practices and actions that influence sustainability, and also expansive, in that it has broadened to include considerations of the social and cultural context of sustainable communities (Christakopoulou et al., 2001; Storey, 2010). Sustainability of community is assessed with reference to prosperity in the three ‘pillars of sustainability’, with growing reference to political engagement and cultural vitality (Magee et al., 2012; Magis, 2007), recognizing that the people are inherently a part of the viability of communities. Sustainability of community’ is
shown to the far right in Figure 3.1, as it is connected largely with 'bridge' sustainability, but also with themes of culture.

Sustainable communities draw on community capital to support community resilience. Community resilience refers to the existence, fostering and intentional utilization of community resources to respond to needs and change, and to thrive in a certain environment (Magis, 2007). As such, community resilience is a product of the community acting as more than 'the sum of its parts'; it is a product of the interactions and functioning of a system (Bajayo, 2010; D. Brown & Kulig, 1997; V. A. Brown & Ritchie, 2006; Dernbach & Bernstein, 2003) and supportive of the sustainability of communities.

3.2.7 Key themes and components

To further organize the literature, key themes are used to identify the core concerns of the various disciplines and related discourses. These aid in focusing the results of the literature review on those relevant to socio-cultural sustainability in the context of northern, Indigenous communities. Key components from the literature, corresponding to these themes, are then identified. These themes are represented in Figure 3.1 in relation to the broader types of social sustainability (level two) as well as the related fields (level three). Below them, in smaller concept bubbles, specific components are shown in relation to the themes (level five).

Satisfaction of basic needs

The primary concern of the discourse on social well-being, satisfaction of basic
needs is a core theme in socio-cultural sustainability. Any degree of sustainability necessitates the health and physical viability of a population (Eckersley, 2009). Satisfaction of basic needs is thus strongly correlated to ‘development’ social sustainability, and the discourse on social well-being, and is shown as such in Figure 3.1.

The literature emphasizes a need to meet basic needs which include services, resources and opportunities required for the full physical, mental and social development of individuals (Colantonio, 2007; Littig & Griessler, 2005). This entails provisions for not just basic physiological needs, but also self-determination, self-reliance, security, participation, national and cultural identity (Higgins et al., 2009; Magis & Shinn, 2009). As such, the satisfaction of basic needs precludes cultural concerns of sustainability but also depends on it. Additionally, the ability to satisfy basic needs is heavily dependent on the interaction of human societies with the environment (Littig & Griessler, 2005; Partridge, 2005).

**Key components:**

1) *Health*

The literature reflects a multi-dimensional understanding and use of the term ‘health’ referring to basic levels of individual, public, physical, psychological and collective ‘health’ within a population as critical to sustainability (Ribova, 2000; VanLente et al., 2012). Health is a critical dimension of the resilience of a society [as] both a consequence and a cause of social changes, an important component of social systems that shapes their capacity to weather adversity. (Eckersley, 2009, p. 36)
There is recognition in the literature that considerations of health must take into account cultural perspectives on health, and the relation of health to the physical environment, both natural and built (Parlee et al., 2005). This is especially true in Indigenous communities (Ford, 2012; Rigby, Rosen, Berry, & Hart, 2011) wherein “concepts of land are indicative of a way of life and worldview in which human health and that of the environment are intrinsically interconnected” (Parlee et al., 2005, p. 128). Health is included in Figure 3.1 as closely related to both the theme of basic needs, and to the components of social infrastructure and employment, as the literature also demonstrates relationships therein.

2) Social infrastructure

Much like health, the literature emphasizes the importance of social infrastructure in supporting social sustainability (Chan & Lee, 2008; Cuthill, 2010). ‘Infrastructure’ includes culturally appropriate and accessible housing (Semken & Brandt, 2010), facilities, financial and human resources support for education, and provision of measures of safety and security (Bankoff, 2007; McHardy & O’Sullivan, 2004). Social infrastructure relates both to the theme of satisfaction of basic needs, but also to issues of social justice and equity in the provision of and access to that social infrastructure, and is positioned in Figure 3.1 as such.

3) Employment

Particularly in the discussion of ‘development’ sustainability, employment is pointed to as a critical component of social sustainability (Storey, 2010) and often
used as an indicator in social assessment (Glasson & Wood, 2009; Graham, 2010). Generating an economic base for social sustainability is largely dependent on the availability, accessibility, and ability to choose between different forms of healthy work, with recognition of worker’s and gender rights (Glasson & Wood, 2009; Littig & Griessler, 2005; McHardy & O’Sullivan, 2004). Employment may aid in addressing poverty, inequality, and housing needs, which are also determinant of levels of social sustainability (Bajayo, 2010; Ranjan & Prasad, 2012). As such, the concept bubble containing ‘employment’ is represented in Figure 3.1 in proximity to health and human capabilities, and under the theme of satisfaction of basic needs.

4) Human Capital and Capabilities

The discussion of human capital is often linked to discussion of social and cultural capital, or used interchangeably (Mauerhofer, 2011), but here refers to the skills, training, knowledge and capabilities embodied in individuals (DeRiviere, 2010; McElroy et al., 2008) and supports the development of social capital (Mauerhofer, 2011). Human capital shapes individual’s perceptions of community, their capacity to participate in community, their awareness of social issues and ability to react, and is partially determinant of cultural continuity. As such, the influence of human capital extends into areas of economic, cultural and environmental concerns, and “should not be understood as being detached from social relationships” (DeRiviere, 2010, p. 190).

Human capital also relates to a ‘capabilities’ approach popular in the field of international development. ‘Capabilities’ refer to the “alternative combinations of
functionings an individual can achieve” (Lehtonen, 2004, p. 203). As such, a capabilities approach places emphasis on what people can ‘do and be’ (human capital) rather than what they ‘have’ (such as income and material possessions) as a determinant of social sustainability. These two components are represented in Figure 3.1 in relation to others in the ‘basic needs’ theme, but also closely connected to the components covered under the theme of social justice and equity.

**Social justice and equity**

A focus on equity is central to many understandings of social sustainability (Baehler, 2007; Bohannan et al., 2005; Cooper, 2006; Cuthill, 2010; Davidson, 2010; Dempsey et al., 2011; Foladori, 2005; Gunder, 2006; Murphy, 2012; Perkins, 2007). Particularly from ‘development’ sustainability perspectives, the literature points to:

> a fundamental contradiction to the principles of sustainable development to believe that it can be achieved without improved social equity and social progress. (Adebawale in Partridge, 2005, p. 7)

Thus ‘equity’ strongly connects social sustainability to traditions of social justice, and ensures the inclusion of issues such as social discrimination and exclusion in the sustainability ‘hegemony’ (Cheney et al., 2004; Dempsey et al., 2011; Gunder, 2006). It also relates to broader sustainability, under the assumption that inequality creates social, environmental and economic instability (Baehler, 2007; Magis & Shinn, 2009).

The theme of equity emphasizes the importance of equal access to and distribution of resources within and across generations (Partridge, 2005), gender and labour rights, equal opportunity (Littig & Griessler, 2005) and engaged,
responsive government (Cuthill, 2010; Rogers et al., 2012). As such, the theme of equity ties closely to social cohesion (Berman et al., 2004; Bramley et al., 2006; Perkins, 2007) as well as basic needs, and thus sits between these two themes in Figure 3.1.

*Key Components:*

5) *Engaged, accessible and responsive government*

Many authors point to the need to assess social sustainability in the wider context of the political economy (Adger, 1997; Cuthill, 2003; Dale et al., 2010). Particularly from the discourses of public policy, the literature is concerned with ‘governance over government’ (Colantonio, 2007), emphasizing community involvement in planning and decision making, within democratic government, as supportive of social sustainability (Christakopoulou et al., 2001; Magis & Shinn, 2009). As this sense of governance relates closely to the components of human capital and capabilities, as well as inter-and intra-generational justice, it is located as such in Figure 3.1.

6) *Inter- and intra-generational justice and equity*

Equity and social justice refer to the distribution of goods and ‘life chances’ on a basis of fairness across all scales (Murphy, 2012), including temporal. A sustainability perspective necessitates that this equity has a ‘futures focus’, extending equity and justice considerations across and between generations (Lehtonen, 2004; Partridge, 2005). Equity thus points to the need to examine
current social conditions, including access to basic needs and opportunity to participate in decision-making processes on issues that affect individuals (Adger, 1997; Bohannan et al., 2005; Dempsey et al., 2011; Gunder, 2006).

As such, the principle of equity has a redistributive element (Gunder, 2006; Partridge, 2005), pays particular attention to the marginalized and disenfranchised, to worker and gender rights (Littig & Griessler, 2005; Magis & Shinn, 2009), and necessitates the “establishment of structures and processes that will guarantee lasting and continuing justice” (Partridge, 2005, p. 8). As shown in Figure 3.1, intra-generational justice spans the themes of social cohesion, satisfaction of basic needs and social justice and equity.

**Social cohesion**

Put simply, social cohesion connotes a sense of ‘togetherness’, or a combination of social support and social capital (Rolfe, 2006). Social cohesion relies on civic participation (Bramley et al., 2006; Chan & Lee, 2008; Colantonio, 2007; Murphy, 2012; Rogers & Ryan, 2001), sense of common purpose, civic pride, social networks and sense of identity and belonging (Boyd et al., 2010; Dempsey et al., 2011), integration into social networks, involvement in activities and tolerant attitudes (Littig & Griessler, 2005). Social networks, as supportive of social cohesion, have been identified as a “key component of adaptive capacity, increasing security and reducing risk” (Ford et al., 2007, p. 155) particularly in the context of broad-scale change. In the literature, social cohesion is a theme arising largely from the discussions of ‘development’ and ‘maintenance’ sustainability types.
Social capital

By far the most prominent theme in the literature is that of social capital, which includes a variety of components, and generally comprises the norms and networks that facilitate collective action, cooperation and cohesion (Cuthill, 2003; Magis, 2007; Perkins et al., 2002), including consideration of the quality and quantity of those social relations (Boyd et al., 2010; Koning, 2002; Lehtonen, 2004). Social capital, like equity, is emphasized in the literature as essential to social sustainability (Bajayo, 2010; Campbell, 2006; Christakopoulou et al., 2001; Cuthill, 2003; Magis & Shinn, 2009; Mauerhofer, 2011).

The literature commonly breaks down social capital into three types; bonding, bridging and linking. ‘Bonding’ capital allows internal groups to form, while ‘bridging’ creates connectivity between those groups, and ‘linking’ reaches out to external groups and resources (Magis, 2007). Social capital is also described in the literature as both structured and cognitive. ‘Structured’ social capital denotes the forms and networks which develop social capital, while ‘cognitive’ refers to the "mental processes and perceptions resulting from norms, values, attitudes, and beliefs that foster mutually cooperative behaviors" (Sherrieb et al., 2010, p. 234).

Social cohesion and social capital are often discussed in an overlapping manner, and are thus closely tied in Figure 3.1. Social capital and social cohesion are central concerns of ‘maintenance’ type discussions of sustainability, and fall under this type in the concept map. Both themes speak to the component of participation, but also link to components under other themes.
Key components of social cohesion and social capital:

7) Participation

Discussions of participation refer both to citizen participation in local governance (Colantonio, 2007; Cuthill, 2002) and to participation in voluntarism, civic duties and social networks. The latter sense is in support of social cohesion and the development of social capital, enhancing social inclusion (Cuthill, 2003; Murphy, 2012). Participation is valuable to social sustainability not only in that it facilitates collaboration and political activities, but that it allows for communities to cohesively express needs and develop greater efficiency in policy and program delivery (Christakopoulou et al., 2001; Colantonio, 2007; Lehtonen, 2004). Participation is a key component of both social cohesion and social capital, and is shown in Figure 3.1 as visually tying the two themes together.

8) Sense of identity and belonging

Much of the social sustainability literature, particularly that from the social sciences, psychology and public health identify the need for community members to have a sense of community and ability to identify themselves as having a role within that community (Christakopoulou et al., 2001). This sense of belonging is a widely valued indicator of social well-being as it denotes perceptions of membership, shared emotional experience, satisfaction, safety and empowerment (Magee et al., 2012; Perkins et al., 2002) as well as a shared sense of morality, common purpose, social control, individual influence and civic culture (Bramley et al., 2006). In particular, the sense of shared values plays an important role in identity and
belonging (Boogaard, Oosting, & Bock, 2008; Goodland, 2000).

Sense of belonging also refers to the need for community members to identify with and feel connected to their environment (Rollero & de Piccoli, 2010), as "place is fundamental to both individual and socio-cultural identity" (Semken & Brandt, 2010, p. 294). This is particularly true in Indigenous communities, wherein identities are tied to land, and connectedness to land is essential to perceptions of health and well-being (Rigby et al., 2011), presenting specific challenges in the context of climate change or natural resource development.

Sense of identity and belonging supports social capital, as well as social cohesion, but also relates directly to the theme of culture, on which much sense of identity and social belonging is built. In Figure 3.1, the concept bubble containing ‘sense of identity and belonging’ spans both social capital and culture.

**Culture**

Culture is recognized and represented in the social sustainability literature, particularly by community planning, socio-ecological and social science disciplines, and through the cultural sustainability discourse, as being central to broader notions of sustainability (Chiu, 2004; Rhodes, 2004; Taurima & Cash, 2000). The growing discussion of the role of culture in sustainability is based in an understanding of humans as cultural beings, of the need to accommodate cultural context of sustainability, and of the role of cultural assets in accounting for the survival of societies (Abi-Hashem, 2011; Adger, 1997; Baehler, 2007; Christians, 2007; Daskon, 2010).
Culture and sustainability have common principles, in that they bestow heritage and identity upon current generations, as well as the responsibility to protect future ecological balance and cultural diversity (Rhodes, 2004). The literature also demonstrates recognition of the dynamic nature of culture (Daskon, 2010; McIvor, Napoleon, & Dickie, 2009).

There are four ‘conceptual threads’ to understandings of culture as supportive of community-level sustainability, as a capital, as a process and way of life, as a binding element providing values, and as providing norms for environmental interactions (Christians, 2007; Duxbury & Jeanotte, 2010; Goodland, 2000; Groenfeldt, 2003; Magis & Shinn, 2009). Culture can also be seen to have both social and ideological dimensions; the social referring to kinship, identity and family structures and the ideological referring to the values, ideas and norms (Chiu, 2004).

In the literature, the human-environment connection is often framed as being inherently cultural (Fernandez & Leiserowitz, 2007; McIvor et al., 2009), as it is through culture that we adapt to nature, and understand the value of the natural environment (Cernea, 1993; Robards & Alessa, 2004). Cultural understandings are foundational to human values, and hence “direct and influence human choices and decisions at every level of normal life” (Rhodes, 2004, p. 15). In the context of environmental crisis, there is growing recognition of the importance of Indigenous cultures, as sensitive to natural limits and counter to urban, ‘consumptive’ cultures, (Berkes & Folke, 1994; Doubleday et al., 2004; Thaman, 2002). The theme of culture thus falls under both ‘maintenance’ and ‘bridge’ types of social sustainability in Figure 3.1.
Key components of ‘culture’:

9) Cultural capital

Cultural capital compromises both tangible assets (artifacts, language, art, valued spaces, etc.) and intangible assets (practices, beliefs, principles and norms, etc.), and can be further conceptualized as embodied (within an individual), objectified (in cultural goods such as books, art, etc.) or institutionalized (recognized in academia) (Boyd et al., 2010; Throsby, 1999). Cultural capital is also used to describe the transmission of knowledge from one generation to the next, particularly through language (Mclvor et al., 2009). In reference to bridge social sustainability, cultural capital is important in that it serves as “the interface between social and natural capital; [...] cultural capital determines how natural capital is used” (Boyd et al., 2010, p. 272). Cultural capital is thus represented in Figure 3.1 directly underneath both the bridge type of social sustainability, and the theme of culture.

Cultural capital is described in the literature as a means by which culture’s influence on sustainability is measured (Rhodes, 2004) as it “embodies or gives rise to cultural value” (Throsby, 2005, p. 3). As viewing culture as a capital has the tendency to monetize cultural value, these empirical measurements cannot fully capture culture’s significance, particularly as it supports social cohesion, social capital and broader perceptions of well-being (Boyd et al., 2010).

10) Knowledge generation and transmission

The literature follows two themes regarding knowledge; knowledge of sustainability and sustainability of knowledge. Knowledge of sustainability (KoS)
refers to levels of public awareness of sustainability issues (Faber et al., 2010; Murphy, 2012). The ability of KoS to be stored and passed on from one generation to the next is determined by the sustainability of knowledge (SoK). SoK is dependent on relevant, applicable knowledge, but also the processes enabling its generation, application transmission, and the development of new KoS (Chiu, 2004).

Discussions of Indigenous knowledge (IK), traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) and local ecological knowledge (LEK) are all prominent in the socio-cultural sustainability literature (Ford et al., 2007; George et al., 1996; McIvor et al., 2009). Particularly from the field of socio-ecology, there is recognition that Indigenous societies have developed “rich sets of experience and holistic explanations relating to the environments they live in” (Robards & Alessa, 2004, p. 416). These knowledges are highly experiential, dynamic, and often incorporate non-traditional knowledge (Ford et al., 2007; Holen, 2009). Literature on IK, TEK and LEK speaks to the central role of intergenerational knowledge transfer in supporting social sustainability (George et al., 1996; Martin, 2012). ‘Knowledge’ is plotted in Figure 3.1 under ‘bridge’ type social sustainability, but as a component in the ‘culture’ theme still relates to ‘maintenance sustainability. ‘Knowledge’ is also closely tied to the discussion of cultural capital.

11) Diversity

Within socio-cultural sustainability literature, the acceptance of cultural diversity, and the role of diverse cultural identities are identified as important to socio-cultural sustainability as they focus on the strengths of a variety of livelihoods
and corresponding adaptive strategies (Groenfeldt, 2003; Trickett, 1994). Multiple understandings, from different cultures, world-views and "axes of social differentiation such as gender, class and race are crucial starting points” (Cote & Nightingale, 2012, p. 483) contribute to deeper understandings of sustainability issues (Chiu, 2004). However, many authors also point to a ‘crisis’ in the loss of cultural diversity mirroring that of loss of biological diversity (Doubleday et al., 2004), presenting a challenge to sustainability objectives, particularly in the social and cultural realms. As diversity speaks to both culture and social capital, it is shown in Figure 3.1 between these two themes, but also in relation to ‘sense of belonging and identity’, as the incorporation of diversity is a key consideration within discussions of social cohesion and social capital.

12) Cultural continuity

Cultural continuity emphasizes the importance of the transfer of cultural capital between generations. The growing recognition of culture within the sustainability discourse has correspondingly led to examinations of cultural continuity, and arguments that it is both an ‘ethical imperative’ (Christians, 2007) and crucial in supporting social sustainability (Abi-Hashem, 2011). These arguments are strongest in the fields of public health and psychology (Chandler & Lalonde, 1998; Gregory, 2001; Lalonde, 2002). Many authors point to cultural continuity as a hedge against social pathologies (Patterson, 2002), such as youth suicide (Chandler & Lalonde, 1998). Links between culture, identity and sense of community support individual and community well-being (Grazuleviciute,
and threats to cultural continuity are equally threats to individual well-being (Lalonde, 2002; Martin, 2012).

Issues of cultural continuity are particularly pertinent for Indigenous communities (Chandler & Lalonde, 1998; Lalonde, 2002; Rigby et al., 2011), wherein cultural loss presents severe challenges to individual identity, perceived community well-being and future viability, as well as reflecting major losses in IK (Ford et al., 2007). Language, in particular, serves as a ‘protective factor’ for cultural continuity and socio-cultural sustainability (McIvor et al., 2009; Willis & Edwards, 1999). Cultural continuity is largely reliant on the generation and transmission of (particularly cultural) knowledge, and is visually represented as such in Figure 3.1.

3.3 Relevance of literature for Northern, Indigenous Community Sustainability

In looking at the origins, development of and trends in the socio-cultural sustainability literature, this review has identified a host of components relevant to community-level sustainability and particularly focused around ‘maintenance’ social sustainability. The review was predicated on an understanding of the importance of underlying socio-cultural principles in a particular context, as they inform interaction with the natural environment, and determine the capacity of communities to adapt to change and plan for future sustainability.

These dimensions are particularly important in Indigenous cultures, wherein cultural values provide the guiding principles of society (Berkes & Folke, 1994; Boyd et al., 2010; Groenfeldt, 2003) and perceived collective continuity and well-being are
highly dependent on cultural vitality and continuity (Chandler & Lalonde, 1998; Lalonde, 2002).

Consideration of the role of culture in Indigenous contexts must also be cognizant of:

persistent attempts by dominant cultures to assimilate Indigenous peoples [which] have caused historic trauma and have had a devastating intergenerational effect on the continuation of Indigenous cultures. (Marshall & Guilar, 2011)

Additionally, I would argue that social planning, public policy and resource management have all underestimated the attachment to land and related cultural values which are at the core of Indigenous communities (Berkes & Fast, 1996). As such, there is a need to make the research processes more inclusive, and encourage greater self-reflexivity in researchers in order to better incorporate these key contextual issues (Becker et al., 1999).

Valuing Indigenous perspectives also holds great potential for the sustainability discourse. Across the literature, authors describe the need for a cultural inertia towards transitions to sustainability (Folke, 2003; Magis & Shinn, 2009; Rogers et al., 2012). An understanding of socio-cultural sustainability from the perspective of Indigenous communities could identify and emphasize key components of communities in context and through a more holistic approach (Berman et al., 2004; Boyd et al., 2010). Research designed to explore questions around socio-cultural sustainability from a community perspective could greatly increase the understanding of the more intangible effects of broad forms of change on social relations and cultural values caused (Boyd et al., 2010; Cernea, 1993; Sakakibara, 2011).
3.3.1 Nunatsiavut SakKijânginnatuk Nunalik (Sustainable Communities) Initiative

For the Nunatsiavut SCI, understandings of sustainability from an Inuit perspective are essential. Literature on community sustainability in the north already points to cultural capital as a “base for which Inuit can adapt to rapid change” (Martin, 2012, p. 89). There can be assumptions made as to other, related components which may be particularly important to Indigenous communities, such as cultural continuity and knowledge management, but it is essential that these are identified and validated by the communities themselves, and with an understanding that culture is dynamic (Doubleday et al., 2004; Higgins et al., 2009).

3.4 Conclusions

*Issues defining socio-cultural sustainability*

The literature still points to major gaps in understanding the cultural context of sustainability (Adger, 1997). Where cultural components are given consideration, they are often addressed in isolation of other components, rather than in relation (Dalziel et al., 2006) or subsumed within social dimensions (Cernea, 1993; Folke, 2003). As such, some of the basic issues of social sustainability have yet to be conceptually addressed (Mauerofer, 2011). The concept of social sustainability is ‘in chaos’ (Vallance et al., 2011) and some clarity in its definition is needed in order to guide strategies towards sustainability appropriately (Partridge, 2005).
Inclusion of socio-cultural considerations in sustainability planning

Difficulties conceptualizing social dimensions of sustainability are mirrored in struggles incorporating cultural aspects into sustainability evaluations. As the discourse remains largely Western, scientific and quantitatively-based, it is in conflict with cultural perspectives on social sustainability which are more holistic. Indeed, the spread of the scientific 'development' or 'sustainability' culture is much like the spread of monocultures in agriculture, resulting in the erosion of cultural diversity (Thaman, 2002). Some argue the spread of this scientific, indicator-based sustainability agenda is a major source of disruptive change in itself, as

many eco-friendly proposals and programs actually disrupt preferred or established patterns of behavior, values and traditions that people would like to see preserved. (Vallance et al., 2011, p. 345)

This type of 'sustainability', mirroring historic trends in 'development', is a barrier to maintenance of cultural values, cultural continuity, and the socio-cultural sustainability they support (Groenfeldt, 2003; Shirazi, 2011).

This is particularly troubling at the community level, wherein it argues that sustainability initiatives not built on a thorough understanding of the cultural context may fall short of socio-cultural sustainability objectives, and undermine broader sustainability (Dalziel et al., 2006; Groenfeldt, 2003; Thaman, 2002).

Focus on community-level sustainability

The literature offers many suggestions for operationalizing sustainability, a central theme being the need to focus on community-level sustainability and holistic approaches to understanding and addressing sustainability issues (Bohannan et al.,
2005; Boyd et al., 2010; Bramley et al., 2006; Christakopoulou et al., 2001; Magee et al., 2012; Redefining Progress, 2002), ensuring participation in decision-making processes, and allowing communities to prioritize their own goals and objectives. Localized, participatory approaches also offer the opportunity to mobilize community resources that are not economically-based, but related to social phenomena; such as social, cultural, spiritual and political resources (Magis, 2010).

It is clear that no dimension of sustainability measurement is ‘value free’, and this is particularly problematic when addressing the socio-cultural dimensions, which are already difficult to define and potentially quantify (Boogaard et al., 2008). Addressing sustainability issues at the community level lends itself to understanding the more complex socio-cultural relationships at the core of sustainability issues (D. Brown & Kulig, 1997; George et al., 1996), such as “the relationship of trees, crime, mental health and educational success” (Bohannan et al., 2005, p. 6).

**Looking Forward- Implications of literature**

There is great emphasis on the potential of sustainability as an ‘integrating framework’ (Partridge, 2005). While there are still considerable gaps in the coverage of social aspects in the sustainability literature, and of cultural aspects in the social sustainability literature, the recognition of the need for more holistic approaches to addressing sustainability issues, inclusive of broader socio-cultural concerns, offers opportunity (Faber et al., 2010; Magis & Shinn, 2009).

From the literature, it is clear that a main benefit of integrating socio-cultural concerns into the broader sustainability discourse is the contextualization of
sustainability (Lehtonen, 2004). As socio-cultural values, principles and norms inform everything from housing choices (Semken & Brandt, 2010) to social relations (Rhodes, 2004), developing clarity in the field of socio-cultural sustainability will contribute to more appropriate sustainability planning processes and ultimately, stronger communities.
CHAPTER 4

CASE STUDY- HOPEDALE, NUNATSIAVUT

4.1 Introduction and Chapter Overview

The five communities of the Nunatsiavut Inuit Settlement Region are no exception to broad-scale changes currently being experienced across the North. In recent decades, the region has seen major mining and hydroelectric developments, and recorded concerning shifts in the natural environment (Ford & Furgal, 2009).

In the face of these contemporary challenges, Nunatsiavut communities remain strongly connected to an Inuit identity. However, with rapid changes in economic opportunities, access to and interest in environmental development and community growth, residents are feeling threats to maintenance of traditional lifestyles, cultural strength and social vitality. Leaders from all 5 Nunatsiavut communities, recognizing these changes and a ‘time to try something different’, came together in 2012 to begin a process of planning towards more sustainable communities; the SakKijânginnatuk Nunalik (Sustainable Communities) Initiative (SCI) (Environment Division of the Nunatsiavut Government Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2012; Goldhar et al., 2012).

This initiative presented a unique opportunity to explore community-level understandings of sustainability, particularly socio-cultural dimensions and priorities. Building on findings from the literature review in Chapter 3, the case study presented here aimed at identifying key elements of socio-cultural sustainability at the community level.
I begin this chapter with a description of the case study, giving context to the research. I then present the case study results, organized to first present descriptive results of responses to questions from the focus group guide. This is followed by a description of findings from the participatory mapping activities, and presentation of the maps created. I then discuss emergent themes and systemic issues highlighted by the case study data. In Chapter 5, I discuss the significance of the results, provide conclusions, and recommendations for research and action.

4.2 Case Study Background

Research Timeline

In 2011 I began working with my supervisor, Dr. Furgal, who was at the time developing a research agenda related to sustainable communities in Nunatsiavut, as supported by the Nunatsiavut Department of the Environment. I had the opportunity to travel to Hopedale that winter to participate in a workshop that discussed community planning in the region, particularly the

\textit{economic, social, cultural, and environmental implications of development, and that contribute towards the continued health and well-being of Nunatsiavummuit for generations to come.} (Environment Division, 2012)

In these meetings, the Joint Management Committee (JMC)\(^6\) mandated further research into sustainability planning, giving rise to the SCI. Members of the SCI research team began the first phase that summer, holding a series of workshops along the north coast to gain understandings of current community priorities,

\(^6\) Consisting of leaders from all 5 coastal communities.
challenges and opportunities (Goldhar et al., 2012). During these meetings, which included the AngajukKâk (mayor), elders, youth, town councilors, town managers and other community members, I asked specifically about social and cultural aspects of the communities, in order to gauge interest in the thesis project.

Participants to each workshop expressed appreciation for the opportunity to talk about issues important to the well-being of their community. In fact many of the themes that emerged from these initial workshops related to social and cultural aspects of sustainability. As such, the ‘Valued Places and Spaces’ sub-project under the SCI was developed, in order to understand and document places, spaces, activities and other aspects in the community that were valued by residents and seen as important to maintain for the future (Goldhar et al., 2012).

4.3 Case Study Context

Labrador

The region now known as Labrador has been inhabited by Inuit and First Nations peoples for thousands of years (Labrador Inuit Association, 1977; Williamson, 1997). Histories of the region are often divided into three phases; an early, pre-contact period; the arrival of European influences and the development of settlements and trade on the coast; and recently, the establishment of western economic culture and social services in the region (Brice-Bennett, 2003; LIA, 1977).
Hopedale

Originally known as Avertok, a name meaning ‘place of the whales’, the area that is now Hopedale was the principle village for Inuit living in the region, and is one of the oldest settlements on the coast, dating back 500 years (Brice-Bennett, 2003; D.W. Knight and Associates, 2005). Moravian missionaries permanently settled at the site in 1782, and gained control of religious, social and economic aspects of life in the community (D.W. Knight and Associates, 2005; LIA, 1977). Labrador Inuit quickly became a critical part of an extensive trade network that ran the length of the coast (Brice-Bennett, 2003; D.W. Knight and Associates, 2005). By the mid- 1800s, Inuit associated with the mission lived a lifestyle described as follows:

>a remarkably different lifestyle than they had a few decades earlier. They generally enjoyed a higher quality of living due to the social and cultural features, as well as economic advantages associated with being members of a Moravian community. These aspects distinguished them from family groups which continued to follow the traditional Inuit lifestyle.

(Brice-Bennett, 2003, p. 48)

However, Inuit remained largely nomadic, spending most of the winter out on the land, and only returning for festivities, particularly Christmas and Easter, which are still major social events in the community (Williamson, 1997).

Controlling influence over many aspects of the community switched from the Moravians to the Hudson’s Bay Company in the early 1900s, and then the Government of Newfoundland in the 1940s (LIA, 1977). Introduction of social welfare and schools under government control, as well as an increase in waged employment, and reliance on manufactured goods further consolidated the community’s population, drastically changed the community’s social organization,
and effectively ended exclusively traditional ways of life (Brice-Bennett, 2003; LIA, 1977; Williamson, 1997).

In the early 1950s the ridge overlooking the community was selected to be the location of an American radar base7. This brought another wave of massive socio-economic changes as Hopedale was ‘invaded’ by 200 military personnel, and many families in the community were attracted to construction work (Brice-Bennett, 2003; D.W. Knight and Associates, 2005; LIA, 1977). Hopedale saw a sort of economic boom, as residents made upgrades to buildings, changed from traditional food and apparel to store-bought goods, and snowmobiles replaced dog-teams (Brice-Bennett, 2003, p. 116). Work at the American base also increased the use of English in Hopedale, and changed social dynamics as men spent time in paid employment, less time in the community, and drinking alcohol became increasingly popular.

Additionally, the northernmost Labrador community of Hebron was closed in 1959, with the residents being relocated to the communities of Nain, Hopedale and Makkovik. This crowded the community, and created a “difficult process of adaptation to a radically different community and environment” for both the Hebron Inuit and those who were already living in Hopedale (Brice-Bennett, 2003, p.114). As such, the mid 20th century was a period of huge social change, as newcomers

---

7 The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)’s Distant Early Warning (DEW) line, military communication network, the spanned the Canadian Arctic, with the ‘Pine tree’ line running down the Labrador coast. The DEW line was a product of heightening political tensions between Western and Soviet powers (Brice-Bennett, 2003, p. 111).
surrounded the historic village, and the community experienced economic flux due to short-term construction jobs (Brice-Bennett, 2003).

The closure of the radar base in 1968\(^8\), simultaneously occurring with the collapse of cod stocks, caused some residents who had become accustomed to paid work to leave the community. By the mid 1970s, many families relied on employment insurance or social assistance as a source of income, as paid employment remained unreliable and often short-term (LIA, 1977). As well, the transition from an economy based on wildlife harvest to one dependent on paid labor increased awareness around the value of formal education for future prospects of the young people of the community (Brice-Bennett, 2003, p. 117). Many Hopedale youth left behind life in the community to attend residential schools farther south.

During this time, the region and its residents, including in Hopedale, were the subject of several studies, including the production of a land use and occupancy study in 1976, to establish claim to the territory by the Labrador Inuit Association (LIA, 1977). Decades later, in 2005, the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement (LILCA) secured provisions for a land claim and self-government agreement, establishing the Nunatsiavut Government (NG, 2009).

As of 2011, Hopedale had a population of 556 residents, with about 90% of those identifying as ‘Aboriginal’ (Statistics Canada, 2013). The community is heavily reliant on public services for employment, and there are few full-time permanent

---

\(^8\) The base was demolished in the 1980s, leaving a legacy of environmental issues from buried debris and chemical contamination. The community experiences ongoing health and environmental concerns because of the site (D.W. Knight and Associates, 2005).
jobs. Many residents are self-employed in fishing, crafting and other local enterprises, some of which are classified as seasonal jobs (Statistics Canada, 2013).

A brief summary of the community’s demographic characteristics is given in Table 4.1

Within Hopedale, there are still visible reminders reflecting the major episodes of cultural change the community has experienced, such as stones outlining tent rings or the walls of sod houses (Brice-Bennett, 2003; LIA, 1977). Along with these features,

*many aspects of Inuit cultural have also persisted, along with an acute sense of identity related to places and the coastal environment that continues to sustain Inuit society.* (Brice-Bennett, 2003, p. 32)

The community retains a rich natural and cultural heritage, and for many the traditional way of life, reliant on the land, is still within living memory (LIA, 1977).

**Table 4.1:** Characteristics of Hopedale, Nunatsiavut

| Land area (square kilometers) | 3.36 |
| Population | 556 (2011) |
| 2006-2011 population change | 4.9 % |
| Median age | 28.8 |
| Mother tongue | English- 84% Inuttitut- 16% |
| Non-official languages spoken | 24% Inuttitut |
| Language spoken most often at home | 97% English 3% Inuttitut |
| Ethnic Origin | 90% Inuit 10% European |
| Education * | 53% no certificate, diploma or degree 23% High school diploma or equivalent 24% Postsecondary certificate, diploma or degree |
| Labour force status* | 61% in the labour force 68% employed 32% unemployed 39% not in the labour force |
| Average income* | $28,958 |

*Of population over 15 years of age

4.4 Case Study Results

Below, I present the results from the case study, first organized around responses to the focus group questions (see Appendix I for full Focus Group Guide). I then present common themes emerging from the data throughout focus group discussion. I include information shared during the discussions from participatory mapping activities throughout the chapter.

For all results, I have indicated the degree of representation of focus groups (n=6) reporting on each element or issue. This scale is as follows, in terms of the proportion of focus groups in which a particular statement was expressed or agreed with: ‘a minority’ being 1-2 focus groups, ‘half’ being 3 focus groups, ‘a majority’ being 4-5 focus groups, and ‘all’ being all 6 focus groups. Where there were different opinions expressed within focus groups, these are noted.

In total, I held 6 focus groups with a total of 23 participants. As outlined in Chapter 2 (Methods), focus group participants were identified and invited by the community liaison, Augusta Erving, based on their role in the community as well as their age and gender. Characteristics of focus group composition are summarized in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Summary of focus group participant attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Attribute</th>
<th>Elder Females</th>
<th>Elder Males</th>
<th>Adult Female Residents</th>
<th>Adult Male Residents</th>
<th>Youth (18-30)</th>
<th>Community Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number (N)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (1 female, 2 male)</td>
<td>5 (3 female, 2 male)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus group questions were developed so as to be able to cover the themes and components identified in the literature review, while also being open enough to allow participants to discuss a range of topics which they felt were relevant to socio-cultural sustainability in the community\(^9\). Questions were structured so as to start broadly in scope and then focus in on specific components, as well as giving an opening and closing to the conversation. Figure 4.1 presents an overall node diagram of the topics covered, and common responses provided by participants in focus groups.

\(^9\) Please see Table 2.2, Methods Chapter, for relation of focus group questions to thesis research questions and results of the literature review.
Figure 4.1: Overall Diagram of Topics Covered and Common Responses
4.4.1 “What sorts of things do you appreciate about living in Hopedale?”

Focus group discussion started by talking about aspects of life in the community that participants enjoyed or valued. Participants talked about social issues such as the sense of ‘togetherness’ in the community, as well as an appreciation of the culture and spending time on the land as part of the local lifestyle (Table 4.3).

**Table 4.3:** Summary of valued aspects of life in Hopedale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social aspects</th>
<th>Cultural aspects</th>
<th>Life on the land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- a small, close-knit community</td>
<td>- eating traditional foods</td>
<td>- access to other communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘togetherness’</td>
<td>- traditional skills</td>
<td>- land-based skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the people</td>
<td>- festivals</td>
<td>- access to traditional foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- visiting with other communities</td>
<td>- the language</td>
<td>- being in nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- history of the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Social aspects of community*

All participants valued Hopedale as a small, close-knit and supportive community with a strong sense of ‘togetherness’. A majority pointed to the support residents found in each other, such as coming together in during hard times. The majority of focus groups reflected the feelings of one focus group participant, that:

*It’s like a whole big family. When something happens in one family it affects everybody. And everybody else tries to help. It’s a community thing.*

A majority of focus groups expressed an appreciation for quality time spent with family, and talked about a sense of pride of the people and heritage of
Hopedale. A minority of focus groups also identified the ability to visit with other communities on the coast as a valued aspect of life in Hopedale.

*Cultural aspects of community*

All focus groups expressed an overarching appreciation of traditional cultural aspects and the unique Inuit identity of the community. Traditional skills were particularly significant to men, women and elders; some described the passing-on of these skills as creating bonds within the community. A majority of focus groups felt it was important for Inuktittuq to be spoken, and that many aspects of being and feeling ‘Inuk’ were part of speaking and understanding the language. A majority also suggested that cultural aspects of the community, such as festivals and traditional crafting workshops, helped bring people together and feel proud.

*Life on the land*

Being out on the land to obtain traditional foods was seen by all focus groups as an important part of life in the community, both for accessing resources and for the enjoyment of being in nature with others. Elder participants highly valued eating traditional foods like wild meats, fish and berries, both for cultural reasons and because they were less expensive and perceived as more healthy than store foods.

4.4.2 “What makes a healthy community? What sorts of things make Hopedale feel ‘healthy’ or ‘unhealthy’?”

As ‘health’ and ‘well-being’ are terms often used synonymously, I asked broadly about the ‘health’ of the community to identify aspects of the community
that participants felt were important for sustainability. Participants spoke about environmental and social attributes of the community, identifying both supports and barriers to Hopedale’s perceived ‘health’, as shown in Table 4.4.

**Table 4.4: Summary of supports and barriers to community health**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support to Community Health</strong></td>
<td><em>traditional Foods</em></td>
<td><em>connection to others</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- healthy</td>
<td>- programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- affordable</td>
<td>- supporting each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- time on the land</td>
<td>- the Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrier to Community Health</strong></td>
<td><em>contamination - PCBs, development</em></td>
<td><em>weakening social connections</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- higher rates of cancer</td>
<td><em>drugs and alcohol</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- contamination of traditional foods, land</td>
<td><em>high cost of living</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- housing issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- few employment and education opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environment**

Participants talked about the health of the environment and natural resources associated with effects on the physical health of community members, both positive and negative.

**Traditional Foods**

Traditional foods were particularly significant to elders, and many talked about fish being *the best meal of the day*. All focus groups identified traditional foods as supporting the health of the community by supplying healthy, affordable foods and that obtaining these foods involved restorative time spent in nature. The
majority of focus groups also expressed preference for foods over store bought foods, pointing to the poor quality of store-bought foods as affecting health negatively.

**Contamination**

All focus groups strongly identified contamination from the former military base as a health concern, and some participants talked about it as a possible cause of high rates of cancer in the community. Half of the focus groups reported development and poor sewage treatment as a worry for the community’s health. As well, all focus groups responded with concerns that contamination and development threatened access to and quality of traditional foods.

**Social**

*Connection to others*

All focus groups spoke of feeling connected to others in the community as very important to their sense of health. The majority saw this embodied in community events, programs, and supporting each other. Half of the focus groups also agreed that Hopedale was ‘most healthy’ when there was a community Hall, which brought people together. As one youth participant expressed:

```
everybody used to be there and that’s where everybody used to get together and catch up. Everybody was out. And now the there’s people stuck in the house doing drugs and that, in a posse, in a group of people. Before, everybody used to get together, go to the Hall.
```

Some participants expressed a feeling that people were not interacting as much since the Hall was lost.
Drugs and alcohol

The majority of focus groups described a sense of frustration with issues of bootlegging of alcohol and drugs in the community and the effects of substances on mental and physical health. Some parents reported that drug and alcohol use in the community made them worry more about their kids, and expressed feelings of insecurity and helplessness over the issue.

Cost of living

Half of focus groups felt that a high cost of living and issues finding employment and educational opportunities in the community negatively affected the community’s ‘health’. A minority also identified housing shortages as a barrier to community health.

4.4.3 “Is Hopedale a healthy place for youth to grow up?”

A ‘futures focus’, emphasizing intergenerational transmission of socio-cultural elements of sustainability, building capacity in the youth, and paying attention to demographic shifts were discussed in the literature as necessary to supporting community continuity. As such, I asked all focus groups whether they felt Hopedale was a healthy place for future generations to grow up, and for them to live in the future. A majority of focus groups talked about the types of programs and socio-cultural supports needed to prevent some of the issues they see now and have experienced in the past. These programs were seen to solidify social and cultural connections to each other and to the land, building cultural strength and building
social capital in youth. Half of the focus groups also talked specifically about the need for jobs and training as an essential part of keeping youth in Hopedale. Overall, having meaningful opportunities for future generations was seen as essential to the community's sustainability by all focus groups.

**Something to keep their minds busy**

The overarching concern in terms of a healthy future for youth in Hopedale was that of few things for youth to do. As one workshop participant put it, "*something to keep them going against the dark*”; positive activities and opportunities to prevent youth from getting involved with negative influences. All focus groups identified a lack of engaging activities as contributing to youth leaving the community, issues with drugs and alcohol, and youth suicide. As one elder participant remarked, “*I think some of them would rather take their life than being bored*” (Abraham Nochasak). For these reasons, the majority of focus groups also pointed to the new Hall being built as supporting the health of the community in the future, particularly for youth.

**Relationships with each other, the culture, and the land**

Connections to each other and to culture were identified by the majority of focus groups as essential to the community being a healthy place for youth. This majority talked about these connections playing an important role in youth’s identity, personal confidence, feelings of belonging, and ability to reach out for help when it is needed, thus supporting a sense of health amongst youth in the
community. For these reasons, the majority of focus groups emphasized the value of on-the-land programming, bringing different generations together to share skills. Youth themselves spoke about their need for connection to elders, and the need to ensure that modern education is balanced with cultural values.

*Employment and Education*

Employment and education were also of concern to the majority of focus groups when thinking of the future of youth in the community, as youth often leave to pursue jobs and schooling elsewhere. Some participants felt that youth change their perspectives on the community when they leave home, and may not return. Community members who were ‘left behind’ spoke of the out-migration of youth as something that may be natural, but still had an effect on the health of the community. It was hard on older generations to witness an outflow of Hopedale’s youth, and as a result they wondered about the future viability of the community. Interestingly, the youth didn’t see education and employment as being as critical to the health of the community as connections to culture and connection to others.

4.4.4 “What social things do you value or feel are important in Hopedale?”

To get a sense of specific social aspects that participants felt were important to the well-being of the community, and that needed to be sustained for the future, I asked broadly about those things that made participants proud of Hopedale and its residents. Specific events and activities, as well as informal opportunities for gathering and socializing, and simply the broader social norms of the community
were noted as being important, as summarized in Table 4.5. Participants spoke of the supportiveness of Hopedale residents, and placed high value on festivals and events for the ability to get together and maintain social relationships. The sites and areas where these occur, both in the community and on the land, were also identified as important social resources for the community.

**Table 4.5: Summary of valued social aspects of the community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Characteristics</th>
<th>Programs and Activities</th>
<th>Important Social Places</th>
<th>Being on the Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- supporting each other</td>
<td>- support groups,</td>
<td>- the Hall</td>
<td>- activities with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- strong leaders</td>
<td>DHSD&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt; activities,</td>
<td>- the school</td>
<td>family (berrypicking, fishing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- commitment to</td>
<td>community freezer,</td>
<td>- Moravian churches</td>
<td>- connecting with each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td>language classes, teen</td>
<td>- the roads</td>
<td>- mentally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- pride in the people</td>
<td>support group festivals</td>
<td></td>
<td>refreshing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social characteristics**

A majority of focus groups described supporting each other as a central social norm; elder men spoke to this as an essential part of Inuit societies. One youth described the importance of this as especially important in hard times;

*the togetherness is what you need to bring yourself back up. I find that if the togetherness wasn’t there, they actually wouldn’t be able to get back up.*

- Amber Vincent

As well, the majority of focus groups expressed pride that there were many strong people in Hopedale that act as leaders, were committed and have made great contributions to the community.

<sup>10</sup> The Department of Health and Social Development, of the Nunatsiavut Government
Programs and activities

The majority of focus groups identified community programs and activities through as important for supporting a sense of ‘togetherness’ and for disseminating information. All focus groups described festivals as supporting traditions, important for ‘celebrating life, celebrating who we are’ as a community. Half of the focus groups expressed the sense that ‘everyone is happier’ during festivals in the community, especially those held outside on the land and when people from other communities visit.

Important social places

Participants identified particular sites in and around the community as having social significance (see Map 4.2). These were places where people hold activities and events, run programs, and where people gather.

The Hall was talked about with more importance than any other site, by all focus groups. A few participants talked about community Halls as having special social importance for small communities on the coast. Since the Hopedale Hall burnt down, other buildings were used, such as the school and Moravian buildings, which half of focus groups now saw as important for social activities. Other areas where people gather were also identified as valued social places. A few participants even identified the roads as being socially important, as it was these places where individuals meet each other and catch up, “where you see the most smiles” (Focus group participant).
Being on the land

All focus groups emphasized the social value of being off on the land. The majority of focus groups described this time with family as important for sharing skills, traditions, and bonding with each other. The youth focus group pointed to time on the land as a chance “to interact more with the people you love” (Boas Mitsuk), and that “it gives you an unknown connection to people” (Amber Vincent). Youth also talked about being on the land as ‘refreshing’, that there were no distractions to interacting with those you love. A youth participant remarked that time on the land ‘cleans out your brain’ and ‘lets the real you come out’.

4.4.5 “What is the status of relationships and interaction in the community?”

To better understand the social landscape of Hopedale, I asked about relationships and interaction; whether there were ‘groups’ in the community, what brings people together and gets people involved, and how people engage with each other.

All focus groups reported changes in terms of relationships and interaction in Hopedale, summarized in Table 4.6. A majority of focus groups talked about the weakening of intergenerational relationships and the sense of supporting each other. All focus groups felt that people were becoming isolated from each other because of the factors listed in Table 4.6. The majority of focus groups highlighted the importance of going out on the land and specific events and activities that brought people together.
Table 4.6:
Summary of changes, supports and barriers to relationships and social interaction in the community of Hopedale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Groups in the Community</th>
<th>Intergenerational Relationships</th>
<th>Interaction and supporting each other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>drugs and alcohol</em></td>
<td><em>elders and youth</em></td>
<td>‘need to get paid’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- creates tension</td>
<td>- not getting together</td>
<td>- fewer people helping out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>young people</em></td>
<td>- values not passed on</td>
<td>- cash prizes, other incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- losing connection</td>
<td>- connections weakening</td>
<td>expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- smaller groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>events and activities</th>
<th>events and activities</th>
<th>going off on the land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>going off on the land</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>‘all spread out’</th>
<th>language</th>
<th>‘all spread out’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>material Possessions</em></td>
<td><em>technology</em></td>
<td><em>material Possessions</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>technology</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changes in Relationships and Interaction**

*Groups in the community*

Though some participants felt that “everybody is together”, half of focus groups felt that there were some divisions in the community. In particular, the majority of focus groups saw drugs and alcohol as a factor creating different ‘groups’ and tension in the community. Smaller groups within the community were of particular concern in terms of the youth, and a majority of focus groups felt that young people were losing a sense of connection to each other and to the rest of the community. Youth participants described “different, smaller groups” where there “used to be one large one”. 
**Intergenerational Relationships**

The majority of focus groups felt that inter-generational relationships were weakening. Youth and elders did not get together as often as they had previously, or, as the majority of focus groups felt, as often as they should. This had prevented social values from being instilled in younger generations.

**Interaction and supporting each other**

A minority of focus groups expressed a feeling that pride in helping each other, a value passed between generations, had been lost. There was a sense that people ‘*need to get paid*’ before they will help out. As one participant stated,

> now you got to pay ... you go to pay someone to do something. Before, without a second thought you’d go visiting or go and help somebody  

-Philip Abel

However, a few participants gave specific examples of recent times when community members have “*really come together*” around an initiative.

**Supports and Barriers to Relationships and Interaction**

**The language**

The majority of focus groups pointed to language as a barrier to inter-generational connections in the community, as many youth did not speak Inuttitut, and many elder residents did not speak English. Some individual participants indicated that people would ‘*get along better if they spoke the same language*’, as there were language barriers even within some families.
'All spread out'

The majority of focus groups expressed a sense that the community was becoming more physically ‘spread out’, and that this affected social connections. All focus groups reported that the loss of a centrally located Hall had affected interaction negatively, and a minority of focus groups felt this had broken the community into smaller groups. A majority of focus groups felt that it was hard for those living in the new subdivision, farther from the center of town, to get out and visit with others.

Events and activities

Festivals were identified as important events to bring the community together, but outside of these times, many felt people weren’t getting together socially as much as they had before. The majority of focus groups also indicated that cash incentives were needed today to get people to participate in festival events, and that without a good chance of winning, many wouldn’t try.

Going off on the land

Activities on the land were seen to reinforce social connections, and were especially important for intergenerational relationships. However, a minority of focus groups saw the rising cost of vehicles and supplies as preventing individuals and families from going out on the land, causing fewer families to do so.
Technology and Material Possessions

A few participants expressed concern that a rising cost of living and material belongings were causing people to ‘separate’, become isolated and protective, rather than sharing and supporting each other,

*It’s like a competition, eh? And people are not the same. People want to be alone. People don’t want to mingle like they used to, eh?* -Melvin Hurley

Additionally, the majority of focus groups saw technology as an isolating factor when it came to connection to others within the community; a few participants described residents relying on the Internet instead of in-person visits. While other participants felt that this helped people keep up with news in the community, it was also seen as having negatively affecting the sense of connection to each other.

Decision-Making in the Community

To better understand participants’ thoughts on feelings of equality and involvement in the community, I also asked about what role participants felt they had in decision-making processes for the community. A minority of participants pointed out specific roles for involvement, and many talked about a lack of consultation in the past, particularly on the topic of development around the community, which affected several berry-picking areas. However, individual participants also said that participation in decision-making processes was simply “not for them”, or that they could make decisions “only for [their] own family”, or only if they get nominated. Overall, there was the sense that while participants saw the need for engaged and responsive government; the majority of focus groups did not
feel it was important for individuals to regularly participate in community decision-making process.

4.4.6 “What cultural things do you value or feel are important in Hopedale?”

To better understand cultural aspects that participants felt were important to the well-being of the community, and that needed to be sustained for the future, I asked broadly about those things that participants felt made Hopedale “feel like Hopedale.” These aspects that speak to the identity of the community are summarized in Table 4.7.

### Table 4.7: Summary of valued cultural aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the community</th>
<th>The language</th>
<th>- speaking with elders in Inuttitut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Traditional activities | - traditional dress  
 - crafts, carving  
 - drumdancing |
| Traditional foods | - berries  
 - caribou  
 - fish and seal |
| Important sites | - Moravian missionary complex  
 - NG Legislative Assembly Building |

| On the land | Traditional activities | - ‘going off’ with family, boil-ups  
 - hunting, fishing |
|--------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Youth on the land | - time with family  
 - teen support group |
| Traditional knowledge | - teaching and learning traditional skills  
 (skinning, sewing, land skills, etc.)  
 - programs and opportunities to share skills |
Participants valued cultural aspects of the community of both a practical nature, such as having and practicing land-based skills, and that are less tangible, such as the experience of speaking the language with elders. Inuit identity runs through all cultural aspects identified by the community; being on the land, eating traditional foods, cultural activities in the community like women’s sewing nights, using the language, and ensuring Inuit skills and knowledge were passed on to younger generations.

*The Language*

The majority of focus groups spoke strongly of the language as a connective tissue between other cultural components, and that Inuit identity was tied up in the language. As an elder male stated, “you’re Inuit because you speak Inuttitut” (Melvin Hurley). The majority of focus groups reported use of the language as facilitating understanding and interaction within the community, and agreed that “people would *get along better*” if they understood the same language. Language differences could be an issue even at the household level; some elders found it hard to participate in the community speaking their own language, and felt that youth may have not been engaging with them because they were uncomfortable that they don’t know the language.

Some individual participants also indicated that older generations felt shame or responsibility for the loss of language in the community. The youth focus group spoke about feeling that bringing the language back would help heal cultural
wounds. Some youth expressed a sense of respect in speaking with elders in Inuittitut;

when someone my age can be able to understand an Elder, it just makes you feel good about yourself. Like it gives you like pure happiness that I can understand it and just makes you feel good. Like, they’re proud of you for trying hard and being able to go the extra mile just to be able to talk to them and be Inuk.

- Amber Vincent

**Traditional activities in the community**

All focus groups identified cultural activities in the community, that made Hopedale feel like Hopedale. They pointed to crafts, carving, traditional dress, and drum dancing as examples of things that “make Hopedale feel like an Inuit community”. Half of focus groups placed particular importance on traditional activities for bringing people together, supporting inter-generational relationships, and passing skills on to younger generations.

**Traditional foods**

Traditional foods were identified by the majority of focus groups as having cultural significance, and as important to the way of life in Hopedale. Elders particularly emphasized the value of traditional foods in ‘feeling Inuk’, and as being healthier than store-bought foods.

**Important sites in the community**

All focus groups talked about the Moravian church as having special significance to the heritage and identity of the community, as well as being connected to the personal history of many Hopedale families. Some individual
participants also spoke of the NG Legislative Assembly building as making Hopedale ‘stand out’ on the coast, as the legislative capital of Nunatsiavut.

*Traditional activities on the Land*

All focus groups emphasized traditional activities on the land as central to culture in Hopedale. ‘Going off’ was something most talked about as having done their whole life, having learned from their parents. Being on the land was identified by the majority of focus groups as valued for the sense of connection to others, to other generations, and to the land. Some participants added that being on the land ‘gives you peace;’ that knowing and learning land-based skills builds self-esteem and a sense of safety.

*Youth on the land*

Time on the land was noted by the majority of focus groups as being especially important for youth, to build a sense of confidence and cultural identity. Youth themselves talked about the feeling of cultural connection they get being on the land. One elder man spoke about the ‘transformation’ he saw in youth when they were on the land,

*first two or three days there were, you know, ups and downs, eh? And about fourth day you could see kids started to turn the opposite way, they were, “Oh, what can I do today? Who’s going in the boat? Can I clean this fish? Can I make pitsik? Can I smoke fish? Show me how to do this. Show me how to do that.” After four days there were kids that were crying on the first day ... after eight days when we left to come home I would say out of fourteen kids ten didn’t even want to come home. They would rather stayed up the bay because they forgot about their iPods.*

—Melvin Hurley
All focus groups felt that time on the land helps keep young people out of trouble, that they were more friendly, more engaged, and more likely to interact with other generations, to share and volunteer, after spending time on the land.

*Traditional Knowledge*

The majority of focus groups talked about traditional knowledge as an important cultural aspect of Hopedale. Learning and passing on traditional knowledge, whether on the land or in the community, was talked about as a special experience which *helps your spirit* by appreciating *‘who you are and what you are’*. As such, a majority of the focus groups identified programs and opportunities for sharing traditional knowledge as having special cultural importance to the community.

4.4.7 “How do people engage with these important cultural aspects?”

In order to better understand how cultural aspects of the community function, I asked how participants felt they connected with cultural activities; how culture was supported, what specific activities or places were important, as well as any changes participants saw taking place in cultural aspects of the community.

The majority of focus groups identified overarching changes in terms of how cultural aspects were enacted, and passed between generations in the community. Lasting effects of residential schools on community members were particularly apparent when talking about culture. Technology and education were seen as modern forces affecting negative changes in cultural aspects of the community,
largely acting as barriers to traditional skills and activities. Participants also identified specific programs and activities they felt support culture in the community. These supports and barriers are summarized in Table 4.8.

**Table 4.8: Summary of supports and barriers to culture in Hopedale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - singing Inuititut hymns at church  
- public postings and radio broadcasts  
- Inuititut ‘speak-off’ competitions at school  
- adult language classes | Traditional Skills and Activities |
| | Intergenerational transmission  
- community programs bringing youth and elders together  
- time spent on the land | On the land  
- seen as important family activity  
- teen support group  
- life skills class at school |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - loss of elders  
- legacy of residential schools  
- gaps in programming, program funding  
- few opportunities to learn, other priorities | Traditional Skills and Activities |
| | - loss of elders  
- legacy of residential schools  
- gaps in programming, program funding  
- technology  
- drugs, alcohol | - cost of fuel  
- changes in the environment  
- legacy of residential schools |

**Broad Forces of Cultural Change**

The majority of focus groups talked about a ‘break’ in the culture because of residential schools. Youth talked about the impact residential schools had on generations older than themselves; that they resented it, and ‘didn’t want to feel Inuit anymore’, causing what one participant described as a lasting, “unexplainable hurt” in the community (Amber Vincent).
Many older participants expressed a feeling of regret over this loss of culture, and a sense of responsibility that they hadn’t been able to pass aspects of their culture on to their children;

*we weren’t strong enough to pass it down to our own children. And it’s because of where we went to school in North West. And, like, in three or four years, made a lot of difference, cut off of our culture and learning how to do it.*

-Focus group participant

Technology and other ‘outside’ cultural influences were described by the majority of focus groups as a broad force of change. As one youth stated:

*growing up, we at first, when Inuit first moved here there was no outside connection. But as the years went on, got more outsiders coming in and like just started growing out, that the outsiders started outgrowing the Inuit tradition. And we started losing our language and traditions slowly through the years. And it’s now getting to the point that we’re almost completely losing it. So now we gotta pick this up and start picking up our own language and our own tradition back up.*

- Boas Mitsuk

A minority of focus groups pointed out that fewer people were involved with cultural activities in the community, instead spending time with TV and Internet, and a majority felt that it was harder to teach youth skills because so many technological distractions exist. Half of the focus groups also pointed to modern, English-based, education as a major force in the loss of the language in the community. Conversely, a few individual participants valued formal education for spurring some Inuit to ‘stand up’ for their culture.

**Language**

All focus groups spoke about the importance of the language, for culture, identity, and building intergenerational connections. However, there was great
concern that the language was *dying off*. The majority of focus groups expressed sadness that young people don’t understand or use their language.

**Supports**

Half of the focus groups described particular pride in those who still speak the language, and many identified the use of the language in the community as critical to supporting culture. A few participants noted differences in the way people in Hopedale use language on a daily basis, versus other communities where Indigenous languages were spoken more regularly. Overall, all focus groups expressed a desire to see the language better supported in the community through programming and general encouragement of speaking Inuttitut. A majority of the focus groups spoke of the ‘*need for balance*’ between English and Inuttitut.

**Barriers**

A majority of focus groups felt that elders ‘held’ the language, but these older generations were passing away without youth learning the language, presenting fewer opportunities for the language to be used and heard, and a barrier to the continuation of Inuttitut.

The majority of focus groups also pointed to outside influences and the use of English in schools as affecting the willingness and enthusiasm to learn Inuttitut. A few participants who teach the language felt it was hard to keep up with technology, and a constant battle to maintain interest in the language. A compounding factor was the feeling, expressed by a language teacher at the school, that there was bullying
around the use of Inuktitut, and a sense that the non-Inuit teachers and the curriculum do not value the language as an essential component of schoolchildren’s learning. The majority of focus groups also strongly linked loss of the language to lasting impacts of residential schools, especially embedded feelings of shame around the use of Inuktitut, due to residential school policies, which had resulted in loss of the language.

**Traditional Skills and Activities**

*Intergenerational transmission*

The majority of focus groups expressed concern that intergenerational transmission of traditional skills had been severely impacted by residential schools, loss of elders, and a dearth of accessible and cohesive programs for learning traditional skills in the community. Technology, drugs and alcohol were identified as ‘distractions’ in passing skills on to young people, as youth were ‘just not as interested’. The majority of focus groups highly valued opportunities that bring youth and elders together.

*On the Land*

It was still seen as important for families to ‘go off’, however, the majority of focus groups reported barriers to their ability to get on the land. The majority also talked about land-based skills as having been lost in the ‘cultural break’ caused by residential school, much the same as the language. This was seen as a major cultural
change, as previous generations spent most of their time on the land, and ‘weren’t hardly in the community’.

Programs that support this cultural way of life were identified as particularly valuable, allowing youth to go fishing and hunting, spend time with each other on the land, learn from elders, try traditional foods, learn cultural skills and activities, and build identity as young Inuit.

4.4.8 “What are your visions for the future of Hopedale? What things would you like to see protected? Are there issues or problems you see that may develop or worsen in the future?”

To get a sense of priority areas for sustainability at the community level, I asked each focus group about their ideal visions and concerns for the future of Hopedale. Responses to these discussions are presented below and summarized in Table 4.9. As ‘issues’ and ‘ideals’ are correlated, I have sorted them in the table according to how they were spoken about in the focus groups; ‘issues’ being those things participants expressed concern over, and ‘visions’ being those aspects which they would ideally like to see for the community in the future.

The community participants identified ‘visions’ and ‘issues’ under five broad themes; built environment and infrastructure, focusing on the basic functioning of the community; environmental concerns, particularly contamination and its effects on health; socio-economic factors, such as the cost of living and issues with employment; social considerations, both broad concerns and specific initiatives; and cultural ideals for the future.
Table 4.9: Summary of ideal visions and issues expressed by focus group participants in regards to the future of Hopedale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Built Environment and Infrastructure</em></td>
<td>- new Hall</td>
<td>- energy costs and supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- more, appropriate and available housing</td>
<td>- water and sewer need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- road upgrades</td>
<td>- upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- supply boats and transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Environmental</em></td>
<td>- ‘PCB free’</td>
<td>- traditional foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Socio-Economic</em></td>
<td>- opportunities for youth</td>
<td>- employment and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- food prices and cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Social</em></td>
<td>- ‘helping each other out’</td>
<td>- changes in participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- community activities and events</td>
<td>- drugs and alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ‘caring, active voice’</td>
<td>- suicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- consultation and clear information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cultural</em></td>
<td>- ‘get the culture back’</td>
<td>- the language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Built Environment and Infrastructure Visions and Issues**

*The Hall*

The Hall had been a critical social element of the community, and brought together people of all ages, from all over the community, for a variety of activities. The loss of the Hall had significant impacts on the community. The majority of focus groups expressed a feeling that people were ‘*all scattered out*’ and not as connected to each other as they had been before. Particularly for the youth, the loss of the Hall was tied to many other social issues. Many individual participants directly linked the loss of the Hall to higher rates of suicide and use of drugs and alcohol. All focus
groups emphasized the importance of a new Hall to Hopedale being a good place to live in the future.

Housing and Energy

The majority of focus groups felt there was a housing shortage in the community. A majority also acknowledged barriers to housing as a reason youth and young families had left Hopedale. While some individual participants felt that housing supply was not as problematic as significant distribution of housing and the willingness to share accommodations with family, all focus groups wanted to see improvements in the community’s housing strategies.

Housing with electric heat was important to half of the focus groups, due to decreased supply of and access to wood for heat. However, frustration was expressed around the cost of energy, and a few participants pointed out that though new hydro developments were being built in central Labrador, their rates were only projected to rise.

Roads

The majority of focus groups felt that the quality of roads made it difficult to get around town, and that more roads would be needed to accommodate a growing community. Some participants entertained the idea of a road from Hopedale to Goose Bay, which might help address issues of food cost and supply, but reported that they felt that ‘the good would come with the bad’ and such a change what not only be a good one for the community in the future.
Water and Sewer

The majority of focus groups wanted to see the water and sewer system improved, as the community had a history of issues with water supply and quality. Additionally, many individual participants felt a ‘proper’ sewage and wastewater treatment system was needed to address concerns over contamination near sewer outflows.

Supply Boats and Transportation

The ability to move goods and people into and around the community was identified as critical to the future of the community by the majority of focus groups. As Hopedale has grown and become more ‘spread out’, some participants reported that they have been visiting less, and participants living at the farther reaches of the community expressed increased feelings of isolation. Transportation services within Hopedale would facilitate better social interaction and ease access to food and services.

The majority of focus groups expressed great frustration over the lack of consistent and affordable service from the supply boats, and an overwhelming feeling that community needs in this regard were being ignored.

Environmental Visions and Issues

‘PCB free’

All focus groups identified a major part of their vision for the community was for Hopedale to be ‘PCB free’. Contamination from the former military bases that
surround the community, leaking PCBs onto the land, into water sources and into the harbor, remained a constant worry for the community. The majority of focus groups made connections between toxins in the environment and perceived higher rates of cancer and early deaths in the community, and questioned the effectiveness of testing and cleanup efforts.

*Traditional Foods*

The health and availability of traditional foods was a related environmental concern for the majority of focus groups, particularly berries, fish, and caribou. Some participants talked about having to avoid or dispose of traditional foods because of concern over contamination. Limits on hunting caribou, combined with the rising costs of going out on the land were reported to have had both economic and cultural consequences in the community. Elder men and elder women pointed to traditional foods as a way of reconnecting to the land and to Inuit identity, and a wish to ‘*bring this back*’ for future generations.

*Socio-economic Visions and Issues*

*Opportunities for Youth*

Creating opportunities for youth to have a bright future in the community, in the form of apprenticeships and other learning experiences, as well as activities, housing and secure employment, were identified as crucial factors in keeping youth in Hopedale. A concern for all focus groups was the effect that lack of education and employment opportunities and a high cost of living had on Hopedale’s young people.
A majority of focus groups felt that many youth were leaving the community for these reasons.

Employment

The importance of jobs, both inside and outside the community, was brought up by the majority of focus groups as essential to the future of the community. Though youth saw employment as less of an issue, a lack of full-time, permanent positions in the community means that many were under-employed.

Education

Correspondingly, educational opportunities were seen as crucial to being able to access employment opportunities. The majority of focus groups identified education as a means for personal growth, socio-economic stability of the community, and a better future for youth.

Food Prices and Cost of Living

Hunger and poverty were a concern to all focus groups. Several participants spoke about going hungry or eating very poorly because of the food available. Community members felt little control over what was shipped in and made available. The majority of focus groups indicated that food issues should be addressed by increasing access to and affordability of appropriate food, both store-bought and traditional foods. Some individual participants pointed to the overall
high cost of living in Hopedale as a barrier to them continuing to live in the community.

Social Visions and Issues

“Helping each other out”

The majority of focus groups expressed a feeling that people were more self-interested, less likely to help out, and more motivated by getting paid today than they had been in the past. Sharing and supporting each other were talked about as social norms central to participant’s vision for the future, as they relate to Inuit values, and support the sense of ‘togetherness’ more common in the past.

Community Activities and Events

The majority of focus groups saw opportunities for community members to get together, especially those with a cultural focus, as important to the future well-being of the community. In addition to festivals and community programming, a majority of focus groups also talked about bringing people outdoors, to be on the land together, as a central part of an ideal future for Hopedale. Several participants said they ‘just wanted to see more people out’, and that even non-organized events, like when the Northern Ranger (a supply ship) comes in, had great sentimental value as times when the community felt ‘together’.
Changes in Participation

As the community had grown, and was without a centrally located multi-purpose facility, all focus groups observed declining rates of participation in community events and activities. Participants expressed a desire to increase participation in community events and programs, supported by a new Hall and improved transportation services.

Drugs and Alcohol

Substance use in the community was something that the majority of focus groups felt frustrated and helpless about, and that youth saw as a major mental health issue. A majority of focus groups also described tension in the community around bootlegging and drug dealing. Several participants expressed a feeling that youth were being targeted, and that without things to do, young people were turning to drugs and alcohol. Youth were concerned about their peers being drawn to these ‘negative parts of society’. Participants wanted to see a drug-free community, with stronger limits on alcohol. Half of focus groups pointed to a need to address the lack of social opportunities as a means by which to proactively tackle issues with drugs and alcohol.

Suicide

Youth suicide in the community was seen by the majority of focus groups as connected to boredom and disconnection from others. All focus groups wanted to see more activities for youth, to support an increased sense of identity, ability to
connect with others, personal confidence and overall mental health. These social and cultural opportunities for youth were emphasized as a means to address suicide;

one of the biggest now, like was always big here is suicide. That’s always going to be an issue here no matter what, but the only thing we could do about that is get more activities on the go, like even outdoor activities, indoor activities, off the land workshops. – Boas Mitsuk

The youth themselves expressed that they felt as though they had little support or connection to each other, to know when someone was hurting or to reach out for help, as the connections built through social interaction had been lost. Additionally, youth wanted to have more people to talk to, in the form of counselors and social workers, preferably who were from the community.

Community Decision-Making and Representation

To address many of visions and concerns for the future, a majority of focus groups felt the need for a ‘caring, active voice’ to better represent Hopedale at the regional and provincial level. In several areas, there was a feeling that the needs of the community were not being heard, or that they were addressed only after something bad had occurred. Additionally, within the community several issues around communication and consultation were raised. The lack of properly disseminated information causing some to miss out on important programs and services, and development occurring without the inclusion of residents’ perspectives were both raised as examples of problems with consultation. In the future, participants wanted to have greater say in community planning, and clear information on available resources and opportunities. This was seen to support a
sense of agency for community members, important to their feeling of belonging and having a role in influencing Hopedale’s future.

**Cultural Visions and Issues**

*“Get the culture back”*

The majority of focus groups talked specifically about culture, and particularly being out on the land and speaking Inuttitut, as a means to solve other social problems. However, some participants felt the culture had been progressively lost, and that ‘*there was more to pass on*’ in earlier generations. Youth spoke about ‘*bringing back*’ traditional skills as a way of healing some of the traumas of the past. All focus groups expressed an overwhelming feeling that there was a need to ‘*get their culture back*’; encouraging cultural activities in the community and on the land, ensuring crafts and traditional skills were passed on, and strengthening socio-cultural norms like sharing were identified as examples of what participants expressed the need to revitalize.

**Language**

Language was a major concern for all focus groups, who expressed an overwhelming feeling that the language was ‘*dying off*’, jeopardizing the future of Hopedale as an Inuit community. The majority of focus groups expressed concern that there were issues with funding and ‘*gaps*’ in the available programming, causing both young and old to lose language skills. The majority of focus groups also
expressed a need for balance in the use of language, for young people to have both languages used around them in the community.

4.5 Participatory Mapping Results- Valued Places and Spaces

During the mapping activity, I asked participants to identify places that represented the values, principles, activities and other important community aspects that were discussed in the first half of the focus group. Maps 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 show features identified by the community as having (respectively) social, cultural, and both social and cultural importance.

Many of the previously presented discussion questions brought up particular sites in the community and on the land, and when looking at the maps, community participants were often reminded of more explanation and locations of importance in this regard. Overall, many of the features on the land were identified to hold both social and cultural importance, and the land was highly valued as a social and cultural place. A summary of the categories of areas and their importance from a social, cultural or social and cultural perspective is presented in Table 4.10. They have been organized under the broad categories of natural resource areas, recreational areas, heritage or cultural sites, and locations of social services.
Table 4.10: Summary of types of sites and areas valued for social or cultural significance in and around the community of Hopedale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Natural Resources</th>
<th>Recreational Areas</th>
<th>Heritage and Cultural Sites</th>
<th>Social Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Types of Areas</em></td>
<td>- berry picking</td>
<td>- boil-up sites</td>
<td>- burial site</td>
<td>- the clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- fishing</td>
<td>- swimming ponds</td>
<td>- Moravian complex</td>
<td>- RCMP station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- hunting</td>
<td>- volleyball courts</td>
<td>- Churches</td>
<td>- stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- sealing</td>
<td>- playgrounds</td>
<td>- other cultural sites</td>
<td>- the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- multipurpose sites</td>
<td></td>
<td>- firehall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- the park</td>
<td></td>
<td>- town council buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- festival sites</td>
<td></td>
<td>- locations of programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- gathering spots</td>
<td></td>
<td>- DHSD buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- trails and routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Natural Resource Areas

Places where people went out on the land for gathering traditional foods and to spend time in nature, were identified by all focus groups as important not only for the natural resources they supply, but importantly, for the other benefits they convey to residents. Relationships with the land, built through time spent hunting, fishing, and gathering berries, were reported to be socially and culturally important to participants. Participants described a sense of identity gained from being on the land, and so most of these areas were identified as culturally important.

Additionally, time away from the community was felt as a type of mental respite, and natural resource areas were described by the majority of focus groups as facilitating good social relationships in that regard.
Recreational Areas

All focus groups identified features in the community and on the surrounding land for recreational use; festival grounds, ponds where youth gather to swim, and places on the land where families hold boil-ups\(^{11}\) were all talked about as having social value. Places where people naturally gather, such as on the wharfs or at the school, were talked about by the majority of focus groups as having particular social importance since the loss of the Hall. In the same way, routes and roads in the community were identified as having social importance.

The festival sites, out on the sea ice, were identified by a majority of focus groups as culturally important as well as having social value. Participants felt that ‘it just wouldn’t be the same’ if festivals were held on the land or indoors; being on the ice connects to the community’s Inuit identity and these sorts of cultural activities bring the community together in a special way.

Heritage and Cultural Sites

The Moravian complex was identified by all focus groups as having great cultural value. The majority of focus groups talked about the social and cultural value of the site on a personal level, as part of family traditions, where they were baptized, and as a place that still brought people together. As well, the former mission site spoke to the broader cultural identity of the community; “it’s just a history, everyone’s Moravian” (Focus group participant). Both Moravian and

\(^{11}\) ‘Boil-ups’ are particular to life in Labrador. A ‘boil-up’ is held on the land, during other activities or for a family activity, and usually involves having a small fire, boiling a pot of tea and having something to eat.
Pentecostal churches were also identified as socially significant, as they host community events and gatherings. Other sites speaking to the heritage and culture of the community were added to the maps by participants, such as the locations of old sod houses and burial sites.

**Social Services**

Places to buy food, where programming was offered, and which support the physical health and security of the community were identified by all focus groups as socially important, as they supply basic services and supports. Participants marked the RCMP station, the clinic, both stores and the firehall as having this importance.

Sites that host cultural activities, such as drum-dancing and language classes, were identified as both socially and culturally important. These include the school, council building and the Department of Health and Social Development (DHSD).
Map 4.2 - Map showing socially important sites and areas
(For full version, please see enclosed DVD.)
Map 4.3- Map showing culturally important sites and areas
(For full version, please see enclosed DVD.)
Map 4.4- Map showing sites and areas of both social and cultural importance
(For full version, please see enclosed DVD.)
4.6 Thematic findings emerging from the Case Study

Throughout the case study process, several themes emerged from the data which cut across and tie together many of the socio-cultural values and priorities of the community. Below, I identify and describe these themes, all of which centre on the importance of relationships in socio-cultural sustainability at the community level; connection to each other, connection to culture, and connection to land. These themes are also represented in Figure 4.5, showing the aspects of the community and physical places in the community and on the land reported to support the three types of connection identified in the analysis.

Figure 4.5 - General themes and elements of socio-cultural sustainability in Hopedale
These three themes are themselves interconnected. Participants expressed a strong feeling that different social and cultural aspects of the community and Hopedale society are interrelated and that it was important to support them holistically rather than individually. As one participant described, when asked about ‘important’ aspects of the community:

\[\text{Going back to how important the thing is to our community, like when I hear someone say talk about important, like I think about levels. Like to me, there's no levels of important on what we got to do to bring back our tradition because everything's all in one group, the traditional language, our culture, everything, hunting, trapping – there's no way you can number it off, what is important. It's all in one group.} \quad \text{– Boas Mitsuk}\]

Figure 4.6 shows a simplified version of Figure 4.5, to highlight common elements of the three overarching themes. Transmission of traditional skills and knowledge, and being on the land connect many of the valued socio-cultural aspects of Hopedale which participants identified, acting as important cultural touchstones. However, they are themselves supported by other socio-cultural aspects the community, such as the language, festivals and traditional foods.

On a broader scale, the connection to place supports connection to culture, as it facilitates those essential land-based activities that are a part of Inuit culture and identity. This Indigenous culture is intrinsically tied to the land and sea, and as such these two senses of ‘connection’ are linked. Connection to culture also supports connection to one another other, as a shared sense of cultural identity supports social capital and cohesion. Cultural bonds tie generations together, and are foundational to a sense of belonging in the community.
Figure 4.6- Common aspects supporting themes of socio-cultural sustainability in Hopedale

4.6.1 Connection to Each Other

Many of the aspects identified by participants as central to the well-being of the community had to do with building and maintaining connection to each other. Social cohesion, belonging, strong relationships and interaction were reasons participants valued community programming, cultural activities, places to gather, and activities on the land. Places and spaces that supported these aspects were marked on the maps, according to these uses, including gathering sites on the wharf, DHSD buildings where programs were held, and boil-up sites used by families out on the land. The importance of 'togetherness' was emphasized in discussions about the community as a healthy place, and a good place to grow up.

Correspondingly, the loss of this connection to others was linked to many social and cultural issues; feelings of isolation, lower participation, 'groups' forming in the community, fewer people visiting socially and weakening intergenerational
relationships. A central concern in many focus groups was that the community felt ‘all scattered out’, and that people didn’t come together as much anymore. Participants also described weakening cultural identity as negatively affecting social connections between individuals. These changes were seen as a product of weakening social norms, ‘outside’ distractions, and few places to gather.

For youth, the connection to others was essential for feeling like they had a place in the community, and that they are supported. Many participants linked feelings of youth isolation and disconnection to suicide, and felt that if youth had those connections to others, particularly elders, it would positively affect their personal sense of well-being. Building connections to others was a key reason community members valued the teen support group, and led participants to identify gathering spots in the community as features on the maps.

4.6.2 Connection to Culture

Throughout focus group discussions participants pointed to culture as a central component in the well-being of the community, especially where issues with language or the transmission of skills and knowledge were raised, but also in the sorts of features mapped.

Many of the features identified were valued for supporting this cultural connection; buildings where cultural programming was held, areas on the land and sea ice where festivals and traditional activities were held, and the Moravian churches which all participants emphasized as central to the community’s heritage.
Participants frequently emphasized the importance of the Inuit cultural heritage of Hopedale in terms of personal and community pride, sense of identity and sense of well-being. However, relocation and residential schools have left a legacy in the community; many participants pointed to these experiences as causing a distinct ‘break’ in the culture. Additionally, like many communities, Hopedale residents described the struggles between ‘traditional’ and ‘modern’ culture, and participants felt this was particularly apparent among the youth.

Language was seen as a connective tissue in the culture of the community; a core element of Inuit identity, a means by which traditional knowledge was conveyed, and a means by which relationships between generations were solidified. In this way, connection to culture may also be seen to support connection to each other, as a base for understanding and shared identity.

Cultural connection, built through time on the land, learning traditional skills and speaking the language, was spoken of as providing future generations with a sense of identity, pride and belonging. Correspondingly, the youth emphasized that cultural activities were a major positive force in terms of ‘keeping youth out of trouble’. Younger generations also felt that re-invigorating this cultural connection could ‘heal the hurts’ of past generations, building a better future as a strong, Inuit community.

4.6.3 Connection to the Land

It is clear, from both focus group discussions and the types of features added during participatory mapping, that Hopedale residents had various, overlapping
uses of and relationships with the land. Throughout discussions of valued aspects of the community, participants identified land-based activities, skills and traditions as both socially and culturally important. Participants often spoke of ‘feeling Inuk’ when on the land. There was a sense that being on the land plays a big part in ‘keeping the tradition strong’ and this connection was important for all generations.

Participants also connected the health of the community and of residents to that of the land; social and physical health is inextricable to environmental health through traditional foods, time outdoors with family, and time away from community. There was the sense that traditional knowledge and practices supported the sustainability of the people and of the community; some participants talked about the need to know those basic skills that kept their ancestors alive.

It is clear that ‘going off’ supports Inuit identity as based in place, and links residents to generations of Inuit past and future. One youth described the feeling of being on the land;

> when you’re hunting on land, it gives you that good connection that you can think that your ancestors hunt there or wood there or trap— yeah. It gives a good feeling inside.
> When you get that feeling that you hunted or trapped on the same land as your ancestors, just because you that good thing, like wow I just did the same thing my ancestors did. And you get back home, you want to pass that on to your like your siblings or people younger than you, like just letting them how good a feeling it is to be hunting and trapping on the same lands as our ancestors.
> ~ Boas Mitsuk

However, participants were concerned that this cultural identity was weaker in younger generations, because fewer people were spending time on the land. ‘Going off’ was important to the youth in terms of building relationships and interpersonal skills, in addition to personal confidence and identity. Some
participants talked about time on the land acting ‘*almost like a treatment center*’ in that it has had positive mental effects on young people and plays a role in decreasing youth suicide in Hopedale.

Many of the sites and areas participants identified outside of the community were valued for both social and cultural reasons, as participants spoke of building social connections while on the land. The process of learning on the land was described as a special experience, valued for building social connections. These experiences are bound by time, place, and space and speak to the Inuit culture’s inextricable connection to the land.

### 4.7 Summary

This Chapter described the Hopedale case study, and presented descriptive and thematic findings of the research. Here, I aimed to identify components and dimensions of socio-cultural sustainability from the perspectives of community participants. The findings show a host of these socio-cultural issues or concerns and aspects of the community and life in the community that participants felt were important to discussions of sustainability at the community level. Overall, there was a sense that the community was losing social cohesion and cultural strength. From the data, I highlighted barriers and supports to these valued social and cultural aspects, including the influence of ‘outside’ culture, the ‘spreading-out’ of the community, and a lack of gathering space resulting in weakened social and cultural
connections. However, participants also identified key strategies to bring residents back together and reinvigorate core cultural elements.

As well, several cross-cutting themes emerged from the results; connections to each other, connections to the culture and connections to the land. These themes are themselves interconnected, and serve as the broad dimensions of socio-cultural sustainability in the community of Hopedale.

In the next Chapter, I will further discuss the findings from the case study, relating the results and emergent themes to findings from the literature review. It is important to examine these component and dimensions, from the perspectives of community participants, to the broader field of socio-cultural sustainability in order to identify gaps and areas for future research. As well, this final Chapter will identify implications and recommendations stemming from the research; for planning in the community of Hopedale, for the NG SCI project and other community sustainability initiatives, and for future research in socio-cultural sustainability.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This research was driven by the need to better understand the social and cultural foundations of communities, a dimension of sustainability that is often taken for granted, frequently neglected and largely undervalued (Bostrom, 2012; Omann & Spangenberg, 2002). The greater challenge, of changing human behavior to alter the unsustainable trajectory of current human society, has not been approached as a socio-cultural problem, though it should be. Through an integrative literature review and a case study in Hopedale, Nunatsiavut, I have explored the dimensions of socio-cultural sustainability, considering perspectives from the research literature and the residents of one northern, Indigenous community. This research has sought to offer understandings on which to progress sustainable community planning, as well as contributing grounded perspectives on the dimensions of socio-cultural sustainability to the growing body of literature on sustainability in general.

Reviewing the literature identified a host of components currently considered in the discourse, as well as major gaps in understanding the social and cultural context of sustainability. Overall, the case study identified many of the same aspects addressed in the literature. However, community perspectives emphasized some of these aspects over others, describing different understandings of the way social and cultural elements support sustainability. As well, research at the
community level through the case study presented here highlighted important additional components to those discussed in the literature.

In this Chapter I present, discuss and relate findings from both the literature review and the case study. I then discuss limitations and challenges with the overall research design, providing my reflections on the process. Relating community perspectives from the case study to themes and components in the literature highlights differences and identifies areas for the sustainability discourse to grow, as well as providing lessons learned and practical points of action for Hopedale and possibly other communities. As such, I conclude the Chapter by situating the research project in the broader context of the socio-cultural sustainability discourse, giving recommendations for both research and action.

Three broad themes emerging from the case study are used to present and discuss the key findings in this chapter: connection to each other, connection to culture, and connection to place. A fourth section is included, covering additional community sustainability issues described in both the literature and case study that do not fit into these three themes but that are relevant to understanding community perspectives of socio-cultural sustainability.

5.2 Key Findings

5.2.1 Connection to each other

A main component of socio-cultural sustainability in Hopedale, as perceived by community residents, is connection to each other; the social relationships and
interaction that support a sense of well-being.

Throughout the case study, the importance of inter- and intra-generational relationships and ‘togetherness’ were highlighted, as were places and reasons to get together, which facilitate connection to each other. Participants also talked about sharing and supporting each other as crucial to the ‘health’ of the community, and as a core Inuit value. Correspondingly, a central concern of participants was the weakening of relationships and interaction within the community; of ‘bridging’ social capital (Perkins et al., 2002).

Case study findings corroborate perspectives in the literature that recognize social networks, which support social cohesion and act as a basis of social capital, as a key component of social sustainability (Bramley et al., 2006; Cuthill, 2003; Littig & Griessler, 2005; Murphy, 2012; Partridge, 2005). The literature also shows awareness of the importance of a sense of shared identity and belonging in building social capital (Boogaard et al., 2008; Christakopoulou et al., 2001; Goodland, 2000). However, while there is a body of existing literature that addresses socio-ecological dimensions of sustainability, understandings are limited as to the role of place-based and cultural identity in supporting social capital. The case study shows that these aspects play a large role in social connections. When talking about ways to strengthen relationships within the community, participants described cultural skills and activities, especially those on the land. These experiences contribute to a shared sense of identity and belonging, as well as facilitating inter-generational relationships.
Community perspectives also provided interesting insight in terms of the importance of participation and social justice and equity, two frequently identified components in social sustainability literature. Participation is discussed in terms of engagement in local government and civic duties, as a means of communities cohesively expressing and addressing needs (Colantonio, 2009; Murphy, 2012). However, the case study findings downplay these formalized avenues of participation, and instead emphasize informal visiting, social events and cultural activities for maintaining a connection to each other. Additionally, though the literature suggests social justice and equity between generations as a critical element to social sustainability, participants emphasized instead that connection between generations, in terms of interaction and shared identity, was more important in supporting a sense of well-being in the community.

Findings from the case study are significant in that they demonstrate the overarching importance of connection to others, both inter- and intra-generationally, but especially the role of culture and place in solidifying this sense of connection. Results, especially from the participatory mapping activity, also illustrate the overall importance of places and activities that facilitate ‘getting together’, both in the community and on the land, offering physical opportunities for the building of social capital.

5.2.2 Connection to culture

Embodied in lifestyle, knowledge, skills and activities, connection to culture was emphasized throughout Chapter 4 as critical to social sustainability. Case study
findings show that culture provides a shared sense of identity, important to individual and community well-being, as well as supporting connections to each other and to the land.

The case study demonstrates that cultural values permeate nearly every aspect identified by the participants as important to community well-being. In particular, participants highlighted the language and being on the land as core cultural components of socio-cultural sustainability; tying together other cultural aspects (such as transfer of traditional skills and sense of Inuit identity), as well as facilitating interpersonal connections, as a means of communicating knowledge and as foundational to the Inuit identity. Participants described the lasting effects of residential schools and modern influences as detrimental to the health of the community, and the healing potential of traditional language, food and activities. Correspondingly, participants stressed sustainability of the culture itself, emphasizing inter-generational transmission of cultural skills, knowledge and identity, as a core element in the future health of the community, but also as essential to current well-being.

Case study findings build on perspectives from the literature, which show a basic understanding of humans as cultural beings, acknowledging the need to accommodate the cultural context of sustainability (Abi-Hashem, 2011; Adger, 1997; Baehler, 2007; Baxter & Purcell, 2007; Berkes & Folke, 1994; Boyd et al., 2010; Christians, 2007; Daskon, 2010; Duxbury & Jeanotte, 2010; Groenfeldt, 2003), and the role of cultural assets in accounting for the survival of societies, especially in Indigenous communities. As such, research results broadly reflect the four
conceptual threads of culture in social sustainability literature; as a capital, as a process and way of life, as a binding element providing values, and as providing norms for environmental interactions (Christians, 2007; Duxbury & Jeanotte, 2010; Goodland, 2000; Groenfeldt, 2003; Magis & Shinn, 2009). There is also a growing body of literature linking culture, identity and sense of community to individual and community well-being (Grazuleviciute, 2006; Higgins et al., 2009; Sani et al., 2008). Attention to this area is critical, as the case study corroborates findings from the psychology discourse, both recognizing strong cultural identities as a hedge against social issues such as youth suicide and substance abuse, as well as supporting an overall sense of personal and community well-being (Chandler & Lalonde, 1998; Lalonde, 2002; Patterson, 2002).

However, the case study also illustrates a ‘cultural gap’ in the sustainability discourse, as the focus remains on eco-cultural interactions and sustaining cultural capital (Abi-Hashem, 2011; Chiu, 2004; Ford et al., 2007; Throsby, 2005) but with limited attention paid to the social aspects of culture. While there is perceived ‘overlap’ between social and cultural realms in the social sustainability literature (Chiu, 2004; Duxbury & Jeanotte, 2010), there still remains little understanding of the inherent interaction therein. The Hopedale case study shows concrete evidence of the role of culture in supporting both individual and collective sustainability, as well as facilitating connection to each other and to the land. These findings are significant in that they illustrate the importance of both connection to culture and connection through culture; having both strong cultural identity, knowledge and
skills, as well as the role of culture in supporting other connections essential to socio-cultural sustainability.

Case study findings are also interesting in that they contain little discussion of cultural diversity; a component identified in the literature as supportive of social resilience. Though many authors point to the ‘crisis’ of cultural diversity loss (Doubleday et al., 2004), cultural cohesion is a greater challenge at the community scale. At national and global levels, maintaining diverse cultures may be a sustainability focus, but at the local level maintaining cultural strength is the objective.

5.2.3 Connection to place

Community perspectives describe a sense of connection to the land which supports both social relationships (connection to each other) and cultural identity (connection to culture). Various, overlapping uses of and relationships with the land, as well as a sense of community, cultural, and individual well-being as attached to that of the land, are prevalent in the case study findings. ‘Going off’ is a major component of the lifestyle in the community, and participants described time spent on the land as supporting place-based identity (‘being Inuk’), which permeated community perspectives on socio-cultural sustainability. Being on the land is also critical to the transmission of social and cultural values, and an important opportunity for people to ‘just be together’. The social and physical health of the community was discussed as inextricable to environmental health through traditional foods, time outdoors with family, and time away from community.
Connection to the land was also discussed as transformative in terms of building confidence and identity in future generations. Participants made strong links between people spending less time on the land and an increase in social issues, such as substance use, and weakening socio-cultural norms.

The socio-cultural literature shows awareness of complex human-nature relationships, particularly in discussions of ‘bridge’ social sustainability. Socio-ecological discourses examining Indigenous communities recognize a worldview, based on relationships with the land, in which human health and environmental health are inseparable (Parlee et al., 2005). The literature also includes connectedness with the environment in discussions of sense of identity and belonging, particularly in Indigenous contexts (Rigby et al., 2011; Rollero & de Piccoli, 2010; Semken & Brandt, 2010).

While some literature acknowledges that approaches to social sustainability must consider this relationship with the natural world (Partridge, 2005) socio-ecological and eco-cultural discussions are still largely concerned with consequences for ecological sustainability (Foladori, 2005; Olsson, 2003). As such, cultural preservation is emphasized because these values are determinant of interactions with the environment and intergenerational knowledge transfer is recognized as supporting environmental sustainability (George et al., 1996; Martin, 2012).

This research demonstrates the shortcomings of socio-cultural sustainability literature, in that little attention is paid to the other side of the human-environment relationship; the social effects of relationships with the land. While separation from
the land has been an ongoing process, beginning with settlement and exacerbated by residential schools and environmental contamination (Brice-Bennett, 2003), participants strongly emphasized the importance of connection to land as a critical element of both social and cultural facets of the community. Case study findings clearly link strong connections with the land to mental health, social relationships, sense of cultural identity and overall community well-being. Time spent on the land is important for all generations, as it solidifies inter-generational connections, facilitates transfer of cultural knowledge, and builds confidence in youth. These findings enrich our understanding of the complexity of socio-ecological relationships, and the role of place-connection in socio-cultural sustainability at the community level.

5.3 Other Community Sustainability Issues

Comparisons between case study findings and results from the literature review reveal other interesting differences between the previously conducted research and community-based perspectives of components of socio-cultural sustainability which do not fit neatly into the preceding themes. Here I discuss some of these differences, addressing components, many emphasized public policy and ‘sustainability of community’ discussions which are concerned with the practical issues of community viability (Magee & Scerri, 2012; Magis, 2007). As such, these additional components also speak to the implications of socio-cultural components of sustainability for economic and environmental sustainability, as they relate to
resident’s livelihoods and issues of community development. In addition to implications from the key findings discussed above, these issues highlight areas for further research and action.

‘Health’

The literature recognizes basic physical and psychological health, on public and individual scales, as critical to sustainability. While the discourse is beginning to recognize cultural perspectives on health as necessary to understanding issues of socio-cultural sustainability, the case study demonstrates a much more highly interrelated perception of ‘health’ with environmental and socio-cultural factors (Berkes & Folke, 1994; Parlee et al, 2005). Participants connected personal and community ‘health’ to that of the land through issues of access, quality and availability of traditional foods as well as concerns over contamination. For example, the clinic was talked about as less determinant of ‘health’ than were places to gather, and areas on the land. Additionally, much of the discussion of the ‘health’ of community was of social issues; relationships and interaction that sustain feelings of connection to others and combat isolation.

_Social Infrastructure_

As the social sustainability discourse has its roots in the ‘basic needs’ agenda, a vast majority of the literature speaks to satisfaction of basic needs, supply of social services and social infrastructure. Talking about sustainability at the community level, participants brought up issues of food security, cost of living, and basic infrastructure. It is clear that Hopedale faces many of the basic sustainability issues
as other northern communities. However, many of these issues were discussed largely in terms their social and cultural impact; for example, fuel costs as being prohibitive of going off on the land, lack of places to socialize, and issues accessing traditional foods.

There is a large body of literature focused on the social sustainability of the built environment; particularly ensuring housing is culturally appropriate and accessible (Semken & Brandt, 2010). While participants were concerned about the quality and quantity of housing, the predominant issue related to the built environment was the effect development had on social relations and cultural activities. The community faces building constraints due to very rocky terrain and in addition to contaminated areas taking up prime land (D.W. Knight and Associates, 2005), causing new development to create physical distance in the community. Participants described the results as making the community feel ‘all spread out’, acting as a barrier to social interaction and weakening the sense of connection to each other. Exacerbating this issue, and a central concern of the community, was the lack of a community Hall. Many issues were tied to the need for a place to get together. Residents also talked about development destroying areas on the land, causing them to feel separated from the land and its socio-cultural importance. It is critical to note that participant’s perspectives of the ‘community’ extended past the built environment; the land is seen as supportive of social and cultural values, as much or more so than the sites and areas within the village. As such, many of the sites identified for social reasons are areas on the land for fishing, hunting and boil-ups.
These findings are significant in demonstrating the effects of the built environment on social and cultural aspects of sustainability, and correspondingly the importance of community involvement in planning for appropriate social infrastructure.

Employment, education, and capabilities

Much of the social sustainability literature emphasized employment as a critical element, by providing an economic base for community sustainability (Glasson & Wood, 2009; Littig & Griessler, 2005; McHardy & O’Sullivan, 2004; Storey, 2010). The literature also suggests human capital and capabilities as supportive of sustainability, as skills, training and knowledge shape individuals’ perceptions of community and ability to participate.

Hopedale has struggled for years to build an economic base (Brice-Bennett, 2003) with few full-time permanent positions. Participants highlighted issues with training program funding and availability in order to access what jobs there are. It was clear that finding work in the community enough to support their family was a concern for many participants. However, much of the discussion of employment and educational opportunities focused on other effects of a lack of these opportunities, particularly young people leaving the community and fewer people volunteering, instead expecting to be paid to help each other out. Although ‘you need money to live’, case study results highlighted deeper socio-cultural sustainability concerns associated with employment and education. These findings demonstrate that,
especially in isolated communities, there is a need for meaningful opportunities to sustain both fragile socio-economic demographics and protect socio-cultural values.

*Engaged, accessible and responsive governance*

Public policy literature stresses ‘governance over government’ (Colantonio, 2007), identifying community involvement in decision making and planning processes as important elements in social sustainability. Focus group discussions highlighted instances where consultation has been insufficient in the past, resulting in social and cultural consequences. Participants stressed the need for a ‘caring active voice’ to better represent Hopedale at a regional level and address many community needs.

*Social justice and equity*

‘Development’ social sustainability discourses position inter- and intra-generational justice and equity as foundational issues, emphasizing equal access to and distribution of resources and ‘life chances’ within and across generations as part of the ‘futures focus’ of sustainability. This literature is also concerned with issues of discrimination and rights, and the establishment of structures and processes to ensure lasting justice. Looking to the case study findings, social justice and equity were discussed mainly in the context of cultural continuity; participants were concerned that the culture was not being passed on; that future generations had less cultural capital and fewer cultural opportunities.
There were few issues of equity or discrimination raised, and community members seemed more concerned with the overall loss of connection to each other. These findings are significant in that they demonstrate the necessity for contextualization of sustainability; ensuring social equity in Hopedale, in the structural and economic terms of the literature, would do little to ensure the cultural ‘life chances’ of future Inuit. Inter- and intra-generational equity must also have an eye towards cultural resources and opportunities.

5.4 Study Limitations and Challenges

Literature Review

In relation to the Indigenous context of the case study, the research approach was limited in that the literature review included only peer-reviewed sources. Though results from the review clearly illustrated that there are many disciplines related to socio-cultural sustainability, using different language to frame similar issues, perspectives from Indigenous scholars and community sustainability practitioners are still limited. Had I included gray literature in the study, making the literature review integrative not only in terms of methods but also in type of literature, case study results may have been better reflected. However, comparing grounded community perspectives to those of previous research offers critical insight into areas for further research and the necessity of trans-disciplinarity in considerations of socio-cultural dimensions, particularly in addressing sustainability at different scales.
Case Study

As this research was exploratory, it was important to ensure that case study results were not bound to the dimensions identified by the literature review. However, findings from the literature review (Chapter 3) informed the guide, to a certain degree, used during focus groups and participatory mapping activities, introducing some predetermined focus into the research. To counteract this, I ensured that the line of questioning was open enough to allow for participants to discuss a full range of community-level values and issues that they felt were relevant. Additionally, I used open coding to begin analysis, and looked for emergent themes throughout the dataset when doing the analysis.

It was also important to consider not just the elements participants identified, but also the ways in which these elements interact; to understand how communities understand the way certain components support social sustainability. Though many of the findings of the case study are similar to those from the literature review, the two do not map onto each other; critical differences exist in the interaction between elements and the emphasis of some over others.

The participatory mapping activity was also a boon to reducing bias, as it opened up discussion further. As land-use studies had occurred in the community before, there was some familiarity with maps and comfort with the process used. When given a chance to look over the maps and develop familiarity before mapping activities began, participants talked about a wide array of topics. This openness of conversation continued throughout the exercise, as the maps visually prompted
participants. The mapping activity also aided in engaging less forthcoming
participants, as they had something to point to in connecting their ideas.

Limitations in the size and scale of maps used presented some challenges in
this portion of the research. As the intention of the study was to gather information
relevant to socio-cultural sustainability, as well as information that can be used by
the community government in planning processes, the maps were limited to roughly
the area of municipal boundaries. As an exploratory study, I was not concerned that
the results reflect all important areas and uses connected to the land, so much as to
understand core place-based values and how they support socio-cultural
sustainability. An exhaustive study of the community’s relationship with and uses
of the land would require covering hundreds, if not thousands, of kilometers of land
around Hopedale.

However, the participatory mapping did have some limitations. Though this
type of data collection stresses participation, in order for the data to have influence
on policymakers, there is some reliance on scientific methods and technology. This
may present a barrier to community members’ full participation in the process
(Chapin et al., 2005). Additionally, storing of the data in licensed software
environmental that are costly and require some training to access may prevent
accessibility to community workers without the training or resources to use such
systems. In this research, I made efforts to ensure that the results returned to the
community are in the most accessible, easily understandable format. However,

---

12 In validation, I did use slightly larger-scale maps in order to collect data on several specific areas
which the participants had indicated were significant for social and cultural reasons, and were
located in proximity to the community (within a day's travel).
neither communities nor cultures are static, and these inventories of community perspectives will need to be refined, verified and updated periodically to monitor for change (Tobias, 2000, p. xii). As such, there is a continued need for research capacity-building in communities looking to undertake these sorts of planning processes.

This study is further limited in scope in that it focuses on Hopedale specifically, and is not representative (nor is it intended to be representative) of other communities on the coast, which may have vastly different priorities, even if identifying with the same Labrador Inuit culture.

Position of the Researcher

As the research project was associated with a regional initiative, and intended to feed into community planning processes, another challenge was ensuring participants were clear of my role in collecting and communicating information. In explaining steps in the research trajectory, I wanted to ensure that participants understood that I was not a community planner, nor was I in a position to directly influence decision-making processes. Additionally, as I was associated with municipal and regional governments through the project, a ‘warming up’ period was necessary in each focus group, wherein I reiterated both my role in the study and their options for anonymity as a participant. Getting participants to view the research as an opportunity to register their perspectives and as a learning opportunity for the NG and Hopedale ICG was critical to the data collection process, and I reminded participants during the focus groups of the use of the results in helping local and regional governments better understanding their community.
Relationship building with the community and participants was hugely important to the success of the research project, but also an essential part of the research process. My position of a white researcher, an academic from ‘away’, may have also presented a challenge to the data collection process, given the history of community research in the northern, Indigenous context\textsuperscript{13}. Spending time in the community prior to the commencement of data collection, in addition to being familiar with the region through prior personal and research experiences helped hugely in developing rapport with participants. Being able to use local terms, refer to pastimes and the general way of life on the coast greatly increased the level of comfort in discussions between participants and myself. A major help in this area, and an essential member of our research team, was our community liaison. Developing a strong working relationship and friendship with her gained us greater degrees of trust. She also acted as an Inuktitut translator, allowing participants to speak freely in whatever language they chose, and helping us explain the research objectives clearly.

5.5 Reflexivity in the research process

As I had completed the literature review before the data collection process, I was conscious of the issue of ‘seeing things’ in the discussions or the data, as they related to results from the literature review. Additionally, I was conscious of my

\textsuperscript{13} See Methods (Chapter 2) “Positioning the Researcher”.
personal biases as someone who has lived in Labrador, and came to research work because of personal interests and convictions.

Throughout the research process, I compiled personal reflections on the research process in a separate notebook. When I felt things were too ‘familiar’, or resembled findings from the literature review or ideas I held coming into the research project, I made note of my perceptions, and looked deeper into the data to ensure these my analysis was firmly grounded in the transcripts. This practice aided me in separating what the data was saying from pre-ordained thoughts I may have had. This degree of reflexivity worked to address the cultural biases, worldviews and pre-existing ideas I undeniably hold, and which affect my understanding of the perspectives of others.

5.6 Conclusions

In the current swell of popularity around discussions of ‘sustainability’, the passing attention given to the ‘social’ realm is insufficient, and potentially damaging. Particularly at the community level, it is clear that understanding the socio-cultural context is essential to sustainability planning. This is especially true in northern and Indigenous communities, wherein climate change contributes to a history of colonial impacts, both undermining communities’ identities and resilience as tied to the land (Ford, 2012; Furgal & Seguin, 2006; George et al., 1996).

This thesis clearly demonstrates significant differences in the way the literature understands socio-cultural sustainability, and how it is described by
community residents. Both the literature review and the case study show a dual understanding of socio-cultural sustainability; as the need to sustain social and cultural aspects of community, as well as the role of these aspects in supporting community sustainability. Although the literature is evolving away from the basic-needs discussion, and towards discussion of elements such as social values, cultural identity and less tangible indicators of quality of life (Colantonio, 2009), the findings of this research highlight a major ‘cultural gap’ in the current discourse. Case study findings also show direct implications of socio-cultural factors for economic and environmental sustainability, in terms of residents’ livelihoods and interactions with the natural environment.

Additionally, this research emphasizes ‘connectivity’ as a central concern in socio-cultural sustainability in the northern, Indigenous context; connection to each other, connection to culture, and connection to the land. These three types of connection cannot be considered in isolation of each other; they are themselves interconnected. Much like the problematic ‘siloing’ of sustainability into pillars, throughout this research it became clear that it is difficult to divide up social relationships from cultural or ecological relationships; they are intrinsically related. Connection to the land facilitates connection to the culture, and cultural connections support a shared sense of identity on which social connections rely. Separating these relationships from each other neglects the interdependencies of socio-cultural aspects of sustainability. Understanding these relationships, in the community context, will better inform discussions for sustainability and planning at the community level.
In conclusion, this research has contributed to the literature in exploring understandings of socio-cultural sustainability from the perspective of both scholars and community residents. It has also identified other relevant fields of discourse and overlaps in disciplinary discussions of sustainability issues. This thesis is, however, limited in time and scope, and there are many areas in which further research is needed. It is clear that the socio-cultural sustainability field is one that is growing, but must grow in breadth as well as depth; extending to other fields of social, cultural, and ecological knowledge. In particular, the dearth of Indigenous voices in the sustainability discussion is hugely troubling, as Indigeneity itself requires sustainability and these voices have much to add to the conversation. This thesis has also emphasized the utility of grounded approaches to sustainability; gaining understandings from the lived experience of others and allowing communities undergoing change to express their own priorities and visions. As the community is the most appropriate scale for sustainability intervention and operationalization (Baxter & Purcell, 2007; Dale et al., 2010), it is essential that residents are engaged in meaningful sustainability processes.

Most importantly, this research has highlighted several areas in which issues of socio-cultural sustainability can be immediately addressed at the community level. It is essential that both current and future generations remain connected to each other, their culture, and the land. This research has identified specific initiatives which support these connections through social opportunities, cultural aspects, and land-based activities. If communities are to become more wholly sustainable, it is essential that social and cultural values and processes be
considered. For all communities, social and cultural aspects of sustainability are the basis of quality of life. For the residents of Hopedale, it is these things that have sustained Inuit for thousands of years, and can continue to inform for generations to come.

5.7 Recommendations

This thesis has identified gaps in understandings of socio-cultural sustainability, as well as several areas for action to support community-level sustainability. Below, I give recommendations stemming from the findings of this thesis.

5.7.1 Recommendations for Research

Substantial gaps in the field of socio-cultural sustainability field were identified through the literature review, identifying potentially fruitful areas for future research, both in the academic study of sustainability and for the NG SCI. These include:

For the Field of Sustainability:

- Inclusion of Indigenous voices into the socio-cultural sustainability literature; learning from and better understanding Indigenous perspectives, principles and values.

- Consideration of ‘gray literature’ in preparing future studies in the field, incorporating the voices of practitioners of socio-cultural sustainability.
• Replication of similar community-based studies (including participatory mapping) in other communities, in a multitude of cultural and geological contexts, to increase understanding of central, common dimensions of socio-cultural sustainability.

• Further identification of other related fields of discourse and relationships between discourses, bridging fields of study and generating a common language with which to address issues of socio-cultural sustainability.

• Encouragement of research approaches which empower communities to determine their own sustainability trajectories, through research that is driven by community needs, in order to support contextually appropriate sustainability planning.

_For the SakKijânginnatuk Nunalik (Sustainable Communities) Initiative_

• Replicate this focus group and participatory mapping process in the remaining 4 coastal communities, so as to develop community- and regionally-specific understandings of social and cultural sustainability issues and supports, including spatial data that can be directly incorporated into planning databases.

• Include community members directly in the research and planning processes, ensuring that information is communicated clearly to residents

5.7.2 _Recommendations for Action_

As the overall objective of the NG SCI is to understand community sustainability from the Inuit perspective in order “to inform best practices and provide guidance for enhancing community sustainability in Nunatsiavut” (Goldhar et al., 2012, p. 3), it was also a concern throughout the research process to generate concrete points of action.

Additionally, in discussions with the AngajuKak of Hopedale during initial stages of fieldwork, I asked about the important outcomes of the project for the
community; what the ICG wanted to see as the outcomes of the project, and how
findings could best be communicated back to residents. He felt strongly that it was
essential for the community perspectives gathered during the project, especially the
maps participants generated, to be included in a database for the community to use
in future planning. He also asked for recommendations for the ICG to consider in
decision-making around development and programming in the community.

As such, the thesis findings have direct implications for both formal and
informal institutions in the community and region. The following sections give long-
and short-term recommendations for consideration by the NG SCI, as well as for the
NG, and for the community of Hopedale.

*For the Nunatsiavut Inuit Regional Government*

- Continue to integrate community-based understandings of socio-cultural
  sustainability into community planning across the region, including social
  programming and policy regarding natural resource management, development and housing.

- Increase support of social and cultural programming through the DHSD,
  public schools, and other organizations, particularly that which brings youth
together with other generations, increases opportunities for going off on the
land, supports use of the language and encourages the mastering of
traditional skills.

- Strengthen approaches to training and education initiatives to reduce
  barriers to employment in the communities of Nunatsiavut.

*For the Inuit Community Government of Hopedale (Long term)*

- To maintain connection to each other;
  . Rebuild the Hall; recognize, respect and protect the Hall as an
    important social institution which facilitates inter-generational
connection and strong relationships and social interaction in the community.

- Continue to support festivals and events on the land as key times for community members to gather and celebrate being together.

- Seek to ensure a greater number of social workers in the community are from the region, if not from the community.

- Seek greater assistance from the RCMP in addressing issues of drugs and alcohol in the community.

- To support connection to culture;
  - Greater emphasize the importance of the language through encouraging use in community, in programs and curriculum at the school, in community postings and by offering adult language classes.

- To support connection to the land;
  - Strengthen approaches to addressing issues of contamination in Hopedale as central to the well-being of residents and as connected to social and cultural health, including communication of processes and outcomes.
  - Include community members directly in decision-making processes, especially issues of future development in the community and the types of programs that would be useful to residents.

*For the Inuit Community Government of Hopedale (Short term)*

- To support connection to each other;
  - Develop some sort of transportation service to move elders and other residents around the growing community, reducing the feeling of being ‘all scattered out’.

- To support connection to culture;
  - Working with the Youth Support Group, DHSD, Youth Recreation Committee, the school and other programs, develop and support more engaging activities for the youth, with their input. Focus especially on activities on the land, wherein youth learn traditional skills and build inter-and intra-generational relationships.
• To support connection to the land;
  . Incorporate traditional on-the-land activities and programs to teach
    traditional skills in school curriculum, making efforts to bring youth
    and elders together.
  . Incorporate community-made maps into planning processes, and
    continue to seek community input in planning activities.

***
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### APPENDIX A: Literature search database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th># Results</th>
<th># pages reviewed</th>
<th># harvested</th>
<th>Topical disciplines represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Google Scholar</td>
<td><em>social sustainability</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>CSR, supply chain management, architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>cultural sustainability</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tourism, urban planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>socio-cultural sustainability</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Architecture, housing, public policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>social resilience</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Disaster risk, socio-economic relations, climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>cultural resiliency</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Housing, psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>socio-cultural resiliency</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sociology, ethnography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>cultural well-being</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mental physical public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>socio-cultural well-being</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sociology, education, native studies, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>community resiliency</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Community planning, ecosystem planning, cultural sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>cultural revitalisation</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sociology, psychology, individual and collective mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>socio-cultural revitalisation</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community development, international development, Aboriginal education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>sustainability</em> <em>&quot;community health&quot;</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sustainability of health programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>community sustainability</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Environmental assessment, forestry, individual health, social capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>cultural capacity</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Human biology, anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>sustainability</em> <em>&quot;cultural sustainability&quot;</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Agriculture, sustainable development, acculturation AND sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>community psychology</em></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Psychology, individual and public mental health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Scholar Portal | *social sustainability* | Abstract | 253 | 18 | Urban planning, supply chain management, housing, built environment |
| | *cultural sustainability* | Title | 76 | 0 | Urban planning, CSR, sustainable development |
| | *socio-cultural sustainability* | Title | 24 | 2 | Urban planning, community planning, urban planning, agriculture |
| | *social resilience* | Title | 5 | 1 | Urban planning, sociology, sustainable development |
| | *cultural resiliency* | Title | 18 | 1 | Urban planning, sociology, sustainable development |
| | *socio-cultural resiliency* | Title | 7 | 1 | Urban planning, sociology, sustainable development |
| | *social well-being* | Title | 14 | 12 | Urban planning, community development, mental health programs |
| | *cultural well-being* | Title | 37 | 4 | Mental physical health, economics |
| | *socio-cultural well-being* | Title | 135 | 12 | Mental physical health, public health, economics, psychology |
| | *community well-being* | Title | 116 | 11 | Mental physical health, public health, economics, psychology |

| ProQuest | *social sustainability* | Document Title | 401 | 3 | 1 | Sustainable development, urban planning, etc |
| | *cultural sustainability* | Document Title | 70 | 2 | 1 | Sociology, planning, sustainability, housing, urban planning |
| | *socio-cultural sustainability* | Document Title | 17 | 1 | 1 | Sustainable development, urban planning |
| | *social resilience* | Document Title | 2 | 1 | 2 | Agriculture |
| | *cultural resiliency* | Document Title | 8 | 1 | 8 | Urbanization, psychology, geography, urban and rural planning |
| | *socio-cultural resiliency* | Document Title | 9 | 1 | 9 | Environmental health, human health |
| | *social well-being* | Document Title | 70 | 2 | 7 | Environmental health, human health, planning, land use studies |
| | *cultural well-being* | Document Title | 14 | 1 | 14 | Sociology, native studies, human health |
| | *socio-cultural well-being* | Document Title | 2 | 1 | 2 | Sociology |

| ProQuest | *social well-being* | Document Title | 244 | 7 | 1 | Individual health, public health, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, sociology, psychology, soci
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;community well-being&quot;</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>CSR, urban planning, native studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;social sustainability&quot;</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Economic development, CSR, social dev, business, urban planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;cultural sustainability&quot;</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Arts and culture, education, architecture, social dev of industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;socio-cultural sustainability&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Public policy, urban planning, cultural studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;social resilience&quot;</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Public policy, urban planning, cultural studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;cultural resilience&quot;</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Anthropology, ethnography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;socio-cultural resilience&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public policy, urban planning, cultural studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;social well-being&quot;</td>
<td>7199</td>
<td>Psychology, public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;cultural well-being&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Psychology, public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;socio-cultural well-being&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Psychology, public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;community well-being&quot;</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>Sociology, psychology, rural studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: Initial Project Summary Document

“Indicators of Socio-Cultural Sustainability in Northern, Indigenous Communities”

MA Sustainability Studies Thesis Project: Janet Kivett Knight

Intro/Rationale
Effects of development without consideration of socio-cultural impacts can be devastatingly apparent, particularly in northern and Indigenous communities. Change manifests in loss of traditional lifestyles, cultural health and social stability and represents an ongoing legacy of communities’ separation from the land in which they are culturally embedded. There must be a thorough understanding of the socio-cultural principles underlying sustainability in the particular context. Socio-cultural principles and values inform interaction with the natural environment, and determine the capacity of communities to adapt to change. My research will address the need in research and policy to identify and validate indicators of social sustainability. These indicators are essential in the creation, evaluation and monitoring of development projects and processes.

Research Questions
. What are the existing indicators of socio-cultural sustainability?
. How do communities identify and describe these indicators or elements that are both indicative of their social well-being, resilience and cultural health and also likely to be impacted by processes of change (natural resource development or community growth)?
. What key indicators more accurately assess and monitor issues related to social sustainability in these communities?

Methods
- Systematic literature review on the concept of social sustainability, identifying current indicators (ongoing; to be finished August 2012)
- Focus groups and semi-structured interviews (Fall 2012)
- Analysis of themes and issues identified, identification of socio-cultural aspects underlying community-level sustainability (Fall 2012, winter 2013)
- Validation of potential indicators by community (Winter, spring 2013)

Expected Results
- Identification of existing indicators of social well-being, resilience and cultural health available in a northern Indigenous context
- Understanding of how communities describe social sustainability, perceive impacts and change, and visions for their future
Suite of potential indicators specific to socio-cultural sustainability in the Nunatsiavut context, validated by community and in support of the NG’s Sustainable Communities Initiative (NG SCI)

Benefits to Region/Community
Evaluating sustainability on economic or environmental terms alone may actually serve to undermine sustainability, through the neglect of key social and cultural factors. This research will contribute to the discourse of sustainability, identifying ways in which social aspects of sustainability can not only be conceptualized, but effectively addressed.

This research could serve as a foundational document for the NG SCI, identifying key socio-cultural values particular to the community context, including best practices and recommendations for indicators and monitoring.
APPENDIX C: Trent University Research Ethics Board Approval

Janet Knight
Sustainability Studies
GCS

February 06, 2013
File # -22792
Title: Core elements of Socio-Cultural sustainability in Northern Indigenous communities: Hopedale, Nunasiavut

Dear Ms. Knight,

The Research Ethics Board (REB) has given approval to your proposal entitled " Core elements of Socio-Cultural sustainability in Northern Indigenous communities: Hopedale, Nunasiavut ".

The committee strongly suggests and encourages you to encrypt any data that is being collected that contains any personal or identifying information. Please add a statement to your consent form concerning this. For help with encryption services, please contact Trent's IT Department.

Please add a running footer to your consent form, with the date of Trent REB approval and consent revisions number (e.g., 01-Jan-12, Version 2), so that the consent form used can be easily identified in future.

When a project is approved by the REB, it is an Institutional approval. It does not undermine or replace any other community ethics process. Full approval depends upon the approval of all other bodies who are named as stakeholders in this research.

In accordance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (article D.1.6) your project has been approved for one year. If this research is ongoing past that time, submit a Research Ethics Annual Update form available online under the Research Office website. If the project is completed on or before that time, please email Karen Mauro in the Research office so the project can be recorded as completed.

Please note that you are reminded of your obligation to advise the REB before implementing any amendments or changes to the procedures of your study that might affect the human participants. You are also advised that any adverse events must be reported to the REB.

On behalf of the Trent Research Ethics Board, I wish you success with your research.

With best wishes,

Dr. Rory Coughlan
REB Chair

Phone: (705) 748-1011 ext. 7779, Fax: (705) 748-1587
Email: r coughlan@ trentu.ca

c.c.: Karen Mauro
Compliance Officer

Responsibility of Researcher and Supervisors
When you receive approval from the REB please remember that:

You are responsible for not deviating substantially from the methodology that was approved by the REB. If you do so, an annual status form has to be submitted to the REB as an amendment to the protocol stating the changes. Only upon approval of the form can you change the methodology. You cannot start the collection of data or gathering research until approval has been given from all organizations vetting this application.

All copies of approvals from other organizations need to be submitted to the REB (preferably at the time of application when possible).

The tri-council states that university ethics committees should insure all researchers working with human participants add a statement to consent forms that provide contact information allowing participants to contact administrative staff responsible for ethics applications. We at the Trent REB believe that it is consistent with research participants rights and general research accountability that a statement outlining for participants that in addition to contacting the researcher for clarification regarding research, that they may also contact the Trent REB at the office of Research Administration with regard to any ethical questions they may have. Thus we ask that from now on all consent forms include a statement advising that research participants can also contact the Trent Research Ethics Board by either phoning Karen Mauro at 748-1011 x 7896 or emailing her at kmauro@trentu.ca
APPENDIX D: Trent Aboriginal Education Council Ethics Review Approval

January 24, 2013

Janet Knight
janetknight@trentu.ca

Dear Ms. Knight:

RE: ABORIGINAL EDUCATION COUNCIL ETHICS REVIEW

Thank you for responding to our concerns regarding informed consent. We have received the following clarification from you:

“As some community members (eg: Elders) may not be comfortable with the formal written consent form, both the Consent Form and the Letter of Information will be used as a 'script' by which to obtain consent. These will be thoroughly reviewed with participants, using an interpreter/translator as necessary. Oral consent, when obtained, will be audio-recorded and this recording will serve as a record of the consent. Those participants giving oral consent will also receive a written overview of the research project (the 'Project Letter of Information'), and a copy of the written consent form containing the names of relevant authorities who may be contacted if the research participant has any concerns.”

We are pleased to give conditional approval to your application, based on this revision to your application, and subject to the following conditions:

. You provide a copy of the letter of review and approval from the Nunatsiavut Government Research Review Process.
. You complete the required review by the community of Hopedale and provide a copy of their authorization letter to us.

Until these approvals are in place, no community research should be undertaken.

We look forward to hearing from you when these approvals are obtained.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Lynne Davis for
Aboriginal Education Council Ethics Review Process

c.c. Dr. Paula Sherman
Dr. Chris Furgal
Karen Mauro, Trent Ethics Review Board
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July 12, 2013

Janet Knight
Department of Sustainability Studies
Peter Gzowski College
1600 West Bank Drive
Peterborough ON, K9J 7B8

RE: Dimensions of Socio-Cultural Sustainability in Nunatsiavut Communities

Dear Ms. Knight

Please accept this letter as confirmation of the Nunatsiavut Governments support for the above research project as outlined in your application, subject to the following suggestions:

1. Traditional Knowledge is a very important issue for the NG and beneficiaries to the Agreement. All of the Traditional Knowledge data, raw and processed, that is collected is to be shared with NG. We require exact copies of all the raw and processed data, plus exact copies of any recording and transcriptions.

2. Please provide copies of any reports, journal articles, papers, posters or other publications related to this project to the, Nunatsiavut Inuit Research Advisor upon completion of your work. A plain language summary detailing the work, translated into Labrador Inuit should also be provided.

3. NG would appreciate copies of any photographs that you acquire during your research in the Nunatsiavut area as Nunatsiavut Government is developing a digital database of regional photos. Recognition will always be given to the photographer.

Please note that if you are going to make any changes to your proposal, any such changes must be considered and supported by the NGRAC before they are implemented.
Sincerely,

[Signature]

Carla Pamak
Inuit Research Advisor
Nunatsiavut Government
P.O. Box 70
Nain, NL
A0P 1L0

carla_pamak@nunatsiavut.com
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Dimensions of Socio- Cultural Sustainability in Nunatsiavut Communities

Primary Contact/Investigator: Janet Knight
Telephone number: (705) 927-1306
E-mail address: janetknight@trentu.ca

Student Faculty Supervisor: Chris Furgal
Telephone number: (705) 748-1011 ext. 7953
Fax number: (705) 748-1416
E-mail address: chrisfurgal@trentu.ca

The purpose of this project, which is funded by ArcticNet and supported by Trent University, is to enhance our understanding of social and cultural aspects which are important to Nunatsiavut communities, and which should be included in community planning. This project has a specific focus on the values, principles and norms of the communities of Nunatsiavut, and participants’ visions for the future of their community. Of particular interest are the Inuit understandings of sustainability, and Inuit perspectives on social and cultural community elements.

I understand that my participation will consist of attending one 2-3 hour (including breaks) focus group session with the researcher and other community members.

This information will be collected and recorded on a digital audio tape recorder (if I provide consent) or by personal note-taking by the primary researcher.

It is intended that there is no risk in participating in this project and I should feel comfortable with the project at all times.

I understand that the contents will be used in a Masters thesis project and potentially in other publications, which stem from this research. It is possible that media releases relating to the report may occur, but the information is not intended for any commercial use.

I understand that my confidentiality will be respected. No personal identifiers such as my name will be utilized and the information I provide will be used in a collective sense. However, if there are circumstances where the researcher wishes to use a direct quote from my focus group session in any publication, I give them permission to contact me and allow me to review the quote in context and with permission use the quote directly from my input at the focus group:

yes [ ] no [ ]
If yes, I would like to have a generic (false) name used instead of my name (e.g. “Nunatsiavut project participant”) □

or I would prefer to be attributed by my real name □

I also give consent to have my photograph taken during the focus group session. I understand my picture will be used by the researcher for reference, and may be published in the Masters thesis.

yes □ no □

Additionally, I understand the need to respect and safeguard the confidentiality of my fellow participants during the meetings.

Both the Masters student, Janet Knight, and the Student Supervisor, Chris Furgal, will be responsible for the storage and security of the information obtained from the interviews and observations. All information will be stored under lock and key for a minimum of five years at Trent University in Peterborough, Ontario. After such time, all materials will be destroyed.

I understand that my participation in this project is entirely voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without judgements or prejudice. If I decide to withdraw from the project, any information I have given will be promptly destroyed and will not be included in the project in any way. I will receive compensation for my time after the completion of the focus group I participate in. If I decide to withdraw after the focus groups are completed, my compensation will not be revoked.

There are two copies of this consent form, one of which I may keep for my records. If I have any questions about the conduct of the research project, I may contact any of the research team members. I may also contact directly the Trent Research Ethics Board (Karen Mauro at 1 (705) 748 1011 x 7050 or e-mail: kmauro@trentu.ca) or the Nunatsiavut Government Research Office (Carla Pamak, Inuit Research Advisor at 1 (709) 922-2380 or e-mail Carla_pamak@nunatsiavut.com).

By signing below, I (______________________) agree that I have been fully informed and understand the nature of the project, and agree to participate. Furthermore, I understand that this project entitled “Dimensions of Socio-Cultural Sustainability in Nunatsiavut Communities” has been approved by the Nunatsiavut Government Research Advisory Committee and the Trent University Research Ethics Board.
Signature of Respondent  

Date

Signature of Researcher - Witness  

Date

By signing below, I authorize the inclusion of my name in the acknowledgements section of the final report.

Respondent’s Authorization  
Copy of transcript requested  yes  no
Copy of final written materials requested  yes  no

Contact Address: ________________________________

Email: ____________________________________________

Telephone: _________________________________________
APPENDIX G: Project Letter of Information and Research Information for Community

Dimensions of Socio- Cultural Sustainability in Nunatsiavut Communities
Project Letter of Information

Primary Contact/Investigator: Janet Knight
Telephone number: (705) 927-1306
E-mail address: janetknight@trentu.ca

Student Faculty Supervisor: Chris Furgal
Telephone number: (705) 748-1011 ext. 7953
Fax number: (705) 748-1416
E-mail address: chrisfurgal@trentu.ca

The purpose of this project is to gain understanding of social and cultural aspects of communities that are important to Nunatsiavut residents, and that should be considered in community sustainability planning. This project has a specific focus on values, principles and norms of residents of Hopedale, Nunatsiavut, and participants’ visions for the future of their community.

Participation in this research project will consist of attending one 3-4 hour focus group session (including breaks), with the researcher and other community members. During the focus group, information from the group discussion will be collected and audio-recorded on a digital recorder (if individual participants provide consent) or by personal note-taking by the researcher.

Efforts will be made to ensure participant confidentiality. Unless given explicit consent, participants' names or other identifying information will not appear in the data or reports for the project.

Only after participants have given consent and had the opportunity to review the use of their name and associated quotes and/or phrases in the context in which they are to appear, will their names be included in the report. Participants also have the option to participate in focus groups without having their name associated in any way with the project.

Participants are asked to respect the confidentiality of fellow participants during the meetings.

Information from the focus groups will be stored securely and only be accessible by the primary investigator (Janet Knight) and the student supervisor (Chris Furgal), at Trent University.

The contents of the focus group discussion will be used in a Masters thesis project and potentially in other publications, which stem from this research. It is possible that media releases relating to the report may occur, but the information is not intended for any commercial use.

It is intended that there is no risk in participating in this project and that participants should feel comfortable with the project at all times. Participation in this project is entirely voluntary, and participants are free to withdraw from the project at any time.
APPENDIX H: Letter of Information for the Community

Dimensions of Socio- Cultural Sustainability in Nunatsiavut Communities
Research Project Information

Who is the researcher?
My name is Janet Kivett Knight, and I'm a graduate student in Sustainability Studies at Trent University.
Over the last year, I've been assisting with the SakKijânginnatuk Nunalik (Sustainable Communities) initiative, developed by the Environment Division of the Nunatsiavut Government in cooperation with the Inuit Community Governments and through partnership with researchers at Memorial University and Trent University.
The overall goal of the initiative is to develop best practices and provide support and guidance for enhancing community sustainability in Nunatsiavut.

What is this research about?
This project has a specific focus on the values, principles and norms of Hopedale, Nunatsiavut, and participants’ visions for the future of the community. Of particular interest are the Inuit understandings of important social and cultural elements of the community itself and life in the community.

This project is working to:
• Gain understanding of social and cultural aspects of Hopedale.
• Identify social and cultural aspects that are important to maintain for the future of the community

How will it be done?
I will be holding focus groups with community members, to identify local priorities and values. These will likely be held in May 2013, and I will return to the community later in the summer to discuss what I've found.

Why is this project important?
Nunatsiavut communities are changing and growing, requiring adaptation and planning for healthy, sustainable communities. In order to respond to these pressures and changes, it is important to have an understanding of current community priorities and values.
The purpose of my thesis project is to enhance this understanding of social and cultural aspects that are important to Nunatsiavut communities, and which should be included in future community planning.

Who can be contacted about this project? You can contact me at Trent University, 1600 West Bank Dr., K9J 7B8, or by email at janetknight@trentu.ca
APPENDIX I: Case Study Focus Group Guide

Proposed Guiding Questions for Focus Groups: “Local perspectives (values & priorities) on environmental, social and cultural dimensions of community sustainability”

Beginning
* Welcoming, introductions to researchers, refreshments, etc.
* Signing and collection of documents
* Overview of study, timelines

- cross off questions/topics as addressed
- make list of important things to keep talk about again
- make list of spaces/sites/activities to map

PHASE 1:

OPENING QUESTION
1) Could you tell us about yourself? Such as your name, and what you do

Alternative: *to begin, could we go around and introduce ourselves? Maybe Diana and I should start-
I’m Janet, I’m from Peterborough, Ontario. I’ve spent some time living and working in Labrador, and right now I’m a Masters’ student at Trent.
Diana:....
Would you please introduce yourself, so we could get to know each other a little better?

INTRODUCTORY
2) What things do you like about living in Hopedale?

Alternative: What aspects of Hopedale do you appreciate?

Probing: Why are these aspects important to you?
Why do you feel that they are unique?

TRANSITION
3) What makes a healthy community?

Alternative: What are important aspects that make a community a healthy and happy place to live in?

Probes: Why are these aspects important to you?
4) Do you feel that Hopedale is a “healthy” community?
Alternative: What sorts of things help make Hopedale a “healthy” community?
Do you believe Hopedale is a good place to live?

Probes: Is there a sense in Hopedale that people can be healthy and happy here?
That there is a good life for young people who want to stay here?
Are there specific programs, activities or other things in the community that support a feeling of health and happiness?
Are there barriers/challenges to maintaining a healthy community here?
How do things like employment affect the ‘health’ of Hopedale?

5) What are social aspects about the community that you value or appreciate?
Alternative: What sorts of things make you proud of the people of Hopedale?

Probes: Are there community activities or traditions that you feel are important?
Why are these important? (Could you explain that?)
Does everyone value these aspects?
Do you feel these aspects have changed over time?

6) How do you feel about interaction and relationships in the community?
Alternative: Is there a sense that everyone who lives here is a part of the community?
Are there specific groups within the community?
How do people interact in Hopedale?
What sorts of things really bring the community together?

Probes: In general, do you feel there is a sense everyone has a place in the community?
How do people participate in or support community programs and projects?
Are there social “issues” that make it feel like there are different groups in the community? How so/why?
Do you feel like you have a voice in community decision-making?
Might there be anyone who feels excluded? Anyone at a disadvantage or struggling?

7) What sort of cultural aspects are valuable to you and to the community?
Alternative: Are there aspects to Hopedale that really make it feel like Hopedale?
Like a coastal Labrador community? That represent an Inuit background?

Probes: Are these traditions, values and principles continuing? How?
What sort of supports are there in the community for cultural activities?
Have these cultural aspects changed? How?
Do you feel like different generations feel the same way about these aspects?
Do you feel like there is a sense of identity with these activities? What else do people identify with?
8) **How are traditions and cultural activities engaged with here?**  
*Alternative:* Is there a sense of connection to traditional activities and values?

*Probes:* Do different generations engage in these activities?  
How are young people taught these things/skills/values?  
How are things like language or arts and crafts valued in the community? Do people still speak/practice these?  
Are there programs for young people to learn these cultural activities?

9) **How do you envision your community in the future? What would you like to see?**  
*Alternative:* What would you like the community to look like in the future?  
Is how the community is now how you would like it to be in the future?  
How so/how not?

*Probes:* Ideally, what elements would you like to see protected?  
Are there elements that you would like to see developed?  
Are there changes that need to be made now to ensure that this future vision is possible?  
Are there any programs that need more support, or activities that are lacking in participation?

10) **What do you see the future of the community looking like now?**  
*Alternative:* When you think of the community 10 years down the line, what kinds of things come to mind?  
What are some future issues, anticipated changes and challenges?

*Probes:* How has the community changed?  
How will the community change?  
What do you think is causing these changes?  
Are there different opinions about this?

**ENDING**

11) **What other things do you feel are important to well-being in the community, now and in the future?**  
*Alternative:* Is there anything we’ve talked about today, or that hasn’t yet been mentioned, that is really important to the community? A priority?

*Probes:* Are these being talked about in community planning?  
If not, how should these be included or reflected in planning?

*** **BREAK-TIME:** Time for coffee, food and smoke break ***
PHASE 2: Mapping Valued Spaces & Places

Summary of 1st half of FG discussion: summarized and highlight main points from focus group discussion so far (did we miss anything, is our understanding accurate?)

Explanation of next FG phase (mapping): explain the procedures, why mapping, purpose of map, how will the map be used?)

*For each location identified follow with questions 2 & 3, then start at question 1 again for other locations or areas. Repeat until no new locations are identified. *Start by asking about broad areas, then specific spots.

1) Are there special places that represent those values, principles, and activities that we talked about in the first half of the focus group?  
Alternative: Based on our previous discussion, what special places in or around the community are particularly important to you or others in your community? (Participant), you spoke about (particular activity), where does that happen?

Probes: Can one person map this place or space on the map?  
What is the specific location?  
What is name of the place (English, Inuktitut) and its meaning?

2) How is this place or area used? Who uses it? And for what? When is it typically used? Is it used often? How often?

Probes: What time of year do you use the area?  
Has it always been used this way?  
In the community, who uses this place?  
Do you think the way this place is used will change in the future? (Is it being used more or less these days? Differently? Explain)  
How long have you used this space?  
How do you get there? (draw route to a site, what type of transportation)

3) Why is this space/place important to you? Or to others in the community?  
Alternative: In what way does this area or place contribute to your sense of well-being and health?

Probes: What are the specific benefits or important aspects of this space/place (physically, culturally, emotionally, spiritually) to you?  
How did you learn about this space/place?  
Who is this space important to in the community? (everyone?, only Elders, only some family members)?  
What has happened here in the past?

* Return to question 1 - identify new space/place and further ask probes.
For each feature, ask:

- **where** (specific spot or more general area?)
- **when** (what time of year? Have things changed? Before or after a big event, like the fish plant? When did you start/stop using it?)
- **how** is it important? (How do you get there? How is it used? How often is it used?)
- **why** is it important? (cultural, social, environmental, economic value?)
- **what** (do you do here? What has changed?)
- **who** (who is it really important to? Who uses it? Who do you go with? Who knows about it? Who told you about it?)

4) **Are there any places or spaces you can think of that we haven’t yet talked about or put on the map that we should?**
   
   Probes: Are there spots or areas that are important to you that aren’t on the map?
   
   Are there any other uses for the spaces we have mapped so far?
   
   Are there any changes or clarifications people would like to make?

   *Ask participants on an individual basis*

5) **Out of all the areas you drew on the map, what spots make you want to live here in Hopedale?**
   
   Probes: What areas would you like to make sure your children or grandchildren will be able to see and experience?
   
   When you leave Hopedale, what areas/spots do you look forward to seeing when you come back?
   
   What really makes Hopedale feel like Hopedale?
   
   What spots have real importance to you, culturally?

6) **Out of all the areas you drew on the map, what spots do you feel you may not be able to use in the same way in the future?**
   
   *Alternative:* Are there spots or places on the map that you are worried won’t be there in the future? Or that you won’t be able to use in the same way?

   Probes: How has the area/place changed? Or has it always been this way?
   
   What do you think reduces the quality of areas or locations like this?
   
   Do you anticipate future changes/challenges that pose risk to this and other locations in and around the community?
   
   Do you feel will you no longer to be able to use this area in the future?

7) **Based on what we have talked about, what particular areas are of most concern to be protected and watch over in the future? (priority)**
Alternative: What areas or locations should be protected and watched over first?

Probes: Why are they seen as a priority? Why should they be protected?

CONCLUSION
Summary *quick overview of reason for study
*Moderator or assistant moderator gives short summary of what has been said,

8) If we are trying to learn with this map about the important or valued places in and around the community, do you think we missed anything?
Alternative: How well does that capture our discussion?
Would anyone like to add anything?

Probes: Is there anything else, related to this study that we should have talked about? Anything we missed?
Do you have any final comments that you would like to add about what we've talked about or what we've drawn?

Closing
*thanks, follow-up steps, contact information, etc.
APPENDIX J: Case Study Focus Group Transcript Coding Protocol

“Valued Places and Spaces” Hopedale Focus Groups:
Protocol for Analysis (for thesis project “Dimensions of Socio-cultural Sustainability”)

Key Research Question:
What social and cultural aspects (principles, values, norms and traditions) are identified by the community as important to its long-term wellbeing (sustainability) and should be considered in community sustainability planning?

Overall Method Design
Analysis will be carried out through thematic content analysis, using a systematic process of coding and identifying themes to interpret data (Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, 2006; Braun & Clarke, 2006). This method is appropriate in contexts where existing theory, research or literature on the phenomenon is limited (Hsieh & Shannon, 2006).
This study will employ a hybrid approach, incorporating both inductive coding (those codes “developed by the researcher by directly examining the data”; Boyatzis, 1998) and pre-determined coding, as drawn from the focus group guide (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The focus group guide itself is based on central themes and components as identified in an integrative literature review, giving some pre-determined themes, such as ‘social cohesion’; and pre-determined categories, such as ‘participation’ or ‘sense of identity’.
Using the focus group guide to pre-determine some categories and themes, the study will be able to identify and extract information relevant to the research question, while inductive coding will allow for themes, categories and codes to emerge from the data. As such, this type of coding will allow for the findings from focus groups to be compared to the findings from the literature review, and (importantly) generate new insights from community perspectives.

These pre-determined categories and themes are as follows:

Pre-determined Categories

• Health
• Employment
• Social infrastructure
• Capabilities
• Human capital
• Engaged, accessible and responsive government
• Intra- and inter-generational justice
• Participation
• Sense of identity and belonging
• Cultural capital
• Knowledge generation and transmission
• Diversity
• Cultural continuity
Pre-determined Themes
- Satisfaction of basic needs
- Social justice and equity
- Social cohesion
- Social capital
- Culture

Stages of Thematic Analysis
The following steps describe the approach that will be used to analyze the focus group data, and were guided by approaches cited in the literature (Saldana, 2009; Rubin & Rubin, 2005; Braun & Clarke, 2006)

1. First Phase of Coding: Descriptive coding

   For this study, descriptive coding will be applied to the data to generate initial labels of data. Coding refers to a way of organizing information into segments of text and applying descriptive labels to them (Creswell, 2009). Descriptive coding summarizes the topic of a passage of the data in a word or short phase, and is used in beginning stages of analysis to provide basic content to begin forming categories for further analytical work (Saldana, 2009). This process also allows for familiarity to be developed with emergent codes and categories.

2. Second Phase of Coding: Categories

   Once initial coding has been completed, codes will be organized into categories, identifying emerging patterns and relationships and pulling together a more meaningful unit of analysis. This is much the same as ‘pattern coding’ (Miles & Huberman, 1994), and creates more accurate and concise development of themes. Themes will later be developed from the grouping together of categories.

3. Summarize & Review Codes

   Following initial coding and grouping of codes into categories, all data units under the same category will be brought together, and a set of clear definitions will be made for each category, ensuring consistency throughout the transcript.

4. Interpreting & Understanding Data

   Interpretation of the data will be performed by:

   (1) Examining the meaning behind the code (ex. “how and why is language (as an identified component) important to community sustainability?”):

       Here I will be developing a deeper understanding of the importance of social and cultural aspects to the community; how they support community sustainability, how they in turn need support, and how they relate to each other.

       This goes beyond summarizing the list of codes, to include other information from the code in context within the transcript (how people talk about language; how is language used in the community; to whom is language important?). This sort of understanding supports more in-depth analysis, teasing out what the data is really saying.
(2) **Ranking codes (or judging importance of elements):**

During this stage of interpretation, I will examine frequency of representation and strength of statement to determine the importance of certain elements. Codes which are emphasized or represented frequently in the text would signify an aspect of importance, whereas codes not frequently represented or spoken about with emphasis would be seen as having less importance.

This will generate an understanding of key areas of priority for future community planning, and give insight into community perspectives on social and cultural dimensions of sustainability.

(3) **Comparing and contrasting codes:**

During the final stage of interpretation, I will examine codes in relation to the characteristics of the focus group in which they occurred. As focus groups were organized largely by age and gender, but also by role in the community (e.g.: elders and those associated with community organizations), this gives interesting insight into how different groups perceive certain elements. For example, the youth talked at length about the need for recreational spaces and paid employment, whereas the elders spoke largely about more ‘traditional’ elements such as language, land skills and cultural identity (as a very stereotypical example). During the focus group, we will also have asked for certain socio-economic demographic information (such as age, type of employment, years living in the community) which may also give some (albeit broader) insights into the data.

During this stage, it will be also be important to pay particular attention to how a concept or code is used or addressed, in addition to the focus group in which it occurred, highlighting differences and commonalities, as well as giving more detailed insight and meaning behind codes.

5. **Quality and Validation Check**

To ensure quality and validity, an accuracy and consistency check will be performed, using the assistance of another researcher with little familiarity with the transcripts. This other researcher will perform the same coding and interpretation steps on a passage of the transcript, and results will be compared (Rubin & Rubin, p. 229). Following this, interpretations will be reviewed and modified if necessary, checking for sufficient evidence for this change.

6. **Final Reporting**

During final analysis and write-up of results, I will identify and explain social and cultural aspects that are important to community members of Hopedale, including areas of priority or greater significance, and how elements relate to each other.
APPENDIX K: Consent Form for Use of Quotations

Dimensions of Social and Cultural Sustainability in Hopedale, Nunatsiavut

Primary Contact/Investigators: Janet Knight
Telephone number: (705) 927-1306
E-mail address: janetknight@trentu.ca

Student Faculty Supervisor: Chris Furgal
Telephone number: (705) 748-1011 ext. 7953
Fax number: (705) 748-1416
E-mail address: chrisfurgal@trentu.ca

By signing below, I, _______________________, give the researcher (Janet Knight) permission to use the following quotations in a Masters thesis project and potentially in other publications, which stem from this research. It is possible that media releases relating to the report may occur, but the information is not intended for any commercial use.

I acknowledge that the researchers have allowed me to review the quote in context, and with explanation of how it has been interpreted.

Where noted, I wish to have a generic (false) name used instead of my name (e.g. “Nunatsiavut project participant”). If I have not noted this, I agree for the quotation to be attributed to my real name.

There are two copies of this consent form, one of which I may keep for my records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Respondent</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature of Researcher - Witness</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotation (What you said)</th>
<th>Context (What we were talking about)</th>
<th>Interpretation Notes (What I think this means)</th>
<th>False Name? (Do you want to use a fake name for this quote?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX L: Poster of Information - Valued Places and Spaces Project

Background of Project

- "Valued Places and Spaces" is the first phase of the SakKijânginnatuk Nunalik (Sustainable Communities Initiative).
- The initiative was developed by the Nunatsiavut Government in cooperation with the Inuit Community Governments and researchers at Trent University and Memorial University.
- This part of the project focuses specifically on areas, places and other things that the community has identified as being important and valued for social, cultural or environmental reasons.
- The project is working to document these places and things, and understand why they are important to communities.
- This information will be used for reports to the communities and to the NG, and for thesis projects of the student researchers.

Why is the project important?

- Nunatsiavut communities are changing and growing
- In order to adapt and plan for the future, it is important to have an understanding of the things residents value and feel are important
- With a better understanding of these perspectives, government representatives will be able to make well informed decisions for healthy, sustainable communities

How was the research done?

- Focus groups: group discussions were held with community members to identify local priorities and values, as well as future visions for Hopedale.
- Hands-on mapping activities: participants drew on maps to show the important spaces and places in Hopedale. These maps will be included in the final reports, and also part of an electronic database to be used for planning.

What has been done so far?

- 6 focus groups were held in July 2013
- 24 community members participated, including:
  - women
  - men
  - elder women
  - elder men
  - youth
  - members of community organizations.
- 12 maps were created (2 per focus group)
  - these maps have been scanned and digitized.
- The research team has looked over the data and created a summary of the results

What are the next steps?

- Follow-up sessions with participants
  - to share results and make sure results are correct.
  - opportunity for participants to look over the maps again
- The research team will prepare a final report for the community, the community government, and the NG

Who can be contacted about this project?

Janet Knight
E-mail address: janetkivellknight@gmail.com
Personal Research Webpage: janetkivellknight.wordpress.com

Diana Kouril
E-mail address: diana.kouril@gmail.com
Personal Research Webpage: dkouril.wordpress.com

Trent University
Nunatsiavut
Health Environment & Indigenous Communities Research Group
Memorial University
ArcticNet
APPENDIX M: Posters of Information - Socially and Culturally Valued Aspects

What we talked about
- What do you really like about living in Hopedale?
- What make Hopedale feel like a 'healthy' community?
- What social things do you value?
- How do you feel about groups, relationships and how people interact?
- What cultural things are important?
- Do people still practice traditional things (like the language, land skills)?
- What do you see the future of Hopedale looking like?
- What would you like to see Hopedale look like in the future?

Weather, participants value Hopedale because:
- It is a small, close-knit and supportive community
- Community programs, like the teen support group
- People still practice traditional Inuit culture (eat traditional foods, speak the language)
- They are able to go out on the land, feel connected to the land, and share this with their families

Legend
- Social area or site
- Site of specific social importance
- Cultural area or site
- Site of specific cultural importance

Type of Use
- Recreational
- Gathering
- Berry picking
- Fishing
- Burial Site
- Other
- Snowmobile Route
- Dogteam Route
- Travel Route
- Area of Concern

Visions for the future of Hopedale

Environment and infrastructure
- "PCB free"
- new hall
- power, roads, housing
- supply boats and other transportation

Social and economic
- activities for young people
- jobs and education
- supporting each other, helping out
- "no more hunger" and lower cost of living

Cultural
- "get the culture back"
- the language
- crafts, traditional skills
- youth learning from elders, going out on the land

Issues
- contamination and wild foods
- drugs and alcohol
- youth leaving town
- feeling of being 'all scattered out'
- suicide

Who can be contacted about this project?
Janet Kive Knight
Master's Student, Sustainability Studies
Trent University, Peterborough
email: janetknght@trentu.ca
jane@knight.wordpress.com