CIVIC CAPACITY: THEORY, RESEARCH AND PRACTICE[1]

Craig W. Shinn

Portland State University

ABSTRACT

T his paper reviews the symposium as a first reporting of a collective research effort in Civic Capacity. Civic capacity includes social capital but extends the domain to the social requirements for successful democratic governance. Research topics include the relationship of the individual and the community; the nature of civic capacity and its relationship to concepts of social capital, trust, and civic engagement; and the relationship between civic capacity and democratic governance. As is common in public administration, the authors in the symposium use different approaches for integrating what is known about civic capacity. This paper develops theory building, the social science research process and reflective practice as distinct conceptual approaches and reviews the symposium papers on that basis in an analysis section. In a discussion section, the set is reviewed for contributions to theory, research and practice.

INTRODUCTION

Civic capacity[2] is problematic at best. Our understanding of it is made more problematic by the great promise of civic capacity to resolve a number of paradoxes in theory and the high hope of civic capacity to solve problems in practice. It is made more problematic still by the very nature of the research enterprise. As both Kass and Heying point out in this Symposium, civic capacity holds great promise in resolving the paradox of modernity where the success of the personal autonomy project threatens the very communal nature of the social world that allows individualism to arise, persist and prosper. Johnson and the case studies offered in this issue by Vizzini and Morgan, Mazaika, Witt and Welsch and Heying, each demonstrate the excitement stirred by how useful ideas of civic capacity seem to be in administrative practice. Whether appropriate or not, civic capacity continues to spawn recipes for improving practice with communities, community based organizations, and public involvement; and for reinvigorating high citizenship, increasing social solidarity, and resolving political conflict, etc. From this broad scope of practical experience comes a basket of ideas (Johnson[3], for instance) of potential, promise and *prima facie* practicality. The domain of civic capacity shows the tension of theory and practice endemic to public administration.

Civic capacity is, perhaps, both symbolic of and symptomatic of reflective practice. It is a domain of understanding of such range and scope that instances of practice and the understanding such practice yields overwhelm the work of those assembling an understanding of civic capacity in a theory building world. As Johnson says, it is disappointing on two levels. At the conceptual level, civic capacity, social capital and related ideas lack clarity, distinctiveness, and precision. At the practical level, these notions are not codified well enough to allow use with confidence. It was out of our awareness of the potential of civic capacity in theory and practice, our deep experience with practice and our confidence in our theorizing that the Civic Capacity Research Group was formed in the fall of 1997 at Portland State University. By civic capacity[4] the group means the ability of communities to respond to events in ways that are self consciously directed at shaping a common future. Civic capacity includes social capital but goes beyond social capital in a search for theory to explain the social requirements for democratic governance. This symposium represents the results of a first round of research in our collective enterprise.

In an area of research like this it is critical to sum up what we think we know and why we think we know it. However, there is not one way or even a best way to integrate what we know. In Public Administration we

strongly favor praxis and espouse reflective practice as a means to capture, share and codify resulting knowledge for the profession. Then too, we practice theory building, at times with strongly normative roots reflective of one of the disciplinary roots of public administration, political science. We also practice research with the multiplicity of approaches reflecting the social science nature of public administration. These represent distinctly different ways of understanding what we know. This paper sharpens the distinction between three ways of knowing and then uses these approaches (theory building, classic social science research and reflective practice) as analytic frameworks to review the Symposia contributions.

THREE FRAMEWORKS FOR ANALYZING WHAT WE THINK WE KNOW

Public administration is a professional domain built by theory, research and practice. Each offers a different way to integrate what we know and so creates a tension. The tension is healthy to the degree we use the tension to gain insight into theory, research and practice. This section explores theory building, research process and reflective practice as ways to integrate what we think we know and offers these analytic models to be used in analyzing the Symposium papers.

Theory Building[5]

There exists in theory building a paradox originating in the dual purposes served by theory. On the one hand theory is the objective or product of a rigorous scholarly process. As a product, theory serves as a status report on the state of the discipline or body of knowledge. On the other hand, theory is the implement or tool that enables research and facilitates the theory building process. As a tool, theory serves a transitory, utilitarian function, readily applied and discarded depending on the exigencies of the moment. Theory is paradoxical in serving as both the ends and the means of inquiry.

As object, theory falls in the realm of reconstructed logic (Kaplan, 1964) as a recapitulation of successful theory building and a summary of existing knowledge. Theory is taken as a robust approximation of the phenomenon under consideration. Here the concern is with an efficacious organization of the knowledge base. Good theory-as-object is theory that is parsimonious, elegant, internally consistent, and logically deductive.

As a tool, theory falls in the realm of logic-in-use (Kaplan, 1964). Here theory is an artifact of theory building process where it is produced and shaped by a community of research practitioners for their inquiry purposes. Theory as tool is malleable, assembled and disassembled for the purpose at hand. Phenomena under study are assumed to be messy. Therefore incomplete, fuzzy and abrupt-edged ideas are tolerated as necessary parts of creative enterprise. Borrowing ideas on the basis of what an idea "buys," the theory builder participates in an honored practice. Utility becomes the ultimate criterion as measured by how useful an idea is in furthering the inquiry process. Here the drive is toward new insight. The criterion for good theory-as-tool includes explanatory yield, empirical correspondence, novelty and insightfulness.

While paradoxical, the two purposes of theory when integrated keep theory development on track. As object, theory creates a tension to explicate a cogent argument. It records a new baseline of understanding in a form accessible to a broad community of scholars. As tool, theory creates a drive to use what we take as known and use it as a springboard to new inquiry, as well as to further understanding (Paluchowski, Shinn & Stevens, 1989). For the purposes of this paper, the task is to review papers in the symposium for contributions to theory building.

Research Process

Researchers have a further dilemma. A first task of theory building is to build correspondence between abstract ideas and the way those ideas are experienced (Agnew & Pyke, 1994). A second task is to codify such theory as a coherent, consistent, systematic conceptual articulation of facts as experienced. It is not enough for the concepts, experience and correspondence to be apparent to an individual; they must become shared within a community of scholars (Brown, 1977). Further, one measure of the adequacy of theory is its perceived value for theory building by a community of researchers. A second measure of the adequacy of theory is its ability to explain what a community of researchers takes as fact. Doing this work of building the correspondence between what we take for the world of ideas and what we take as facts is the special task of research practice.

Social science research offers a litany of ways to approach the task of doing research from logical positivism (Popper, 1959) and the "scientific methods" (c.f. Kerlinger, 1986) to action research (c.f. Harmon, 1981)

and the discovery of grounded theory (Glasser & Strauss, 1967). The debate in social science methods and particularly in public administration centers around the epistemological questions and the assumptions made in answering such questions. The implications of the epistemological stance taken by a researcher color the research process (Durkheim, 1964; Giddens, 1976; Harmon, 1981). The stance helps determine what the researcher takes as the world of reality and the world of ideas, what the researcher looks for in the real world, and what the researcher takes as problematic. It is quite clear that development of these pre-theoretical concepts is subject to social production and, therefore, the research process is necessarily a collective process. It is only as a collective process that the argument of Kuhn (1970) regarding paradigm building and science revolution makes sense.

It is not the intent of this paper to further the debate about the most appropriate epistemological stance for public administration. Each approach necessarily develops categories of meaning by linking a world of ideas and a world of facts. Each approach then links these categories of meaning together in ways that allow researchers to describe, explain, predict and assert. Whether a single epistemological stance is taken as Mazaika and Witt do in this Symposium or several stances are taken in concert as Welsch and Heying do, the research process offers a way to develop correspondence between ideas and experience, between theory and reality. Here research process is seen as a problem of correspondence between a world of ideas and a world of reality. The task in this paper is to measure the contributions of the research reflected in the symposia papers to the understanding being generated within the research community.

Reflective Practice

Public administration is built on reflective practice (Schön, 1983) where professionals embrace practice informed by theory and maintained by a tension between the scholars and the practitioners. This tension, rather than to be decried, is desirable. Tension is essential in creating understanding. Whether seen as problem of research (Kuhn, 1959) or as a problem of professional education (Morgan, 1994), the tension between theory and practice can inform both. As this Symposium demonstrates, there is promise in exploiting the tension creatively.

The tension between theory and practice is clearly

evident in Johnson's paper and the tension between scholar and practitioner is explicit in the Vizzini and Morgan article. However, each paper in this Symposium is informed by such tension since scholars and practitioners rather equally split the Civic Capacity Research Group. Further, the research group actively exploits the tension in several ways. The Group designed forums linking practitioners with academics in a common discourse and the Group paired practitioners with academics for writing and research purposes. At the same time, the Group gives weight to reflections by practitioners in research and theory building. The task in this paper is to summarize the yield of reflective practice for theory building, research and practice.

Summary

The challenge of this paper is one of meta-analysis. It is an analysis that asks a series of questions. As a result of the understandings offered linking particular ideas to experience, what do we know? As a result of our reflection on our collective experiences, what claims can be made about the utility of civic capacity in administrative practice, theory building and the enterprise of improving practice? Finally, where does the research vessel head next? The paper will use each of the conceptual frameworks (reflective practice, research process and theory building) to review what we know, identify the yield, and summarize the state of research in the area of civic capacity based on the papers offered in the Symposium. The discussion and conclusion will develop this new understanding into contributions to research, theory and practice.

ANALYSIS

Approach to Analysis

Each paper in this Symposium stands on its own, a paper offered because of potential contributions to theory, research and practice. Taken together the papers offer an opportunity to develop not only summary conclusions about the state of theory building in the area of civic capacity but also interesting insight into the research process of a particular research community, the Civic Capacity Research Group at Portland State University. The purpose of the research group is to improve administrative practice and democratic governance. Therefore, each paper is reviewed for contribution. The review of other papers in the set to each paper relates findings of other papers in the set to the primary work of the paper under review. Following the paper by paper review a summary and conclusion

identify overarching contributions by the research group to civic capacity theory building, the research process and administrative practice.

A Practitioner's Perspective

Johnson's practitioner perspective provides him with his central purpose: how useful is the concept of social capital in his work? While clearly an exercise in reflective practice and learning heavily on the notion of theory-as-tool, Johnson undertakes as his task bringing his experience to bear on the work of "academic researchers," those building theory as object. While the paper can be analyzed from all three analytic frameworks for integrating knowledge, the paper is best viewed from the reflective practice model. Reflective practice can be both the appropriation of theoretical components for practice and generalizations based on experience to inform theory and hence improve practice. Johnson's paper shows evidence of both but primarily reports on generalizations from his experience.

At issue for Johnson is how government programs effect the capacity for communal action and identity. Johnson plucks Putnam's (1993, 1995) theoretical approach out of the basket of ideas about civic capacity in part because of its utility. Johnson (this issue, p. 13) notes that Putnam's work links social capital "to discussions about civic engagement and civil society". For Putnam, social capital is seen as the trust, networks, and norms that enable individuals to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives. Johnson is able to integrate for practice the heritage of ideas from Bourdieu (1986), "durable network of institutionalized relationships," and from Coleman (1988), "a by-product of other intended actions." The integration of these ideas for Johnson is not for theory building per se, but rather the abstract integration is used to understand his experience. This is evident in his reflection on the nature of the social capital research movement. Is it simply a term of currency that appeals to funders and therefore is used as a new label for old ideas or do the ideas of social capital make a difference that counts in practice?

Johnson consolidates theory claims about social capital with two explanations that he is willing to "buy" because they seem widely held by academics and by practitioners. There is a general consensus, Johnson notes (this issue, p. 13), that "social capital is rich in small communities characterized by face to face communication, stability and weak class division." This leads to a thick trust, a social trust, and a civic engagement that are strongly correlated (Putnam, 1995). Like others who practice public involvement and community stewardship, Johnson finds a *prima-facie* similarity in the academic expression of social capital and his experience. This allows Johnson to posit a working model useful to organize his experience. He then tests the model against practice.

Johnson's Prospective Model. The consensus is that communities small in social scale are more likely to be rich in social capital but such communities are the exception in modern, urban society. Can thin trust or abstract trust substitute for thick trust? From this general theorem, Johnson derives several propositions. First, *social capital in the modern world is best understood through the relationship of individuals to institutions*. After reviewing the historical changes in a number of institutions like religion and education, Johnson concludes that significant changes have occurred and that the changes likely affect social capital. For example, globalization of the modern political economy reduces the likelihood of "multiplex relations," where one individual interacts with another frequently for many different reasons, and globalization increases the likelihood of "simplex relationships," where interactions are single purpose. These changes reduce community level engagement and hence are likely to reduce social capital.

A second proposition offered by Johnson is that *social capital in a modern world can best be understood through the state and condition of associations*. Primarily through a theoretical review with experiential examples (Putnam, 1995; Berman, 1997; Wood, 1997) Johnson concludes that interest based or purposive associations, i.e. Sierra Club or National Rifle Association, do not substitute for civic associations as a basis for social capital formation. For associations to contribute to social capital formation, they must cut across social divisions within the community, provide "multiplex" relationships, and institutionalize crosscutting engagement.

A final proposition suggests that *social capital can best be understood though analysis of structure of governance*. Johnson reviews several theorists and examines electoral politics to explore this proposition. He discovers two views. First, Edwards and Foly (1997) point out that civil society lies outside the formal structures of the state and therefore can countervail the state. Second, Putnam (1993) suggests that social capital

reinforces the structures of economy and state. Johnson is less conclusive about this idea since testing this proposition against electoral politics yields little. What Johnson does conclude is that perhaps governance is more than electoral politics.

Social Capital as a Tool for Practitioners. To be useful to practitioners, Johnson says that the practitioner must be able to measure the status of a community in terms of social capital. Then, the practitioner can measure effects of current community building activities on social capital. Johnson suggests that we can identify a collection of characteristics that can be scaled presumably in association with social capital, i.e. level of volunteerism, number of associations, "engagement activities", etc. Johnson leaves open the research question of how well we understand the link between such characteristics and social capital. However, Johnson clearly concludes that social capital is a by-product of social interaction and, therefore, administrators should monitor programs for effects on social capital.

Normative Bases of Social Capital

Kass starts by affirming what recent social theorists have suggested, that people today face a dilemma in that the pursuit of individual autonomy conflicts with the quest for social rootedness. He seeks to locate social capital as a theoretical idea in his on going work on "socially secured autonomy" (c.f., Kass, 1996). "So-cially secured autonomy" is problematic in a modern society, particularly a liberal democracy. Social capital, Kass suggests, is helpful in dealing with this dilemma, if and only if, the value of social capital is understood as subjective, and differentially held by individuals in a community on the basis of their own normative judg-ments. Kass explicates this problematic in a theory building exercise. He is primarily interested in theory-as-object, where the appropriate measure of a theory has to do with internal integrity, cogency, parsimony, and elegance.

Normative Judgment and Social Capital. Social arrangements, Kass argues, are not neutral, but value-laden as a result of the inherent normative character of institutions (Selznick, 1992) and corresponding norma-tive judgments made by individuals. Therefore, social arrangements, from which social capital derives, are differentially available to individuals to use in pursuing public policy outcomes' depending on the correspondence of an individuals'

values to those of the social arrangements. This rein-forces a widely shared view that social structures are socially constructed and therefore held but may conflict with sociologic notions of "factness" (Durk-heim, 1895/1964; Berger & Luckman, 1967). However, Kass' view raises serious questions about social capital. Is social capital a property of society, a social fact directly discernible at the social level, or is it a social-psychological property that can not be discerned at the social level beyond aggregating subjectively held measures of value by members of a social unit? If the later, then some of the current research should be realigned to understand the way in which individuals value social structure as social capital.

Pursuing this direction leads Kass to raise an interesting distinction of social arrangements as either capital, presumably positively seen by individuals, or social liability, presumably negatively viewed (Kass, this issue, p. 3). Appropriating this idea as theory-in-use, one can frame the existence and use of social capital more complexly at the community level. More-over, the means and ends of social capital become complicated by the view that social capital is best understood in its use by individuals. This line of thought can be extended into a four-fold table for understanding community level effects of individuals' value of social arrangements and their positions on a public policy outcome. An individual's normative judgments makes social arrangements either a liability or asset to the individual, one side of a four-fold table. The position individuals take on a particular public policy event, for or against, create the other side of the table. Locating community members in such a four-fold table would create a static view of the effect of social capital at the community level. Such a model may be helpful in thinking about measuring social capital or in understand-ing policy outcomes. For civic capacity, this raises an interesting question about the nature of the relationship between the individual and the community in which the deep structures and social arrangements occur.

Similarly, the argument that Kass makes for a normative basis for social capital can be appropriated to explore the individual and collective nature of social capital (see Coleman, 1990 as referenced by Kass, this issue p. 3). In economic terms, this can be seen a matter of private vs. public good. To the degree it is a private good, social capital can be evaluated as the aggregated, subjective utilities of the individuals appropriating the social capital in a particular policy context, as suggested

above. Though clearly framed as a "twin-natured" property by Kass, the normative argument as characterized by Kass is less clear on the value of social capital as a public good. A way to add to the argument might be to use the economic logic of pricing externalities, for example "shadow" price. The public good value of social capital could be calculated as a residual of the potential public policy outcomes in settings of high and low social capital potential. Social capital potential needs better definition. Perhaps social capital potential is a way to use the measures implied by Putnam (1993, 1995). The point of this extension of the normative hypothesis is not to discount or reinforce the notion, but extend its implication. Part of theory building in a theory-as-tool mode is its ability to spark further research. Kass' normative hypothesis is interesting in this regard.

Associational and Communal Themes. Kass turns to the association and communal themes that he sees in current theory and builds these into an account to explain social capital in modern society. Theory-as-object and theory-as-tool are both evident as Kass seeks a cogent explanation by building together theoretical threads. The result is robust statement of association and communal themes built from existing theory. For researchers and other theorists, this is interesting work. If the association theme reduces to classic liberalism, interest group liberalism and the procedural republic, then this theme is intellectually parallel to similar development in Heying and Vizzini and Morgan. If the communal theme reduces to the small republic, Bellah et al.'s (1985) second language, and communitarianism, then this theme is parallel to Heying and Vizzini and Morgan. However, it seems that Kass is asking for more from his theory development. These themes, Kass suggests, are both available as deep structures that relate the individual and the collective experiences in community. This is an interesting notion. The nature of the relationship between deep structures, the community and the individual is not clear. The relationship can be read as either mediating or moderating in Kass. In either case, the individual is necessarily embedded in the community or the individual would be unable to capture either the rights of the autonomous individual or the good of the whole. In this context Kass is correct in linking normative judgment to the individuals' experience of the deep structures of society. Clearly the associational theme facilitates the life project of the autonomous individual, just as the communal theme bridles the individual in favor of a collective good. As

Heying argues, the communal theme is coercive on the individual and if pervasive can extinguish autonomy. However, if an individual's norms align with the values in the dominant culture of the community, the bridle will be experienced as held with a light hand, a greater comfort by the individual with the accommodation. Here Kass differs; the deep structures giving rise to the elements of the associational theme and the communal theme maintain a healthy tension on the individual, because of the embeddedness. That tension, suggests Kass, is capable of producing effective, tactical solutions to the question of "socially secured autonomy."

Building a Communitarian Perspective

Heying, like Kass, begins his theory building with a review of the postmodern problem of balancing individual autonomy with communal solidarity. Social capital is a useful idea, though ubiquitously used by explanation-hungry researchers and by theorists as theory-as-tool. A similar, less widely used idea, communitarianism, is both a social movement and a political philosophy. These two threads are very present in the real world and have theoretical potential. Heying engages in theory building to develop into theory-as-object the communitarian discourse and social capital research currently available. His goal is to place communitarianism into a world of ideas occupied by classic liberal theory and totalitarian theory.

Communitarian Theory as a Third Way. Liberal and totalitarian traditions emerge in the modern era as political solutions to the individual autonomy we each desire and the solidarity we all require. Building a model of modernity drawing largely from Giddens (1990), Heying identifies the political solutions of liberalism with the desire for autonomy and totalitarianism with the need for community solidarity. All three, the expression of the modern dilemma, the reprise of liberalism and the re-framing of totalitarianism, are well-crafted building blocks, succinct and cogent. Turning to communitarianism, Heying says that communitarians seek to preserve the tenets of liberalism while embracing a communal solidarity. Reflective of the associational and communal themes of Kass, Heying develops the twin thrusts of the modern dilemma, autonomy and solidarity, into a third way. Communitarianism has the potential to resolve the dilemma by re-embedding the autonomous individual in civil society. The next part of Heying's paper uses the building blocks of modernity, liberalism, and totalitarianism to explore communitarianism. The concerns Heying identifies as a

result of his exploration are significant: mass culture and particular culture; the forces of markets and politics; the nature of a "civil religion;" and the difficulty of dissent in a strong culture. While this section of his paper is concise and the issues are worth pursuing, what may be more valuable for this symposium is to extend the theory Heying has offered in relationship to social capital.

Communitarianism and Social Capital. The communitarian movement as a field of practice has many examples of and recommendations for the good life (Etzioni, 1993; 1998) and Heying has provided a more robust theoretical model. However, there remains a theory building task similar to that of Kass's project of "socially secured autonomy" (c.f. Kass, 1996 and this volume). As framed by Heying, communitarianism requires a way to mediate between the broad influences of mass society and the particular community within which responsible individuals reside. The concept of social capital may be of value in the way Kass has developed it. Recall that for Kass, deep structures in society mediate or moderate the relationship between the individual and society. These structures are differentially available to community members based on their particular community and the repository of its "civil religion" based on the mix of individuals and their particular community and their individual normative judgments. The deep structures then might become the fabric for the expression of a particular community and the "civil religion" of the community and an individual's normative position. The more normative agreement among individuals within a community, the more available social capital would be to further community purposes. This is consistent with positive aspects of social capital theory and community building (c.f. Welsch & Heying) and negative aspects such as those identified by Witt. However incomplete the project, the idea of community based "civic religion" based in deep structures and available as social capital is intriguing.

Communitarianism and Civic Capacity. As Long recounts in a classic essay (1958), we are concurrent members of multiple political communities: local, state and federal. As Vizzini and Morgan, Witt, Mazaika, and Welsch and Heying all discover, the question of individual differences within a community and membership in multiple communities are at the center of a second set of questions arising from the review of communitarianism. What processes are available to

manage disagreement in substantive political outcomes that leave both the individuals and the social fabric of a community intact? If the discussion immediately above is directed toward the kinds of social structure necessary for "socially secured autonomy," then the question here goes to the processes necessary. Here the link of social capital (after Putnam, 1993; 1995) to civic capacity becomes important. Civic capacity is not only a matter of trust, norms and networks but also of citizenship skills and knowledge required for different kinds of political processes. Linking social capital with citizen competence is characteristic of the work by communitarians (c.f. Kemmis, 1990; 1995) and it is characteristic of the case studies reported here. Recognizing that many of the political effects on a community are rooted outside the community, the question becomes one of the capacities of the community to influence exogenous events. This causes Witt and Mazaika to each offer cautionary notes about romanticizing a small republic approach. Welsch and Heying and Vizzini and Morgan suggest alternative models of co-production and multiple concurrent types of political activity. Taken together these are first steps in examining the communitarian ideals of consensus decision-making, universal values over particular values, and community stewardship models of co-production.

Transforming Customers into Citizens

Vizzini and Morgan draw from extensive practice and years of academic experience a salient test of ideas about civic capacity. This is reflective practice. At the center of the paper is the same set of issues driving other papers in the symposium, but informed by a notion that two competing traditions exist in what counts for good citizenship. The conclusion is that the dichotomy between a civic republic and a procedural republic tradition is a false one.

By exploring two instances of practice, The Oregon Commission on Child Care and The Mid-County Sewer Project, Vizzini and Morgan test the proposition that a civic republic tradition of citizenship is superior to the procedural republic tradition. The basis for this claim is the general support of high involvement strategies being promoted today (c.f. Barber, 1984) to deal with "distrust in government." As Vizzini and Morgan explicate, citizenship in American political philosophy is problematic because the Lockean liberal democratic principles do not provide a recipe for political obligation. Obligation or responsibility comes from characteristics of society outside the formal political structure. What are

of particular interest to Vizzini and Morgan are administrative practice and the effect of administrative practice on the individuals and institutions involved. Where as Kass looks at society more generally, and as Heying looks at political philosophy, Vizzini and Morgan bring the struggle in the twin traditions that support American liberal democracy to administrative practice.

The case studies provide information that causes the authors to reject the notion that either the civic republic tradition or the procedural republic tradition is sufficient alone for the task of reconstructing democratic governance. In fact, they find evidence in the two instances they review of the need for both types of traditions and so suggest an approach that embraces both traditions: hybrid citizenship. Hybrid citizenship as offered by Vizzini and Morgan is more than a dualism where administrators balance the themes of the civic republic tradition with those of the procedural republic, but a third way highly dependent on an understanding of institutions. While not completely developed, the idea of hybrid citizenship demonstrates the fecundancy of reflective practice and its potential contribution to theory building and practice. Hybrid citizenship represents a different basket of administrative activities and a different engagement with citizens and a different measure of success.

Neighborhood (Re) Action and Social Capital

Witt uses a deep case study of a north Portland neighborhood to test key ideas about social capital and community governance. His model of social capital draws from Putnam (1993) emphasizing trust, social networks and norms of reciprocity. According to Witt, the case study reveals evidence that city wide subsidies and rules created circumstances which did not yield the promised increase in social capital, or at least not in the simple, straight forward way anticipated (Berry et al., 1993) and prospectively offered by Witt. Rather, when the local, place based neighborhood members organized in response to the neighborhood organization formally initiated by the city and in response to local collective action needs, the "local group confront(ed) a challenge (hostility, conflict, coercive control) by the neighborhood association sanctioned by the city.

The summary contributions from Witt include reinforcement of the notion of a "civic republic" and "procedural republic" offered by Vizzini and Morgan. Witt offers the two periods of North Portland neighborhood activism as "place making" and "rule making."

These concepts are reflective of Vizzini and Morgan both in how these are described and how the terms are used. On the other hand, Witt's work can inform Vizzini and Morgan in two important ways. First, Witt reminds us that institutionalization predates practitioner intervention and so preconditions the intervention whether substantive, i.e. sewer over flow or process, i.e. neighborhood associations. More directly, Witt provides compelling evidence that the Neighborhood Association characterized by Vizzini and Morgan as falling into the civic republic tradition in at least the instance of North Portland must be seen as falling into the procedural republic tradition. This should require a rethinking by Vizzini and Morgan of the conditional nature of their typology. What institutionalized precursors modify the expected placement of neighborhood associations into civic republic category? Witt's work though, reinforces the conclusion offered by Vizzini and Morgan that civic and procedural republic traditions are both at work at the community level and that neither at this point in the research process is evidently superior in either enhancing social capital or making democratic governance work. Conversely, Vizzini and Morgan would undoubtedly find corroborating evidence in Witt's case for the value of procedural republic for mediating disputes among community levels.

The Case of the Grande Ronde Model Watershed

While communities of place (Kemmis, 1990) are part of the American tradition, so to are associations of interests. Mazaika provides evidence in the case of the Grande Ronde watershed of a community of place where values, tradition and belief as wells as rules of engagement define an intact local political culture. This is the embedded society of Giddens, the community of place of Kemmis, the *Gemeinschaft* of Tonnies. However, Mazaika also provides evidence of purposeful association in the Grande Ronde. Her explanation for associations of interests builds primarily from public choice theory, but is reflective of interest group liberalism (Lowi, 1969). What is different in Mazaika's treatment of self-interested joint action is that the setting remains geographically isolated. Because of the geographic relationship where multiplex relationships necessarily occur, Mazaika is able to see a modified pattern of collective behavior. Based on the Grande Ronde case, Mazaika supposes associations of interests can work together in the Grande Ronde where the community becomes a place to do their work, carryout joint action and therefor attract external resources to the community. Against this back drop, Mazaika speculates

on the effect of governance strategies based on a desire to build social capital, especially public involvement, face-to-face communication and participatory decision making. Do such strategies have as a goal the state and condition of the community, that is, building social capital, or do the strategies draw down the stock of capital in the pursuit of associated interests? What is remarkable about the case study is the long history of the "community" being buffeted by external forces, changes in federal timber harvest or regional water supply, for example, and the use of community re- sources to influence the community level effects.

Mazaika leaves the paper having raised as many questions as she has answered. On balance, how impor- tant is the net importation of assets to the community? Should the accounting of comparative community well- being have different measures for "associated interests" aspects of the community and for the community of place aspects? Might the subjective utility orientation drawn from the work of Kass offer a measurement strategy for associated interests? Might a household economics or ecological economic approach offer a measurement strategy for the community of place aspects? What are the limits of "community" via the rate, frequency and scope of intrusions from outside? Because of her deep knowledge of the watershed in the Grande Ronde, Mazaika raises a speculative question as to whether the goal of the State-wide watershed program was to simply harness the social capital embedded in local communities or whether the state intended to sustain or build the capital stock on hand.

Coproducing Research and Social Capital

The Community Watershed Stewardship Program has all of the earmarks of a policy intervention informed by the kind of work about social capital reported in this symposium. Unlike the North Portland Neighborhood Association reported by Witt, the Community Steward- ship project report by Welsch and Heying uses a co- production strategy. In co-production strategies the community targeted for intervention co-develops the intervention using three types of citizenship strategies: civic republic, procedural republic and hybrid citizen- ship (Vizzini & Morgan, this issue). Welsch and Heying use the opportunity of their participation in this research project to test the effect of the intervention on both social and ecological outcomes. In this case the primary public policy outcomes are watershed restoration goals. However, in the spirit of comprehensive community partnerships (Brock, 1999) community capacity goals

are of equal importance. This is a research project where the purpose of the project is to test abstract ideas in the empirical world.

Welsch and Heying blend two research approaches to meet the design requirements of the ideas under test and the context of the test. The authors carry out a quasi-experiment (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) by intervening in one neighborhood and not in a second neighborhood that is roughly similar. They have pre- tested each neighborhood with a standardized question- naire and intend to carry out a community building intervention in one neighborhood and not the other; and then retest at some future point. The authors also decided that because of the nature of the research topic, they needed to use action research strategies as well. If community capacity is an important part of the model and part of community capacity is social capital, then the social production of trust, norms, and networks will be influenced by the very activities of testing, re-testing and carrying out the intervention or not. This project has yielded the preliminary results reported. Of particular interest are those results reported that correlate partici- pation in community life with significant effects on interpersonal trust, social trust and trust in government. This is consistent with expectation.

Welsch and Heying do not report out the action research outcomes beyond administrative aspects of the project. Through the survey activity and intervention in community, there is an opportunity to capture the rich data of face-to-face involvement with and observation of the communities under study. For example, are there differences in subject attention to survey content from the neighborhood where members co-produced the survey and the neighborhood where members did not? Further, within the co-production neighborhood, are differences notable between those individuals that participated and those that did not? Such reporting would be interesting now in comparison to similar observations in the post test period.

The Community Stewardship project is interesting as a research project designed for its current purpose and also for potential further research. The target community is in a period of initiating policies, programs and projects. In the profession, there are well-devel- oped techniques for developing agreement in a mixed stakeholder group (c.f. Miller, Shinn & Bentley, 1994). Sustaining agreement is another matter. The current research can track the community's ability to sustain

agreement and note differences between the two neighborhoods. In the future, policy change maybe necessary and then the current project could serve as a baseline for more complex theoretical propositions. For example, if a federal Endangered Species Act listing requires radical change in the community in opposition to community preference, will there be a difference in the capacity of the two neighborhoods to respond? This would be a good test of the civic capacity ideas offered in this volume.

DISCUSSION

The Symposium papers contribute to our understanding in theory, research and practice. However, the papers contribute in different ways. While the domain of civic capacity is large, these papers share several commonalties in the framing of the study domain. First, in using civic capacity the authors focus on the use of social capital in democratic governance. Second, although several papers take on other perspectives, the administrative perspective dominates the way issues are framed for study. Third, the authors carryout their investigations within the political economy of the Untied States. By taking this approach, they give little consideration to the significance of other institutional arrangements or their effects. Comparative studies could help understand the significance of such effects. Ambiguity exists in the set of papers around fundamental questions of social scale of investigation, epistemology and causality. Civic capacity as an area of theory building, research and practice is both a young and old domain of investigation. As the authors universally show, it is easy to reach back and draw forward social scientists and political philosophers and practitioners who have wrestled with similar questions at earlier times. Also, the domain is broad. The authors draw from several disciplines of theory and professional practice. Finally, the research strategies evident in the symposium or implied by work in the symposium cut across approaches to research. The task here is to sort out a few contributions to theory, research and practice that will move the study of civic capacity forward.

Theory

In theory building, the Symposium underscores the idea of a "third way," rejects notions of a simple relationship between social capital and its effects, and adds complexity to the problem of valuing social capital.

A Third Way. Kass leads in the direction of a third way

in developing the associational and communal themes and resolving the dualism by arguing for a creative tension between autonomy and solidarity. For Kass, the third way represents a linkage of the *right* and the *good* in society. Heying and Vizzini and Morgan actively develop "third ways." Heying builds on the communitarian perspective (c.f. Etzioni, 1998) and presents communitarianism as a third way. While building from liberalism and totalitarianism, the characteristics of communitarianism are of sufficient distinction to allow typing as third way. Vizzini and Morgan reify "hybrid citizenship" and do so through the administrative implications apparent in hybrid citizenship. Like Heying, the third way is distinct. Left for another day is the integration of "hybrid citizenship' and other third ways.

Interrelationships Among Civic Capacity Variables

From the introductory paper by Johnson, through the last by Welsch and Heying, the symposium rejects the notion of a simple relationship between social capital and its effects in democratic governance. In applying Putnam's (1993; 1995) model of social capital as an additive model of trust, norms and networks, Witt discovers that the relationship between trust and networks is more complex and may not be parallel. Mazaika finds the community of Grand Ronde to be infinitely more complex than expected in the nature of social capital available and in its use. Similarly, Kass develops a conditional model of social capital where social capital must be understood as a multi-layered model of social arrangements, individual access and appropriation of such structures for particular effects. Welsch and Heying and Vizzini and Morgan offer similar complexity to social capital and civic capacity. This is both liberating and disheartening to theorists. Conditional, moderating and intervening models all are worth exploring.

Special care should be given nonlinear, especially U-shape pattern of effects, where the promise of social capital is not visible at either end of a progression (high or low) but only in some middle zone (medium). One church or hundreds of churches in a community may not provide crosscutting interactions but some moderate number, fifteen, might and thereby contribute to social capital. For an example from the case studies report here, trust and networks may not be parallel in effects (Witt). When networks are sparsely populated and interactions strictly utilitarian and infrequent trust may be low. Trust and networks may not be parallel in effects when the network is multi-noded, with few,

single stranded interconnections. However, other arrangements of networks may engender trust building. Other social structures may also have such nonlinear or U-shape effects on social capital or the influence of social capital on civic capacity. The mid-point between Kass' social capital and social liability may be indifference. Clearly the evidence and theory building in this Symposium provides license to researchers and theorists to explore more complex interrelationships among the variables of the civic capacity model.

Valuing Social Capital. Endemic to many of the papers in this symposium is the problem of valuing social capital. This has several parts. First, there is the difficulty in theory as well as research and practice of measuring social capital and its effects. Secondly, there is the problem of how to value social capital. The symposium papers lead in different directions here. Setting aside the problem of measurement per se, valuation is tied to the expectation of social capital to contribute to civic capacity, defined by this group as the ability of a community to influence political events facing the community. As a theory problem, valuation depends somewhat on the framing of social capital. If it is seen as a private good, differentially available to individuals and primarily evident through individuals, (see Kass and his explication of Coleman) then assessing value is appropriately the aggregation of subjective utilities. However, most problematic is the nature of social capital or civic capacity as a common good. Here the individual may or may not make personal use of or even ascribe value to a "communal theme" (Kass), but still benefit from the occurrence of high social capital. A neighborhood that is high in social capital (norms, networks, and trust) can handle a "free rider" problem. The problem of valuation becomes more complex when normative judgments about the policy outcomes are linked to the nature of social capital as suggested by Witt's discovery in neighborhood associations, Mazaika's insight in dependent rural communities and Kass's theorizing. Here the direction as well as strength of value must be considered. Kass deals with this by offering social liability as the opposite of social capital. This is perhaps a false scale. At the community level, social capital as a resource or means can be high or low at the same time it is valued positively, contributing to desired social ends or negatively, a force against preferred ends. Kass raises questions about the normative content of institutions and the deep ideational structures that support them and the effect of such content on the instrumental values of social arrangements. A discussion

of valuing social capital returns quickly to political philosophy. The institutions of the American political economy are embedded with conflict as a hedge against tyranny. Can social capital and its contribution to civic capacity be separated from outcomes be they political, social or economic? The symposium papers make clear that this is neither an easy conceptual matter nor tidy practical matter. The normative consequences to individuals, groups, communities and society are real. They deserve our considerable attention.

Research

The symposium represents the first fruits of a collective research effort. While the Civic Capacity Research Group is loosely coupled, its engagement is pervasive. If the credits on each paper reflected the contact among authors, the relationships outlined would be multiplex. The research reported ranges in its development. Some projects are exploratory; others first stage reports and others more summative. The range of different research strategies apparent or implied in the papers of the Symposium is purposeful. In an arena like civic capacity, a range of methods are appropriate. The variety of research strategies, theoretical approaches and cases in the Symposium are useful for reviewing ideas about research. Like the theory section above, other research insights are available in papers. Here the task is to identify several that will move the civic capacity research effort along. The comments will be divided into three areas: methods, bridge strategies and unit of analysis.

Methods. Under the heading of methods, I explore the value of narratives in understanding subjective claims about civic capacity, proposition testing of social facts, and the difficulty of settling on research strategies that explicate social facts. Johnson's review of his practice is one kind of narrative, a reflection of what he as a practitioner sees in his work and how that relates to a set of ideas he is building about social capital. The use of narrative can be extended to explore claims like those of Witt, Welsch and Heying and Mazaika. Like Witt, the claims Kass makes about the normative judgment of individuals and the effect of that judgment on social capital and its use requires a research approach that listens to individuals. Narrative accounts can be extremely useful in understanding such judgments. As Kass suggests, and Witt's research supports, the same social arrangement may be valued negatively by one person and positively by another. The use of narrative may be one of the few research strategies that can

uncover the subtle differences these theoretical ideas imply.

Testing propositions in a socially constructed world is always a challenge. The current set of papers shows two successful attempts to do this. Witt, even early in his research, shows how promising research testing of ideas can be. Witt raises serious questions about key assumptions in civic capacity research. Welsch and Heying also lay out a research model that has the potential to test critical theoretical ideas. A quasi-experiment (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) has been created by controlling the community building intervention in one neighborhood and not in a second. This research design will allow testing of a basic civic capacity concept that administrators through programs like the Community Watershed Stewardship Program, can build social capital.

Most problematic in a carrying out research in a socially constructed world is elucidating the very social facts others want to work with as variables in more complex theories. Both reflective practice and grounded theory have merit in the civic capacity research. Vizzini and Morgan and Johnson use this approach to identify elements that can become social facts[6] like "hybrid citizenship." Also, the work of Mazaika is instructive. She built a case using basic tenets of grounded theory, (Glasser & Strauss, 1967). She combined observation, direct involvement, and secondary data to build theory inductively. Grounded theory is also a way that categories of meaning can become reified and fact-like. In an area of research like social capital and civic capacity, explicating the social facts is a necessary first step to theory testing.

Bridge Strategies. The research in civic capacity becomes complicated because of the subjective nature of many of the elements of the model researchers are using. Research strategies useful in a world of mixed facts include bridge strategies like methodological triangulation, enfolding other literature and experience, and reflective practice. Methodological triangulation (Jick, 1979) is the use of two or more research methods to meet the goal of the research project. In this set of papers, Welsh and Heying use methodological triangulation in mixing both quantitative and qualitative approaches to testing basic notions of community building and its effects on social capital and substantive policy outcomes. Another bridging strategy is enfolding (Eisenhardt, 1989) where other research, other cases,

other literature is used as additional evidence in testing a proposition. For example, after Vizzini and Morgan introduce their cases and build evidence for their idea, they enfold the research in the general area. Johnson enfolds years of practice into his project. This strategy allows enfolding of other theory or research results as evidence. Finally, another bridge strategy is to capture reflective practice. Clearly Vizzini and Morgan and Johnson capture reflective practice for research use.

Community as a Unit of Analysis. In civic capacity research the unit of analysis needs serious consideration. In organization studies there are clear frames for research: ecological, organizational, group and individual. While some research questions do not fall within these units of analysis, such frames have become accepted through research as appropriate for different theory. Civic capacity has not developed accepted units of analysis. Witt and Mazaika clearly demonstrate the importance of unit of analysis. For Witt, the unit of analysis selected helps define appropriate theory and potential consequences. The class differences and political consequences might disappear in a different unit of analysis. In the Grand Ronde case offered by Mazaika the unit of analysis is also problematic. Mazaika maintains a common community base for her study but finds that the Grande Ronde may not have been "a community" in itself and that the institutions and social relationships of most interest range well beyond the geo-physical community of Grande Ronde.

Civic capacity research can be improved by maintaining the community as a unit of analysis but rethinking how to define community as a social phenomena rather than physical territory. Much case study research in civic capacity is framed around an issue or event rather than the community. Without baseline information about the community, the close inspection that civic capacity research seems to require (use of narrative, etc.) is likely to disassemble the very subject of study, the community. Wondolleck (1996) suggested "relation-sheds" as a way to define the social unit of analysis for studying the human dimension of watershed management. Perhaps revisiting a definition of community for the purpose of civic capacity research has merit. At a minimum community must be defined across issues and through time. The importance of clarity in unit of analysis goes up when the research goes in the direction implied by Kass. The importance of the individual to the research blurs the line in research areas like normative judgment and access to social capital and subjective

utility as a way to value social capital. Perhaps multiple units of analysis in a single study will be needed. The papers reported here show the need for care in selecting the unit of analysis and tiering what we explain at one level of analysis with what we expect to find at other levels. Such complexity is being embraced in policy implementation and intergovernmental relations and in applied areas like watershed governance. In civic capacity research a tight hand must be held on the idea of community.

It is important to develop an understanding of the nature of community common to researchers in civic capacity. It is always possible to deconstruct community. At the center of civic capacity research is the ability of a community to purposefully respond to events that challenge the community. This is a question that must be addressed at the social level and necessarily requires community as a construct. Community is socially constructed. From political boundaries to neighborly sentiments, the characteristics that give rise to community are social facts. This creates significant research issues, but anthropology and sociology offer methods for the study of such cultural and institutional features as community. The boundary of a community is also porous. Vidich and Bensman (1968) describe the difficult of researching community in a mass society:

> ...we undertook a survey of all major cultural and institutional areas in the community for the purpose of isolating those aspects of the life and organization of the community which were intrinsic to it and those which were the products of the surrounding society. Despite our attempt to find original and indigenous sources of the community's culture and values, we were unable to find any. Instead we found external sources and origins for everything that the community cherished as being most genuinely representative of its own spirit. (Vidich & Bensman, 1968, pg. 318)

The origin of the features of a community can not cause dismissal of the nature of community. As an analogy, in role theory and individual identity, formal roles in organizations of work, play and prayer give identity to an individual. Though exogenous to the locale, the features of the community studied by Vidich and Bensman were identity-giving in much the same way as a

work role outside of the community is still identity-giving to the individual. Community must be seen as having the potential to be institutionalized, giving an object-like quality to community. Rural sociology and urban studies may help civic capacity researchers in forming a common collective understanding of community and community as a unit of analysis.

Civic Capacity and Administrative Practice

The nature of the Civic Capacity Research Group mixes practitioners with academics. It is not surprising that contributions to administrative practice are important conclusions in most of the papers in the symposium. Several are worth noting because of the persuasiveness of the recommendation or their importance for how administrators do their work. These contributions to practice include: understanding social capital as a by-product of social interaction, taking note of substantive as well as procedural engagement in civic life, and developing civic space in the American political economy. All these refine the role of administrators in enhancing social capital and making democratic governance work.

Social Capital as a By-Product Social Interaction. Of the most intriguing contrasts in the symposium is the one apparent in comparing the co-production/stewardship model of learning-by-doing offered by Welsch and Heying with the findings of Witt regarding the subjugation of active citizens by an external initiated neighborhood association and Vizzini and Morgan regarding the usurpation of city-wide formal procedures by a locally active citizenry. One possible resolution to the apparent contrast is Johnson's reminder that social capital waxes and wanes in every social interaction. Further, social capital is but one element of civic capacity. As important as norms of reciprocity, networks and trust are to civic capacity, citizen competence in the civic process is also important. This observation is clearly demonstrated by Vizzini and Morgan's work and is currently being tested by the ongoing research of Welsch and Heying. This makes community success or failure in a particular policy outcome hard to assess in terms of civic capacity. The heighten involvement of locals in opposing an external Neighborhood Association may or may not contribute to civic capacity. Similarly, Mazaika's intriguing questions about the Grande Ronde as a community of interest rather than a community of place may at any one time suggest a withdrawal of capital from the community bank. However, given the long history of association in the Grand Ronde, the

success of locals in attracting external resources to the community, it may be that civic capacity is high while social capital is low. In summary, while the effect of any particular social interaction on social capital and further on civic capacity is not clear, that there is an effect seems to be a widely shared conclusion in these papers.

Substantive and Procedural Engagement. Kass and Heying make strong theoretical arguments for administrators taking note of substantive as well as procedural engagement in civic life. The communitarian argument developed by Heying requires attention to responsibilities as a rein on individual liberties. Whether the rein is or is not coercive is seldom the question. This is Heying's caution of totalitarianism. What is at issue is whether or not individuals experience the rein as coercive. As Etzioni and other communitarians point out, this is a matter of values and substantive claims embedded in the community. Kass builds his notion of social capital and social liability as based on normative judgment. His argument is built in part from Witt's research that supports the importance of substantive issues. While the role public administrators should fill in creating civic capacity is unresolved by this Symposium, the values and normative fabric of society deserve attention by administrators. This is an old claim for public administration, but a new emphasis.

Maintaining Civic Space. A significant issue in modern society is the formalization of much of life activities. From childcare to exercise and food preparation to work, much of social life has been formalized. Johnson and Witt imply the need for "civic space" in the modern American political economy. Heying cautions against naively assuming that the localism of past is reproducible in the present. However, the solidarity offered by such localism is the correction communitarianism offers. It may be that informality is an important component of localism that is separable from, but associated with localism. Also, informality in civic life need not be solely equated with volunteerism. It may be that allowing informal associations to erupt irregularly in response to problems amenable to community action contributes to both civic capacity and social solidarity. Citizens in a community may be able to learn a variety of citizenship strategies including less formal strategies, so that they are capable of appropriately accessing the range of formal public, private or not for profit organizations to accomplish collective action. It may be that an important part of administrative practice is to not solve all community problems through government action. This is an old American idea, but a rather novel administrative idea. In fact, a progressive philosophy is a birthright of American public administration. The emphasis on civic space may also suggest a different role where administrators re-inhabit the locales they serve in order to become familiar with the informal as well as formal community resources.

CONCLUSION

Have we in the modern world have been cut adrift from our "home place?" Perhaps not, suggest a number of the papers in this set (Johnson, Vizzini & Morgan, Welsch & Heying). The Symposium papers, taken together, suggest that our home place is a crossroads. Crossroads are endemic to an American society that reifies both the individual and community, both free market capitalism and the small republic, and both the global market place where value is produced and the small town where value is known. The question of the moment is not whether the tension exists, but rather how to manage, individually and collectively, the tension that arises from the dualism we reify. While others have taken on the task of helping individuals cope with modernism, the task taken by the Civic Capacity Research Group has been the task of improving how we collectively manage the dualism.

ENDNOTES

REFERENCES

Agnew, N.M. & Pyke, S.W. (1994). *The Science Game.* (2nd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Barber, B. (1984). *Strong Democracy: Participating Politics for a New Age.* Berkeley; CA: University of California Press.

Bellah, R., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W.M., Swindler, A. & Tipton, S.M. (1985). *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Berger, P.L. & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality.* New York, NY: Doubleday Anchor.

Berman, S. (1997). Civil society and political institutionalization. *American Behavioral Scientist,* Vol. 40 No. 5, March/April, 562-574.

Berry, J., Portney, K. & Thompson, K. (1993) *The Rebirth of Urban Democracy.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Brock, D.M. (1999). *Comprehensive collaborative community partnerships: Alternatives to reinventing government* (unpublished manuscript). Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University.

Bourdieu, P. (1986) The forms of social capital in Richardson, J.G.,(Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education.* New York, NY: Greenwood pp.241-58.

Brown, H.I. (1977). *Perception, Theory and Commitment.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, D.T. & Stanley, J.C. (1963). *Experimentation and Quasi-Experimentation Designs for Research.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (Supplement), S95-S120.

Coleman, J. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory.* Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University.

Durkheim, Emile. (1895/1964). *The Rules of Sociological Method.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Edwards, B.&d Foley, M.W. 1997. Social capital and the political economy of our discontent. *American Behavioral Scientist,* 40:5, pp. 669-678.

Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review.* 14:4, 532-550.

Etzioni, A. (1998) The responsive communitarian platform: Rights and responsibilities. In A. Etzioni, (Ed.), *The Essential Communitarian Reader.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

[2] Note that the term civic capacity is inclusive of social capital but goes beyond social capital. Shinn (1998) offered a model of civic capacity where civic capacity is an additive function of civic (social) capital, civic competence and civic enterprise. Shinn defines civic or social capital as the state and condition of built relationships and institutions, civic competence as the organizational and individual competencies available in the community and civic enterprise as community level experience in synergistic or collective action. The editorial note on the Civic Capacity Research Group in this volume also develops the relationship of social capital and civic capacity.

[3] Author references from this point forward without dates are for papers in this issue and are parts of the Symposium on Civic Capacity.

[4] The understanding of Civic Capacity offered here is taken largely from the Civic Capacity Research Proposal (1997), Hatfield School of Government, College of Urban and Public Affairs, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon. A copy is on file with the author. See also the editorial note on the Civic Capacity Research Group in this volume.

[5] "Social fact" is offered by Durkheim (1895/1964) and the concept is used by Berger and Luckmann (1967) among others to describe the reification of social phenomena such that they become object like and cause object like effects in social life.

[6] The section on theory building is taken largely from Paluchowski, Shinn and Stevens (1989). *The Spiral of Theory Development.*

Etzioni, Amitai. (1993). *The Spirit of Community: The Reinvention of American Society*. New York, NY: Touchstone Books.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Giddens, A. (1976). *New Rules of Sociological Method: Positive Critique of Interpretative Sociologies*. London: Hutchinson & Co. Publishers Ltd.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Harmon, M.M. (1981). *Action Theory for Public Administration*. New York, NY: Longman.

Heying, C. (this issue). Autonomy vs. solidarity: Liberal, totalitarian, and communitarian traditions. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*

Jick, T.D. (1979) Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: triangulation in action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 24: 602-611.

Johnson, S. (this issue). Applying social capital theory to needs assessment, social program development, and evaluation: A practitioner's perspective. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*.

Kaplan, T.S. (1964). *The Conduct of Inquiry*. San Francisco, CA: Chandler Publishing Co.

Kass, H.D. (1996). The Logics of trust: The foundational role of institutions in building social trust. *Administrative Theory & Praxis. 18:2*, pp. 57-73.

Kass, H.D. (this issue). The normative bases of social capital in the public sector. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*.

Kemmis, D. (1990). *Community and the Politics of Place*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Kemmis, D. (1995). *The Good City and the Good Life*. Boston, MA: Houghton, Mifflin.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). *Foundations of Behavioral Research* (3rd ed.) New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kuhn, T.S. (1970). The Essential Tension. *Third University of Utah Research Conference on the Identification of Creative Scientific Talent*, C.W. Taylor, (Eds.). Salt Lake City: Utah Press.

Kuhn, T.S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*.(2nd ed.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Long, Norton. (1958). The Local Community as an Ecology of Games. *American Journal of Sociology*. 44:251-261.

Lowi, T. (1969). *The End of Liberalism: Ideology, Policy, and the Crisis of Public Authority*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Mazaika, R. (this issue). The Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program: A case study. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*.

Miller, S., Shinn, C.W. & Bentley, W.R. (1994). *Rural Resource Management: Problem Solving for The Long Term*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Morgan, D. F. (1994) The role of liberal education in professional education. In Brody, C.M. & Wallace, J. (Eds.). *Ethical and Social Issues in Professional Education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Paluchowski, T, Shinn, C. & Stevens, C. (1989). *The Spiral of Theory Development: Reconciling Theory as Object and Theory as Tool*. Western Academy of Management Proceedings.

Popper, K.R. (1959). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Putnam, R.D. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: University of Princeton Press.

Putnam, R.D. (1995, December). Tuning in, Tuning Out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America. *Political Science and Politics*. pp. 664-683.

Schön, D.A. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professional Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books.

Selznick, Philip. (1992). *The Moral Commonwealth: Social Theory and the Promise of Community*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Shinn, C. (1998) Status report: The civic capacity model. *Annual Meeting of American Society for Public Administration*. May. Seattle, Washington.

Vidich, A.J. & Bensman, J. (1968). *Small Town in Mass Society: Class, Power and Religion in a Rural Community*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Vizzini, D. and Morgan, D. (this issue). Transforming customers into citizens: Some preliminary lessons form the field. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*.

Welsch, A. and Heying, C. (this issue). Watershed management and community building: A case study of Portland's Community Watershed Stewardship Program. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*.

Crag W. Shinn is Associate Professor of Public Administration at Portland State University where he teaches administrative theory and environmental and natural resource policy and administration. He is co-author of *Rural Resource Management* (1994) with Sandra Miller and William R. Bentley, a book developed from his fifteen years of experience in community based natural resource management. His current research focuses on community based natural resource management using a model of civic capacity, on institutional arrangements for environmental management particularly across jurisdictional boundaries and on watershed governance.

Witt, M. (this issue). Case study: The origins and evolution of conflict in North Portland Neighborhood Association politics. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*.

Wood, R.L. 1997. Social capital and political culture. *American Behavioral Scientist*. 40: 5.

Wondolleck, J.M. (1996). Personal communication. Partnering Workshop. Spring Meeting US Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Adaptive Management Area Managers.