

Social Capital, Community, and Place A Primer



www.chrysaliscollaborations.com

This report was produced with generous support from the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation

February 2017

© Jo Anne Schneider
Chrysalis Collaborations

Table of Contents

About the Author and Research Cases	1
About Chrysalis Collaborations	2
A Note on Group Labels:	2
Summary of Key Points and Concepts	3
Introduction	4
Defining Social Capital	5
Norms or Cultural Capital	6
Three Types of Social Capital	6
Civic Engagement and Social Capital.....	8
Using Social Capital to Foster Community, Combat Poverty, and Improve Health.....	10
Underlying Concepts.....	10
Creating Vibrant Communities and Improving Civic Engagement Through Enhancing Places.....	12
Indicators of Vibrant Communities.....	13
Improving Physical Spaces and Enhancing Civic Engagement/Social Capital	14
The Role of Organizations in Generating Social Capital and Civic Engagement	16
The Role of the Internet and Social Capital in Place Based Social Capital and Civic Engagement.....	16
Summary	17
Social Capital and Public Health.....	17
Poverty, Place and Social Capital	19
Summary	23
Network Analysis: An Approach to Measuring and Understanding Social Capital.....	24
Conclusion.....	25
Selected References.....	26
Appendix A: Two Schools of Thought, Two Different Problems.....	30
Networks.....	30
Trust	31
Norms or Culture	31

About the Author and Research Cases

Dr. Jo Anne Schneider is an applied social scientist with over 25 years experience working with non-profit organizations, foundations, government, and communities to develop innovative, evidence based research, policy, and model programs on a wide range of community development, workforce development, employment, human services and health topics. Her expertise combines 7 years as a non-profit administrator, over 20 years as a consultant to government, foundations, and private service providers, and 4 years working in the federal government and congress with her research experience. A former American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) Science and Technology Policy Fellow and American Anthropological Association Congressional Fellow, she is internationally known for translating research into practice.

Her work on social capital began in the 1980s with research on refugee resettlement, and has been a continued theme through all projects. She examines social capital at the multiple levels of individuals, organizations, communities, and policy systems, showing how trust based connections and culture play out in the success or failure of initiatives to foster opportunity and create community. This primer draws on cases from the following projects:

- **Changing Relations, Newcomers and Established Residents in Philadelphia:** (Judith Goode co-PI) One of six sites on a national Ford Foundation study looking at the dynamics between newcomers and established residents in U.S. communities. The Philadelphia project focused on schools, workplaces and community organizations in three neighborhoods. The project examined interactions among U.S. born whites, Polish émigrés, Latinos, African Americans and Koreans.
- **Kenosha Conversation Project and Kenosha Social Capital Study:** The Conversation Project was a community needs assessment, local systems change and policy change process regarding workforce development and welfare reform in Kenosha, WI — one of the models for the 1996 welfare reform legislation and health insurance reform. The Kenosha Social Capital Study came out of the conversation project, based on a request from county policy makers to better understand two communities most marginalized from local support systems. The social capital study explored social capital in the Latino and African American sub-communities of Kenosha, focusing on the dynamic among Latino and African American CBOs and churches; community residents; employers; and the city-wide community organization and faith community contexts in order to improve health, employment, workforce development, social welfare, and human services delivery systems.
- **Silver Spring Neighborhood Center Policy Impact Analysis, Needs Assessment, and Evaluation:** The Silver Spring Neighborhood Center is a settlement house using a one-stop-shop model for the entire age range through partnerships with 15 organizations and local government. The project began as a needs assessment and impact evaluation of the effects of changing welfare, workforce development, health insurance, and child welfare policy on a Milwaukee community based organization, its neighborhood, and its participants. Given evolving community needs and pending leadership changes in the organization, the project broadened to explore connections between the organization, its community, and its sponsors. In addition to comprehensive study of the organization, its participants and community, the project included social network analysis and GIS mapping of where participants in various programs lived. The social network analysis explained the various constituencies that used the Center and their role of sponsor organizations in drawing participants.
- **Gateway Cities Religion and New Immigrants Study:** (Dean Hoge and Michael Foley PIs) As part of the Washington DC project in the Pew Charitable Trust's *Gateway Cities* initiative — a multi-site national study of the integration of post-1964 immigrants into U.S. society, developed and conducted research on social service agencies either founded by or serving immigrants from selected populations. Analyzed data collected by the larger project on the interaction between immigrant churches and local organizations.
- **Faith and Organizations Project:** Responding to a request from faith community and faith-based organization (FBO) leaders, this Lilly Endowment, Louisville Institute, and Bradley Foundation sponsored project developed and implemented a series of research-to-practice projects designed to 1) understand the relationship between founding communities and FBOs, 2) understand the role of founding faith traditions in systems and practices, 3) clarify the role of FBOs in their sector and relationships with government and other funders, and 4) understand relationships with people served by FBOs. Compared organizations providing health, senior services, social services, community

development and education founded by Catholics, Mainline Protestants, Jews, Evangelicals, Peace churches, Muslims, and African American Christians. (See <http://www.faithandorganizations.umd.edu/>)

- **Social Capital and At-Risk Communities:** Conducted for the Annie E. Casey Foundation, this work involved a series of projects that built on Dr. Schneider's previous studies of social capital for communities, social service agencies, faith communities, families and individuals. The projects supported the foundation's initiatives on social capital and the *Making Connections* initiative, a multi-city research/practice project to build capacity in targeted neighborhoods.

Jo Anne Schneider is author of two books; numerous policy and practice reports, briefs, summaries, white papers, and factsheets; editor of three journal special issues; and has developed numerous workshops, webinars and trainings on various topics for practitioners, policy makers, and researchers. In addition to serving as Principal at Chrysalis Collaborations, she is currently an Associate Research Professor in Anthropology at George Washington University.

About Chrysalis Collaborations

Chrysalis Collaborations, LLC works with organizations, community members, and government to understand how community development, human services programs, workforce development and employment work on the ground. We develop innovative, evidence based programs and policy that improve employment success and life chances for community members. Chrysalis Collaborations offers a full range of research, evaluation, planning, training and technical assistance, writing, program and policy development, organization and system integration services tailored for each organization and community. The consulting firm is a woman and person with disability owned Minority Business Enterprise (MBE/DBE) registered in the state of Maryland and certified as an MBE in Maryland and Pennsylvania.

A Note on Group Labels: Labels for various ethnic and racial groups are the subject of much debate and have changed over time. In this primer, I generally use the labels that people in projects used for themselves. African-American is used for people born in the U.S. of African descent and Black to include both African Americans and immigrants from African and Caribbean countries that would call themselves Black. Older terms for people from racial groups used in titles in early publications that were the standard at the time are left alone. Latino is used for people who may call themselves Latino or Hispanic. People with disabilities is used throughout.

Social Capital, Community and Place: A Primer

Jo Anne Schneider, Chrysalis Collaborations

Summary of Key Points and Concepts

Social capital refers to *the social relationships and patterns of reciprocal, enforceable trust that enable people and institutions to gain access to resources necessary to fulfill a particular need or solve a specific problem*. Understanding social capital is more than an academic exercise. Used correctly, the concept can help foundation staff, program designers, policy makers, community members and local organizations develop and implement effective programs that can create thriving communities and foster inclusion and opportunity for everyone living in that area. Developing successful initiatives depends, in part, on understanding the role of three different forms of social capital. As outlined on table one, bonding, bridging, and linking social capital come from different types of relationships and involve different kinds of networks.

Table 1: Three Types of Social Capital

Type	Definition	Culture/Relationship
Bonding	<i>Networks among individuals or institutions with close, long standing relationships and similar culture such as race and class-based groups.</i>	Homogenous culture (although not all members may agree with networks cultural capital).
Bridging	<i>Established, trusting relationships that cross boundaries of race, class, culture, or philosophy, regardless of power relations.</i>	Network members come from different cultures or communities, but are equals in the network
Linking	<i>Established, trusting relationships among people or institutions where one person or organization has power over the other.</i>	Usually shared cultural cues or respect for differences, patron/client or mentor/mentee relationships

Several aspects of social capital are important to remember when applying the concept:

- **Social capital involves long term relationships with enforceable, reciprocal trust.** Building social capital means not just bringing people together, but creating opportunities for them to do activities together to develop trusting relationships.
- **Everyone has social capital, but their social networks may not have the resources they need to achieve a particular goal.**
- **Organizations have social capital, not just individuals, and an organization's or civic associations' connections can be used to build social capital for people participating in their projects.**
- **Bonding, bridging, and linking social capital are equally important for any project to succeed.** This is also true for individuals seeking new opportunities. Successful initiatives and individuals take stock of their existing social capital and make efforts to reach out through their existing connections to foster new social capital to meet their goals.
- **Norms and cultural capital are critical to effectively using social capital.** Each social capital network comes out of a community with its own norms and cultural cues. Individuals and organizations need to learn the appropriate culture if they want to access resources in that network. In bonding networks, members usually have learned appropriate cultural cues as part of their long term affiliation with network members like their family or people they

went to school with. Appropriate culture for bridging and linking social capital is learned through a combination of experience with members of that network and coaching from network members helping a newcomer to join.

- **The most effective people and organizations learn to be multicultural, using the appropriate cultural cues with each social capital network they are involved with.** When developing bridging and linking social capital, sometimes members develop a new culture for that network or a way to understand and respect differences among members.
- **Social capital and civic engagement are sometimes, but not always connected.** Initiatives to develop civic engagement should use social capital to generate interest, but should also use social and traditional media for outreach. Civic engagement can lead to developing social capital in a community if efforts are taken to foster continuing relationships and develop trust among participants.

Introduction

Philadelphia's Norris Square neighborhood and the park at its center have been the focus of community building and revitalization for nearly 30 years. The park was deeded to the community by the heirs of prominent early Quaker Isaac Norris in 1848, when it was the center of a thriving working class community home to immigrants from many countries. By the 1980s, the mills and factories that had supported the neighborhood had left, poverty rates increased, and the park had become a "needle park" full of drug users and dealers. At the time, the community was home to a diverse mix of African Americans, predominantly Puerto Rican Latinos, and whites. With the exception of a few middle class urban pioneers, most whites were low income or elderly on fixed incomes.

Despite its decline, Norris Square was not a socially isolated neighborhood. It was home to a number of thriving nonprofits focused on youth or community revitalization and several active churches. Leadership of several of the nonprofits and churches had ties to Philadelphia government and civic leadership, providing attention and resources to the neighborhood. More important, these organizations worked with concerned residents to organize effective neighborhood watches and drive out the drug dealers. The coalition to save the park quickly turned to revitalizing the community and building connections among its diverse residents through a wide variety of events and programs. Today, Norris Square has drawn some more affluent residents, but remains a mixed income, multi-ethnic community with active civic participation and many supportive organizations.¹

The story of Norris Square demonstrates that through working together, community residents and local institutions can turn a distressed neighborhood around and create a thriving community. The people involved in Norris Square drew on their connections both within the neighborhood and throughout the city to achieve their goals. Unlike many distressed neighborhoods, Norris Square had strong connections to city government and elites through Quakers and others who had founded community organizations in partnership with local residents. Norris Square's organizations and active residents also worked hard to build bridges across the diverse racial and economic groups living in the neighborhood. While not always successful, their efforts were unusual because of the importance of including everyone for project organizers and the ability of the community to sustain activities over time.

These connections that lead to resources are called *social capital*. While those involved in improving communities and the lives of their residents have long known that connections are important to get ahead or get things done, social capital became the go-to concept for everything from community improvement, to combating poverty, to improving health since the mid-1990s. Drawing on thinkers focusing on different goals, several similar definitions currently exist and the term is used to mean many different things. Policy makers and practitioners seeking to apply social capital are often uncertain about what techniques will work because of the confusion over what the term means and how to identify social capital.

This primer is designed to provide an introduction to social capital as a concept and its application through programs to improve communities. The first section clarifies the definition of social capital and related concepts, outlining the various schools of thought that have contributed to our understanding of the concept. Next, the primer briefly describes key research that explores the role of social capital in 1) improving community and revitalization in public spaces or neighborhoods and 2) improving health and 3) combating poverty through neighborhood based initiatives. The second section will also discuss the role of community based organizations, faith communities, and social media or other

¹ See Goode and Schneider (1994) *Reshaping Ethnic and Racial Relations in Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press for detailed discussion of Norris Square and its organizations in the late 1980s. Current information is available at <http://www.philaplace.org/story/357/>

internet based initiatives in these efforts. A final section briefly discusses network analysis, a tool to identify networks that can be combined with social capital techniques to improve community. References for major thinkers for each section are provided at the end of the document.

Defining Social Capital

Table 2: Social Capital Ingredients

Concept	Definition
Social Capital	<i>The social relationships and patterns of reciprocal, enforceable trust that enable people and institutions to gain access to resources necessary to fulfill a particular need or solve a specific problem.</i>
Connections	<i>Relationships with people or organizations who have access to resources</i>
Norms/Culture	<i>Knowledge of cultural cues which indicate that an individual is a member of a group and should be given access to those relationships</i>

As defined in table two, social capital has two ingredients: 1) trust based connections and 2) knowledge of the cultural cues necessary to get access to either people who can help or resources. Social capital is not just connections, but connections to people or organizations that have the resources needed to solve a particular problem or meet a goal. Social capital is not knowing lots of people, but people with access to specific resources. If you are looking for a job, you need someone who has access to jobs in your field. If you want to drive drug dealers out of a park, you need networks that can mobilize community residents concerned about this issue to spend their evenings patrolling the neighborhood for years. You also need cordial relations with the police and other city agencies that can help address the problem. If you want to beautify and rebuild the park, you need people who have the money to pay for materials or know how to write grants and successfully apply to foundations or city-wide programs to get resources to do the work. In each case, it might be a different group of people or institutions that has the resources to solve each aspect of the problem.

These connections are not just meeting someone once at a meeting, public event or party. The kind of relationships that create social capital are built over time. They are reciprocal, trusting relationships among people or organizations that know that if they give access to resources, the person or project asking for help will put them to good use. And those giving resources know that they will get something in return, either in the form of knowledge that their resources have been used to meet a stated goal, or in those receiving resources providing them to others at a later date.

For example, in Detroit, a Knight foundation sponsored initiative called Detroit Soup brings together Detroiters for a monthly dinner where participants raise money to fund projects with microfinancing. The dinners probably rely on social capital to draw participants who use their resources to support projects. Those receiving funding both potentially improve their community and may in turn support others in future.²

This does not mean that an individual or organization can only get support if they have a long established relationship with someone with the necessary resources, although this is often the case. People may have access to resources just by belonging to the same family, going to the same school, or belonging to a faith community. For example, the *Putting Faith to Work* project asked faith communities to help their members with developmental disabilities find jobs through using social capital among congregation members. While the individuals with disabilities who found jobs were often not well known in their churches, members were willing to help because they were affiliated with the church. In the process, the job seekers often became better known and part of the more active networks of the faith community, building their social capital at the same time as finding jobs.³

Organizations also have social capital as institutions. This includes not just the networks of their staff but the connections that the organization has developed over its life time. A new staff person can get support for their program or someone served by the agency by using these established organizational social capital ties. Like individuals, agencies

² See Hoene, C., Kingsley, C. Leighinger, M. (2013) *Bright Spots in Community Engagement*. Washington DC: National League of Cities, 29-31.

³ See www.puttingfaithtowork.org.

have established reputations that help them access resources. This means that if a new program doesn't go well, a funder knows that this is just a problem with the start up, and they can depend on the organization continuing to do the same good work it has done in the past. If a program participant referred for a job or training program has issues, partner agencies know that the organization will work with the participant to resolve the problem. Ties are not broken if an agency with existing social capital among its peers and funders has a few problems. This may not be the case for an organization funded for the first time or a new entity founded by people unknown to the established network of funders.

Norms or Cultural Capital

Knowledge of cultural cues means knowing how to act, dress and what to say to fit in. In various definitions of social capital, cultural aspects that signal that someone is a member of a social capital network and should be given access to resources are called norms or cultural capital. Each of us learn appropriate cultural cues in our families, schools, neighborhoods and different contexts throughout our lives. People that move between different contexts often learn additional forms of cultural capital, becoming bicultural or multicultural. The important thing is that cultural cues needed to access social capital can be learned. Many successful people have connections in many different groups and have learned the appropriate cultural cues for each environment.

Important cultural cues are often little things. For example, knowing the right clothes to wear to a job interview and the jargon that is appropriate for that workplace. In a community project, those cues may be subtle and different for various organizations participating in an event. For instance, in one community organization in Philadelphia, newcomers were made to feel uncomfortable because more established members gave them looks when they got coffee before a meeting. The practice in that organization was to have coffee after the meeting. Our work to help this organization become more inviting in an increasingly diverse neighborhood involved helping participants share their practices and become more comfortable with other ways of doing things.⁴

Even organizations have cultural cues. For example, when doing a project on social service agencies in Washington DC, I learned that organizations that provided specific services all had similar waiting rooms, even displaying information in the same way. But the materials used to make the counters and artwork on the walls reflected the culture of the dominant racial, ethnic, or immigrant group using that organization. Working with these organizations, it became clear that the similarities in layout and subtle differences in decoration were meant to signal to the people who used the organization that it was a welcoming and professional environment. The waiting rooms were the first indication of the way the organization did its work. While people might be referred to these organizations through a combination of local networks, government agencies, or other service organizations, the organizations wanted to signal that they meant to make them comfortable, to provide resources in a culturally appropriate way, to keep them coming in the door. And the similarities in layout were meant to provide the same information to the government and private funders of this work. The organizations tried to please both groups at one time.⁵

As discussed in later sections, social capital takes time and care to develop. Most communities have multiple social capital networks that can help individuals or communities achieve their goals. Identifying those networks and learning the right cultural cues to get access is the first step in developing a successful project. This involves tapping several different kinds of social capital, and perhaps facilitating building new social capital across groups.

Three Types of Social Capital

So far, our discussion of social capital suggests that getting access to a network's resources requires long established relationships among people who are similar to each other. While this is often true, researchers have identified three kinds of social capital that families, organizations and communities use to meet their goals. Each kind of social capital works slightly differently and involves different kinds of networks: 1) bonding, 2) bridging, and 3) linking social capital.

Table 1 defines these three types of social capital. Robert Putnam and his colleague Lewis Feldstein noted the differences between Bonding and Bridging social capital in their book *Better Together*. Bonding social capital involves strong ties within communities, such as a cohesive neighborhood or ethnic group. Bonding social capital can also mean a person's close friends and family. For example, a neighborhood where neighbors look out for each other and help each

⁴ See Goode and Schneider, (1994) *Reshaping Ethnic and Racial Relations*.

⁵ Research conducted as part of the Pew *Gateway Studies* project in Washington DC, Dean Hoge and Michael Foley PIs.

other out on a regular basis. These bonding ties are critical for most people, including the family and friends they feel that they can rely on at all times.

Like all social capital, bonding ties may lie dormant until needed, then bring people together to address community concerns over time. For example, in *Smallville*, Carl Milofsky tells the story of environmental activists in central Pennsylvania that have known each other for years, and were able to organize mass protests against an incinerator. After they won the incinerator battle, the network persisted as a small watch group until the next environmental crisis, then activated their connections again.⁶

Bonding social capital can also develop among organizations. For example, Kenosha, Wisconsin, a small city on the Wisconsin/Illinois border had small, tight knit African American and Latino communities. While some members of these communities were middle class, many of the community's poor came from these two groups. The African American community had two social service organizations and four main churches, all of which worked closely together to meet the needs in that community. For instance, two high level officials in the school district and welfare department, both African American, knew that the best way to support African American children showing signs of neglect in school was to contact the pastor of their church and work with him to ensure that they received support from both faith community and the city's formal welfare system. All of these churches and social service agencies worked together to put on the annual Juneteenth celebration.⁷

Bridging social capital refers to relationships that cross boundaries. For example, people from different racial or class backgrounds who develop friendships through work or arts activities that turn into long term sharing relationships. Established connections among community based organizations can also serve as bridging social capital. For example, in Norris Square, several of the youth focused organizations had worked together for years but each served people from different networks in the community. A local community development corporation (CDC) focused almost exclusively on Puerto Ricans, but developed ties to the youth serving organizations as part of the initiatives to combat drugs in the neighborhood. A neighborhood watch organization, supported by the local police, drew from another set of community networks. Through shared activities, these organizations developed ties to each other and began to expand networks in the community.

Bridging social capital involves creating shared understanding and often shared culture across groups. For example, the various organizations in Norris Square started holding festivals for the entire community in the late 1980s. Organizing these events took several months and much negotiation. Part of developing these events included ensuring that all of the cultures of the various organizations and communities were represented. For example, the Latino community contributed a pig roast and Spanish translations for all materials. Organizations serving African American and white youth also brought in their traditions.

Bridging social capital can develop in situations of community conflict with intentional effort. For example, when I first started working in Kenosha, the interfaith organization was dominated by white churches that firmly told me that they were not interested in service activities. The Latino and African American communities in Kenosha were socially isolated, with only one pastor from their churches attending the interfaith meetings. However, after several highly visible racial incidents, the more liberal white churches and the synagogue reached out to the key African American churches and the Catholic parish hosting the Latino mass. Over time, these organizations developed bridging ties, first developing a joint multicultural celebratory event and then engaging in community organizing activities. A key African American pastor became chair of the interfaith and was the first non-white elected to the school board.

Bridging and bonding social capital are equally important for communities and individuals. Bonding networks are those we most depend on and are most comfortable with. But bonding social capital also is designed to keep out those outside the network. For instance, excluding people who did not all go to the same schools or have lived in the neighborhood a long time. Bridging social capital is designed to develop connections across communities that are equal, but different. In the *Strength of Weak Ties*, Granovetter explains how people can move into new fields through developing contacts with someone in different bonding networks. In this work, a weak tie is an ongoing relationship among people with ties in both networks. For example, in Kenosha, the person who served as a key bridging tie was the college educated African American pastor who had been a high level school district administrator in a neighboring town.

⁶ See Milofsky, C. (2008) chapter 3, Organizational Phoenix. *Smallville*. Medford, MA: Tufts University Press, 50-67.

⁷ See Schneider, J.A. (2001) *Kenosha Social Capital Project Education Report: Churches, Non-profits and Community*. <http://chrysaliscollaborations.com/kenosha-social-capital-study/>

This person had professional ties with other professionals in the key white churches, using these established ties to develop connections across the white and African American communities. The Catholic church hierarchy helped bridge between the isolated Latino community and the white churches.

Much of the confusion about bridging social capital involves people thinking that weak ties are one time connections. As discussed in more detail in the section on social capital and place based solutions, this is seldom the case. Instead successful initiatives build bridging relationships through multiple opportunities over time.

The World Bank's development work identified a third, equally important kind of social capital. Linking social capital involves trust based connections between an organization or individual in a position of power and someone they support. For individuals, linking social capital could include a strong relationship between a student and a faculty member where the person in power helps the student move forward in their career. The relationship is reciprocal as the student brings credit to his/her school and may refer other good students in future. Linking social capital can also refer to relationships between community based organizations and government or other funders.

Often, linking, bridging, and bonding social capital work together. For example, in Kenosha, the county Medicaid agency was concerned about providing children's health insurance, WIC, and food stamps to U.S. citizen children of Latino migrants. Since many of these migrants were undocumented, they were afraid to come into the county agency. Some refused to come into the Latino social service agency that provided many social services through contracts with government. Using its linking ties to the Latino social service agency, government developed a partnership with this agency and a Latino Catholic church mission program to reach into the bonding networks of new migrants. Bonding ties existed between the Mexican-Americans active in the church mission and the Latino social service agency. These organizations had established bridging ties into the largely central American new migrants who took language classes at the agency and received support through this mission attached to the Latino Catholic mass. The new migrants were willing to apply for benefits for their family members because they trusted that these organizations would not report them to immigration. Government worked with the same organizations to encourage people to fill out their census forms.

While these three types of social capital are recognized by most people using the concept, there is much confusion about when something is bridging or bonding social capital. In some cases, people refer to a community having "not enough" social capital, or the wrong kind. Sometimes bridging is considered "good" social capital, while "bonding" is labeled "bad" social capital which encourages bigotry or exclusion. While bonding social capital can mean leaving others out, it is also an important social glue that can be used in many different kinds of projects.

Civic Engagement and Social Capital

Table 3: Civic Engagement and Social Capital

	Civic Engagement	Social Capital
Forms of Trust	Generalized	Reciprocal, enforceable trust in people and institutions that are part of the network
Strength of Connections	Unspecified	Strong enough to ensure reciprocity and guard against misuse of network resources
Who Benefits	Society as a whole	Members of the network
Role of Norms, Values, Culture	Tocquevillian interpretations presume a reciprocal relationship between generalized community norms and civic engagement	Members demonstrate the shared culture of that network to indicate membership

Much of the confusion over what social capital means stems from a tendency of some to use social capital when they are really talking about civic engagement. Civic engagement means *citizens working together for the common good*

Table three outlines the differences between civic engagement and social capital. As this table demonstrates, both concepts include similar elements that are important to help a community fulfill its needs: trust, connections among people, and common norms, values and cultural attributes. However, the two concepts use these various elements differently and who benefits from any activity may vary dramatically.

Note that civic engagement uses generalized trust, rather than specific trust in people that are part of a given network. Generalized trust means thinking that society is generally good, most people can be trusted, or that one's community is safe. Generalized trust is usually measured through questions like "I feel that I can trust people in my community," or "I can trust the police," or "If I dropped my wallet, someone would pick it up and turn it in." Specific trust implies that a person can trust the people s/he knows or who are affiliated with his/her social network but not others. Many followers of Putnam's approach to social capital use generalized trust when they measure social capital. It is easy to see how social capital could be confused with civic engagement in this situation. Given that Putnam and his followers see social capital as a building block for civic engagement, the potential for some people to merge social capital and civic engagement is not a surprise.

This definition of civic engagement implies that citizens are participating in civil society institutions like non-profit organizations in order to serve general social goals. For example, people participate in a project to clean up a stream run by a local environmental organization in order to improve this water source and beautify the community for everyone who uses the stream. However, civic engagement also implies that participation in civil society will help individuals develop informed opinions of critical social issues that will lead them to actively engage in political activities. The connection between political engagement and voluntary action through associations in the U.S. stems largely from Alexis de Toqueville's 19th century study of the United States. He noted that the many civic organizations as a key factor in fostering democracy. The act of working together gives individuals power.

Putnam and his followers stress this connection between participating in voluntary associations and political activity because they see voluntary action as fostering the social skills and generalized trust characteristic of civic engagement. The connections of social capital serve to bring people to organizations, which in turn generate civic engagement. Putnam himself understands that social capital and civic engagement are different concepts. However, some of his followers either merge the two concepts or use them interchangeably.

An organization combatting poverty and homelessness in Washington DC provides a good example of the difference between civic engagement and social capital. The organization began as a soup kitchen started by a few pastors in a distressed part of the city, but has grown to a multimillion dollar agency with transitional housing, education and health programs in addition to its food programs and homeless shelters. The organization is well known locally and regularly featured in white house speeches on combatting poverty.

The soup kitchen is still run through various organizations and churches providing meals on a rotating basis. These are the same organizations year after year, part of the original social capital network of faith communities and civic organizations that founded the soup kitchen. These participating organizations use the social capital within their congregations and organizations to find people to provide for their neighbors in need. This represents an example of social capital used to generate civic engagement.

However, this agency also relies on a different kind of civic engagement. At thanksgiving and other major holidays, literally thousands of people contact the organization looking to volunteer on or near the holiday as a way to give back to society at a symbolic time of the year. They are drawn to this organization because it is well known through the media, not through social capital connections. Given the volume of requests and the fact that most volunteers come from established networks, the agency has created opportunities like a run for homelessness to use this energy.

In this case, civic engagement has little to do with social capital. The same thing happens in natural disasters, when thousands of people offer to give blood at the Red Cross even when blood is not needed. When the impulse to help arises in a crisis or regular time when citizens help each other, people turn to well-known organizations to show their support for others. This is an important type of civic engagement to generate, and the mechanisms used to foster support are different than for initiatives using social capital. As our discussion of efforts to improve community and combat poverty or illness in the next section demonstrate, understanding how social capital and civic engagement work is important in order to improve society either for individuals or a community as a whole.

Using Social Capital to Foster Community, Combat Poverty, and Improve Health

This section briefly outlines the results of research and foundation projects that explore the role of social capital in efforts to foster vibrant communities, combat poverty, and improve health. The various projects address a wide range of problems – from creating welcoming spaces used by an entire community, to helping individuals in high poverty neighborhoods find jobs, save and improve their educations, to understanding the connections between community social capital and health. Along the way, thinkers looking at different problems have developed a number of terms related to social capital to explain what they find. Discussion will outline the meaning and uses of these terms along with social capital as part of this section.

Underlying Concepts

Table 4: Underlying Concepts

Concept	Building Blocks for Community	Where Used
Social Networks	<i>Connections between people</i>	Used in all concepts
Community	<i>Social bonds, not tied to place but to an awareness of interconnectedness and sense of mutuality, which shapes behavior.</i>	Used in all concepts
Norms/cultural capital	<i>Expected beliefs and behaviors that are necessary to fit in to a particular network, organization or community. Both organizations and individuals need appropriate cultural capital</i>	Used in all concepts
Human capital	<i>Skills or education needed to achieve a goal or participate in a particular activity</i>	Primarily used with social capital, equity, or poverty focus, but implied in many civic engagement initiatives

The work discussed in this section relies on a number of concepts affiliated with social capital. Social networks are a key element in social capital, simply referring to the connections between people. Unlike social capital, networks in and of themselves are neutral. Connections can offer a whole range of supports to people or simply mean that two people or organizations know each other. Likewise, networks can be closed to outsiders, but those closed networks may not mean that others are excluded from social or personal resources. For example, people born on the 4th of July in one town may gather to celebrate their birthdays together, but that doesn't mean that others couldn't do the same on their birthdays. It is not the same as excluding someone from a school or denying them membership in a community organization.

Sociologist James Coleman is often credited with coining the term human capital to refer to education and skills that individuals obtain throughout their lives. Like social capital, people need to have the right kind of human capital for a given task. Coleman's key article describing the importance of social capital stressed that connections were both essential to create a supportive environment for education and give people links to jobs where they could use skills once they are acquired. In other words, social capital was just as important as human capital in helping people reach their potential.

Community is an underlying concept that deserves particular attention. Most of the projects discussed in this section aim to enhance or build community. While some people understand community as geographical places, like a neighborhood or city, most research on community stresses that community involves connections among people that span space, and sometimes time. For example, *Code for America* brings together people with computer skills to improve local governments.⁸ An example of virtual community, the organization brings people together from across the country to solve local problems.

⁸ See <https://www.codeforamerica.org/>

Geographic areas can include many different communities. Simply living in the same space does not necessarily mean that people know each other. For example, looking at maps of where participants in Milwaukee’s Silver Spring Neighborhood Center lived revealed that participants in the after school programs and food pantry came primarily from a public housing project surrounding the center, while the participants in the senior programs came from the surrounding houses. In both cases, participants knew about the center due to social capital in different communities in this diverse neighborhood. Day care participants came from African American neighborhoods throughout the city, drawn to this highly regarded program through word of mouth among people who had attended the program as children, went to the same churches, or otherwise were part of the several communities that knew about this center. The social capital within a geographically dispersed African American community provided information on this program.⁹

As discussed in more detail below, many efforts to improve communities fail because they assume that moving disparate groups together will necessarily foster community and social capital. For example, churches with active members that have moved away from their traditional neighborhoods may have little to do with current neighborhood residents. Like social capital, building community involves intentional efforts and often takes time.

This section of the primer looks at concepts like community, social capital, human capital, cultural capital and social networks in action as government, foundations and networks of citizens try various ways to improve the places where they live. Along the way, researchers and practitioners have developed a number of terms to explain what they see. Some of these terms are designed to supplement social capital as a concept or explain different aspects of it. Each of these terms will be explained in more detail as part of the section on the series of problems they are meant to address.

Table five provides a comparison of the various terms used in the literature on social capital and place. Several of these terms have been discussed in detail earlier in this primer. Others, like civic participation, are synonyms for civic engagement. Still others came out of a focus on particular problems. For example, social cohesion and collective efficacy originated in research on health but are used in work on a number of other problems.

Table 5: Concept Comparisons

Concept	Definition	Where Used
Social Capital	<i>The social relationships and patterns of reciprocal, enforceable trust that enable people and institutions to gain access to resources necessary to fulfill a particular need or solve a specific problem.</i>	Used across issues and focus on individual/community
Social Cohesion	<i>The ability of a society to work toward the well being of all its members, foster a sense of belonging and trust among residents, prevent exclusion and marginalization, and create equitable access for everyone.</i>	Used across issues and focus on individual/community
Civic Engagement	<i>People working together for the common good</i>	Focus on community quality of life and involvement of community members in community activities and politics
Civic Participation	<i>People participating in community events, political activities, and activities to improve the community (often interchangeable with civic engagement)</i>	Focus on community quality of life and involvement of community members in community activities and politics

⁹ See Schneider, J.A. (2010) *Social Capital and Social Geography*. Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation, 70-84.

Concept	Definition	Where Used
Collective Efficacy	<i>Shared expectations and mutual engagement by community residents to take responsibility for each other and work together to resolve particular issues.</i>	Initial focus on health, but also used for focus on combating poverty, building community, and promoting social cohesion
Social Isolation	<i>Individuals that have few friends, family or connections to others and are not involved in the community</i>	Focus on poverty, health, community building, and promoting social cohesion
Social Exclusion	<i>Marginalization of members of society from social solidarity, cohesion, or the moral bonds of rights and obligations that knit a broader society together and denying those individuals or groups respect and recognition given to other members of society.</i>	Primarily used in Europe and Latin America, focus on integrating newcomers or outsiders into society, poverty, building community

The concepts of social isolation and social exclusion predate social capital. Social isolation has been used for decades to talk about both individuals with few connections and groups that are isolated from the rest of society. Social exclusion became popular in Europe in the 1970s, but comes out of the aftermath of the Holocaust to understand how whole ethnic groups, people with disabilities, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals and others could be deemed outside of society and subjected to mass deportations and extermination.

Discussion will look at how these concepts can be used together to better understand community issues and improve connections in communities. This section starts by looking at initiatives designed to understand civic engagement and social capital across cities, rural areas, or neighborhoods in a city. Projects to create vibrant communities, build inviting spaces, and foster civic engagement through place based programs aim to foster civic engagement, social capital, or both. In many cases, they rely on bonding, bridging, and linking social capital to achieve their goals. The role of community organizations and internet based connections in fostering or hindering social capital and civic engagement is also discussed here.

Many projects to improve public spaces like parks, sidewalks, and recreation areas seek to improve both health and the general quality of life. Public health research and practice has also looked at the role of social capital in understanding how community indicators such as poverty, crime, the quality of local infrastructure, and the quality of neighborhood housing influence the health of community residents. In efforts to improve community health, these projects have compared levels of social capital, social cohesion, and collective efficacy across neighborhoods. This section summarizes these projects next.

An important part of improving quality of life in a city or region involves improving the lives of those in poverty, either individually or improving conditions for everyone in a high poverty neighborhood. It is also the most difficult task to achieve at the neighborhood level. The final part of this section will explore the role of social capital in this issue.

Creating Vibrant Communities and Improving Civic Engagement Through Enhancing Places

These initiatives often focus on entire cities or rural regions, seeking to understand the role of social capital and civic engagement in creating vibrant communities. While some rely on bonding social capital to achieve their goals, most hope to foster bridging social capital. Almost all projects rely on linking social capital, although the term is rarely used. Some focus exclusively on improving civic engagement, with little or no mention of social capital. The projects in this section include efforts to improve the built environment or neighborhood amenities while fostering social capital and civic engagement.

Indicators of Vibrant Communities

A recent Knight Foundation sponsored *Soul of the Community Study* explored the role of social capital and civic engagement in twenty-six cities, comparing residents' overall satisfaction, their satisfaction with social life and infrastructure satisfaction. The survey looked at satisfaction at two levels, individual's personal levels of satisfaction and the pooled satisfaction of the community as a whole. Social capital was measured by the number of local friends, number of family members in the community, and how often people talked to their neighbors. Counting a person's number of friends and family primarily measures bonding social capital, while talking to neighbors could indicate bonding or bridging social capital, as well as social cohesion. As defined on table five, a socially cohesive neighborhood means that neighbors are involved in each others' lives and concerned about the neighborhood as a whole. Civic engagement was measured through volunteering, attending a public meeting, and attending a public festival.¹⁰

This complex analysis revealed that social capital and civic engagement are associated with both positive and negative satisfaction levels, depending on the context. For example, people who attended a community meeting or talked to their neighbors often were personally less satisfied with their social environment and infrastructure. These people may be active citizens engaged in civic engagement to improve local problems. People who lived in communities where many residents volunteer were more satisfied with their communities overall, while living in a community where people both volunteer and attend public meetings was positive for social life satisfaction. This suggests that people enjoy living in communities with engaged citizens. People with large friendship networks were satisfied with local infrastructure, perhaps showing that a safe community with good transportation supports a vibrant social life.

The *Soul of the Community Study* also showed that insular communities where established residents had strong family networks led to newcomers feeling excluded. The authors noted that *living near one's family enhanced community satisfaction, but living near others who are locally networked into their own families leads to less satisfaction*.¹¹ This suggests that high levels of bonding social capital, in the form of family networks, can lead to social exclusion and less satisfaction with a community overall.

An example from Baltimore shows the challenges of building vibrant communities that reach everyone in communities with high levels of bonding social capital. The Baltimore Jewish community is known for its vibrant community and levels of social cohesion. The Associated, its umbrella Federation for community service, educational and recreational activities is considered one of the strongest in the country. But Baltimore is also known as a close-knit community with little mixing among racial, ethnic, or religious groups. The first question people ask you is "Where did you go to high school?" If the answer is not somewhere in Baltimore, established residents will often move on to someone they already know. Newcomers are shut out of both social and organizational networks, denied access to the social capital of the established community. This is true within the Jewish community as well as outside of it.

Most Baltimore Jews live in a few neighborhoods in Baltimore and specific suburbs, go to the same schools and community centers, and socialize with each other. Baltimore also has a growing Orthodox Jewish community, which does incorporate newcomers, but maintains tight social bonds among themselves. Jews moving to Baltimore for work or other reasons, often living throughout the city, found that they had trouble connecting to the established community.

In order to remedy this problem, the Associated created a number of events targeted toward Jews who had moved to the community. These included social events like Sabbath dinners in downtown Baltimore or other areas outside of the traditional Jewish neighborhoods. There were also special invitations to regular community events like lighting Chanukah candles. These initiatives led to creating bridging social capital between Baltimore's Jewish institutions and Jews newly moved to the area. They also created bridging and bonding social capital among these newcomers. They were less successful in creating bridges between the Jews who had lived in Baltimore for generations and newcomers.¹²

What makes a vibrant community? Research consistently shows that places with higher incomes, higher education, and generally better infrastructure show higher levels of civic engagement and higher levels of community wide social capital. Since better infrastructure is often associated with community wealth, the links between the two should come

¹⁰ Fitz, B., Lyon, L., Driskell, R. (2016) Why People Like Where They Live: Individual- and Community-Level Contributors to Community Satisfaction. *Social Indicators Research* 126(3), 1209-1224.

¹¹ Fitz et al, p. 1220.

¹² See Schneider, JA (2010) *Jewish Strategies to Maintain Connections Between Faith Communities and Their Nonprofits: Findings from the Faith and Organizations Project*. <http://faithandorganizations.umd.edu/pdfs/Strategies-Jewish.pdf>

as no surprise. This is true for communities that support sustainability as well as those known for strong economies and intentionally developed spaces.

Given the increasing use of private developers to create neighborhoods and community amenities like shopping malls or town center developments, researchers have explored the role of these private developments in fostering or hindering social capital, civic engagement, and social cohesion. While many studies observe that gated communities can exclude people from different races or classes, recent research in Phoenix suggests that intentional developments can create bridging social capital and civic engagement through involvement in home owners associations or residents' general interest in neighbors in their community. However, like other studies, wealthier communities had higher levels of social capital and civic engagement. People may come from many different places and diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds, but they share the same income levels. Likewise, malls and "town center" shopping developments create safe spaces that may sponsor civic activities traditionally offered by local government like holiday celebrations, but the center owners and their security teams control who can come in and their activities in this privately owned public space.¹³

How can communities use social capital and civic engagement to both improve physical space and enhance civic engagement and bridging social capital? In general, projects have focused on one of three strategies: 1) projects that combine improving physical spaces like parks, forests, or creating arts venues, 2) projects that focus on the role of local organizations like community based civic organizations and local business to enhance social capital and civic engagement, 3) analysis of the role of internet or social media based initiatives in enhancing social capital and civic engagement in geographic communities. A recent *National League of Cities* study of projects in fourteen cities identified the following common threads and challenges for these types of initiatives:

- *The more networks and representatives from all facets of the community are invited to the mix, the greater the benefits to community well-being.*
- *What we saw lends credence to the claim that engagement generates opportunity by creating networks of individuals, organizations, and institutions committed to development and sustainability.*
- *A challenge common to nearly all the cases is how to achieve scale—by expanding upon the highlighted bright spots, creating networks of micro-level efforts focused on shared learning and replication, or building the successes into reshaped institutions and systems.¹⁴*

Improving Physical Spaces and Enhancing Civic Engagement/Social Capital

Many of the projects designed to simultaneously enhance the physical environment and build social capital and civic engagement involve projects to improve parks or other public amenities like swimming pools or community centers, address environmental issues, or build arts venues. These projects often involve local stakeholders in the development of the project, both drawing on existing community social capital and attempting to build bridging social capital among stakeholder groups. For instance, the *No Barriers Project*, a Knight funded project in Charlotte designed to bring together people separated by physical barriers, intentionally draws on existing social capital to build civic engagement and develop bridging social capital across neighborhoods. The project director notes:

The No Barriers Project identifies physical barriers between diverse communities that act as real and symbolic divides. (Think railroad tracks, bridges, parks.) ... As part of the project, neighborhoods on both sides of the barriers are invited to work together to co-create something in a location or space. Residents will be asked to give feedback about the perception of the space and what could improve it including lighting or access, and then design or construct an installation as a way to reinvent their shared space. The hope is that by working side by side, people build relationships and connections with neighbors from nearby neighborhoods that they would not have otherwise made.¹⁵

Projects like these primarily seek to build bridging social capital and enhance civic engagement. They also rely on linking social capital like foundation grants or government support to achieve their goals. As a recent urban institute evaluation of a Wallace Foundation parks initiative observes:

¹³ See Kirby, A. (2008) The production of private space and its implications for urban social relations *Political Geography* 27 (1), 74-95.

Staeheli, L. and Mitchell, D. (2006) USA's destiny? Regulating space and creating community in American Shopping Malls. *Urban Studies* 43 (5/6), 977-992.

¹⁴ See Hoene et al., (2013) *Bright Spots in Community Engagement*, p 8.

¹⁵ See <https://medium.com/@CLTgov/barriers-not-included-34a33d73adcf#.rfufufxpl>

Parks help build and strengthen ties among community residents by bringing people together, including those who are otherwise divided by race or class, and by helping them work together on common projects. These ties—often labeled “social capital”—represent subtle but important assets for a community and build collective efficacy [by]:

- *Helping youth choose rewarding paths to adulthood by providing programs and opportunities to build physical, intellectual, emotional, and social strength;*
- *Helping new entrants to the workforce find productive jobs by offering decent, entry-level employment opportunities in the community;*
- *Helping community residents improve their health by providing a place to enjoy fresh air and exercise; and*
- *Helping citizens join together to make their communities better, by encouraging them to participate in park planning and management.¹⁶*

Some projects involve youth organizations or schools, particularly environmental or parks projects that use service learning. Service learning uses community service to teach academic or practical skills, for instance teaching science through a water quality project or teaching carpentry by repairing a public building or dilapidated homes. These projects aim to build both human and social capital through the community improvement activity.

Likewise, many arts activities intend to expand the number of people coming into the neighborhood and introduce neighborhood residents to the arts. Often, these projects involve local youth in activities that build their creativity while teaching about the arts. For instance, the *Crosstown* initiative in Memphis wants to bring in the “creative class” to a diverse African American and immigrant neighborhood with twenty percent poverty through developing galleries in historic structures. The project seeks to build bridging social capital through arts initiatives that involve the community like a local arts presentation space, redoing an existing flea market, and a youth arts program.¹⁷

Two *Urban Institute* reports note that few of the arts and community space creation projects have been rigorously evaluated.¹⁸ While their creators are enthusiastic about their ability to create vibrant communities, only unbiased evaluation of the social capital and civic engagement generated by these initiatives will show if they have long term effects. The *National League of Cities* report cited earlier suggests that sustaining these initiatives and bringing them to scale are concerns. Observing progress in Norris Square for over 25 years suggests that to succeed in the long term, these initiatives need to foster a combination of bonding, bridging, and linking social capital to sustain civic engagement. The various anti-drug, park improvement, and public celebrations drew on bonding and bridging social capital already existing in the neighborhood, creating a community wide practice of using bridging social capital to foster civic engagement. The key organizations involved in these efforts had long-term linking social capital ties to the city elite and government that funded these initiatives. These linking ties also kept city-wide attention on Norris Square over time.

Careful analysis of the grant making process of the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program (CFRP), a pilot program implemented in New Mexico using U.S. Forest Service dollars, shows how linking, bridging, and bonding social capital can have a real impact on local communities. Projects were selected by a panel of government, tribe, and other related community stakeholders. This panel selection process funded projects that potentially built collaborations among community stakeholders and slightly preferred projects coming out of poorer communities, showing some social equity building in the process. Projects that crossed jurisdictions and owned by various government entities were less likely to be funded, suggesting that the opportunity to build bridging social capital may be limited by the challenges of different government entities working with each other. The bridging social capital created by these projects:

... increased social capital results in positive environmental outcomes through information spillovers. When relationships are cultivated through participation in environmental-management processes, the transmission of information among community members is made easier... Another way in which social capital leads to improved environmental outcomes is by creating a sense of community or reciprocity within an area. In communities with well-developed social networks, locals are more inclined to respond to the environmental stewardship undertaken by others within their community.¹⁹

¹⁶ Walker, C. (2004) *The Public Value of Urban Parks*. Evaluation of Wallace Foundation Urban Parks Initiative. Washington DC: Urban Institute, 2-3.

¹⁷ See Thomas, E., Pate, S., Ranson, A. (2015) *The Crosstown Initiative: Art, Community, and Placemaking in Memphis*. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 55 (1/2), 74-88.

¹⁸ See Jackson, M. and Herranz, J. (2002) *Culture Counts in Communities: A Framework for Measurement*. Washington DC: Urban Institute and Taitan, P., Kingsley, T., Parilla, J. Pendell, R. (2012) *Building Successful Neighborhoods*. What Works Collaborative. Washington DC: Urban Institute.

¹⁹ Prante, T., Thacher, J., McCollum, D. Berrens, R. (2007) *Building Social Capital in Forest Communities: Analysis of New Mexico's Collaborative Forest Restoration Program*. *Natural Resources Journal* 47 (4), 884-885.

The Role of Organizations in Generating Social Capital and Civic Engagement

All of the initiatives described above rely on local organizations, and sometimes government, to achieve their goals. People that participate in many different kinds of local organizations engage in civic engagement activities that can benefit their local communities. Often, they are drawn to participate in these activities through social capital, but as the earlier example of the Washington DC homeless organization suggests, civic engagement can be generated through social media or just the reputation of an organization in the community as well. The literature on volunteering uniformly shows that people with more income and higher education are more likely to engage in a wide array of civic engagement activities.

Faith communities are another place where social capital is generated. Studies of both volunteering and more general civic engagement show that churches, synagogues, mosques, temples and other worship communities are key places where both social capital and civic engagement develop. As with the Kenosha African American and Latino community institutions described earlier, clergy and active faith community members found service oriented nonprofits and serve on their boards. Faith community members support each other through women's committee and pastoral care activities. Youth group activities and service projects involving the general membership provide a wide array of civic engagement activities in the community. For example, the Washington DC homeless shelter is typical of emergency services in this country, with faith communities providing the bulk of volunteers for soup kitchens, food pantries and similar initiatives.

Local businesses are another source of civic engagement and social capital. Tolbert discusses the importance of civic community, particularly a thriving local middle class small business class, in creating thriving small towns and rural areas. Using data following rates of local level businesses over time, he demonstrates that states with higher levels of local retail and local manufacturing do better on a number of measures of civic health and health of residents. He also shows that places with more local retail have higher civic engagement. In addition, more local retail leads to higher levels of young people participating in civic activities. For example, in Kenosha, every local business had a bin to collect food for the local homeless shelter.²⁰

The Role of the Internet and Social Media in Place Based Social Capital and Civic Engagement

Does the internet and social media draw people away from involvement in local communities and their institutions? As online use became more prevalent, both policy makers and scholars became concerned that those without internet access, particularly the poor, elderly, rural residents and others who were socially isolated, would be left behind by the digital divide. Studies suggest that low income residents and people that are socially isolated for a variety of reasons may both have limited computer access and be less involved in civic activities.

That said, recent studies suggest that internet use does not curtail involvement in the local community. In fact, it enhances it. People who are involved in local civic engagement initiatives or active in community organizations are more likely to be online. They use the internet and social media to communicate. Community list serves can also create some weak links among community residents that could lead to building social capital.

Like *Code for America*, a number of government and foundation sponsored initiatives bring together people to use their computer skills to improve access to information for the general public. For example, *Open Access Philadelphia* brought together local government, private sector, and university stakeholders to foster data projects involving programmers from throughout the city in providing public data to citizens. More recent initiatives like *Digital On Ramps* and *Freedom Ring/Keypots* are attempting to make these data more easily available to the public and cross the digital divide through educational initiatives. The *National League of Cities* report notes that online and computer aided initiatives are common across the country:

Across these strategies, technology emerged as a prominent engagement tool, with cities facilitating online discussions, involving residents in developing apps to solve city problems, engaging community members in public meetings through live blogs or providing online platforms to build networking and sharing opportunities. Despite the acknowledged

²⁰ Tolbert, C. (2005) Minding Our Own Business: Local Retail Establishments and the Future of Southern Civic Community. *Social Forces*. 83 (4),1309-1328. Kenosha examples are discussed in Schneider 2001, the *Kenosha Social Capital Study*.

importance of technology however, most strong civic engagement efforts are still rooted in opportunities for in-person gatherings to share ideas, narrow options and come to consensus on a recommended path.²¹

Summary

Taken together, the research and practice experience on the connection between social capital/civic engagement and improving physical places in communities suggests that a combination of bonding, bridging, and linking social capital is needed to develop successful projects that will develop connections among residents over the long term. Too much bonding social capital in neighborhoods or a city/region can create a supportive environment for established residents, but make it more difficult for newcomers to become involved.

Social capital and civic engagement come out of both the activities of local organizations and the initiatives of unaffiliated residents drawn to a project through personal interest, local social capital networks, or online information. While some residents may not have access to the internet, in general, online forums and social media serve to enhance social capital and civic engagement, not decrease it. The challenge is to create access to the internet among those without the resources or skills to use it, otherwise already vulnerable populations will become more socially isolated.

While most initiatives attempting to create vibrant communities through place based improvements genuinely intend to include the poor, unemployed, less educated, elderly, people with disabilities, or others at the margins of society, most projects fail at this goal. Those involved in these civic engagement activities tend to be better educated and wealthier. The remaining parts of this section focus on initiatives to improve public health, improve poor neighborhoods, and lift individuals out of poverty.

Social Capital and Public Health

Public health is concerned with far more than the numbers of people with certain diseases, the levels of obesity, or the spread of infectious disease. While these issues concern health practitioners, public health also considers levels of crime, social disorder that can contribute to drug use and mental illness, and simply the safety of community residents as integral to community health. The built environment can also impact on public health in a number of ways, including asthma and intellectual disabilities caused by lead paint, rodents, and insects in older, dilapidated houses. Living near polluting factories or waste treatment plants can also cause a variety of illnesses. Obesity and diabetes levels are influenced by the amount of exercise people get. People living in places where it is unsafe to walk or lacking inviting parks may have less opportunity for physical activity than those living in neighborhoods with sidewalks, walking or biking trails, and plentiful parks. Community crime levels also influence public health, with many more injuries in neighborhoods with lots of crime and drug use. Crime levels also impact on obesity, diabetes, and other illnesses caused by lack of exercise simply because people are afraid to go out.

Researchers exploring the relationship between neighborhood conditions and public health have long known that the ability of neighbors to address conditions in their neighborhoods influences the general level of health in the neighborhood. Before social capital became popular, Wilson and Kelling noted in 1982 that neighborhoods with more broken windows and other signs of deterioration were likely to draw more criminal activity. Looking at ways to understand how some neighborhoods maintained community safety and public health regardless of income levels, public health researchers began looking at social capital soon after the concept received attention in research circles. Public health research on the relationship between social capital and place is very sophisticated, looking at data from many different sources at the community and neighborhood level. As such, their work has much to tell us about the role of social capital in creating healthy and vibrant communities.

Some public health researchers look at Putnam's community level indicators of social capital to understand public health at a city, regional or state level. Usually, social capital is measured through questions about generalized trust, people helping each other, and sometimes membership in organizations. These studies suggest that more people are in poor health in places with lower social capital and lower public benefits like welfare, WIC, SNAP (foodstamps) and Medicaid. Health improves as social capital and public benefits improve. Poor health is also associated with low income, lower education, being older or Black. Social isolation also is connected to poorer health.

Sampson, the key thinker who developed the concepts of social cohesion and collective efficacy, and others using his approach, look carefully at the role of connections, collective action, and community culture in a wide range of health

²¹ Hoene et al, (2013) *Bright Spots in Community Engagement*, 49. See pages 32-37 for information on Philadelphia's open access initiatives.

indicators. Noting that social capital provides an ability to access resources, but requires action in order to use those resources, Sampson developed several additional concepts to indicate the willingness and effectiveness of a neighborhood to use resources residing in the networks of its residents. These concepts were originally designed to explain the ability of adults to influence the behavior of children and youth in their neighborhood but have been generalized to people of all ages. *Collective efficacy* is defined as *shared expectations and mutual engagement by community residents to take responsibility for each other and work together to resolve particular issues*. In order to be able to influence the behaviors of one's neighbors, community residents would need to have the reciprocal, reinforceable trust, practice of sharing information and other resources, and commonly held norms or culture of social capital. Collective efficacy involves the comfort to take action to address a community concern or neighborhood problem. For example, helping a neighborhood child that is playing in a busy street find a safer place to play, calling the police if someone is breaking into a house or car, or asking neighbors playing a stereo loudly while someone is sleeping to turn it down and expecting that they will comply.

Social cohesion is the result of a neighborhood with strong bonding and bridging social capital and high collective efficacy. Social cohesion is defined as *the ability of a society to work toward the well being of all its members, foster a sense of belonging and trust among residents, prevent exclusion and marginalization, and create equitable access for everyone*. A neighborhood or region with high levels of social cohesion would be a place where mechanisms are in place to check on people who are frail and socially isolated. It is a place where children can play alone in the neighborhood park because community adults would be looking out for them. Neighbors would stop an individual that tried to hurt someone else. People pay attention to environmental concerns, from garbage that could draw rats to a leaking gas pipe, promptly talking to their neighbors to see if a problem could be addressed before calling the authorities. These are the kind of neighborhoods that fight a potentially polluting factory opening nearby, organize to address concerns at a corner bar that is the source of fights and drug use, or lobby for speed bumps to calm traffic. Like Norris Square, it is also the kind of neighborhood that is likely to mobilize its citizens to turn a needle park into a community asset.

What factors lead to these kinds of neighborhoods? Most of the research on social capital, collective efficacy and place focuses on this issue. Sampson and his colleague's initial research involved analysis of data from the *Project in Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods*, which combined a large sample of residents in Chicago with a wide array neighborhood measures on public health, income, education, and neighborhood conditions. The study did not just look at individual neighborhoods, but looked at the impact of neighborhoods nearby on the residents in each neighborhood. It compared the impact of concentrated disadvantage, concentrated immigration, or concentrated affluence both in the neighborhood and nearby neighborhoods on children in each locality.

This research found that concentrated wealth and concentrated disadvantage, or being in neighborhoods near other neighborhoods with these attributes, heavily influenced public health and levels of social capital and collective efficacy. In general, neighborhoods with wealthier and more educated residents did better. Concentrated disadvantage included more poverty, higher crime levels, lower education, and various indicators of social disorder. In disadvantaged neighborhoods, there were lower expectations that adults would intervene with children and less useful social capital and collective efficacy. The opposite was true with neighborhoods with concentrated affluence. More African American and Latino immigrant neighborhoods had concentrated disadvantage, but race or immigration status in and of itself was not related to low collective efficacy or social capital. Length of residence and other factors that influence neighbors getting to know each other also played a role in positive social capital and collective efficacy. That said, neighborhoods with higher collective efficacy were able to create positive environments even with high levels of collective disadvantage and residential mobility.

A number of scholars have used the same data set or Sampson's measures in similarly sophisticated studies in other parts of the United States. This research uniformly shows that high levels of poverty, low education, lots of residential mobility, and high crime rates are associated with low levels of social capital and collective efficacy while neighborhoods where people move infrequently and with higher levels of wealth and education do better on these indicators. Given the large gaps between rich and poor and the overlap between race and class in the U.S., Lenzi and colleagues performed similar studies in two cities in Italy to understand social networks of youth and their connection to community adults. With less economic disparity, friendship networks proved more important than neighborhood indicators for youth connections to their community. In other words, bonding social capital among neighborhood youth lead to more positive interactions with neighborhood adults and involvement in community activities. Neighborhoods with high levels of immigrants had fewer networks within the neighborhood, unsurprising since immigrant networks

often include other immigrants who may live in many different places. Lenzi and colleagues 2nd study suggested that even in neighborhoods with high social disorder, youth did well if they had fun places to hang out.

These studies highlight the importance of cultural capital in understanding collective efficacy. Sampson and his colleagues work in Chicago, as well as studies across the United States, showed that people in neighborhoods with high levels of social disorder responded differently to community issues than those in neighborhoods with concentrated affluence. Adults in neighborhoods with high levels of crime and social disorder disciplined neighborhood children and youth less for transgressions like loud music, vandalism and behaviors deemed inappropriate in other neighborhoods. It is unclear if adults were less willing to step in because it was culturally inappropriate or simply unsafe.

One study that asked neighborhood residents for their definition of a good neighborhood, high quality of life, and community problems, found that people mentioned the same things – parks and natural beauty, safety, food stores, pollution, municipal service, and stress regardless of the levels of wealth, poverty, and physical disorder in their neighborhoods. However, these terms meant very different things depending on the affluence of the neighborhood. In poorer neighborhoods, a potted plant represented natural beauty while the more affluent neighborhood expected a tree canopy and parks. Stress in poorer neighborhoods meant hearing gunshots nearby while traffic caused stress in higher income neighborhoods. Similar differences existed for each theme. These cultural expectations reflected the level of resources in the community and influenced the kinds of collective efficacy neighbors exhibited.²²

What do the physical attributes of place have to do with neighborhood health, social capital, and collective efficacy? Several studies explore this issue. Most notably, Cohen and colleagues explored the role of the built environment on collective efficacy, testing the relationship between collective efficacy and the presence of parks, places selling alcohol, fast food, and elementary schools in neighborhoods in Los Angeles. They found that the presence of well maintained parks improves collective efficacy. None of the other measures were important once poverty levels and social disorder were included in the analysis. While this study would indicate that projects to support parks would improve social capital and collective efficacy, several writers note that the impact of these types of projects on these aspects of community has not been adequately evaluated.

The public health literature adds nuance and sophistication to our understanding of social capital. While collective efficacy has gained currency in research in other fields, health research is still often isolated from the broader conversations among people involved in community planning or development, poverty, and civic engagement. Using the measures developed by this research could enhance our understanding of related problems.

The public health research also highlights the role of poverty in neighborhood social capital, collective efficacy, and social cohesion. In the United States, race, ethnicity, and immigration status often overlap with poverty. As such it is difficult to disconnect the impact of poverty, bigotry, or structural racism from other factors that would influence social capital, collective efficacy, civic engagement, and social cohesion. The last part of this section looks at efforts to use social capital to combat poverty in low income neighborhoods.

Poverty, Place and Social Capital

The role of social networks, neighborhood cultural capital, poverty, race, and neighborhood have been a subject of research and social experiments long before the terms social capital and collective efficacy were developed. In 1974, Carol Stack's classic *All Our Kin* showed how poor African Americans shared what they had among their family and close friends to get by. While some of these networks were neighborhood based, family ties spanned neighborhoods and even states in sharing networks.

Stack's book also demonstrated that poor people could not get ahead because welfare rules meant that they could not have much in savings in order to keep Medicaid and other needed public benefits given their unstable incomes. When a family member got a small inheritance or large paycheck, it was quickly used to buy things people in the network needed and distributed so that family members could still keep benefits. This habit of sharing rather than saving became part of the culture in these communities, making it difficult for people to move up financially. Strong bonding

²² Altschuler, A., Somkin, C., Adler, N. (2004) Local services and amenities, neighborhood social capital, and health. *Social Science and Medicine* 59, 1219–1229.

social capital helped the poor survive, but the culture associated with these networks limits the ability for any individual or family in the network to accumulate wealth.

Stack's book showed that people move back and forth between the nuclear family "norm" and resource sharing networks essential to low income families depending on current economic circumstances. Different cultural capital was important for people who relied on sharing networks than those with stable incomes that could survive without network support. Family members with stable jobs withdrew from sharing networks, but when a marriage or job ended, they quickly gave their goods to relatives and rejoined the network. More recently Katherine Newman showed that welfare dependent and working families are often intertwined, with child care arrangements often anchored to the availability of a welfare dependent relative or friend who has the time to provide free or low cost day care. The working poor seldom qualify for benefits and can not afford to move to neighborhoods with better schools or amenities. They participate in the same bonding social capital networks as those dependent on government benefits.

The same is true for people with disabilities today, because their family members and individuals with disabilities know that they can only work or save without losing public benefits they need to survive. With limited money for housing, many live in poor neighborhoods or use public housing vouchers in low income neighborhoods. While asset building initiatives for poor people and people with disabilities have made it easier to put some money aside, asset limits for essential services such as housing and Medicaid remain. Earning only a few dollars over income limits or saving too much means the loss of essential benefits. While people with disabilities from middle class families can rely on benefits in special needs trusts, Able accounts, or in-kind gifts from families, those whose networks have fewer assets must survive on very limited income from social security.

For the poor and those with disabilities, needs based systems contribute to continuing a cycle of poverty. Given that people with disabilities and many of the poor must rely on the unreliable low wage labor market, the limited income allowed by public benefit systems have created a culture where temporarily earning too much risks long term destitution. Changing this culture requires changing public benefit systems to provide basic benefits like health insurance and housing subsidies to people with limited earnings potential.

This example shows that cultural beliefs and behaviors that may appear as counter productive to middle class program managers trying to help people escape poverty, may in fact reflect economic realities in their communities. Teaching multicultural strategies involves both modeling new cultural cues and addressing the limited economic capital for those in poverty. Having the "wrong" social or cultural capital is not the only reason people are in poverty. Solutions to poverty involve fostering a combination of productive social, cultural, and human capital, as well as sufficient, stable income.

In *The Truly Disadvantaged* and *When Work Disappears*, books focusing on the plight of inner city African American men, William Julius Wilson suggested that changes from manufacturing to a service economy, movement of jobs to the suburbs and overseas, movement of middle class African Americans to better neighborhoods, and the continued deterioration of inner city institutions combine to lead to devastated neighborhoods full of people who lack the human, social, and cultural capital to escape poverty. Describing neighborhoods with few working males, Wilson stated that lack of employed role models encouraged alternative cultural styles which hurt the employment prospects of people living in these communities.

Neighborhood poverty is also connected to social isolation. The Annie E. Casey foundation's *Making Connections* project spent ten years in ten neighborhoods across the country with highly concentrated poverty using a series of interventions to foster connections among residents and between poor neighborhoods and their wider community. The project was based on the premise that there are few ties between poor neighborhoods and other parts of the city. My analysis of *Making Connections* data and research in Milwaukee suggested that some community members did have bridging ties, and those ties meant better social and economic prospects. This suggests that both bridging and bonding social capital is important for residents of poor neighborhoods.²³

²³ See Bailey, T. (2006) *Ties that Bind*. Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation for an early discussion of Making Connections and Schneider, J.A. (2010) *Social Capital and Social Geography* for discussion of the role of bonding and bridging social capital in Milwaukee's *Making Connections* site. AECF (2013) *Community Change: Lessons Learned from Making Connections*. Baltimore: Annie E Casey Foundation, provides an overview of lessons learned from the project.

Some studies show links between the nature of individual's social networks and their employment prospects. People in impoverished neighborhoods only have equally poor friends and relatives to rely on to find work. Massey and Denton's influential book *American Apartheid* suggests that segregation creates the same effect for all African Americans, regardless of whether they live in poor neighborhoods. These people have lots of social capital, but not networks that can lead to good paying jobs.

Most researchers concerned about impoverished neighborhoods note that few employers are located where poor people live. Kain first proposed a *spatial mismatch* between the residence of center city dwellers and the placement of jobs in a 1968 classic article entitled *Housing Segregation, Negro Employment, and Metropolitan Decentralization*. A spatial mismatch means that jobs and the people that need them are located at a distance from each other. Kain presumed that impoverished neighborhoods became poor because residents have difficulty finding work due to distance and transportation problems. Numerous studies of spatial mismatch conducted in later years yielded mixed results, with some supporting this idea and others showing more of a mix in locations for employment. Reviews of these studies point out several problems with the assumption that living in a poor neighborhood necessarily hurts families' chances to develop stable income and other positive outcomes:

- These studies show that poor people, crime, joblessness, and other negative conditions cluster together, but they do not really show that neighborhood conditions cause these problems.
- Most of this research focuses on African Americans, and may not apply to other groups.
- While these studies sometimes look at social networks, they only look at networks within neighborhoods.
- Some studies measure civic engagement or collective efficacy, but find that higher levels of collective efficacy only work in some situations.
- Presumptions that poor neighborhoods lack institutions are based only on the presence of organizations in a neighborhood. There is no way to tell if people use organizations outside of the neighborhood where they live.

More recent work shows income diversity within neighborhoods and that families try to find alternatives through their networks to get away from problems in poor neighborhoods. Jargowsky observes that even the ghettos, barrios and white slums he documents in his national study of urban poverty contain many working people. While the streets in impoverished neighborhoods may be dominated by blight, crime and drugs, these communities provide homes to both people following "mainstream" American lifestyles as well as those getting by through a combination of bonding social capital and under the table jobs, selling handicrafts, Avon or Amway, dealing drugs, or other means. In *Streetwise*, Anderson describes "street" and "decent" families with very different cultural attitudes and styles living in the same neighborhood. As in the public health research on social capital and place, many different social capital networks and communities can exist in one neighborhood.

Both the federal government and major foundations have engaged in a number of social experiments designed to improve conditions in impoverished neighborhoods. Many earlier strategies focused on improving the physical infrastructure in high poverty neighborhoods by demolishing large public housing projects and replacing them with low-rise mixed income neighborhoods, improving amenities, encouraging businesses to locate in these areas, providing money for community development, and revitalizing urban parks.

Other initiatives built on existing neighborhood social capital and civic engagement through supporting neighborhood watch programs, community policing, and Weed and Seed projects that first focused on combatting neighborhood crime and drug use followed by introducing positive programs for neighborhood youth and adults. Most of these programs used linking social capital between local government and community institutions to initiate projects. Their success depended on their local contacts' bonding and bridging social capital with other neighborhood residents and local organizations to implement the program.

Making Connections and the *Promise Neighborhood* initiatives both developed multiple programs in impoverished neighborhoods meant to improve the lives of local residents. *Promise Neighborhoods* started in Harlem and has been used as a model for a combination of government and private foundation initiatives in other communities. While *Making Connections* finished several years ago, *Promise Neighborhoods* is just getting started and it is too early to see long term results. These projects include efforts to improve schools, day care programs, and a wide range of programs for adults. The logic behind these initiatives is that using linking social capital to bring in resources to improve poor

communities will yield better human capital, improved health, and other social benefits which will improve social, education, and economic outcomes for residents.

Making Connections explicitly used social capital in its program design. While programs differed across communities, they included a combination of resident leadership development initiatives, clubs that promoted savings, networked programs to improve the quality of home day care providers, workforce centers offering jobs, training and supports to encourage people engaged in the workforce, and a variety of other programs. *Making Connections* reports on these initiatives showed that bonding social capital in the savings clubs encouraged saving and leadership development programs succeeded in developing both bonding social capital and civic engagement among participants.²⁴

All of these place based initiatives involved bringing resources into impoverished communities in the hopes that generating bonding social capital, teaching middle class cultural capital, and improving human capital would lead to better economic capital in the neighborhood and improved outcomes for neighborhood residents. By improving education and incomes, the projects sought to enhance collective efficacy. All used linking social capital between government or private funders and neighborhood based organizations in developing these projects.

Another strategy to both improve conditions in high poverty neighborhoods and improve the future social and economic prospects of their residents involved encouraging working class and middle income people to move into new housing in high poverty neighborhoods. Poor residents in high poverty neighborhoods were encouraged to relocate to middle income neighborhoods where they would have more opportunities to improve their educations and find good paying jobs. Unlike gentrification, where poor residents are replaced with middle income or wealthy newcomers as houses are renovated, these projects sought to keep low income residents in these neighborhoods to create mixed income communities.

The philosophy behind these projects was that low income neighbors would benefit from the resources of higher income neighbors and develop connections with them. Presuming that higher income residents used their social capital and collective efficacy to work for better schools and amenities, the quality of life in formerly high poverty neighborhoods would improve. Low income families moving to higher income communities would benefit from already existing better schools, jobs and amenities.

The largest of these projects were federal Housing and Urban Development *Hope VI* and *Moving to Opportunity* initiatives. *Hope VI* replaced large public housing projects with mixed income housing, encouraging working and middle class residents to move into revitalized neighborhoods. *Moving to Opportunity* gave public housing residents, some of them displaced by *Hope VI* projects, vouchers to move into better neighborhoods. In an experimental design study managed by Urban Institute, some public housing residents in *Hope VI* projects received a combination of counseling and vouchers to move into better neighborhoods, some simply received vouchers to move elsewhere, and others were given new housing in the completed *Hope VI* project. Social, educational, and economic outcomes were assessed for these three groups. The project presumed that residents in the new housing projects and better neighborhoods would develop bridging social capital with residents in their new communities.

Both the place based initiatives and those designed to create an income mix of poor and more affluent residents either largely failed to achieve their goals or had mixed results. A recent Urban Institute overview of these initiatives, *Building Successful Neighborhoods*, identified 5 types of initiatives: (1) institutional/service mechanisms, (2) social-interactive mechanisms, (3) environmental mechanisms, (4) geographical mechanisms, and (5) residential mobility. In reviewing these efforts, the authors commented:

[Some] emphasized direct investment to improve conditions in the troubled neighborhoods themselves, while others have put more weight on mobility strategies, facilitating the movement of the poor out of the worst areas and into "neighborhoods of opportunity" elsewhere. Now, however, there is a growing recognition of the benefits of seeing these approaches as complementary and explicitly planning for their implementation regionally in concert with policies that support sustainable regional development.

Further, when social networking is happening within neighborhoods, evidence suggests it tends to occur along strict race, class, and education lines... review of the literature concludes that "there is relatively little social networking between

²⁴ See Ahsan, N. (2007) *Social Networks Make a Difference: Family Economic Success*. Making Connections Study Reports. Baltimore: Annie E Casey Foundation and Hebert, S. and Gallion, J. (2015) *The Making Connections Experience with Resident Engagement and Leadership*. Washington DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy.

lower-income and higher-income households or children in the same neighborhood, and this lack is compounded if there are also racial differences involved.”²⁵

Taken together, these results suggest that bridging social capital is not created simply by people living in the same neighborhood. In fact, moving poor people away from their neighborhoods sometimes disrupted existing bonding networks they needed to survive. While women and girls moving to higher income neighborhoods benefited from the safer environment, most of the members of these families of both genders suffered from social isolation in higher income neighborhoods. Some moved back to poorer neighborhoods both because they could not afford rising rents and because they missed their friends and family. Others maintained friendship networks from their old community.

One of the missing ingredients in these initiatives involves intentionally building bridging social capital and fostering multicultural cultural capital to help people to create connections with new neighbors and those outside of their community. My research in various communities suggests that people from high poverty neighborhoods with bridging networks outside of their place based and bonding networks have much greater chances for social and economic success than those exclusively with bonding networks or relying on resources coming into their neighborhood. For example, in Milwaukee, one middle class, professional community leader had developed bridging social capital by participating in the Boys and Girls club as a child. The social and cultural capital she developed through this experience led to other bridging experiences throughout her life. Like many change agents in high poverty neighborhoods, she chose to move to a neighborhood similar to where she grew up. Others maintain contacts in their original neighborhoods or similar places when they move out, fostering bridging social and cultural capital for others in their communities.²⁶

The Urban Institute *Building Successful Neighborhoods* report identifies the LISC *Building Successful Communities* (BSC) community improvement initiative as one potentially successful model. BSC is currently in 114 neighborhoods in twenty-four metropolitan areas:

The core tenets of BSC are extensive and include continuing community organizing, engaging residents in the preparation of a community quality-of-life plan, enduring community partnerships, and active intermediation across sectors and between the neighborhood and the broader system of support. The model explicitly calls for coordinated investment across five programmatic domains: housing and real estate, connection to regional economies, family income and wealth generation, education, and public health and safety. In some BSC neighborhoods, the range is wider still, including, for example, early childhood development and youth programs.²⁷

While creating vibrant neighborhoods and fostering connections among diverse neighbors is clearly much more difficult in high poverty neighborhoods, these examples of successful people and projects suggest that it is possible. This involves both recognizing the existing bonding social cultural capital in these neighborhoods and using linking social capital to create cross community ties and bring in more resources. However, the most important strategy involves building bridging and linking social capital both within neighborhoods and to targeted networks outside of the geographic community that have the resources residents need to succeed. Part of building bridging and linking social capital also involves encouraging people to learn to be multicultural so that they can fit into multiple worlds and access resources from multiple networks. Given the nature of class, racial, and ethnic relations in the United States, this process is complicated and sometimes difficult, but learning to cross cultures is critical element to accessing necessary social capital, improving collective efficacy, fostering social cohesion and preventing social exclusion.

Summary

The goals of these various projects to create vibrant communities may differ, but they share an expectation that creating connections can lead to social cohesion. Each has its own challenges, but all share a need to develop long term, enduring relationships across social communities and multicultural understanding. Researchers focused on all three problems note that little evaluation exists for many of the most popular approaches to using social capital to foster

²⁵ See Taitan, et al. (2012) *Building Successful Neighborhoods* for a detailed overview of recent work on social capital, poverty and place. Quotes are from pages 1 and 18-19. Popkin, S. (2008) *New Findings on the Benefits and Limitations of Assisted Housing Mobility*. Urban Institute Brief. Washington DC: Urban Institute, summarizes findings from the *Moving to Opportunity* project.

²⁶ See Schneider, J.A. (2010) *Social Capital and Social Geography*, 21.

²⁷ See Taitan, et al. (2012) *Building Successful Neighborhoods*, 7.

social cohesion and civic engagement. The primer's final section outlines a measurement technique that potentially enhances program development and provides one strategy for evaluation.

Network Analysis: An Approach to Measuring and Understanding Social Capital

Social network analysis has been an important tool for social science and health researchers from the beginning of studies on these issues. Researchers rapidly discovered that connections between individuals or organizations are central to the way information is spread, understanding sources of support for people in need, and partnerships among organizations. In recent years, geographers have put sophisticated mapping tools into the hands of community organization leaders and local residents. Policy makers, civic leaders, and community residents alike found that mapping connections and resources in both physical and social communities was important to understand who was connected to whom and what potential resources could be tapped to reach a community goal. This section outlines how network analysis works and outlines some recent projects that help explain the relationship between social capital and place.

As discussed earlier, social networks are the building blocks for social capital, but networks are neutral. Techniques to map social networks are only the first step in understanding the social capital potential of a given network. Along with using computerized social network mapping software or creating a network map by hand, projects need to gather information on the strength of ties among network members, the resources available through the network, and the cultural capital cues needed to gain access to its social capital. This information can be gathered through open ended survey questions or interviews.

While network analysis has always been part of the research tool kit, it has become increasingly popular in recent years. Two very different forms of social network analysis co-exist. Analysis methods for network analysis differ significantly between quantitative and qualitative approaches. However, the data collection techniques have much in common.

First, computerized network analysis has become a field of study and community information tool in itself. In a quantitative approach, data are collected on who belongs to a network and the strength of those network ties. Network analysis may gather information from individuals and organizations about who they partner with and how frequently. The strength of a tie may refer to whether this person is the first, second, or last person that a particular individual would rely on for help, with the first person being the strongest tie. Network analysis may also gather how frequently someone uses a particular resource for help to indicate the strength of a connection.

Quantitative network analysis is becoming increasingly sophisticated and the number of programs available to analyze networks continues to expand. Software can document and visualize the number and strength of relationships in a variety of ways. A comprehensive guide of networking software and an introduction to computerized network analysis is available at <http://www.gmw.rug.nl/~huisman/sna/software.html>.

The network analysis program creates a series of maps showing the number of connections among people or organizations in the network. People or organizations with many connections to others are called "nodes" or "network centers" and those linked through multiple ties or a single node to each other are called "network clusters." People or organizations that serve as bridges between clusters are called "brokers." These maps would be interpreted along with qualitative network analysis to understand the role of networks and social capital for the population or community being studied.

Qualitative analysis for social networks and social capital is similar to other qualitative analysis, except that the researchers look for connections and subgroups within the communities that are being studied. Developing a qualitative network map involves sitting down with a chart with circles within circles or interlocking circles and asking the person who they would put in each circle when addressing certain needs. Information on how the person knows this individual or organization, how often the person is in contact with that network member, and the kinds of resources available through the network would be gathered at the same time.

For example, a chart of people and organizations community resident Barbara would ask to help organize a neighborhood holiday care package project for elderly community residents may have close friends and members of her faith community in the inner circle as the people that would be asked first for help. Barbara would report that she interacts with these people at least once a week and asks them to help with all kinds of projects to support those in need. A secondary circle might include people from a local school or girl scout troop known through her children. While not as close to these people, she sees them regularly and knows from previous experience that both organizations look for service projects for the children. An outer circle may include staff at a local social service agency and other faith

communities in the neighborhood that she has worked with a few times before and are known to both provide resources and know of elderly residents in need of the care packages.

Network analysis on the connections between places and social capital involve many creative uses of data and can provide a number of insights into potential resources and how social capital works. For example, a recent project uses Instagram posts to map networks and show where pictures were taken, showing clusters of users by ties and where they took their pictures. Groups are identified by their Instagram bios and other factors, clustering mostly on interest and age. Using Instagram posts from people involved in projects to bring people together or build social capital may be a method to trace results of social connection projects. For example, asking people to share their Instagram posts related to the project and noting if connections made at an event lead to future posts with those people.²⁸

Other projects combine computerized network analysis, interviews, and surveys to learn how initiatives build social capital. For instance, the Get Wet! Project brought together state and local government water quality officials with college professors, local educators, and others involved in local water quality for a service learning project testing well water contamination. Qualitative interviews with key informants in each state combined with collection of statistical data on networks and network analysis was used to show how the project built social capital. Analysis found that involvement in the project increased connections for some participants - particularly state or local government employees and educators, and turned weak ties into trusting social capital that allowed the project to continue and expand in all but one state. Participants that worked in education served as brokers, providing bridging social capital among schools and people representing water quality organizations.²⁹

Social network analysis can be used in many ways in projects. Mapping networks at the beginning of a project can show existing connections and resources, as well as gaps in the social capital available to the project. Gathering information needed to map connections later in the project can be used to improve the program along the way, evaluate results, and identify ways to expand it. Given that developing ongoing relationships and bringing projects to scale is a challenge to community improvement projects seeking to develop social capital, these mapping tools may be an important technique to improve long term success.

Conclusion

This brief outline of social capital and related concepts suggests that understanding concepts is important to developing successful initiatives. Programs that address different goals – from creating community spaces that foster connections to combatting poverty and improving health, all rely on a combination of bonding, bridging, and linking social capital. A key missing ingredient in many initiatives is consistent ways to build bridging social capital among participants. Including program elements that foster connections across groups is key to long term success.

Projects also need to include evaluation and ways to measure what they achieve from the start. The various reviews of projects attempting to build social capital highlight that outside evaluation is often missing or an afterthought. Requiring evaluation and providing tools to measure outcomes is an important component for any initiative. Network analysis and other tools can be used to evaluate the creation of various kinds of social capital.

While social capital as a concept is relatively new, the importance of connections to achieve success has been noted for centuries. Understanding the nuances of social capital and related concepts offers additional tools to build the right kinds of enduring connections that can create vibrant communities.

²⁸ See Boy, J. and Uitermark, J. (2016) How to Study the City on Instagram. *Plos One* 11(6), 1-16.

²⁹ Thornton, T. and Leahy, J. (2012) Changes in Social Capital and Networks: A Study of Community-Based Environmental Management Through a School-Centered Research Program. *Journal of Science Education & Technology* 21 (1), 167-182.

Selected References

These references include key sources on social capital and the various topics discussed in this primer. Publications included are often cited in discussions of social capital, overviews of research, evaluations of various initiatives using social capital to address issues related to place, and recent projects of particular note. Sources for examples cited throughout this report are in the footnotes. Not all of the example projects have references in this list.

1. Key Literature on Social Capital

- Bourdieu, P. (1986) The Forms of Capital. In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. John G. Richardson (editor). Richard Nice (Transl). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burt, R. (1992) *Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Coleman, J. (1988) Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94 Supplement, S95-S120.
- Granovetter, M. (1973) The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78 (6), 1360-1380.
- Lopez, L. and Stack, C. (2001) Social Capital and the Culture of Power: Lessons from the Field, in Saegert, S, Thompson, J P and Warren, M editors, (pp 31-59) *Social Capital and Poor Communities*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Portes, A (1998) Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 1-24.
- Portes, A and Landolt, P (1996) The Downside of Social Capital. *The American Prospect*, 26, 18-21.
- Putnam, R. (1995) Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1), 65-78.
- (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Putnam, R. and Feldstein, L. (2003). *Better Together: Restoring the American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Skocpol, T. (1999). How Americans became civic. In: T. Skocpol and M. Fiorina (Eds.). *Civic Engagement in American Democracy* (pp 27-80). Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press and Russell Sage Foundation
- Stack, C. (1974) *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Woolcock, M. (1998) Social Capital and Economic Development: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework. *Theory and Society* 22, 151-208.
- Woolcock, M. and Narayan, D. (2000) Social Capital: Implications for Development Theory, Research and Policy. *World Bank Research Observer*, 15 (2), 225-249.

2. Concept Articles Used as a Basis for this Primer

- Schneider, J.A. (2006) Small Nonprofits and Civil Society: Civic Engagement and Social Capital, in Cnaan, R. A., and Milofsky, C. *Handbook of community movements and local organizations*. Springer.
- (2009). Organizational social capital and nonprofits. In M.E. Harris (Guest Editor), Nonprofits and voluntary action: Theories and concepts. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(4), 643-662.

3. Creating Vibrant Communities and Improving Civic Engagement Through Enhancing Places

- Bowen, S. (2011) The Importance of Place: Re-territorialising Embeddedness. *Sociologia Ruralis* 51(4), 325-348.
- Boyes-Watson, C. (2005) Community is not a Place but a Relationship: Lessons for Organizational Development. *Public Organization Review* 5 (4), 359-374.

- Fitz, B., Lyon, L., Driskell, R. (2016) Why People Like Where They Live: Individual- and Community-Level Contributors to Community Satisfaction. *Social Indicators Research* 126(3), 1209-1224.
- Jackson, M. and Herranz, J. (2002) *Culture Counts in Communities: A Framework for Measurement*. Washington DC: Urban Institute.
- Kirby, A. (2008) The production of private space and its implications for urban social relations *Political Geography* 27 (1), 74-95.
- Hampton, K. Lee, C., Her, E. (2011) How new media affords network diversity: Direct and mediated access to social capital through participation in local social settings.. *New Media and Society*. 13 (7), 1031-1049.
- Hoene, C., Kingsley, C. Leighinger, M. (2013) *Bright Spots in Community Engagement*. Washington DC: National League of Cities.
- Lamore, R. Link, T. Blackmond, T. (2006) Renewing People and Places: Institutional Investment Policies that Enhance Social Capital and Improve the Built Environment of Distressed Communities. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 28(5), 429-442
- Portney, K and Berry, J. (1997) Mobilizing Minority Communities: Social Capital and Participation in Urban Neighborhoods. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40 (5), 632-644.
- (2010) Participation and the Pursuit of Sustainability in U.S. Cities. *Urban Affairs Review* 46(1): 119-139.
- Portney, K. and Cuttler, Z. (2010) The local nonprofit sector and the pursuit of sustainability in American cities: a preliminary exploration. *Local Environment*. 15(4), 323-339.
- Prante, T., Thacher, J., McCollum, D. Berrens, R. (2007) Building Social Capital in Forest Communities: Analysis of New Mexico's Collaborative Forest Restoration Program. *Natural Resources Journal* 47 (4), 868-915.
- Smith, R.D. (2003) *Beyond the Boundaries: Low Income Residents, Faith-Based Organizations, and Neighborhood Coalition Building*. The Leadership Center at Morehouse College. Baltimore: Annie E Casey Foundation.
- Staehele, L. and Mitchell, D. (2006) USA's destiny? Regulating space and creating community in American Shopping Malls. *Urban Studies* 43 (5/6), 977-992.
- Stern, M., and Dillman, D. (2006) Community Participation, Social Ties, and Use of the Internet. *City and Community* 5 (4), 409-424.
- Swedeen, B., Cooney, M., Moss, C., Carter, E. (2016) *Launching Inclusive Efforts through Community Conversations*. Natural Supports Project. Waisman Center: University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities, University of Wisconsin-Madison: Madison, WI. www.waisman.wisc.edu/naturalsupports.
- Thomas, E., Pate, S., Ranson, A. (2015) The Crosstown Initiative: Art, Community, and Placemaking in Memphis. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 55 (1/2), 74-88.
- Tolbert, C. (2005) Minding Our Own Business: Local Retail Establishments and the Future of Southern Civic Community. *Social Forces*. 83 (4), 1309-1328.
- Torgerson, M. and Edwards, M. (2013) Demographic Determinants of Perceived Barriers to Community Involvement: Examining Rural/Urban Differences. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 42 (2), 371-390.
- Walker, C. (2004) The Public Value of Urban Parks. Evaluation of Wallace Foundation Urban Parks Initiative. Washington DC: Urban Institute.

4. Social Capital and Public Health

- Altschuler, A., Somkin, C., Adler, N. (2004) Local services and amenities, neighborhood social capital, and health. *Social Science and Medicine* 59, 1219-1229.
- Carpiano, R. (2006) Toward a neighborhood resource-based theory of social capital for health: Can Bourdieu and sociology help? *Social Science and Medicine* 62, 165-175
- Cohen, A. and Schuchter, J. (2012) Revitalizing Communities Together: The Shared Values, Goals, and Work of Education, Urban Planning, and Public Health. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 90 (2), 187-196.

- Cohen, D., Imagami, S., Finch, B. (2008) The Built Environment and Collective Efficacy. *Health and Place* 14, 198-208.
- Folland, S. (2007) Does “community social capital” contribute to population health? *Social Science and Medicine* 64 (11), 2342-2354.
- Kawachi, I., Kennedy, B., Glass, R. (1999) Social Capital and Self Rated Health: A Contextual Analysis. *American Journal of Public Health* 89(8), 1187-1193.
- Lenzi, M., Vieno, A., Perkins, D., Pastore, M., Santinello, M., Mazzardis, S. (2012) Perceived Neighborhood Social Resources as Determinants of Prosocial Behavior in Early Adolescence. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 50, 37–49.
- Lenzi, M., Vieno, A., Santinello, M., Perkins, D. (2013). How Neighborhood Structural and Institutional Features Can Shape Neighborhood Social Connectedness: A Multilevel Study of Adolescent Perceptions. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 51, 451-467.
- Price, G (2016) Broken Windows and Crime in Development Challenged Urban Areas: Evidence from Jackson Mississippi, USA. *The Journal of Developing Areas* 50(3), 209-220.
- Sampson, R., Morenoff J., Earls, F. (1999) Beyond Social Capital: Spatial Dynamics of Collective Efficacy and Children. *American Sociological Review* 64, 633-660.
- Subramanian, S.V.; Lochner, K.; Kawachi, I. (2003) Neighborhood differences in social capital: a compositional artifact or a contextual construct? *Health and Place* 9 (1), 33-44.
- Wilson, J.Q. and Kelling, G.I. (1982) Broken Windows. *Atlantic Monthly* 249 (3), 29-38.

5. Poverty, Place and Social Capital

- Anderson, E. (1990). *Streetwise: Race, Class and Change in an Urban Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (1999). *Code of the Streets: Decency, Violence and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Bourgois, P. (1995). The Political Economy of Resistance and Self-Destruction in the Crack Economy: an Ethnographic Perspective. In *The Anthropology of Lower Income Urban Enclaves: the Case of East Harlem*. Judith Freidenberg, Editor. New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences.
- Bridgeland, J. and Khazei, A. (2013) Nice Places Finish First. *Washington Monthly*. 45 (11/12), 50-52.
- Cohn, S. and Fossett, M. (1996). What Spatial Mismatch? The Proximity of Black Employment in Boston and Houston. *Social Forces*, 75 (2): 557-574.
- Curley, A. (2010) Relocating the Poor: Social Capital and Neighborhood Resources. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 32 (1), 79-103.
- Daly, M. and Silver, H. (2008) Social exclusion and social capital: A comparison and critique. *Theory and Society* 37 (6), 537-566.
- Elliot, J. (1999). Social Isolation and Labor Market Insulation: Network and Neighborhood Effects on Less Educated Urban Workers. *Sociological Quarterly*, 40(2): 199-217.
- Furstenberg, F., Cook, t., Eccles, J., Elder, G., Sameroff, A. (1999) *Managing to Make It: Urban Families and Adolescent Success*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Galster, G. (1996). Polarization, Place and Race. In *Race, Poverty and American Cities* edited by John Charles Boger and Judith Welch Wegner. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 186-227.
- 2002. *A Review of Existing Research on the Effects of Federally Assisted Housing Programs on Neighboring Residential Property Values*. Washington, DC: National Association of Realtors.
- Gilbert, M. (2010) Theorizing Digital and Urban Inequalities. *Information, Communication and Society* 13 (7), 1000-1018.
- Holzer, H. (1991). The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: What has the Evidence Shown. *Urban Studies*, 28(1): 105-122.

- Ihlanfeldt, K. and Young, M. (1996), The Spatial Distribution of Black Employment Between the Central Cities and the Suburbs. *Economic Inquiry*, 34 (4), 693-708.
- Jargowsky, P. (1996). *Poverty and Place: Ghettos, Barrios and the American City*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kain, J. (1968). Housing Segregation, Negro Employment, and Metropolitan Decentralization. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 82(2), 175-197.
- Kasarda, J. (1989). Urban Industrial Transition and the Underclass. *Annals, AAPS*, 501, 26-47.
- Massey, D. and Denton, N. (1993). *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Miller, P. (2012) Community-Based Education and Social Capital in an Urban After-School Program. *Education and Urban Society* 44 (1), 35-60.
- Newman, K. (1999). *No Shame in My Game: The Working Poor in the Inner-City*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf and the Russell Sage Foundation.
- (2001) Hard Times on 125th Street, *American Anthropologist*, volume 103 (3), 762-778.
- Popkin, S. (2008) *New Findings on the Benefits and Limitations of Assisted Housing Mobility*. Urban Institute Brief. Washington DC: Urban Institute.
- Rankin, B. and Quane, J.. (2000). Neighborhood Poverty and the Social Isolation of Inner City African American Families. *Social Forces*, 79 (1): 139-165.
- Sampson, R., Morenho, J., Gannon-Rowley, T. (2002) Assessing Neighborhood Effects: Social Processes and New Directions in Research. *American Review of Sociology* 28: 443-478.
- Taitan, P., Kingsley, T., Parilla, J. Pendell, R. (2012) *Building Successful Neighborhoods*. What Works Collaborative. Washington DC: Urban Institute.
- Tienda, M. and Stier, H.. Generating Labor Market Inequality: Employment Opportunities and the Accumulation of Disadvantage. *Social Problems*, 43 (2), 147-165.
- Tigges, L. and Browne, I.. (1998). Social Isolation of the Urban Poor: Race, Class and Neighborhood Effects on Social Resources. *Sociological Quarterly*, 39 (1), 53-78.
- Turner, S. (1997). Barriers to a Better Break: Employer Discrimination and Spatial Mismatch in Metropolitan Detroit. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 19(2), 123-142.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (1996). *When Work Disappears*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

6. Network Analysis

- Boy, J. and Uitermark, J. (2016) How to Study the City on Instagram. *Plos One* 11(6), 1-16.
- Jordan, A. (2006) *Tapping the Power of Social Networks*. Baltimore: Annie E Casey Foundation.
- Thornton, T. and Leahy, J. (2012) Changes in Social Capital and Networks: A Study of Community-Based Environmental Management Through a School-Centered Research Program. *Journal of Science Education and Technology* 21 (1), 167-182.

Appendix A: Two Schools of Thought, Two Different Problems

Three major scholars are generally credited with developing social capital: Robert Putnam in Political Science, James Coleman in Sociology, and Pierre Bourdieu in Philosophy and Anthropology. Putnam's work is well known, but there has been much debate about his approach to social capital. Alejandro Portes, an Economic Sociologist, has played a significant role in developing Coleman and Bourdieu's concepts. Putnam's definition and the *Social Capital Benchmark Survey* measures produced by the Saguaro Seminar that supports his work at Harvard, are used in a wide array of projects. That said, many social scientists and those working on poverty and health have critiqued Putnam's approach, using a combination of Bourdieu, Coleman, and Portes work instead. Bourdieu's approach to social capital was developed to explain social class in France, and is often used in Europe as well as U.S. studies focused on poverty. Scholars at the World Bank, particularly Woolcock and Narayan, adapted the concept to international development and developed the concept of linking social capital.

These key thinkers' works have evolved into two camps. Proponents of Putnam's version of social capital focus on the role of social capital in civic engagement and as a community wide indicator of civic health. Putnam defines social capital as *social networks, norms of reciprocity, mutual assistance and trustworthiness*. Social capital is developed through face to face interactions in neighborhoods and in voluntary organizations like faith communities, PTAs, or local civic organizations. Community organizations are seen as the place where social capital and civic engagement are fostered. For this reason, people using Putnam and his followers' approach identify social capital by measuring the number of friends a person has, the number of neighbors they interact with, and also if they belong to a faith community and voluntary organizations, as well as volunteering and taking on leadership roles in community organizations. For Putnam and his followers, both individuals and communities have social capital, and social capital is often assessed for local neighborhoods, cities, and even states or countries.

Social scientists interested in the role of social capital in opportunity, social equity, poverty, health, and development draw on Coleman, Bourdieu, and Portes work to explore the role of trust based social networks and cultural capital in opportunity structures for various populations. This research draws on earlier social network theory for individuals which showed that connections are essential to get ahead in life. While some people think that poor people lack social capital, often they have very strong social capital, but not networks that have access to the resources they need. For example, Carol Stack's classic *All Our Kin* shows how poor families share what they have to get by. But the rules of government programs and the expectations of their networks make it hard to get ahead.

The social science approach to social capital looks more often at the resources available through an individual's networks, rather than just counting the number of friends and family. These scholars focus primarily on the networks of particular individuals or among a small group in a community. Communities could be geographic areas like a neighborhood or social communities like people involved in a faith community that draws members from across a city or a virtual network of artists. This approach rarely looks at community, city, or statewide measures of social capital.

The differences between Putnam and this social science school stems as much from the different problems they explore as different definitions of social capital. While Putnam and followers focus primarily on the role of social capital in promoting community wide civic health, Portes and others in the social science school focus primarily on the impact of social capital for individuals or marginalized communities. The World Bank projects identifying the role of social capital in alleviating poverty develop a middle ground between these two approaches by focusing on both institutions involved in community wide development and the impact of social capital for individuals attempting to gain access to resources.

While various definitions of social capital all contain the same three elements - networks, trust and norms or culture - ways these various schools understand these elements differ. Much of the confusion about what social capital means comes from differing ways of understanding these three elements. Projects using social capital succeed or fail based on misunderstandings about these three key parts of social capital.

Networks

All three schools consider networks an important part of social capital, but Putnam's school tends to measure networks through memberships and number of family/friends, while the social science school focuses on durable networks of individuals. World Bank scholarship and its followers tend to study both individual and institutional connections. Much of the confusion regarding the role of networks in social capital involves the nature of the relationships in a network. Social capital networks are not simply connections, but ties that people and organizations use over time to get access to

the resources they need. These ties are reciprocal, enforceable and durable, relationships do not end if one promise is broken or a partner does not come through in a single instance.

Presuming that belonging to an organization, volunteering or providing a service to someone else automatically generates social capital among everyone involved in the activity leads to much of the misunderstanding about social capital. None of the major thinkers in the three schools support this view. A close reading of Putnam shows that he emphasizes mutual, reciprocal relationships. People often misinterpret Grannovetter's discussion of the *strength of weak ties* to mean that short term connections lead to social capital. However, Grannovetter notes that closer relationships more often lead to jobs than fleeting contacts.

Trust

Putnam's followers usually focus on generalized or thin trust, while those coming out of study of social networks stress that social capital involves long term, enforceable trust. That said, Putnam's discussion of *bonding* social capital suggests tight bonds among people that would involve specific trust. The major instruments in the World Bank social capital tool kit include measures of generalized trust, but also ask where individuals find personal resources using questions that gather information on specific trust among networks of individuals.

Norms or Culture

Putnam and followers include norms in their definition of social capital, but understand norms differently in various contexts. The discussion of generalized community wide social capital tends to suggest community wide norms. Putnam also notes that communities with significant cultural diversity have lower levels of community wide social capital, suggesting that community wide norms are an important element in his approach to social capital. In other words, Putnam recognizes that bonding social capital networks involve homogeneous culture while bridging social capital crosses cultural boundaries. In diverse communities, people may not develop common norms if they have less bridging social capital. This highlights the importance of bridging social capital in Putnam's vision of vibrant community.

The social science school sees social capital and cultural capital as linked, but not merged concepts. Bourdieu identifies three primary types of capital that work together to maintain a social hierarchy: social capital (networks), economic capital, and cultural capital. Most of the research coming out of this social science school uses culture to mean the behaviors, beliefs and practices of a group of people. When talking about challenges people face escaping poverty, they talk about subcultural differences that can be used to keep people out of social networks with the resources they need to move up or participate in the broader community. Portes calls this the downside of social capital. As with the other key elements of social capital, the World Bank work falls somewhere between these two approaches.

The basic definition of social capital used throughout this primer comes out of the social science approach, relying on a combination of Bourdieu, Portes and Coleman. That said, my conversations with Robert Putnam over the years reveal that our basic understanding of the term is the same. I use Putnam's definitions of bonding and bridging social capital. Linking social capital comes out of the World Bank work. The different in definitions influence the ways that social capital is measured, with Putnam's Saguaro seminar school relying on quantitative surveys of entire communities while the social science school uses a combination of qualitative research like interviews, focus groups, and observation, surveys, and network analysis. My research used as examples here tends to use mixed methods, including surveys, a wide variety of qualitative measures, network analysis, and geographical information system (GIS) mapping.

**Additional copies of this report are available at
<http://chrysaliscollaborations.com/social-capital-and-place-primer-and-factsheet/>**