

Building Social Capital: A Learning Agenda for the Twenty-first Century

Patricia A. Wilson

1. Introduction

Social capital creates local economic prosperity. This finding by Putnam (1993a), Fukuyama (1995), Coleman (1988, 1990) and other social scientists has lent legitimacy to what those involved in community economic development have known intuitively for years: the level of inter-personal trust, civic engagement and organisational capability in a community counts. Their research indicates that the lack of, or decline in, social capital lies behind the psychological, spiritual and economic malaise in communities throughout the world.¹ While there is a rich literature deploring the lack of civic commitment and the rise of individualism (Bellah *et al.*, 1985, 1991; Etzioni, 1994; Lappe and DuBois, 1994), the social capital literature gives the issue a more compelling rationale for urgency: the bottom line.

Just as the inter-personal aspects of total quality management (TQM) ushered in trust-building and team-building to the private and public sectors (Deming, 1982; Osborne and Gaebler, 1992), the concept of social capital brings these same values centre stage in the so-called third sector: civil society. The recognition of social capital as a determinant of local economic development directs the attention of development planners to a very intangible goal. In addition to creating jobs, disbursing loans, generating income, training the labour force and delivering services,

development planners must now confront head on the fuzzy task of shaping levels of inter-personal trust, feelings of belonging and responsibility, and the quality and efficacy of civic engagement in a community. These intangibles can no longer be relegated to quaint touchy-feely by-products of community economic development. A central task for development planners is now social capital formation—i.e. community-building itself.

2. Overview

There are three questions to be confronted in the daunting task of building social capital. First, how do you know what level of social capital you are starting with and when you have successfully created more? Many development agencies have simply avoided the question by focusing on the more traditional tangible products or using input measures for the intangibles—number and size of organisations assisted, number of meetings held, etc.

The next question is even more unsettling: How do you create it? Building community, or social capital, is not a technical problem requiring expert solutions. Nor is it a problem of resources. Social capital, unlike physical capital (machinery and equipment), financial capital and human capital, is free—

Patricia A. Wilson is in the School of Architecture, University of Texas at Austin, Graduate Program in Community and Regional Planning, Sutton Hall, Austin, Texas 78712-1160, USA; Fax: (512)-471-0716. E-mail: pwilson@mail.utexas.edu.

it requires no natural resources, no machines, no bricks and mortar, no paid labour. It does not respond to large-scale social engineering (Fukuyama, 1995; Senge, 1990). It is built in a very humble, piecemeal way through countless decisions of individuals about whether or not to get involved, and once involved how to proceed. So what then is the role of professionals in building social capital for community economic development? What values are necessary? What skills must be learned?

Finally, if these values, roles and skills are not the ones currently being taught in planning and policy programmes, how must colleges and universities respond to become relevant to the new roles their graduates will be called upon to play?

The answers to these questions point to an agenda for the next century for professional practice and academia in building social capital for community development. Whether the focus is community economic development, community social development or strengthening local democracy, productive social capital rests on the values of trust and openness. The role of the professional as technical expert, master planner or manager will be embedded in the larger role as catalyst, facilitator, communicator, team-player.

There are specific theories, tools and skills that the professional can use to assist community organisations in becoming effective learners, problem-solvers and seeds of societal change. The theory derives from social learning; the methods, tools and skills from organisational development and quality management. Yet the real learning comes from experience—reflection-in-action. And all must be embedded in a framework of democratic values and personal development. Professional education must bring together in creative tension both theory and practice, intellect and intuition, thoughts and feelings, values and objectivity, the personal and the professional, the individual and the group, the classroom and community.

3. Social Capital and Community Economic Development

The term social capital has been used to describe what the Frenchman Alexis De Tocqueville observed in the US in 1835—a propensity for individuals to join together to address mutual needs and to pursue common interests. What he described was the level of community—community spirit, civic engagement, a sense of individual stewardship or trusteeship for the common good, a sense of being recognised and valued, a sense of belonging. He noted that it was

the influence of customs [social capital] that produces the different degrees of order and prosperity which may be distinguished in the several Anglo-American democracies. (cited in Daly and Cobb, 1989, p. 334)

De Tocqueville also warned that the healthy tension or balance between civic engagement and individualism in the US stood the chance of being lost. There is strong indication that social capital has been eroding in the US, reflecting the rise of deeply ingrained individualism concomitant with advanced industrial society (Bellah *et al.*, 1985). Lack of social capital is also pointed to as a major problem in less developed countries and newly emerging democracies, which Fukuyama categorises as low-trust cultures. There the challenge is to build, rather than re-build, social capital, drawing in some cases—as in Latin America—on pre-modern mores of reciprocity.

Social capital increases a community's productive potential in several ways (Putnam, 1993b). It promotes business networking; shared leads, equipment and services; joint ventures, faster information flows and more agile transactions. (See the literature on network capitalism and industrial districts, reviewed in Wilson, 1995.)

The moment that trust breaks down among members of a business network, relations have to be spelled out in detail, unwritten rules codified, and third parties brought in

to resolve differences ... At this point the network...begins to resemble either a market relationship or an old fashioned hierarchical corporation. (Fukuyama, 1995, p. 342)

However, the trust and spontaneous sociability of social capital are not a product of utilitarian rational calculation of self-interest (Fukuyama, 1995). They are not the pinnacle of modernist utilitarian rationality. Rather, they embrace generalised reciprocity much more akin to the Native American concept badly misnamed 'Indian giving'—that a gift is meant to be given away again, not appropriated as personal property (Hyde, 1983): I will help you with your needs now and trust that when I need help my needs will be met. Generalised reciprocity is based on a sense of belonging to a larger circle and a long time-cycle, with trust in ultimate equity.

Social capital not only produces an atmosphere conducive to economic activity, it provides the cultural will to solve community problems collaboratively (Lean, 1995). The organisational infrastructure of social capital creates pragmatic skills that enable citizens to act directly to solve problems. Thus block associations, social clubs, civic groups, churches and other grassroots groups may meet social and economic needs that increase the well-being and productive capacity of the members of a community—e.g. counselling, social services, even housing and economic development (McDougall, 1993, p. 207).

Social capital is essential for maintaining and enhancing the value of public goods. Public goods are those whose value can be maintained only through co-operation and trust, and whose value is lost through the pursuit of individual self-interest. Thus maintaining public goods such as quality of life, environmental preservation, even traffic safety, requires social capital. Those systems where the rationality of individual short-term gain leads to collective irrationality are known as the 'tragedy of the commons' (Senge, 1990). Social capital not only creates the goodwill to solve 'tragedy of the

commons' systems, it allows more creative solutions. A collective sense of responsibility generates broad-based participation in problem-solving; no longer is it just the boss or the mayor who has to solve the problem when social capital is highly developed.

Social capital can take different faces. Its nature is rooted in history. The social capital that De Tocqueville witnessed grew out of an agrarian-based mercantile economy. The gated neighbourhoods and life-style communities of the current era are manifestations of an increasingly polarised global economy. Productive social capital generates understanding, compassion, trust and an inclusive concept of community (Peck, 1987; Etzioni, 1991). Unproductive social capital, in contrast, is built on fear and mistrust, even hate. Its goal is to protect a group's self interest against perceived outside threats (Putnam, 1993b). Civic participation puts the common good over self interest only when citizens respect and trust each other (Boyte, 1991; Daly and Cobb, 1989). Productive social capital "depends on learning to listen to one another, to resolve conflicts, and to overcome barriers of fear and suspicion" (Lean, 1995, p. 6).

While some see productive social capital as a fortunate holdover from pre-modern cultures (for example, Fukuyama, 1995), others see it as a harbinger of the leading values for the 21st century (Robertson, 1985). Social capital could lay the basis for what Harman (1988) says is the next epoch: the transition from a fear-based to a trust-based economy. Various authors posit the possibility of consciously promoting such values and skills, not in the sense of social engineering by the State, but by a diffused process of individual and group development (see, for example, Mackie, 1995, and Baum, 1990).

4. Social Capital and the New Professional Protocol

What is the role of the development planner in social capital formation? If social capital is a self-organising system with many actors

connected in an amorphous web or network, it cannot be controlled with the tool kit of rational utilitarian instrumental planning:

We cannot control self-organizing systems; we can only serve them. There is a natural potential for self-healing (re-organizing) within each organism or system or cell. The therapist [like the professional development planner] should be an attendant at the process, not a master planner. (J. D. Laing, cited in Capra, 1988, p. 27)

A self-organising system can be managed only through self-regulation (Senge, 1990, p. 387). The intervenor must work with, not against, the forces of a system to transform or heal it (p. 355). The 'master planner' paradigm of professional practice—i.e. the utilitarian model of technical expertise—has been largely discredited in the planning theory literature (see the 'critical pragmatists' such as Friedmann, 1987; Forester, 1985, 1989). Moreover, the growing literature of stories about planning practitioners documents the rise of a new planning protocol that is relational, intuitive and values-based (e.g. Forester, 1993; Hoch, 1994; McClendon and Catanese, 1996).

The real work of planet-saving [and planning] will be small, humble, and humbling.... The greatest obstacle may not be greed but the modern hankering after glamour. A lot of our smartest, most concerned people want to come up with a big solution to a big problem. (Berry, 1993, pp. 23–24)

Argyris and Schön (1974) were among the first to articulate an alternative professional protocol adequate to the humbling challenge of dealing with self-organising systems. Rejecting the protocol of the technical expert (Model I), Argyris and Schön posited an alternative model: the reflective practitioner (Model II): whereas the technical expert is presumed to know and must claim to know, the reflective practitioner assumes that both the client and the professional have knowledge that is important to the problem. While

the technical expert keeps his/her distance, the reflective practitioner seeks out connections to the client's thoughts and feelings and allows the client to discover his/her own thoughts and feelings. While the technical expert expects deference and status from the client, the reflective practitioner needs no professional pretence and instead seeks a sense of freedom and connection to the client. Planning becomes recast as mutual learning-in-action (Friedmann, 1987; Senge, 1990, p. 187). For Model II to be successful, both professional and client need to change in order to let go of clear contractual relationships and to accept the frustration of uncertainty. The result is a collaborative exploration of trust-building in which each empowers the other (Schön, 1983).

5. The Intellectual Roots of the New Professional Protocol

The intellectual roots of the new protocol are found in social learning, organisational development and dynamic systems theory. Social learning developed from the American educator John Dewey's pragmatist philosophy of learning from action for the betterment of all. It advocates participatory action research and experiential learning, based on the idea that the individual has an innate wisdom that can be tapped if limiting beliefs are discarded (Friedmann, 1987). Participatory action research also has roots in both the Frankfurt school of critical theory, especially Habermas, and the educational philosophy of Paulo Freire. (See Fals Borda, 1988; Horton and Freire, 1990; Forester, 1985.)

In social learning, an informal task-oriented action group or team learns from its own practice through reflection and dialogue. Social learning may involve a professional change agent or facilitator who encourages, guides and assists the process. The change agent must develop a *rapport* with the group that is conducive to mutual learning. An effective learning process allows the group to learn far more than how to adjust its tactics to solve a problem. It can change the group members' theories of reality, values and

beliefs that can lead to individual inner transformation in self-image and ways of seeing and relating to others (Argyris and Schön, 1974, 1978).

After World War II, social learning spawned the field of organisation development, or OD, which translated social learning into a set of professional practices and tools for the change agent or facilitator. OD drew from the study of group dynamics which arose from the famous 1930s Hawthorne experiment (Lewin, 1951). This experiment showed that worker productivity increased when workers were involved in small-group decision-making about their work. OD found its principal source of inspiration, however, in psychology—particularly in the humanistic psychologies of Carl Rogers and Abraham Maslow (Friedmann, 1987). Drawing on this psychological inspiration, OD provided almost a spiritual vision of transforming America from a dehumanising industrial capitalism to a decentralised, non-hierarchical post-industrial society that would treat individuals as whole human beings.

Management tools coming from OD include trust-building, team-building and community-building within and among networks. These methods and values became part of what is commonly known in business and government circles as total quality management (TQM) (Lindsay and Patrick, 1996).² While OD has been applied primarily in places of employment, the fields of community psychology and community development have applied it to civil society, especially community organisations (Newbrough, 1973; Leonard, 1994).

OD utilises dynamic systems theory as its organising principle for change (Senge 1990): the idea that in social systems there is no top or centre from which power emanates in a hierarchical, linear fashion; rather, there is a complex self-organising web of actors interrelating and creating power through relationship. Acting in social networks is the key to change. And it is precisely the key to building social capital.

6. A Comparison with the Social Mobilisation Approach

OD shares many values with the more radical social mobilisation approach to social learning advocated by Saul Alinsky and Paulo Freire. Both approaches see the ultimate source of power as lying within the community itself. Power rests in the people's capacity to make sense out of reality, to generate knowledge about their reality from action and reflection, to build their own identity, and to become more fully human. However, social mobilisation advocates criticise the OD approach to social learning as manipulative and naive: manipulative of workers for the benefit of capital and naive for not taking sufficiently into account the structure of power that lies outside the community (Friedmann, 1987; Forster, 1989).

The OD approach to social learning, especially as applied to the community level, emphasises the participatory tools for building organisations and institutions that enable citizens/members to solve problems in an economically sustainable way. This approach advocates unity (solidarity), discipline and improved organisational methods, and not simply the "exuberance of democracy" that has led to corruption, irresponsibility and lack of accountability in many emerging democracies (Fuglesang and Chandler, 1993, p. 30). While resting on democratic participatory values, the OD approach requires disciplined learning and practice to build harmony out of social discord. Muhammad Yunus founded the Grameen Bank on these principles about 20 years ago:

While both Alinsky and Freire to some extent advocate conflict and confrontation as a means of synthesizing action for liberation and development, the Yunus approach is analytical, process-oriented and non-confrontational. Its strength is competence in organizational development. To counteract and supersede oppressive structures, it builds alternative, more effective and enabling

socio-economic frameworks (i.e. organizations) through which people can participate in action towards their liberation. And it attempts to do so on a large scale. (Fuglesang and Chandler, 1993, p. 31)

7. Examples of Changing Roles for Development Professionals

Development planning has already ventured far beyond the technical expert model (Rodwin and Schön, 1994). Development planning now includes the collaborative process skills that are the key to building social capital. By addressing social capital formation, development planners are joining the larger professional tide toward the model of the reflective practitioner. The following examples give a taste of the new tools, skills and sensitivities already being demanded in the field of community economic development: promoting stakeholder participation, measuring qualitative change and catalysing inner development.

Promoting Stakeholder Participation

Fed from above by the popularity of TQM, and from below by the long history of grassroots participatory efforts, development organisations have begun to promote 'stakeholder' participation in decision-making (Campbell 1995). These efforts are spurred by budget cutbacks and the desire for sustainable development (i.e. development efforts that will be carried on by the stakeholders after the agency withdraws).

Stakeholder participation has become an explicit agency-wide strategy only in the last five or six years among major bilateral development agencies such as Canada's CIDA, the German GTZ and the USAID. USAID, for example, issued a high-level Statement of Principles on Participatory Development in 1993 that committed itself to constructing a development approach based on participation.

In 1994, the World Bank concluded that stakeholder participation would enhance the

quality, effectiveness and sustainability of its projects (World Bank, 1994). As the Bank aims to become more accountable and client-centred, it is encouraging the governments it assists to promote the participation of a wide range of stakeholders, especially the poor themselves (World Bank, 1994, p. 30). Participatory mechanisms being used by the Bank vary in the degree to which stakeholders have influence, from information-sharing, consultative mechanisms, and joint assessments, such as participatory poverty assessments, to shared decision-making and implementation, capacity building of stakeholder organisations and support of stakeholder initiatives.

The Bank has been accused of using participatory methods for social marketing of its own operations plans (World Bank, 1994, Annex VI, p. 6). In response to this criticism, the Bank is considering ways of creating a culture of participation among Bank staff by bringing in NGO practitioners experienced in participatory methods; providing staff training in participatory methods using case studies and role-playing; offering three-month grassroots sabbaticals for the Bank's operations staff to learn by doing; and developing an inter-agency consultative learning group (network) on participation (p. 7).

In the US, stakeholder participation is becoming more common in federal, state and local government economic development efforts. (See Program for Community Problem Solving, 1996, for examples of participatory economic development projects at the local level; also Sharp and Bath, 1995). At the federal level, President Clinton's 1993 empowerment zone legislation required local governments to bring the private-sector and community-based stakeholders to the table to design and implement job-generating projects aimed at poverty alleviation (Gittel et al., 1996). Community development corporations in the US have been pursuing stakeholder involvement in multi-sectoral strategic planning efforts (Halpern, 1995; Medoff and Sklar, 1994). Many church and other community-based organisations combine aspects of personal development, self-

esteem building and individual empowerment with stakeholder participation in community development (Hinsdale *et al.*, 1995; McDougall, 1993).

Measuring Intangibles

Among international development organisations, the importance of social capital in community development has long been understood, but seldom explicitly targeted. Most donor agencies, especially the large ones, have measured their success primarily in terms of tangible outputs—for example, number of micro-enterprises created, loans disbursed, jobs created, income generated, infrastructure built or people served. As larger agencies have downsized, however, they have begun to adopt the catalytic role of building social capital, rather than (or in addition to) the instrumental role of creating direct tangible outputs.

The Inter-American Foundation is known for its participatory grassroots approach to community development in Latin America (Ritchey-Vance, 1994). However, it was only in 1992 that the IAF began to develop a method for measuring the intangible impacts of its projects on social capital. Called the Grassroots Development Framework, it measures three intangible factors: personal capacity (self-esteem, cultural identity, creativity, critical reflection); organisational culture and capacity (vision, participatory practice, autonomy, solidarity); and community norms (values, attitudes, relations). Organisational culture and community norms are direct reflections of social capital; their presence rests on personal capacity-building (Ritchey-Vance, 1996).

Facilitating Inner Development and Group Learning

Many organisations both small and large are now paying attention to the organisational learning cycle and the inner development it rests on, in order to generate authentic, empowered participation (see discussion in Wilson, 1996). Using a participatory method-

ology does not by itself ensure the formation of productive social capital:

People can participate without learning. Beginning where people are, and then designing steps to help them move through the [learning cycle] increases the possibility of a sustainable impact. (S. Dunsmore, quoted in Gooden, 1996, p. 10)

PROCAP (Programa de Capacitación y Apoyo), a small NGO that works on reconciliation and community economic development in ex-combat zones of El Salvador, combines inner development and group learning with its own staff as well as with project participants. For PROCAP, responsible participation in decision-making requires an understanding of the community's needs, and not merely the capacity to advocate in one's own interest. Participation means more than simply having people express their opinions. The right to participate in the decision-making process brings with it the responsibility to act for the common good (Gooden, 1996, p. 9).

In designing programmes for individuals with little experience in democratic participation, PROCAP creates a learning cycle. First participants reconceptualise themselves as actors; they identify their concerns and set priorities for action; they prepare themselves to act with appropriate training; they learn by doing; and, finally, the participants evaluate each action for greater group learning (Gooden, 1996, p. 10).

PROCAP's professional staff members accompany the participants through a series of learning cycles, building trust along the way. With a staff of 50, PROCAP hires professionals who show a commitment to these participatory values.

Learning to Walk in the Other's Shoes

The 20-year-old Grameen Bank, known for its successful micro-enterprise group lending to the landless poor of Bangladesh, defines its essence as linking social development, economic development and empowerment,

with microcredit as the catalyst. The 1.8m borrowers, 90 per cent women, are members/owners rather than clients of the Bank. Now with over 12 000 employees, the Bank operates on the principles of TQM, with group decision-making, team work, quantitative and qualitative participatory evaluations, and a computerised management information system. Each of its 1000 branches is a profit centre that must carry its own weight, maintaining group accountability and transparency (Fuglesang and Chandler, 1993).

The Grameen Bank has gradually developed an intense six-month training programme for its entering professionals, all of whom must have a Master's degree in any subject. The training "plunges a person into direct contact with the poor" by living in a village and working at the local Bank branch (Fuglesang and Chandler, 1993, p. 70). Ninety-five per cent of head office staff have been trained in the rural areas and worked there as trainees and branch managers before moving to the head office in Dhaka. Thus the field experience becomes "the yardstick by which subsequent decisions are made" (p. 74).

The field experience, which leaves trainees largely to their own devices, teaches self-reliance, co-operation, innovation, listening and empathy. Not even being allowed bicycles to get around, the trainees must share the daily experience of the branch workers they will eventually supervise, as well as the daily experience of the rural poor themselves. The training involves primarily living in the village where the branch operates, listening and learning, and letting go of prior concepts. Besides formal training in Bank procedures, the trainees carry out action research projects—case studies of Bank members to find out the impact the loans have had on their lives. They learn group process skills, team work, participatory management skills, conflict resolution, and listening and communication skills. Every eight weeks, the trainees come together to share experiences and to learn from each other. Those who complete the training have increased self-confidence and a higher level of commitment

to, and understanding of, the Grameen process for building social capital (Fuglesang and Chandler, 1993, p. 79).

8. New Tools and Methods

The new roles being played by development planners require a bundle of tools and methods for community-building which go well beyond substantive expertise.

Participatory Action Research

Aimed at collaborative problem-solving of community-defined problems, participatory action research respects and works with people's own capability to produce knowledge. It is an educational process of community mobilisation for development through dialogue and reflection on action (Hinsdale *et al.*, 1995). The dialogue is

not simply a form of exchange or bargaining around pre-defined interests. It involves mutually reconstructing what constitute the interests of the various participants—a process of mutual learning through mutually searching to understand. (Healey, 1992, p. 155)

Participatory action research can have a transformative effect on the hearts and minds of the participants (Forester, 1989, p. 195; Rahman, 1993).

The learning process may be facilitated by an outside professional, but with control in the hands of the community (Burkey, 1993). Specific methodologies for facilitating participatory action research are proliferating. Two used by the World Bank are Participatory Rural Appraisal and SARAR (an acronym standing for self-esteem, associative strength, resourcefulness, action planning and responsibility) (World Bank, 1995).

Organisational Learning

Organisational learning is participatory action research applied to the dynamics of the group or organisation itself. Carried out

through dialogue and reflection for mutual learning from action (Argyris and Schön, 1974, 1978), it too can have a transformative effect on the participants, generating a renewed commitment to group and sense of direction (Forester, 1989, p. 195).

Dynamic Systems Analysis

A tool for enhancing both action research and organisational learning, dynamic systems analysis helps the members of a group to see interrelationships rather than linear cause-effect chains, wholes rather than isolated parts, and processes of change rather than static snapshots. It allows people in a system to be visualised as actors and subjects, not reactors and objects (Senge, 1990, p. 73). Specific systems skills useful for learning from action include reframing (Schön and Rein, 1994) and double-loop learning (Argyris and Schön, 1978). Dynamic systems analysis is also used as a tool for comprehending and facilitating small-group development (Newbrough *et al.*, 1997).

Communicative Action

The German critical philosopher Habermas provides principles for facilitating stakeholder-based small group learning. Called communicative action, this form of learning rests on equal access to information and consensus-building through dialogue rather than power relationships (Innes, 1995, p. 187). Tools for analysing language, discourse and representation are essential for communicative action. Both modernist approaches to discourse analysis such as Forester (1989) and post-modern approaches such as Healey (1992) provide useful tools for understanding and guiding communicative action. (See Lauria and Soll, 1996, for an application of communicative action tools to economic development planning.) Communicative action is part of the reflective practitioner's tool kit (Innes, 1995, p. 188).

Non-traditional Indicators

Non-traditional indicators measure organisational capacity, personal sense of coherence

and self-efficacy, level of inter-personal trust and co-operation and other intangible products of community-building (Anderson, 1991; Feurstein, 1986; Rahman, 1993; Quintero Uribe, 1995; Rubin and Babbie, 1993; see also Mackie, 1995).

Participatory Methods

The tool box of participatory methods in social learning is expanding rapidly, some with 'brand names' (i.e. service marks, as opposed to trade marks). They include workshop-based methods such as appreciation-influence-control (AIC)—a method for guiding empathic listening, dialogue and action decisions by small groups developed by a private company (ODII) and used by the World Bank. The PC/team up method, also used by the World Bank, employs a computer software package that guides participants through team research, project design, planning, implementation and evaluation. Another method is objectives-oriented project planning (ZOOP), which builds stakeholder commitment and capacity with a series of participatory planning workshops (World Bank, 1995).

Participatory methods for stakeholder consultation and deliberation include focus groups and rapid appraisals. One group of participatory methods brings together a randomly selected representative sample of citizens for dialogue and consensus-building. Examples include the Kettering Foundation's National Issues Forum, the Jefferson Center's Citizen Juries, and the Planning Cell method developed by Peter Diemel in Germany (World Bank, 1995; Diemel and Renn, 1995; Renn *et al.*, 1995).

9. Inter-personal and Group Process Skills

Sometimes called "people skills" (Bolton, 1979), "democratic arts" (Lappe and DuBois, 1994) or "emotional intelligence" (Goleman, 1995), there is a set of interpersonal and group process skills that are useful for community-building:

1. Communication skills, especially active listening (Bolton, 1979; Forester, 1989; Covey, 1989).
2. Relationship skills, such as building mutual respect, understanding, trust and empathy (Hoch, 1994, p. 314; Baum, 1987, 1990).
3. Group process skills, such as conflict resolution (Fisher and Ury, 1981; Susskind and Cruikshank, 1987); group facilitation (Burkey, 1993; Ewert *et al.*, 1994); participatory problem-solving and decision-making (Meck, 1996, p. 284); team-building (Catanese, 1996, p. 294); celebration, ritual and appreciation (Hindsdale *et al.*, 1995, pp. 102–126).
4. Networking skills, i.e. creating linkages and networks within and outside the community, both virtual and actual (Friedmann, 1987, p. 400; Hanna, 1994; Mayo and Craig, 1995; Shuman, 1994).
5. Leadership skills, focusing on leader as coach, catalyst and change agent (Burkey, 1993); leader as articulator of participants' hopes and desires (Hoch, 1994, p. 304); leader as builder of shared vision (Catanese, 1996, p. 295); leader as servant, leader as reframer (Senge, 1990, p. 289); leader as empowerer of others (Robinson Jr, 1994; Catanese, 1996, p. 297); and co-operative leadership (Giloth and Mier, 1993).

10. Values, Virtues and Inner Development

Community-building is not a formal activity requiring only the correct set of tools and skills. To be effective, community-builders and development planners must embed the tools and skills in a set of conducive personal values and virtues (Lean, 1995). Humanist psychologist Carl Rogers lists the following: openness, authenticity, intimacy, comfortableness with process and uncertainty; caring attitude (gentle, non-judgmental); closeness to and caring for elemental nature; trust in one's own inner knowing; unimportance of material accumulation; yearning for the spiritual, the experience of unity and harmony

(Rogers, 1980; pp. 351ff, cited in Friedmann 1987, p. 208). Stan Burkey adds that the successful catalyst or change agent is one who can detach from ego, for whom "fulfillment is to be sought not in establishing one's own image but in liquidating it" (Burkey, 1993, p. 105).

Values and character ethic are intimately connected with inner development. Two of the leading authors under the TQM umbrella, Stephen Covey (1989) and Peter Senge (1990), eloquently argue that it is inner change that lies at the basis of sustained external quality improvement.³ Downplaying personality development as the superficial acquisition of useful abilities and traits, these authors stress character development—the continuous, long-term process of becoming more self-aware. Inner work on one's state of being leads to personal mastery and personal renewal. Through continual learning, reframing and changing mental maps about one's self and one's relationship to the world, an individual reaches ultimately what Senge calls 'metanoia' and Covey calls 'paradigm shift': a fundamental shift of mind and change in heart that generates a felt sense of compassion, trust and connectedness to the whole (Senge, 1990, p. 167). When widespread paranoia becomes widespread metanoia, social capital will flourish!

11. The Implications for Professional Education

In the coming century, professionals will be called upon to create the kind of 'public space' that generates social capital—i.e. the patterns of mutual accountability and co-operation that enhance connectedness (Sullivan, 1995, p. 234). If we are on the cusp of a new epoch that will make community-building a central feature of professional life—what Sullivan calls 'civic professionalism' (p. 234)—it is clear that professional education will be profoundly affected. Professional training will need to teach development planners to empower clients and build community. It will transcend the old model of dependence on technical expertise. It will

teach the relational and process skills, tools and values necessary for community-building. The current widespread interest in social capital is an invitation to universities to reassert their leadership in developing a responsible and empowering cadre of professionals, as well as a responsible and empowered citizenry.

Academia is gradually adopting the new professional protocol of the reflective practitioner to its own practice of teaching. The relational and process skills, tools and values necessary for community-building cannot be taught using traditional pedagogy. The student cannot acquire these skills by being told about them. However, students can be coached to discover and to appropriate them for themselves, through a combination of experiential learning and reflective dialogue—what Schön calls reflection-in-action (Schön, 1987, p. 92). Open-ended practicums, along the lines of the architectural design studio and in-class role-playing of case studies, provide a medium for individual and group reflection-in-action (Schön, 1987, p. 17). These practices can be transformative for the student (Forester, 1989, p. 198).

The effective teacher models the skills of community-building in the classroom. The classroom becomes a collaborative community that fosters belonging, caring, mutual respect, stewardship, generosity, service and responsibility (Sergiovanni, 1994, p. 117). The tools of co-operative learning (Godsell *et al.*, 1992), team learning (Michaelsen *et al.*, 1993), active learning (Bonwell and Eison, 1991), and quality teaching (Millis, 1993) are useful in this endeavour, but are ultimately effective only if the teacher him or herself has done the necessary inner work. To model the skills for social capital building, the teacher must become an empowered individual, strong enough to step aside and listen, to motivate without controlling (Millis, 1993, p. 160). The effective teacher, like the social learning facilitator, is able to “relinquish the authority role while assisting the students to take over their own learning processes” (Innes, 1995, p. 187). The Model II teacher, according to Schön (1991), is trusting enough

in dialogue with students to verbalise tacit assumptions, test attributions, communicate feelings and let go of outcomes. In contrast, the Model I teacher, motivated by an underlying fear, attempts to control the classroom process (Argyris and Schön, 1974).

Effective universities will become social capital builders both inside and outside the classroom. Faculty will model the collegiality of community-building among themselves, from faculty meetings to research projects. They will need to be supported by an administrative structure that understands, rewards and also practises the new paradigm (Sergiovanni, 1990).

The new pedagogy cannot be confined to the university. Action research workshops, internships and extended residencies will take the student into the community as a core part of the professional curriculum in the next century. Universities will reach out to the organised civil society to create a synergistic partnership. Community leaders and professional practitioners will spend their ‘sabbaticals’ in academia, enriching classroom learning by their presence. Students will do field work and internships with community-based groups and other non-profit organisations engaged in social capital building. Some of these partnerships between university and community will extend beyond borders to other countries, especially in the developing world and newly emerging democracies.

Professional education will bring together in creative tension both theory and practice, intellect and intuition, thoughts and feelings, values and objectivity, the personal and the professional, the individual and the group, the classroom and community. Citizenship skills will be an integral part not just of professional education, but of the entire academic curriculum at all levels. Schools and universities will play an important role in building social capital for the next century.

12. Putting It All Together: An Example from Cali, Colombia

One university that is taking the lead in preparing the new professional is the Univer-

sidad del Valle in Cali, Colombia. Univalle, as the university is known, is partnering with the Fundación Carvajal, a non-profit organisation with 30 years of experience in community economic and social development in low-income areas of the Cali region. A few years ago, Univalle began to send some of its business students to work as management interns with community-based organisations receiving assistance from the Fundación. The interns experienced the social learning approach to empowerment that the Foundation had recently developed (the 'CORPOS' model, described in Wilson, 1996). Out of these experiences grew the idea for a School of Management in Social Development that would prepare professionals to build social capital.

The new school at Univalle will teach the skills, tools and sensitivity necessary for building social capital in low income communities. The school will emphasise group learning and experiential education. Students of the school will undertake community-living experiences (*vivencias*), case studies of the Foundation's current projects, and year-long management internships in community organisations. The new school will bring grassroots community leaders, local government officials and experienced practitioners into the classroom experience. The Foundation and Univalle are partnering with universities in other countries that are actively pursuing this new pedagogy for professional education.⁴ The ultimate vision is to create a collaborative network throughout Europe and the Americas of universities, non-governmental organisations and community-based organisations that use a social learning approach to building an 'economy of solidarity' (Razeto, 1993).

13. Conclusions

One of the consequences of the mainstreaming of the social capital concept and its underlying values is that it flies right in the face of the two central tenets of mainstream economics. First, is the assumption of scarcity. Social capital is free. It requires no

natural resources, no machines, no bricks and mortar, no advanced degrees, no paid labour. It is invisible. But it is real. And it is now recognised as a major determinant of a community's wealth and prosperity. The social capital boom may be the wedge in mainstream economics that finally breaks an opening for post-industrial economics to move centre stage—the economics of sustainability (for example, Gandhi, Wendell Berry, Herman Daly, E. F. Schumacher).

The concept of social capital also mocks the other leading tenet of mainstream economics—the idea of 'economic man', the individual separate self rationally calculating the costs and benefits of his every action on the basis of self-interest. Instead, the concept of social capital lends legitimacy to the idea of individual-in-community: each person is defined not just alone but in relationship to others; each person seeks to be part of something larger and can realise him or herself only when part of something larger. The successful community is not a collection of atomistic individuals bumping into each other's self-interest, but rather is a network, a web of individuals-in-community.

Social capital will not be built through social engineering by technical experts. By its nature, it is being built (and rebuilt) humbly in small increments by individuals stepping out of isolation, enjoying connectedness and taking responsibility for their public lives. Nevertheless, there is a role, an opportunity, for professionals who work with people, whether in the public, private or non-profit sector, to become catalysts of productive social capital. The view of the professional as the technical expert dispensing expertise to solve problems for the client is being softened by the view of professionals as catalysts, facilitators, coaches, working with clients to learn to solve problems.

The communities that successfully build or rebuild productive social capital will be those best positioned for prosperity and adaptability in the coming century. Those professionals who learn the tools, skills and values of social capital building will lead their communities and their profes-

sions. Those schools and universities that educate their students with the values and skills to build social capital, both in the work-place and in the community, will help to set the standards, the pace and the vision.

Notes

1. "Bowling alone", Robert Putnam's often-quoted (1995) article based on extensive empirical data from Italy and the US (Putnam, 1993a), seems to have captured the image for North Americans, while Francis Fukuyama's (1995) book *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity* does the same for other parts of the globe.
2. One glaring discrepancy between OD and TQM arises from the latter's preoccupation with client or customer as the *object* of service, rather than OD's concept of client as partner. The OD approach is not one of 'doing for' the client, but rather 'doing with'—collaborative problem-solving "in a way that strengthens the initiative and participation of citizens, both as individuals and within their communities and associations, rather than reducing them to the status of clients" (Bellah *et al.*, 1991, p. 27).
3. At an industrial plant with 20 000 workers in India, TQM rests explicitly on the practice of "listening to the inner voice" (Lean, 1995, p. 123).
4. The Foundation and the Univalle have begun a learning partnership with the University of Texas in Austin (through the U.T. Quality Center and the Graduate Program in Community and Regional Planning) and a university in Paris, France.

References

- ALINSKY, S. (1969) *Reveille for Radicals*. New York: Vintage.
- ALLEN, J. (1993) Friends and neighbors: Knowledge and campaigning in London, in: R. FISHER and J. KLING (Eds) *Mobilizing the Community: Global Politics in the Era of the Global City*, pp. 223–239. Urban Affairs Annual Review 4. Newbury Park: Sage.
- ANDERSON, V. (1991) *Alternative Economic Indicators*. London: Routledge.
- ARGYRIS, C. and SCHÖN, D. (1974) *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- ARGYRIS, C. and SCHÖN, D. (1978) *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- BAUM, H. (1990) *Organizational Membership and Personal Development in the Work Place*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- BELLAH, R., MADSEN, R., SULLIVAN, W. M. *ET AL.* (1991) *The Good Society*. New York: Random House.
- BELLAH, R., SULLIVAN, W. M., SWIDLER, A. and TIPTON, S. M. (1985) *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Society*. New York: Harper and Row.
- BERRY, W. (1993) *Sex, Economy, Freedom and Community*. New York: Pantheon.
- BOLTON, R. (1979) *People Skills*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- BONWELL, C. C. and EISON, J. A. (1991) *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom*. Washington, DC: George Washington University Press.
- BOYTE, H. (1991) The growth of citizen politics, *Kettering Review*, Fall, pp. 67–68.
- BURKEY, S. (1993) *People First: A Guide to Self-reliant, Participatory Rural Development*. London: Zed Books.
- CAMPBELL, T. (1995) *The quiet revolution and reform of the state in Latin America and the Caribbean: the Bank in the age of local politics*. LATAD Dissemination Note, World Bank, Washington, DC. May.
- CAPRA, F. (1988) *Uncommon Wisdom: Conversations with Remarkable People*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- CATANESE, A. J. (1996) Conclusion: lessons learned, in: B. MCCLENDON and A. J. CATANESE (Eds) *Planners on Planning: Leading Planners Offer Real-life Lessons on What Works, What Doesn't, and Why*, pp. 287–295. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- COLEMAN, J. (1988) Social capital in the creation of human capital, *American Journal of Sociology*, 94 (Supplement), pp. S95–S120.
- COLEMAN, J. (1990) *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- COVEY, S. (1989) *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People: Restoring the Character Ethic*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- DALY, H. and COBB JR, J. (1989) *For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Toward Community, the Environment, and a Sustainable Future*. Boston: Beacon.
- DEMING, W. E. (1982) *Out of the Crisis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Center for Advanced Engineering Study.
- DIENEL, P. C. and RENN, O. (1995) Planning cells: a gate to "fractal" mediation, in: O. RENN *ET AL.* (Eds) *Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation: Evaluating Models for Environmental Discourse*, pp. 117–140. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- ETZIONI, A. (1991) *A Responsive Society*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- ETZIONI, A. (1994) *Spirit of Community: The*

- Reinvention of American Society*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- EWERT, D. M., YACCINO, T. G. and YACCINO, D. M. (1994) Cultural diversity and self-sustaining development: the effective facilitator, *Journal of the Community Development Society*, 25, pp. 21–33.
- FALS BORDA, O. (1988) *Knowledge and People's Power: Lesson with Peasants in Nicaragua, Mexico and Colombia*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- FEURSTEIN, M. T. (1986) *Partners in Evaluation: Evaluating Development and Community Programmes with Participants*. London: Macmillan.
- FISHER, R. and URY, W. (1981) *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement without Giving In*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- FORESTER, J. (1985) *Critical Theory and Public Life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- FORESTER, J. (1989) *Planning in the Face of Power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- FORESTER, J. (1993) *Critical Theory, Public Policy, and Planning Practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- FRIEDMANN, J. (1987) *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- FUGLESANG, A. and CHANDLER, D. (1993) *Participation as Process, Process as Growth: What We Can Learn from Grameen Bank*. Bangladesh: Grameen Trust.
- FUKUYAMA, F. (1995) *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: Free Press.
- GILOTH, R. and MIER, R. (1993) Cooperative leadership for community problem-solving, in: R. MIER ET AL (Eds) *Social Justice and Local Development Policy*, pp. 167–181. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- GITTELL, M., BOCKMEYER, J., LINDSAY, R. and NEWMAN, K. (1996) *The Urban Empowerment Zones: Community Organisations and Community Capacity Building*. New York: Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center, The City University of New York.
- GODSELL, A., MAHER, M. ET AL. (1992) *Cooperative Learning: A Sourcebook for Higher Education*. University Park, PA: National Center of Post-Secondary Teaching, Learning and Assessment.
- GOLEMAN, D. (1995) *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
- GOODEN, J. (1996) Case study of comparative model: PROCAP/FUNDAMUNI, in: P. WILSON ET AL (Eds) *Interim Evaluation of USAID's Municipal Development and Citizen Participation Project in El Salvador*, App. 5, pp. 1–11. Washington, DC: Cambridge Consulting Corporation.
- HALPERN, R. (1995) *Rebuilding the Inner City: A History of Neighborhood Initiatives to Address Poverty in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- HANNA, M. G. (1994) *Strategies for Community Empowerment*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press.
- HARMAN, W. (1988) *Global Mind Change*. New York: Warner Books.
- HEALEY, P. (1992) Planning through debate: the communicative turn in planning theory, *Town Planning Review*, 63, pp. 143–162.
- HINSDALE, M. A., LEWIS, H. M. and WALLER, S. M. (1995) *It Comes from the People: Community Development and Local Theology*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- HOCH, C. (1994) *What Planners Do: Power, Politics and Persuasion*. Chicago: Planners Press.
- HORTON, M. and FREIRE, P. (1990) *We Make the Road by Walking: Conversations on Education and Social Change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- HYDE, L. (1983) *The Gift: Imagination and the Erotic Life of Property*. New York: Vintage.
- INNES, J. E. (1995) Planning theory's emerging paradigm: communicative action and interactive practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 14(3), pp. 183–190.
- LAPPE, F. M. and DUBOIS, P. (1994) *Quickening of America: Rebuilding Our Nation, Remaking Our Lives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- LAURIA, M. and SOLL, M. J. (1996) Communicative action, power, and misinformation in a site selection process. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 15(3), pp. 99–211.
- LEAN, M. (1995) *Bread, Bricks, and Belief: Communities in Charge of Their Future*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press.
- LEONARD, J. E. (1994) Rededicating ourselves to community, *Journal of the Community Development Society*. 25(1), pp. 35–44.
- LEWIN, K. (1951) *Field Theory in Social Science*. New York: Harper (Research Center for Group Dynamics, University of Michigan).
- LINDSAY, W. M. and PATRICK, J. A. (1996) *Total Quality and Organization Development*. Delray Beach, FL: St Lucie Press.
- MACKIE, K. (1995) *The relationship between exposure to employee involvement management practices, sense of coherence, and depression in state employees*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Texas at Austin.
- MARRIS, P. (1990) Witnesses, engineers, or storytellers? Role of sociologists in social policy, in: H. GANS (Ed.) *Sociology in America*, pp. 87–103. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- MAYO, M. and CRAIG, G. (1995) Community participation and empowerment: the human face of structural adjustment or tools for democratic

- transformation?, in: G. CRAIG and M. MAYO (Eds) *Community Empowerment: A Reader in Participation and Development*, pp. 1–11. London: Zed Books.
- MCCLENDON, B. and CATANESE, A. J. (Eds) (1996) *Planners on Planning: Leading Planners Offer Real-Life Lessons on What Works, What Doesn't, and Why*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- MCDOUGALL, H. A. (1993) *Black Baltimore: A New Theory of Community*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- MECK, S. (1996) Understanding and improving the management of planning agencies, in: B. MCCLENDON and A. J. CATANESE (Eds) *Planners on Planning: Leading Planners Offer Real-Life Lessons on What Works, What Doesn't, and Why*, pp. 276–286. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- MEDOFF, P. and SKLAR, H. (1994) *Streets of Hope: The Fall and Rise of an Urban Neighborhood*. Boston: South End Press.
- MICHAELSEN, L. K., JONES, C. F. and WATSON, W. E. (1993) Beyond groups and cooperation: building high performance learning teams, *To Improve the Academy*, 12, pp. 127–145.
- MILLIS, B. (1993) Creating a “TQM” classroom through cooperative learning, *To Improve the Academy*, 12, pp. 147–161.
- NEWBROUGH, R. (1973) Community psychology: a new holism, *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 1, pp. 201–211.
- NEWBROUGH, R., McMILLAN, D. and OTIS, P. (1997) A systems-centered community, *Journal of Community Psychology*. (forthcoming).
- OSBORNE, D. and GAEBLER, T. (1992) *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading, MA: Addison/Wesley.
- PECK, M. S. (1987) *The Different Drum: Community Making and Peace*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- PUTNAM, R. D. (1993a) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- PUTNAM, R. D. (1993b) The prosperous community: social capital and economic growth, *The American Prospect*, Spring, pp. 35–42.
- PUTNAM, R. D. (1995) Bowling alone: America's declining social capital, *Journal of Democracy*, January, pp. 65–78.
- QUINTERO URIBE, V. M. (1995) *Evaluacion de Proyectos Sociales: Construccion de Indicadores*. Cali, Colombia: Fundacion FES.
- RAHMAN, M. D. A. (1993) *People's Self-development: Perspectives on Action Research, A Journey through Experience*. London: Zed Books.
- RAZETO, L. (1993) *De la Economía Popular a la Economía de Solidaridad*. Santiago, Chile: Programa de Economía del Trabajo, Academia de Humanismo Cristiano.
- RENN, O. ET AL (1995) *Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation: Evaluating Models for Environmental Discourse*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- RITCHEY-VANCE, M. (1994) *The Art of Association: NGOs and Civil Society in Colombia*. Arlington, VA: Inter-American Foundation.
- RITCHEY-VANCE, M. (1996) Social capital, sustainability, and working democracy: new yardsticks for grassroots development, *Grassroots Development*, 20, pp. 3–9.
- ROBERTSON, J. (1985) *Future Work: Jobs, Self-employment and Leisure after the Industrial Age*. New York: Universe Books.
- ROBINSON JR, J. W. (1994) Ten basic principles of leadership in community development organizations, *Journal of the Community Development Society*, 25(1), pp. 44–48.
- RODWIN, L. and SCHÖN, D. A. (Eds) (1994) *Rethinking the Development Experience*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- ROGERS, C. (1980) *A Way of Being*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- RUBIN, A. and BABBIE, E. (1993) *Research Methods for Social Work*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- SCHÖN, D. A. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- SCHÖN, D. A. (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- SCHÖN, D. A. (1991) *The Reflective Turn: Case Studies in and on Educational Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- SCHÖN, D. A. and REIN, M. (1994) *Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies*. New York: Basic Books.
- SCHUMACHER, E. F. (1973) *Small Is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered*. New York: Harper and Row.
- SENGE, P. (1990) *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- SERGIOVANNI, T. J. (1990) *Value-added Leadership: How to Get Extraordinary Performance in Schools*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace.
- SERGIOVANNI, T. J. (1994) *Building Community in Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- SHARP, E. B. and BATH, M. G. (1995) Citizenship and economic development, in: R. D. BINGHAM and R. MIER (Eds) *Theories of Local Economic Development: Perspectives from across the Disciplines*, pp. 213–231. Newbury Park: Sage.
- SHUMAN, M. (1994) *Toward a Global Village: International Community Development Initiatives*. Boulder, CO: Pluto Press Books.
- SULLIVAN, W. M. (1995) *Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America*. New York: Harper Collins.

- SUSSKIND, L. and CRUIKSHANK, J. (1987) *Breaking the Impasse: Consensual Approaches to Resolving Public Disputes*. New York: Basic Books.
- WILSON, P. (1995) Embracing locality in local economic development, *Urban Studies*, 32, pp. 645–658.
- WILSON, P. (1996) Empowerment: community economic development from the inside out, *Urban Studies*, 33, pp. 617–630.
- WORLD BANK (1994) *The World Bank and Participation*. Operations Policy Department, World Bank, Washington, DC. September.
- WORLD BANK (1995) *World Bank Participation Source Book*. Environment Department Papers, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- YUNUS, M. (1994) *Grameen Bank, As I See It*. Dhaka: Grameen Bank.

Copyright of Urban Studies is the property of Carfax Publishing Company and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.