

Chapter 1

CREATING SOCIAL CAPITAL THROUGH SERVICE-LEARNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AT FAITH-BASED LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

Gail Gunst Heffner

Introduction

SCHOLARS IN MANY DISCIPLINES have discussed the concept of social capital at great length within the past decade. In this chapter, I will examine the theory underlying social capital as a concept and define several types of social capital that will bear upon the discussion of higher education as an engine for social capital formation. I will next turn to an exploration of the particular role of religious social capital and argue that there is a unique contribution being made by religious institutions in the formation of social capital in society at large. I will explore how higher education can both create social capital and destroy it. Then, I will examine the unique role of liberal arts colleges with a particular eye to faith-based liberal arts colleges in the building of social capital. Christian liberal arts colleges are in a position to (and have a particular responsibility to) increase the stock of social capital in their local communities. I will use Calvin College as an example of a Christian liberal arts college that has been and is investing in the local community in ways that build social capital. Finally, I will consider challenges that institutions of higher education will need to meet if they want to position themselves as social-capital creating enterprises in the future.

Theories of Social Capital

Robert Putnam, a noted scholar of social capital, asserted in his article “Bowling Alone” that American social capital has been in decline over the past two to three decades. His research examined rates of voter turnout, trust in public officials and elected representatives, and participation rates in voluntary associations among other indicators. He has argued that Americans are less engaged in face-to-face contact with neighbors and colleagues and less involved in civic activities and organizations than in decades past (Putnam 1995, 68).

Jane Jacobs first coined the term *social capital* in her classic book, *Death and Life of Great American Cities* published in 1961. More recently, James S. Coleman developed the theoretical underpinnings of the concept. Coleman distinguished social capital as different from natural capital, physical capital, human capital, or economic capital. *Economic capital* (the most commonly understood term) refers to financial resources that can be employed to productive ends; *human capital* refers to skills, knowledge, education, and training that enhance the productivity of individuals. *Natural capital* is based on the value of the services provided by the ecosystem; *physical capital* refers to tools, machines, and other productive equipment developed by humans using natural capital. *Social capital* refers to the networks, exchanges, trust, and reciprocity that exist between and among people. Stated another way, social organization among people affects economic exchange. All these sources of capital serve as resources, which can be applied to solve problems.

Social capital is defined by its function. It is not a single entity, but a variety of different entities having two characteristics in common: They all consist of some aspect of a social structure, and they facilitate certain actions of individuals who are within the structure. Like other forms of capital, social capital is productive, making possible the achievements of certain ends that would not be attainable in its absence. . . . A given form of social capital that is valuable in facilitating certain actions may be useless or even harmful for others. Unlike other forms of capital, social capital inheres in the structure of relations between persons and among persons. It is lodged neither in individuals nor in physical implements of production (Coleman 1990, 302).

What is noteworthy here is that in order to determine if a particular action generates *social capital* in a given setting, it must be analyzed by whether it

promotes interactions, exchanges, and trust among people. Social capital is important because it enables people to accomplish that which would not be possible without it. Social capital is a valuable resource that should not be overlooked (because people use social resources to accomplish their goals) whether it be to obtain a job, pursue higher education, or solve a neighborhood problem.

Putnam's research in Italy found that regions with a high degree of social capital and civic engagement (as exemplified in cooperatives, mutual-aid societies, and neighborhood associations) benefited from higher rates of economic growth, educational achievement, and efficient government.

These communities did not become civic because they were rich. The historical record strongly suggests the opposite: They have become rich because they were civic. The social capital embodied in norms and networks of civic engagement seems to be a precondition for economic development as well as for effective government (Putnam 1993, 37).

Social capital, according to Coleman, Putnam, and others, consists of networks and norms that effectively enable people to act together to pursue shared objectives. Social capital can serve as a bonding function to bring closer together people who already know each other or as a bridging function to bring together people or groups of people who did not previously know each other (Gittel and Vidal 1998, 15). The underlying assumption here is that as people connect with each other, trust will develop and this can lead to social and economic well-being. This sense of trust and cooperation becomes a resource that forms the glue in a given community, and it can be built or lost, developed or squandered.

While it may be obvious that close ties among people in a community are beneficial, research shows that so-called weak ties have an equally important function to play. Granovetter defines the strength of a tie as "a combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual confiding) and the reciprocal services" shared among people (Granovetter 1973, 1361). Weak ties have the benefit of expanding a person's knowledge base and sphere of influence beyond his/her close-knit inner circle and can prevent a person from becoming too insulated and narrow in perspective. Weak ties serve as a bridge to other people, ideas, perspectives, information, and so forth.

The fewer indirect contacts one has the more encapsulated he will be in terms of knowledge of the world beyond his own friendship circle; thus,

bridging weak ties and the consequent indirect contacts are important . . . those to whom we are weakly tied are more likely to move in circles different from our own and will thus have access to information different from that which we (normally) receive (Granovetter 1973, 1371).

To analyze social capital within the context of how it functions (i.e., to bond or to bridge) leads us to consider the institutions that serve either to build or to destroy it. Social capital is generated in multiple activities through various mediating structures. Research has shown that church congregations play an important role in the formation of social capital in the local community. Neighborhood associations and community development corporations play a vital role by mobilizing residents to act on issues of mutual concern. Larger national organizations such as the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) (Gittell and Vidal 1998) or the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) (Warren 1998) focus on community organizing as a means to build social capital and foster community-building.

Social capital provides the theoretical constructs to help us view communities on the strength (or lack thereof) of their *capacity to act* for mutual gain. Note that this is not automatically positive. Communities can also take negative collective action to exclude those not considered part of the “in” group, which has often been the case with minority discrimination. The social capital in a given community is its capacity to act for good (or ill) to bring about a community’s desired goals for improvement. All communities have internal strengths and can make decisions to act in ways that lead to the improvement of the community. This stands in contrast to a dominant perception that low-income communities are only places of need or deficits; their strengths often remain invisible to outsiders.

Religious Social Capital

Many social scientists avoid religion as a basis for social analysis, but in recent years, it has been recognized as influential in shaping corporate and/or communal life. Robert Putnam asserted that while religious affiliation is by far the most common associational membership among Americans, religious sentiment seems to be less tied to institutions and to be more self-defined. Church-related groups are the most common types of organization joined by Americans—so Putnam surmised from the aggregate results of the General

Social Survey. However, Putnam asserts that while individuals may be becoming more religious, he does not equate this with increased social capital because participation in groups has declined since the 1960s (Putnam 1995, 68-69).

A number of scholars argue that Putnam fails to recognize the unique role that religion has played in building social capital. In his study of religious congregations, Ram Cnaan argues that local religious congregations are one of the key foundations of social capital and human capital production at the local level. “They operate as sources of skill acquisition, social interactions, mutual exchanges, mutual obligations, and trust [the lack of] which are roadblocks to the promotion of social activism and civic engagement” (Cnaan 1998, 1).

Donald Miller, in an unpublished paper that considers the nature of civic engagement in a changing religious environment, asserts that religion has more potential to contribute to America’s social capital than any other institution in society. His research demonstrates the complex ways in which religion in America is simultaneously becoming more privatized and more engaged in civic life. However, religious institutions are filled with people who have a vision for the possibility of a better society and thus are more willing to get involved. “Religion is one of the few institutions that is trusted in many inner city neighborhoods” (Miller 1998, 24).

Richard Wood argues that church-based organizing in urban areas has become more successful than other efforts because religious institutions are among the few settings that still generate trust. “In many urban areas those settings that previously generated trust and sustained broad social networks have deteriorated badly: unions, blue-collar workplaces, cultural associations, families and so forth” (Wood 1997, 601). But the level of interpersonal trust that can still be engendered because of shared religious convictions should not be underestimated.

Cnaan emphasized three points regarding theological teachings that serve as a foundation for the building of social capital:

First, teachings of the major religions emphasize mutual responsibility, the need to assist strangers in need, and most importantly, the legitimate claim of the weak and needy upon the community. Second, the major religions have advocated for social care and compassion for the needy regardless of location and economic conditions. Third, religious teachings, even when they are not put into practice, are still part of the socialization process of younger

generations into the faith tradition and serve as instructions for desired behaviors of compassion and social care. If we assume that religion has a powerful and lasting effect on people's attitudes and behaviors, then religious teaching may contribute to a more civil and caring society (Cnaan 1998, 36).

In a comprehensive study on civic participation, Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995) concluded that religion is the predominant institution that provides opportunities for women, people of color, and the poor to enhance their human capital and acquire the civic skills needed for political participation. When one builds human capital and enhances skill acquisition, one increases interactions and exchanges, which eventually grows into increased obligations and trust (i.e., increased social capital).

Andrew Greeley, in a study of religious structures as a source of social capital, studied the volunteer phenomenon in the United States and indicated that social and ethical concern is increasing. Americans are significantly more likely to volunteer than are people from any other country according to the World Values Study, and American volunteer rates increased dramatically between 1981 and 1990. Greeley found that religion generated social capital not only for its own projects but for many other kinds of voluntary efforts as well. Greeley concluded that, "religion is (at least potentially) a powerful and enduring source of social capital in this country, and indeed of social capital that has socially and ethically desirable effects" (Greeley 1997, 593). Religious social capital alone cannot generate a renewal of trust, but it is a resource that must not be ignored.

Much has been written about *congregations* as the foundation for social capital formation (see Ammerman, 1997; Coleman, 1990; Cnaan, 1998; Miller, 1998; Wood, 1997), but is it congregations, per se, who are the predominant religious institution in the building of social capital? Or, can this be broadened to include other religious institutions such as Christian colleges, which are also influential because they are driven by a moral imperative and are embedded in a particular locale or place? While there is a unique role that church congregations can play in the local community, other religious institutions, such as Christian colleges, must not be overlooked as a potential source for the generation of social capital within the larger society.

The Role of Higher Education in the Formation of Social Capital

I think it needs to be said from the beginning that the primary role of colleges and universities is not to build social capital. Historically, the role of higher education has been to advance and transmit knowledge, and this has been accomplished mainly through teaching and research. Colleges and universities have played a foundational role in the formation of human capital. However, we ask the question: Is it not possible to go about our primary mission or purpose in such a way that we build social capital as an important and necessary byproduct? We will consider how this might take shape.

Ernest Boyer, former president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, stated that in order for higher education to advance intellectual and civic progress in this country, the academy must become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing, social, civic, economic, and moral problems (Boyer 1996, 11). He calls for higher education to broaden the scope of scholarship to include the scholarship of engagement in addition to that of discovery, integration, the sharing of knowledge, and the application of knowledge. If colleges and universities undertake the scholarship of engagement as Boyer advocates, the rich resources of the university or college would be connected with our addressing societal problems. “Campuses would viewed by both students and professors not as isolated islands, but as staging grounds for action” (Boyer 1996, 20).

The historic mission of several leading urban American universities in the late 1800s (Johns Hopkins, Columbia, the University of Chicago, and the University of Pennsylvania) was to create a better city and society through advancing and transmitting knowledge. The model employed was essentially one that integrated research, teaching and service to make structural change and impact the lives of people and their communities. Harkavy’s research identified World War I as the end of an era in history where faith in human progress was the driving force. Disillusionment and despair led many academics “to retreat into a narrow scientific approach. Scholarly inquiry directed toward creating a better society was increasingly deemed inappropriate” and less important than empirical science in the larger research universities (Harkavy 1996, 6). Today, however, there is an ongoing conversation emerging about the role of research and scholarship as it relates to the civic engagement of the university. In some

places, faculty are linking their teaching and their research with their service rather than keeping each a disparate responsibility.

Historically, colleges and universities have played an important role in public life by facilitating events, colloquia, or forums that bring people together for conversation, debate, and careful consideration of issues of importance to the community and the world. Broadly speaking, colleges and universities build social capital by being a bridge to connect groups of people who did not previously know each other. Colleges and universities are gathering places for people to explore ideas, to consider differing viewpoints, to debate, and to learn together. Scholars and teachers from varying academic backgrounds gather with colleagues to dialogue and consider the merits of opposing perspectives. Students from varying ethnic, racial, and economic backgrounds gather in classrooms, residence halls, and coffee shops to talk and debate. Insofar as these dialogues foster respect and openness to new ideas and perspectives, trust levels between and among people are strengthened. Athletic events, concerts of all types of music, and theatre productions encourage people to gather for recreation rather than stay isolated. Such types of interaction and face-to-face contact can increase levels of trust and demonstrate that a college is able to contribute to the formation of social capital. When the university as an institution builds bridges beyond the walls of academia and makes connections to the larger culture a certain measure of social trust is engendered.

Colleges and universities build social capital by bringing people, who have some previous knowledge of one another, together to work on issues of common concern. They educate and train the next generation to become leaders. In this role, universities contribute to the formation of human capital, but also, insofar as it helps people (students, alumni, and so forth) discover their vocational callings by connecting them to others in their respective fields, the university helps to form social capital.

A college or university needs to be consciously aware that it can contribute to the destruction of social capital also. If it portrays an image of exclusivity or superiority, the public will be less likely to view it as an institution concerned with the common good. A simple example of how social capital can be destroyed is related to off-campus student housing. If the university's students are viewed as a liability within a given neighborhood because of violations of zoning, overcrowding, too many cars on residential streets, noise, or overuse of alcohol, social capital in that locale has a negative effect.

Colleges and universities can use their resources to both bond (bring people together who already know each other) and to bridge (leverage their resources to connect people who have not known each other; i.e., foster weak ties). If a college is serious about making a difference in its community, it must attempt to link those in need with outside resources and opportunities. Social capital is not really valuable unless it connects someone to something new. A local college student could tutor an at-risk child. This cultivating of so-called weak ties (or bridges to social capital because the child and the college student were not part of the same social network originally) connects the child to outside resources that may help her learn to read so she can advance in school.

Unique Role of Faith-based Liberal Arts Colleges

While it is commonly accepted that public institutions of higher education have a responsibility to engage in community service in addition to research and teaching, less attention has been paid to the role that private liberal arts colleges play in service to the community. Teaching has been viewed as the primary mission of liberal arts colleges. In a recent journal article, Fear, Lelle, and Sandman identified four reasons why private liberal arts colleges have been absent from the debate about higher education's public service mission:

1. Private liberal arts colleges often lack the financial and human resources with which to conduct community service or other innovative activities.
2. Unlike state universities and community colleges that are chartered to serve defined, distinct, and known geographic areas, the geographic service area of private liberal arts colleges is self-determined.
3. Growing secularization of private higher education and the quest for financial stability and prestige has been a limiting factor.
4. Private liberal arts colleges lack institution-appropriate definitions of service (Fear, Lelle, and Sandman 1998, 52).

Other researchers claim that private liberal arts colleges, particularly church-related colleges, have always had a service mission. Church-related private colleges could more appropriately be labeled as "public Christian colleges," because they were often founded for the public interest to serve the

common good. Some Christian colleges participated in social reform activities, such as Oberlin's Anti-Slavery Society (Ringenberg 1984, 77).

Liberal arts colleges often have religious perspectives and convictions that lead them to engage with the local community in ways that build social capital. The size of many liberal arts colleges is an asset that can facilitate more interaction and connectedness between college personnel and community members and can lead to a greater sense of reciprocity between the two. There are mutual benefits to be gained for community organizations and for colleges when they share a sense of common purpose in addressing local problems. The potential is there, but institutions need to be intentional about making connections that fit clearly with their own sense of purpose or mission.

A Christian college has a unique challenge and responsibility to flesh out its religious convictions in the way it educates and equips its students. As Nicholas Wolterstorff states it, "the Christian College must become far more concerned with building bridges from theory to practice. The goal is to equip and motivate students not just to understand the world but to change it." Wolterstorff argues that Christian colleges need to move beyond merely introducing students to the breadth of high culture and actually help students and faculty engage with society. Wolterstorff has made careful distinctions between culture and society.

Culture is something different from society. Culture . . . consists of *works* of culture. Society, by contrast, consists of *persons* who interact in various ways. From that interaction arises social roles, social practices, and social institutions. And here in college you may learn how to appropriate for yourself various offerings of the stream of culture, when you leave here you cannot simply appropriate culture. You will have to fill certain social roles, engage with your fellows in certain social practices, participate with them in certain social institutions (Wolterstorff 1983, 16).

One role of a Christian college is to help people make connections between how they think/believe and how they live so that healing and shalom may come in all dimensions of human existence.

Christian colleges have a unique contribution to make because of the religious social capital they can draw upon and simultaneously build. For many faith-based colleges, strong denominational ties, which can be employed for mutual gain, already exist. When faith-based colleges collaborate with denominational or parachurch social-service organizations, they are

strengthening their bonds of mutual trust and thereby increasing the stock of social capital. This is a unique resource available to religious colleges that does not exist for public universities.

Some faith-based colleges are intentional about building bridges to other denominations or racial-ethnic groups in their particular locale. Sharing a common faith perspective, despite different denominational affiliations, is a resource to draw upon when larger issues need to be addressed collaboratively. Additionally, by interacting and working with those who do not share the same religious convictions, new opportunities and new ideas emerge, which expand the possibilities for all involved.

Calvin College: A Contributor to the Formation of Social Capital

Calvin College is a comprehensive liberal arts college that stands in the Reformed tradition of historic Christianity. The college has always had a clear sense of mission, which begins with faith and the call to serve God. The *Expanded Statement of the Mission of Calvin College* states that our “confessional identity informs all that we seek to do. It shapes our vision of education, scholarship, and community” (Van Harn 1996, 13). Calvin College’s present mission is further articulated: “Remembering that we are called to obey God as whole persons in every area of life, we believe that education should explicitly connect the way we think with the way we live” (Van Harn 1996, 18). Three convictions have special status at Calvin.

First, the aim of Christian education is to let faith find expression throughout culture and society. Second, the life of faith, and education as part of that life, find their fulfillment only in a genuine community. Third, the Christian community, including its schools, is called to engage, transform and redeem contemporary society and culture (Van Harn 1996, 32).

Unlike some institutions of higher education, Calvin does not lack an institution-appropriate definition of service.

In particular, the college must make sure to maintain its historic strength in serving the denominational community while broadening the scope of that service to include more civic, professional, and other religious organizations. Applied scholarship is the readiest avenue for such service. To qualify as

scholarship, it must reflect persistent intellectual engagement with the substance of the arts and sciences; to qualify as service, it must challenge, instruct, and learn from its audience (Van Harn 1996, 50).

One of the specific ways that Calvin College has fleshed out this understanding of service and contributed to the formation of social capital has been through Academically Based Service-Learning (ABSL). Calvin College has invested significant resources to connect faculty and students to the Grand Rapids community in reciprocal relationships. Numerous faculty-development workshops have been held to help Calvin faculty understand how service-learning can be used as a pedagogical tool. Ongoing assistance is available to help faculty construct discipline-specific assignments for students who are involved in academically based service-learning so that they can begin to see the connections between theory and practice in the courses they are taking.

At Calvin College, ABSL has been defined as service activities that are related to and integrated with the conceptual content of a college course and that serve as a pedagogical resource to meet the academic goals of the course as well as to meet community or individual needs. Academically based service-learning at Calvin is a serious attempt among faculty and students to learn *with* the community, *through* the community, and *from* the community, not merely *in* the community.

Much of the current literature about service-learning focuses on the moral and civic development of students. Service-learning contributes to the development of human capital in the form of increased skills and advanced education for particular students. Additionally, it has been documented that service-learning is a valuable teaching tool that contributes to a faculty person's professional development. While these are not insignificant, something is missing if an equal emphasis is not also placed on community development. Ira Harkavy asserts that

the service-learning movement has not "rightly placed" the goal. It has largely been concerned with advancing the civic consciousness and moral character of college students, arguing that service-learning pedagogy also results in improved teaching and learning. Although service to the community is obviously an important component of service-learning, it [often] does not focus on solving core community problems. . . . Urban colleges and universities are in a unique position . . . [to move to] strategic

academically-based community service, which has as its primary goal contributing to the well-being of people in the community both in the here and now and in the future. It is service rooted in and intrinsically tied to teaching and research, and it aims to bring about structural community improvement (Harkavy 1996, 2-3).

Unless service-learning is cast in a community development context that fosters the building of social capital, it remains largely an academic exercise.

The specific examples of academically based service-learning given in the chapters of this book demonstrate some of the possibilities available to a Christian college that desires to invest in its local community so as to build social capital. Serious and sustained engagement and partnerships with local organizations has been undertaken to increase connectedness among diverse peoples, to increase capacity building, and to give voice to those who have felt ignored and powerless. Calvin is committed to building community partnerships at many levels and has established significant relationships with both geographical and professional communities.

An example of bridging social capital is Calvin College's commitment to the Pathways to Possibilities program, a precollege program for ethnic-minority students. The broad goal of Pathways to Possibilities is to help inner-city children and youth value learning, seek academic success, become aware of career and higher-education opportunities, and strive to live responsible lives. Various program initiatives provide opportunities for urban minority youth (and their parents) to develop the knowledge and skills necessary for successful entry into higher education.

The Pathways to Possibilities program is a collaborative effort involving Calvin College and churches from four different denominations. Some of the churches are members of the denomination in which the college is also a member but not all of them. This program demonstrates how a Christian college can use its resources to build both bonding (as seen in the social networks of existent denominational ties) and bridging social capital (as seen in the new weaker ties across racial, ethnic, and denominational boundaries). Once established, these networks need to be maintained and nurtured for them to remain viable.

Conclusion and Future Challenges

Private liberal arts colleges are in a unique position to contribute to their local communities. The activities described above, though beneficial, may not necessarily build social capital and lead to community development unless there is a clear sense of reciprocity, mutual trust, and cooperation. This is accomplished both through our close ties (in the case of a Christian college through collaboration with other Christian institutions where religious social capital is found) and through our weak ties (with people and institutions who do not share our perspective). As Granovetter states, “Weak ties are more likely to link members of *different* small groups than are strong ones, which tend to be concentrated within particular groups” (Granovetter 1973, 1376). Granovetter’s research asserts that strong ties (like kinship and intimate friendship) are less important than weak ties (like acquaintances and associations) in sustaining community cohesion and collective action.

This points to the importance of Christian colleges’ building relationships beyond denominational and cultural lines while maintaining their own unique sense of vision. Reciprocity and mutuality are key ingredients in the building of social capital. They can be fostered best when the institutions (or individual people for that matter) can not only articulate their own distinct identity but also recognize their need for others. One’s unique identity does not have to be lost in order for collaboration and mutuality to occur. Christian colleges need to remain true to their mission as they work in the local community but must realize they have as much to gain from their so-called weak ties as they do from their strong ties. I want to close by outlining three broad challenges that higher education needs to recognize in if it wants to be in a position to create social capital.

First, colleges and universities need to connect their research to identified needs in the community. Given the particular needs and demands of the twenty-first century, colleges and universities need to focus some portion of their research capabilities and resources on local community issues. We need to connect to local constituencies in ways that will enable our research findings to be used by those who most need the information our research uncovers. In other words, we need to find ways to construct our research in collaboration with those who will benefit from the results of our research. Too often good research is conducted, but the findings are hidden in the pages of a journal rather than

being employed to bring about needed change. Simply put, our research and scholarship (in many disciplines) needs to be connected to real people.

A Christian liberal arts college can make significant contributions if it uses its research capabilities to serve the local community. Liberal arts colleges have often been overlooked as potential resources for community-based research. The assumption is that only larger universities have the capacity and the mandate to be involved in research. Liberal arts colleges can make a unique research contribution (without having to leverage huge amounts of research dollars) if faculty creatively connect both their teaching and their research by involving students.

A growing body of literature affirms the value of community-based research, which is seen as contributing simultaneously to scholarship and to the direct needs of the local community. Collaborative research makes a distinction between research in a community (as a place) and research with a community (as a social and cultural entity). Community members are valued as collaborative partners in all phases of the research process, and there must be a clear return for the community on the investment it has made in the research. Participatory-action research, a type of collaborative research, demands that those most affected by the research be involved in setting research parameters, posing the research questions, and determining how the research findings will be used at the conclusion. Research so defined can make a significant contribution to community development and can increase trust levels, which build social capital. If this does not happen, opportunities to build social capital are missed.

Second, many colleges and universities need to develop a stronger sense of place. This is clearly connected to their understanding of their role in the local community. Social capital cannot easily be built when people do not have a sense of commitment to and/or embeddedness in a particular place. Eric Zencey challenges those in academia to cultivate a sense of connectedness to the place where they live and work.

Academics in all disciplines ought to work to acquire a kind of dual citizenship—in the world of ideas and scholarship, yes, but also in the very real world of watersheds and growing seasons and migratory pathways and food chains and dependency webs. What is needed is a class of cosmopolitan educators willing to live where they work and to work where they live, a class of educators willing to take root, willing to cultivate a sense of place. These educators could exemplify in their teaching and in their lives their own

manner of accommodation to the fruitful tension between local and universal, particular and general, concrete and abstract (Zencey 1996, 19).

Colleges and universities face difficulties in creating social capital when many of their personnel do not view themselves as rooted to a particular locale.

Third, colleges and universities need to recognize the huge issue of power and the “uneven playing field” that exists between academia and the community in terms of leveraging resources. This is complicated and beyond the scope of this chapter but it needs to be said that uneven power relationships can negatively affect the formation of social capital and must not be overlooked. It is difficult to foster reciprocity when there are glaring economic and social inequities.

These are challenges that all institutions of higher education both public and private and secular and religious need to consider if they are serious about wanting to be engines of social-capital formation. A college or university *can* make unique contributions to both the formation of human capital and the formation of social capital. Because of its unique religious perspective, a Christian college has a responsibility to generate and invest social capital in the place where it is embedded.

References

- Ammerman, Nancy Tatom. 1997. *Congregations and community*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Boyer, E. L. 1996. The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* 1 (1): 11-20.
- Cnaan, R. A. 1998. *Bowling alone but serving together: The congregational norm of community involvement*. Paper presented at conference, Religion, Social Capital, and Democratic Life Conference. Grand Rapids: Calvin College, 1998.
- Coleman, J. S. 1990. *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Fear, F. A., Mark A. Lelle, Lorilee R. Sandman, 1998. A legacy rediscovered: Public service at private colleges. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* 3 (2): 48-53.

- Gittell, R. and A. Vidal. 1998. *Community organizing: Building social capital as a development strategy*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Granovetter, M. S. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (6): 1360-80.
- Greeley, A. 1997. Coleman revisited: Religious structures as a source of social capital. *American Behavioral Scientist* 40 (5): 587-94.
- Harkavy, I. 1996. *Service Learning as a vehicle for revitalization of education institutions and urban communities*. Paper delivered at the American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada.
- Miller, D. E. 1998. *Religion, privatization, and civic life: The nature of civic engagement in a changing religious environment*. Paper presented at conference, Religion, Social Capital, and Democratic Life Conference. Calvin College: Grand Rapids, 1998.
- Putnam, R. D. 1993. *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1995. Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy* 6 (January): 65-78.
- Ringenberg, W. C. 1984. *The Christian college: A history of Protestant higher education in America*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Van Harn, G. 1996. *An expanded statement of the mission of Calvin College: Vision, purpose, commitment*. Grand Rapids: Calvin College.
- Verba, Sidney, Scholzman, Kay Lehman and Brady, Henry E. 1995. *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Warren, M. R. 1998. Community building and political power: A community organizing approach to democratic renewal. *American Behavioral Scientist* 42 (1): 78-92.
- Wolterstorff, N. 1983. The mission of the Christian college at the end of the twentieth century. *The Reformed Journal* 33 (6): 14-18.
- Wood, R. L. 1997. Social capital and political culture: God meets politics in the inner city. *American Behavioral Scientist* 40 (5): 595-605.
- Zencey, E. 1996. The rootless professors. In *Rooted in the land: Essays on community and place*, edited by Willem Vitek and Wes Jackson. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press: 15-19.