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What is This?
Policy Partnering Between the Public and the Not-for-Profit Private Sectors

A Key Policy Lever or a Dire Warning of Difficulty Ahead?

NICHOLAS P. LOVRICH, JR.
Washington State University

There is good reason to attempt to draw on existing stocks of social capital in collaborative partnerships directed to community quality-of-life improvements. Such efforts tend to be broadly supported by conservative and liberal elements alike, and where social capital is strong, positive effects can be observed in a relatively short period of time. It is important to recognize, however, that in settings where social capital resources are weak, it will be necessary to make a long-term commitment to (and patience with) agency-community partnerships.

Policy partnering between the public and the not-for-profit private sectors has been little studied. This article clarifies this special relationship, outlining the unexpected strengths and the nonintuitive weaknesses of social capital in explaining partnering successes and failures. The criminal justice system of Washington State breaks new ground in policy-partnering studies. I begin by outlining how social capital is central to these developments, which are grounded, ironically, in both cooperation and conflict. Next, I outline the history, evolution, and political ramifications of the social capital concept. This rich concept is relevant across a range of policy arenas. I consider these in turn. I move on to review, as yet unpublished, research of significance for public/not-for-profit private partnering from recent dissertations under my direction, at the Division of Governmental Studies and Services (see appendix). A broader understanding emerges through this review as to when and how social capital facilitates public/not-for-profit private partnering. I come to an understanding of the limits, as well as the strengths, of social capital. Most importantly, I suggest that social capital cannot always play the role of facilitating public/not-for-profit private partnering relationships because social capital is underdeveloped in many areas. Where this social capital is weak, it is very difficult to develop it and sustain an undertaking that is likely to succeed only through a long-term sustained effort.
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CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND THE LATE DISCOVERY OF COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES

In working with courts, corrections, and law enforcement agencies in Washington during recent years, it is clear that most public agencies in these areas are not accustomed to the kinds of sharing of information and organizational resources that are essential to effective multiagency collaboration. The historical norm has been for courts, corrections, and law enforcement agencies to work hard to maintain professional independence from one another (with separate information systems, separate training and professional development processes, etc.). Moreover, they tend to seek and maintain a similar professional distance from their environment—including citizens, citizen groups, and community-based non-profit organizations; the latter of which tend to attract the "bleeding hearts" that are inclined to be critical of law enforcement and the criminal justice system. Such a professional distance was commonly thought to be necessary to maintain proper objectivity in dealing with the world outside of the criminal justice community (Crank, 1997).

The combination of influences—namely, a strong movement toward collaborative problem solving in inclusive, multiagency and multigroup efforts by other state and local government agencies and the attractiveness of federal grants from the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Community Policing Services, and other extramural sources—led to the widespread adoption of collaborative partnerships among criminal justice agencies all across the country. Unprecedented efforts to share information and organizational resources among criminal justice agencies and build bridges to the public and citizen-based groups grew relatively commonplace. Judges running for public office now frequently speak of court outreach and public education goals. Candidates for the position of sheriff invariably indicate their support for some citizen engagement oriented definition of community policing. Now, even the ultra-closed world of Washington State corrections is witnessing the first stages of a dramatic initiative to decentralize the corrections operation into a set of strong regional offices, each of which is mandated to build bridges to its public and devise appropriate means by which information on public support, public preferences, and public concerns will be made determinative of correctional policy in each region. One central aspect of this correctional reform initiative is designed to promote effective collaboration between community corrections, local law enforcement, and prosecutorial personnel by colocating these three groups of criminal justice professionals in neighborhood-based storefronts (or "Community-Oriented Policing [COP] Shops" as they are known in Washington). These COP Shops are themselves set up as neighborhood-based, citizen-operated entities that are coordinated by a nonprofit organization working in cooperation with a municipal police department. The Spokane Police Department, one of 12 COP Demonstration Cities in the nation and recent recipient of the 1998 International Association of Chiefs of Police award for the most outstanding program for cities over
50,000, operates 10 (with 2 more being developed) COP Shops that involve over 700 citizen volunteers providing regular assistance to police agency operations.

The state requires that inclusive county law and justice councils be involved in the collaborative planning of the use of state criminal justice funds. Restorative justice efforts to create and sustain lay, community-based disciplinary processes in lieu of court-based processing of nonviolent criminal offenders are increasingly commonplace across the state. In the Spokane setting, the nonprofit COP Shop organization is a key player in the restorative justice effort. Equally commonplace is the observation that although this collaborative process is indeed capable of leading to the effective development of collective action on tough, shared problems in many cases, in other cases the same process leads to enhanced conflict and prolonged deadlock. The construct of social capital is increasingly seen as a critical element accounting for the success and/or failure of collaborative partnerships; a better understanding of the concept is believed to be essential in making further progress toward the effective use of collaboration among public agencies and the effective operation of productive partnerships between those agencies and community-based nonprofit agencies.

THE POWERFUL APPEAL OF THE SOCIAL CAPITAL CONSTRUCT

Initially developed by James S. Coleman (1990) as a term that applies to the strength of trusting interpersonal relationships that obtain in a social collectivity, the concept of social capital has been applied (quite creatively) by Robert D. Putnam to the question of governmental performance. His "Bowling Alone" article (1995), his book on the comparison of regional governmental performance in postwar Italy, and a myriad of related studies have all led to the development of an active and stimulating area of research in contemporary social science. Social capital is seen by many researchers as an essential building block for collective action, which itself is irrational from a rational free rider perspective absent a strong sense of reliable reciprocation (social trust) and an affective tie to others in the social network (sense of community). As for ideological predispositions relating to social capital, social liberals of a communitarian bent find the focus on community attributes, civic engagement, other-regarding values, and the building of interpersonal trust and strong social networks an appealing message. Social conservatives, for their part, are also strongly attracted to the argument that firm family ties, healthy neighborhood interactions, respect for the rights of others, and strong churches and civic organizations are more important to governmental performance and community viability than big government intervention and high-cost public-sector programs.

Social capital was discovered by a wide range of scholars interested in governmental performance before its increasingly frequent application to criminal
justice phenomena. In the areas of public school performance, the promotion of public health behaviors, the enhancement of environmental sensitivity, and the promotion of economic development, a number of contemporary scholars have fruitfully explored the area of community asset mapping (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993) and the coproduction of public services (Brudney & England, 1983), and in the process discovered the utility of the social capital concept. Not to be left out, the criminal justice community has similarly explored the utility of the concept (often referred to as social disorder—the obverse of social capital—by criminologists; see Rose & Clear, 1998) for understanding how COP, community corrections, and restorative justice might all be better understood from a social capital perspective.

Although the applicability of social capital analysis is indeed evident in numerous areas of basic criminal justice research and applied policy studies alike, what is less clear is whether the concept provides a key lever for effective governmental performance, or if it instead constitutes an insight into the ultimate futility of government-led efforts to accomplish enhancements in the quality of community life in geographic areas where such enhancements are most needed. Although a debate among scholars continues as to whether America’s fund of social capital is in serious decline or being maintained at an acceptable level (Jackman & Miller, 1998), a wide range of public service–oriented elements of local government are increasingly inclined to build reliance on the existing stock of social capital to help solve their public policy problems.

For example, in public education (K-12), the proponents of the site-based management concept assume that parental, local private sector, and local nonprofit sector assets can be effectively tapped to substantially improve school performance. Similarly, local social service agencies, coping in an era with hitherto radical and somewhat mean-spirited concepts of welfare reform, are laboring to enhance public-private partnerships and inclusive collaborative relationships with community-based nonprofit organizations to enhance the rather wide-meshed safety net with which they are working. In like manner, local public health authorities, struggling with the containment of health care costs and the need to stretch their arms out to a growing uninsured population, are seeking to build locally based, broad-scoped collaborate efforts to bring about the synergy needed to find creative solutions to public-health problems.

For their part, in the criminal justice area, local police authorities, state and local corrections administrators, and trial court officials, in ever-growing numbers of locales, are reaching beyond their respective professional boundaries to tap into the same base of local social capital to secure broader civic engagement in their own particular areas of public policy concern. As noted previously, such attempts are nearly always broadly supported, with political conservatives welcoming the focus on the reinforcement of traditional mores and community-regarding values, and welcoming the de-emphasis of big-government programs. On the part of communitarian liberals, the renewed focus on the sense of
community and mutual obligation born of common humanity appears to be both timely and correctly directed. A long-standing common refrain among American liberals—ranging from Reisman, Glazer, and Denney’s *The Lonely Crowd* (1950); through Mansbridge’s *Beyond Adversary Democracy* (1980); Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, and Tipton’s *The Habits of the Heart* (1985); Etzioni’s *The Moral Dimension* (1988); Kemmis’s *Community and the Politics of Place* (1990); to Michael Sandel’s *Democracy’s Discontent: America in Search of a Public Philosophy* (1996)—is that the hyperindividualism of American legal-constitutional processes and popular culture (Lipset, 1963, 1996) lead to a host of problems in the accomplishment of social goals that require persistent and concerted collective action.

To these scholars and their many supporters, the enhancement of civic institutions, the promotion of public deliberative processes (Yankelovich, 1991), and the building of a sense of community through “civic journalism” (Cappella & Jamieson, 1997) all represent timely and well-directed efforts. DeLeon (1997) sees public agency managers as being key figures in the process of bringing citizens into the policy process in meaningful ways, and argues that they must learn to be effective facilitators of inclusive, collaborative problem solving processes that engage citizens, capable nonprofit organizations, and strategically situated private sector actors in service coproduction efforts (see Whitaker, 1980).

What difference does social capital make in those state and local government settings where public/not-for-profit private partnering is featured as a major aspect of public policy (intended to address a substantive problem of governance)? As with Robert D. Putnam, we will accept the following definition of social capital offered by James S. Coleman (1990):

> Like other forms of capital, social capital is productive, making possible the achievement of certain ends that would not be attainable in its absence. . . . For example, a group [or community] whose members manifest trustworthiness and place extensive trust in one another will be able to accomplish much more than a comparable group lacking that trustworthiness and trust. (pp. 302, 304)

Putnam argues that social capital is build on “trust, norms, and networks” (1993, p. 167), and that it serves to facilitate collective action; he argues further that “spontaneous cooperation is facilitated by social capital” (p. 167). Putnam shares with Barber (1988), Fukuyama (1995), Seligman (1997), and Kramer and Tyler (1996) the belief that interpersonal trust lies at the core of social capital. For Putnam, the concept of social capital connects directly to the American experience through the powerful writings of Alex DeToqueville. Putnam (1993) notes that “as depicted in Tocqueville’s classic interpretation of American democracy and other accounts of civic virtue, the civic community is marked by an active, public-spirited citizenry, by egalitarian political relations, by a social fabric of trust and cooperation” (p. 15).
THE EVIDENCE THAT SOCIAL CAPITAL MAKES A DIFFERENCE

What empirical and qualitative evidence can be presented from the applied research in public policy recently performed by the Division of Governmental Studies and Services to prove that the level of social capital makes a substantive difference in the performance of local governments? Given the potential importance of social capital phenomena to the many areas of applied research being conducted by the division, no fewer than four recent Ph.D. dissertations have been devoted to the exploration of social capital phenomena as encountered in the work of the research unit. In the paragraphs to follow, the principal findings of each doctoral thesis will be presented in a brief overview.

When Social Capital Fails to Increase School Performance (Simon, 1997). The amount of social capital is not determinative of success in conditions of severe socioeconomic disadvantage. This finding from Christopher Simon is based on a study of K-12 public school performance. He used standardized test scores and parental surveys for all of Washington’s more than 290 school districts. Employing an inventive “outlier analysis approach,” Dr. Simon compared two sets of above expectation and below expectation school districts. He reports a strong association between advantage and test score performance (a widely observed finding).

Most importantly, a number of school districts within the categories of high, medium, and low levels of advantage are either considerably above or considerably below the predicted score for the school district. In comparing the two outlier groups within each trichotomized level of advantage, he found that in the mid-level advantage pairings and the high-level advantage pairings, the above expectation school districts did indeed demonstrate higher levels of social capital than school districts that were performing below expectation. Parents in the above expectation school districts were more likely to take part in their child’s learning, to be engaged in civic affairs, to turn out for local elections, and to support school levies when they voted. Importantly, this pattern of effect was not in evidence in the case of the low-level advantage school districts.

Social Capital Translates Into Public Health District Successes (Grott, 1999). This study explores public health district successes in collaborative problem solving in the integration of client services and in the development of access for uninsured persons to appropriate health care education and clinical services. In Dr. Catherine Grott’s dissertation, she reports results from her study of six county public health districts in the state of Montana. She investigated the hypothesis that those counties with higher levels of social capital would be more likely to be successful in their efforts than counties with lower levels of social capital.
Grott found that county public health districts achieved their goals in rather direct proportion to how much interpersonal trust they reported, how much civic engagement they indicated, and how strong a sense of community they felt. Putnam's argument that social capital translates into easier spontaneous cooperation found support in Grott's findings from the public health policy administration area. She used citizen surveys and public agency personnel surveys in each of the counties she studied. Her personal interviews and focus group sessions with personnel in each county public health district tended to confirm the impressions gained from her community and organizational surveys.

Social Capital and Community Policing: Six Cities (Correia, 1998). Mark Correia investigated the character of connections between the nature of COP programs and community level of social capital in six comparable middle-sized cities in five states. He selected six cities from a nationwide survey of nearly 300 police agencies. His 1996 survey focused on the implementation of COP, and employed a set of six highly similar middle-sized cities that differed significantly in their respective community policing programs.

Correia discovered a U-shaped relationship between social capital and commitment to community policing taking place. Implementation effort was high in both high-range and low-range social capital jurisdictions, but low in mid-range social capital jurisdictions. Success in the execution of community policing initiatives was high in high-range social capital jurisdictions, and low in low-range social capital jurisdictions. These findings are based on Correia's exploration of the connections between social capital and community policing. Correia employed a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods. He collected citizen surveys in each of the six communities (with the same instrument employed in the Grott study) and conducted extensive staff interviews with each police department. His findings were quite unexpected, and his interpretation of results observed deserves some careful consideration.

Community policing tends to be taken seriously in jurisdictions that can succeed at it easily, or in jurisdictions that see COP as a way of enhancing social capital in places where it is seriously lacking. In the mid-range social capital jurisdictions, it seems that the internal opposition to change is sufficient to keep police executives from pursuing COP with any great degree of enthusiasm. Of particular interest in the Correia study was the partial replication of his findings at the neighborhood level in one of his cities. As part of an in-depth case study in this jurisdiction, Correia compared the level of implementation of COP across neighborhoods and found that the success of COP was common in high-range social capital neighborhood settings and the lack of success was common in low-range social capital neighborhood settings. Correia found a strong association between socioeconomic advantage and social capital at the neighborhood level, which brings the findings reported in the Simon study back to mind.
Social Capital: Easy to Reinforce, Difficult to Engender (Fredericksen, 1995). The fourth piece of research to be considered here is that of Patricia Fredericksen. Fredericksen’s study explores the possibility of enhancing the social capital of a given community that is going through an economic transition and experiencing substantial growth. The community in question was moving toward the initiation of an inclusive growth-management planning process when community leaders requested that the Program for Local Government Education provide some targeted training in collaborative problem solving directed toward constructive participation in an open, community-wide planning process.

The Program in Local Government Education secured the services of noted nonadversarial dispute resolution trainer Bill Lincoln, a chief trainer for Fisher and Ury (1981) in their Harvard Negotiation Project and a former faculty member of the Federal Executive Institute. Lincoln trained over 150 local leaders representing labor, business, local government, nonprofit, press, civic groups, and social service groups. The training took the form of 6 intensive days spread over two 3-day weekend sessions.

Fredericksen’s study entailed participation in and close observation of the experiential training provided. It also included follow-up contacts with all participants at 6, 12, 18, and 24 months. The intention of the study was to determine if this effort to enhance the ability of community group leaders to engage in collaborative, nonadversarial problem solving produced demonstrable, lasting, and favorable effects. The training was oriented toward building trust and exploring collaborative approaches to the development of consensual agreements on quality of life issues. It also demonstrated how this same nonadversarial approach to problem solving (and conflict management) has parallel applications in family, associational group, and community settings. The data for her study included extensive pretraining attitudinal surveys and follow-up interviews in which training participants were asked to indicate how they used the concepts featured in the training in their family, work group, and community activities.

Fredericksen’s principal findings were that the training in a trust building-oriented approach to nonadversarial problem solving had quite differential effects on the participants. For those who were inclined to be mistrustful and who were not highly integrated into associational networks, the training had rather limited results. For these participants, the training effects tended to fade quickly over time and were limited to applications in the family setting. In sharp contrast, those training participants that tended to be trusting in outlook and who tended to be engaged in a wide network of groups and associations were inclined to report strong and lasting effects derived from the training. They were inclined to offer examples of the application of interest-based, nonadversarial (win-win) problem solving in family, associational, and community settings alike. It was Fredericksen’s observation that the substantial investment made by the Program for Local Government Education in this community leader training effort produced strong evidence that social capital is relatively easy to reinforce if it is
already in existence, but it is much more difficult to engender among social actors not predisposed to trust and engagement in social networks.

NAGGING SUSPICIONS: THE POTENTIAL FOR GOOD (AND EVIL) IN SOCIAL CAPITAL-DIRECTED PUBLIC POLICY INITIATIVES

The findings drawn from this research serve to raise some serious questions about how the concept of social capital is best understood vis-à-vis the requirements of effective public policy making in the contemporary governmental affairs setting. This contemporary setting features an ongoing process of policy and program devolution of governmental responsibilities from the federal to state and local levels of government (Staeheli, Kodras, & Flint, 1997), and an active pursuit of the reinvention of government that has occasioned a great deal of exploration of the potentialities associated with public-nonprofit group partnerships and "load shedding" to nonprofit organizations (Galaskiewicz & Bielefeld, 1998; Handler, 1996).

At the outset, one core question arises, namely, if all of these parties—local police and community corrections agency officials, public health district administrators, public school principals and staff, community planners, judges and court administrators, and others—are seeking to tap into a finite fund of social capital, can that base for civic engagement support all of these attempts to draw on it? Given our knowledge that this social capital resource varies in strength from weak to strong across geographical settings, will not such a reliance on civic engagement and networks of trusting associations serve to exacerbate existing social inequities? The Simon, Grott, and Correia dissertations reported highly differential results associated with social capital in three different areas of public policy. These results indicate that, in highly disadvantaged circumstances, the effort to draw energy from social capital community assets is exceedingly difficult, and the fruitfulness of such efforts tends to be very limited. On a related note, if government-led efforts have been made to enhance social capital where it is weak, what is the track record of such efforts?

The Fredericksen dissertation suggests that efforts to bolster social capital are far more likely to succeed in places where social capital is already strong than in places where it is currently weak. The same phenomenon of disproportionate effects across high and low socioeconomic status communities has been witnessed in the area of community problem solving in COP efforts (Thurman & Reising, 1996).

Perhaps the most important question to be asked about social capital-directed public policy initiatives is the following: Can the fund of social capital be enhanced through sustained efforts by public agencies to get to know their community and establish a community base of operations in partnership with
community-based groups and rank-and-file citizens? From the findings reported by Simon, Grott, and Correia, there is good reason to attempt to draw on the existing stocks of social capital in collaborative partnerships directed to community quality of life improvements. Such efforts tend to be broadly supported by conservative and liberal elements alike, and in places where social capital is strong, positive effects are observed in a relatively short period of time. It is important to recognize, however, that in settings where social capital resources are weak, it will be necessary to make a long-term commitment to agency-community partnerships. The lack of immediate successes and favorable outcomes, and the frequent experience of disappointments and setbacks, should all be viewed in the broader context of building the trust necessary to initiate cooperative collaboration. As Putnam correctly notes, "the greater the level of trust within a community, the greater the likelihood of cooperation. And cooperation itself breeds trust. The steady accumulation of social capital is a crucial part of the story behind the virtuous circles of civic Italy" (1993, p. 171). It is likely that the very same phenomenon can occur in American community settings. If the strong dependence on social-capital-directed public policy processes is to avoid an exacerbation of existing socioeconomic inequities, there must be a commitment to concentrate social capital building efforts in disadvantaged areas. It is necessary to note from Simon's findings that social capital building is not likely to serve as a full substitute for broader social investments in the most depressed settings. Nothing observed in the Simon, Grott, or Correia research suggests that social-capital-directed policies provide a fit substitute for more direct forms of community economic, employment service, and health service investments. Social capital is not the cheap and effective solution to the long-term inequities of American society. Without due attention to such inequities, a greater reliance on social-capital-directed public policies could even exacerbate such inequities.

Perhaps one additional question might be considered fairly central to the consideration of social-capital-directed public policy efforts. Do the simultaneous efforts of multiple areas of public service delivery—police, corrections, courts, schools, social services, parks, public works, and so forth—complement one another, or do they instead serve as competitive drains on a depleted common resource? My reading of the social capital literature leads me to suspect that no one public agency, no matter how enlightened its approach, is likely to succeed in building social capital where it is very weak. However, a comprehensive effort with simultaneous endeavors to promote social capital formation by many public agency actors working in partnership with community-based nonprofit organizations serve as a key policy lever in reinventing the government context. As these efforts develop, however, it is critical that social scientists document the progress and setbacks encountered, and that they collect the observations necessary to support and sustain such efforts in socially disadvantaged areas so that the least well-off among us are not made even more detached from our prosperous and democratic country's socioeconomic institutions.
APPENDIX
The Context of the Research:
The Role of the Division of Governmental Studies
and Services at Washington State University

The observations offered here on the critical importance of the role of public sector
and nonprofit sector partnerships in the era of the broad-based devolution of government-
mental programs and policies in contemporary American federalism stem from over two de-
cades of direct experience in working with federal, state, and local government agencies in
the Pacific Northwest. As the director of the Division of Governmental Studies and Ser-
vices at Washington State University since 1977, I have witnessed a veritable sea change in
the governmental conceptualization of societal problems, and a corresponding paradigm-
atic change in the way public-sector agency officials view the roles of their agencies in
the policy development process and in the administration of public programs. In this pro-
cess of dramatic change in problem conceptualization and agency role definition, the
concept of collaborative, multiagency partnerships has assumed a contemporary impor-
tance far beyond anything it has enjoyed in the past. This development, in turn, has led to
the discovery of the widespread utility of the social capital construct in understanding
when community-based collaborative partnerships work as intended, and when they do
not produce the results hoped for by participants.

Over the course of the past two decades, the Division of Governmental Studies and
Services has joined with Washington’s three local government associations—the Asso-
ciation of Washington Cities, Washington State Association of Counties, and Washin-
ton Association of County Officials—in a multiagency partnership with Washington
State University’s Cooperative Extension to operate the Program for Local Government
Education designed to provide timely training and applied research services for the
state’s local government elected and career officials. Owing to the high priority of crimi-
nal justice issues in the Evergreen State, a major portion of the work done by the Divi-
sion of Governmental Studies and Services has come in the area of criminal justice policy
assessment and program administration in corrections, law enforcement, and court ad-
ministration. The formal adoption of COP as the official form of law enforcement taught
at the state’s Criminal Justice Training Commission in the 1991 legislative session re-
flects well the high level of interest in criminal justice and public order issues in the
state—and clearly reflects as well the multiagency, multigroup collaboration emphasis in
public policy commonly witnessed in Washington’s contemporary governmental affairs.
In this regard, the state of Washington is quite typical of the country as a whole; the rein-
venting of government in the devolution of policy and program authority context is lead-
ing to widespread state and local government public agency experimentation with locally
focused endeavors to establish effective collaborative partnership efforts to address pub-
lic policy problems.

In numerous areas of Washington state public policy, there is evidence of a heavy reli-
ance on inclusive collaborative processes to identify problems, to search out win-win (or
superoptimal) solutions, and to implement agreements on cooperative efforts arrived at
by means of localized multiagency efforts. The early success of the virtually unprece-
dented Timber-Fish-Wildlife Agreement (Northwest Renewable Resources Center,
1987; Protasel, 1991), bringing together long-time opponents—timber companies, Na-
tive American tribes, environmentalists, state and federal natural resource agencies, local
governments in timber dependent areas, and recreationalists—into an effective collabora-
tive process, led to the extension of this inclusive collaborative problem-solving
approach to policy problem solving and policy development in many other areas of public
concern requiring effective collective action. For example, the state’s Growth Manage-
ment Act of 1990 relies heavily on the ability of local governments within each county to
come to agreement on a comprehensive land use plan (and associated zoning regulations)
that preserves environmentally sensitive areas, concentrates growth within urban-growth
boundaries, provides for low- and moderate-cost housing, minimizes travel between
work and place of residence, and promotes other quality of life and environmental values
deemed to be important to Washingtonians by their state government (Andranovich and
Lovrich, 1992).

Similarly, in the area of public education (K-12), a heavy reliance is placed on site-
based management principles and the encouragement of the building of strong partners-
ships between schools and elements of their local communities. In a like manner, in the
area of social and health services, the long-standing community-based Community Ac-
tion Centers and United Way organizations have received a powerful shot in the arm with
the advent of welfare reform and recognition of the need for effective “community asset
mapping” (McKnight, 1995, pp. 161-172). State-level social assistance, employment
and housing policies are aimed at the mobilization of local community resources that pro-
mote self-sufficiency among the poorest of the state’s population. Nonprofit partnerships
with state agencies dispensing both state funds and federal pass-through funds are at the
core of Washington’s Work First program, and they occupy a strategic role as concrete
evidence of community-based buy-ins (required in many federal funding arrangements)
for its various low-cost housing and public health services programs.16

NOTES

1. Whether the problem be domestic violence, workplace violence against women, traffic
safety, DUI enforcement, crime prevention through environmental design, juvenile justice services,
the availability of alternatives to incarceration, or the tracking of sex offenders in the community,
one is likely to find a multiagency, multigroup effort under way in the criminal justice policy area.

2. See the special symposium issues of the American Behavioral Scientist (Edwards & Foley,
“Social Capital, Civil Society, and Contemporary Democracy,” 1997) and Political Psychology
(Mondak, “Psychological Approaches to Social Capital,” 1998) devoted to social capital.

3. Simon is now on faculty in the Political Science Department at the University of Nevada, Reno.

4. Simon made use of each school district’s mean parental education level and a number of
socioeconomic indicators to calculate a composite measure of relative advantage for each school
district, then regressed the mean test scores for reading, math, and verbal abilities on this variable.

5. We will return to this observation at the conclusion of this set of reflections on the two deca-
des of applied research experienced in the Division of Governmental Studies and Services, and in
connection with Cooperative Extension’s Program for Local Government Education at Washington
State University.

6. Catherine Grott is currently associated with Montana State University at Billings.

7. Correia is now in the Criminal Justice Department at the University of Nevada, Reno. The
research reported here is from his 1998 dissertation.
8. These cities have been surveyed by the Division of Governmental Studies and Services every 3 years since the late 1970s to monitor changes in important law enforcement policy and program emphases over the years.

9. This is based on Correia's data and his extensive personal interviews with law enforcement personnel.

10. This material is from her doctoral dissertation. She is now in the Department of Political Science and Public Affairs Program at Boise State University.

11. This effort is described in a brief account in Fredericksen (1996).

12. This was determined by an exhaustive battery of pretraining assessment forms and questionnaires.

13. The research consisted of four recent Ph.D. dissertation efforts stemming from the applied research of the Division of Governmental Studies and Services at Washington State University, and in conjunction with the Program for Local Government Education.

14. This is from my two decades of experience with applied public policy research, and my oversight of the Fredericksen, Simon, Correia, and Grott dissertations.

15. This was the first state to enact a "three strikes, you're out" law in 1993. It was also the first state to establish a means of administrative detention for noncured, convicted sex offenders who have served out their prison terms.

16. The nonprofit Community Action Centers are now such a major partner of county governments throughout Washington (as is the case in many other states as well) that the Program for Local Government Education partnership includes action center managers in its various training and applied research and planning operations.
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