DIS/ORGANIZING SOCIAL CAPITAL: TENSION IN A U.S. NATIONAL PARK

by

Blake Allen Harms

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Communication

Boise State University

May 2020

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE COLLEGE

DEFENSE COMMITTEE AND FINAL READING APPROVALS

of the thesis submitted by

Blake Allen Harms

Thesis Title: Dis/organizing Social Capital: Tension in a U.S. National Park

Date of Final Oral Examination: 06 March 2020

The following individuals read and discussed the thesis submitted by student Blake Allen Harms, and they evaluated their presentation and response to questions during the final oral examination. They found that the student passed the final oral examination.

John McClellan, Ph.D.   Chair, Supervisory Committee

Matthew Isbell, Ph.D.   Member, Supervisory Committee

Pei-Lin Yu, Ph.D.   Member, Supervisory Committee

The final reading approval of the thesis was granted by John McClellan, Ph.D., Chair of the Supervisory Committee. The thesis was approved by the Graduate College.

DEDICATION

To the people I interviewed who dis/organize the national park.

To my God who communicated peace, and encouragement through this process

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ABSTRACT

The National Park System in the United States is a unique work environment filled with tension, organizational complexity and challenges. Scholars often argue that these types of organizational complexities should be addressed by increasing social capital. Social capital scholars direct practitioner attention toward relational connection as a means of increasing social capital, however without delving into the communicative processes of connecting with others. In this thesis, I embrace a communication as constitutive of organization (CCO) perspective with a focus on dis/organization to investigate "messiness" of employee expressions of social capital in a large western national park. Engaging in qualitative analysis of semi-structured interviews, this study reveals expressions of social capital as constituted in dialectical tensions. These findings direct scholars and practitioners interested in social capital toward the dis/organizing processes in which social capital is constituted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1:

Organizational Problems in U.S. National Parks

In this thesis, I explore social capital as a dis/organized communicative process arising in unique expressions by employees of a major national park in the western United States. The National Park System (NPS) in the United States is a unique work environment filled with tension and organizational complexity. In response to the uniqueness of the complex work experiences at national parks, many scholars have suggested the NPS should develop social capital in their organizations. Given that social capital is often understood as the investment in social relations with expected returns (Lin, Cook, & Burt, 2001), exploring social relations is often central to understanding the generation and use of social capital in organizations. Recent Communication as Constitutive of Organization (CCO) perspectives, however, have encouraged scholars to focus on the ways order and disorder are inseparable components of organizational life and in fact simultaneous features of all organizations (see Putnam, Fairhurst, & Banghart, 2016). These scholars utilize the term dis/organization to reflect that notion. In adopting the call to study dis/organizing processes within this study I focused on dialectical tension-filled communication to study how employee social capital are expressed in tension. This qualitative interpretive study consisting of 45 interviews among employees who work in a large national park in the U.S. reveals that tension constitutes the expressions of social capital. Because dis/organization is constituted in dialectical tension filled communication, social capital is thus dis/organized.

The Uniqueness of the National Parks

The National Park System (NPS) in the United States is a unique organization with a long history that started with a tension filled mission and continues with a mix of passionate voluntary, contracted, fulltime, and seasonal employees as well as a unique hierarchical structure and positioning as a public space. NPS operates over 419 national parks, and over 150 other protected lands which make up more than 85 million acres (U.S. National Park Service, 2019). The United States (U.S.) National Park Service (NPS) is the organizational body responsible for preserving wilderness and promoting recreation for visitors. The NPS mission was founded upon a responsibility to preserve the land, and provide enjoyment of the lands for future generations. The founding and subsequent laws enacted create contradictory law's which guide the employees in the NPS (Winks, 1997). In recent years, employees have faced increasingly complex organizational challenges including: funding and government shutdown issues, climate change challenges, and employee barriers to merely address challenges. Because of the tensions and the organizational challenges faced by employees, scholars studying organizations and communication may best address these unique features as experienced by employees. In this chapter, I outline the organizational and communicative issues that demonstrate the need for further research on, and enactment of organizational communication within the NPS.

Since the establishment of the Organic Act which gave rise to the NPS in 1916, employees have sought to organize through tensions in the NPS mission. Initially, the organizational structure of the park mimicked a hierarchical military organization, and subsequently, the structures in the park have become as varied and diverse as the natural

features which NPS employees seek to protect. Since its founding, the NPS has operated

with a uniquely unifying mission; that is tension filled and contradictory. Winks (1997)

describes the contradictory mission of the NPS as:

> to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life
> therein [within the national parks] and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in
> such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment
> of future generations. (p. 575)

Winks reviewed the initial law written by Fredrick Law Olmsted Jr, and introduces the

potential contradiction between, "leave them unimpaired," and, "for the enjoyment of."

Winks explains this contradiction has been amplified through a history of acts passed by

the U.S. government, which demonstrates a long history of contradiction employees'

must "attempt to solve" (p. 575). Winks concludes this tension constitutes the everyday

negotiations and interactions of the NPS. This uniquely unifying feature has been the

central focus of the park amidst a diverse array of organizational faces. Indeed, the NPS

mission enacted by passionate employees despite challenges is one example of what

makes the NPS system unique.

The mission of the NPS is further complicated due to major resource constraints.

A lack of funding and deferred maintenance grips the NPS, in the sum of 11.6 billion

dollars (McDowall, 2018). This deferred maintenance shows how the NPS itself is

paradoxically out of compliance with the regulations of the federal government.

McDowall (2018) also highlighted how five government shutdowns in 25 years have

caused many issues to employees. For example, the most recent shutdown from

December 22, 2018 to January 25, 2019 resulted in 21,000 NPS employee furloughs,

3,000 employees required to work without pay, and resource damage including "trash

build-up, restroom waste problems, accidental and intentional damage to natural

resources, among others" (Comay & Vincent, 2019, p.1). These combined tensions, paradoxes, and challenges demonstrate the unique experiences NPS employees must navigate to accomplish their organizational mission.

An additional unique challenge to the organizational mission of the NPS is climate change effects on the natural resources. According to Karl et al. (2009), if current greenhouse gas emissions are maintained the global temperature is projected to increase from 7 degrees to 11 degrees Fahrenheit. Climate change of this magnitude places a variety of constraints on the U.S. National Parks including "sea level rise, reductions in water quality, increased frequency of heavy flooding, increased frequency of forest fires and insect outbreaks, reduced snowpack, glaciers, permafrost and sea ice" (Jantarasami, Lawler, & Thomas, 2010, p.1). Given the climate diversity of natural resources the NPS seek to preserve, most parks are affected by the changing climate (Jantarasami et al., 2010).

To address these challenges, the NPS has sought to implement unique multi-faceted management strategies, yet, very few of these adaption strategies have been implemented (Jantarasami et al., 2010). Jantarasami and colleagues (2010) found unique internal and external barriers that NPS employees faced in implementing these multi-faceted organizational strategies. Internal barriers included varying processes which NPS employees sought to implement, including "unclear mandates from superiors and bureaucratic rules and procedures," (p.33). External strategies also proved to be riddled with barriers including; an expressed need for a variety of approaches not in the direct control of the NPS (e.g. environmental laws). These approaches included needs for changing laws, increased public education, increased funding, updated organizational

partner policies, and additional time to implement strategies. Park employees expressed that these barriers both hindered and enabled their adaption to the strategies, and perceived internal barriers "as greater constraints than external barriers" (p.33). Jantarasami and colleagues (2010) also found that park employees expressed decision making dilemmas challenging the very mission of preserving U.S. National Parks. For instance, some park employees have expressed, "being forced to choose between protecting endangered species and protecting or restoring important ecosystem processes like river channel migration" (p. 44). The scholars conclude that "there can be no one-size fits all agency direction as to what adaption strategies should be implemented" (p. 47).

In addition to these unique barriers, many NPS leaders have advocated publicly on behalf of the park service for public action to address NPS challenges. For instance, a superintendent within the NPS promoted an approach calling agencies to work together on these issues with community partners. Specifically, the superintendent explained that the most significant problems facing the parks are not solvable by the employees of one park alone, and thus makes the call for a collective action mentality. This collective mentality is a public communicative effort by the superintendent to encourage community action.

Given the uniqueness of the NPS system, seen in the contradictory tensions (Winks, 1997) and organizational challenges and implementation of solutions (Jantarasami et al., 2010) with which employees struggle, scholars would do well to attune themselves toward the organizational experiences constituted through tension, and practices of the NPS employees amid the NPS and its challenges.

Communication and Organization

A constitutive view of organizing in communication is a fundamental focus among some scholars within the field of organizational communication (Schoeneborn, Kuhn, & Kärreman, 2019). This view posits that organizations are constituted in the ongoing processes of organizational communication. Such a Communication as Constitutive of Organization (CCO) perspective focuses attention to the ways organizations are created, maintained, and changed in communication. As such, through CCO views, organizational communication may be uniquely positioned to gain insights into the struggles of the NPS employees as they experience tensions and seek to address the challenges they face.

Given the complex organizational, communicative, and tension filled challenges which NPS employees seek to navigate at work, organizational communication scholars are well positioned to understand these employee challenges. Recent scholarship positions tension as communicative, which constitutes the experiences of organizational participants (Putnam et al., 2016). In embracing CCO orientations (Schoeneborn et al., 2019) to NPS challenges, and new research on communication which constitutes tension (Putnam et al., 2016), this study focuses on new insights into the complex experiences of employees who attempt to organize the NPS. These CCO perspectives of organizing offer a complex and practical approach to understand how employee's experience the complexities of organizing.

Social Capital and the NPS

In the face of these unique organizational situations of the NPS, other scholars have argued that Social Capital offers theoretical and practical implications for the NPS

(Miller, Carter, Walsh, & Peake, 2014). Outside of the NPS context, social capital as a concept has often been positioned as the solution to many complex problems facing communities (Robert Putnam, 2000). Social capital also has extended theoretical history in addressing dilemmas of cooperation and collective action (see: Blau, 1955; Gulati, 1995; Gulati & Gargiulo, 1999; Adger, 2003; Hamilton & Lubell, 2019). Although social capital has been used as a solution to the complex issues facing organized society (Robert Putnam, 2000), social capital may also be understood as a constitutive process as I will argue in this thesis. Specifically, through this study I will argue that a constitutive process view of social capital centers on the experience of social capital within the organizing processes of communication. Such a perspective offers scholars and NPS employees a more complex understanding of social capital that may better relate to employee experiences of tension as they address the challenges they face.

In arguing that social capital is constituted in tension-filled communication, this thesis extends social capital literature. Extending perspectives on social capital also responds to the calls of communication scholars including Putnam, et al., (2016), Lee and Sohn (2016), and Putnam (2019) to extended CCO theorizing. Beyond extending literatures and theoretical conceptions, this study may help employees of the U.S. national park I studied, begin to understand their expressions of social capital, as the constitutive fabric by which they dis/organize around challenges to said park. Embracing this view, employees may espouse a perspective where their social capital is communicatively constituted in tensions which constitute the park. This perspective directs employees to gain more awareness in the tensions they experience as they seek better strategies for negotiating tension. Indeed, social capital may be needed to address

the major challenges facing national parks (Miller et al. 2014), and under a dis/organized view, social capital itself is a tension to be negotiated. Thus, employees may attune themselves to their expressions of social capital constituted in the dis/ordered interplay of tensions.

In the next chapter, I provide a literature review of recent CCO perspectives and discuss recent directions focused on dis/organization to understand how organizations are constituted in tension-filled communication. I also review scholarship on social capital and when combined with perspectives on dis/organization will build an argument and framework for a constitutive view of social capital. In the third chapter, I will review the qualitative interpretive methods I used to study employee expressions of social capital at a 'big western' national park. In the fourth chapter I present my findings from this study revealing how expressions of social capital were constituted in tensions. I conclude this thesis with a final chapter discussing how these findings offer new directions for scholars, and new praxis perspectives which may be beneficial for employees who struggle with organizing the NPS..

CHAPTER 2

Communication Constitutes Social Capital in Dis/organization

Communication as constitutive of organization (CCO) perspectives offer an alternative view of social capital. CCO perspectives orient scholars toward communication and the underlying tensions inherent in organizing processes (Fairhurst et al., 2016). This perspective offers the notion of dis/organization as a way to discuss how organizations are simultaneously organized and disorganized (Schoeneborn et al. 2019). These approaches direct attention to communication as central to both tension and dis/organization and reorients focus on social capital in organizations.

To appropriately ground this study on employee expressions in a western national park. I review how scholars have conceptualized dis/organization, and the underlying tensions which constitute organization. I will then review literature on social capital, and how a CCO focus redirects attention in social capital toward the processes of social capital—specifically expressions of employees within this thesis. After reviewing this literature, I develop an argument that CCO perspectives provide alternative ways to explore social capital which I argue is constituted through tension, and which constitutes the order and disorder, dis/order, of the NPS. This perspective places communication as the central focus of expressed social capital when attending to the struggles of working in the NPS, and extends the ways scholars approach social capital by embracing tension as constitutive of social capital. I conclude this literature review by offering the research questions guiding my study..

CCO Perspectives

Management and organizational literature historically views communication as an occurrence within an organization. However, growing organizational communication scholarship ontologically repositions communication as organization (see Ashcraft, Kuhn, & Cooren, 2009). Such a process view of organizing was inspired by Axley's (1984) critique of the transmission view of communication and Weick's (1979) sociology of organizations and extended by others attentive to the complex relationship between the structure of organizations and the communicative processes that shape them. Over the years, this research ultimately resulted in scholars seeking to understand the relationship between organizations and communication (Ashcraft et al., 2009; Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004). In seeking to understand the processes of organizations, scholars began to develop different theories of how communication constitutes organizations, which would eventually become collectively known as CCO perspectives. These CCO perspectives belong to a family of theories which understand communication as constitutive of organizations (Shoeneborn et al., 2019). Schoeneborn and colleagues explain that CCO perspectives position communication as "a process of meaning production and negotiation" which constitute organization (Schoeneborn et al., 2019, p. 477). CCO scholars shift organizational scholarship focus from communication as the transmission of messages within organizations, which has been seen as a problematic and limiting view of communication (Axley, 1984), to favor approaches to communication that focus on the "process of meaning production and negotiation" which co-construct organizations (Shoeneborn et al. 2019, p. 476; Ashcraft et al., 2009).

Grounded in a "process view" of organization, expressed by Wieck (1979), CCO orientations direct scholars to understand organizations as "verbs not nouns" (Putnam & Fairhurst, 2015, p. 375). This constitutive approach subsumes the occurrence view of communication, and scholars began to look "at communication, rather than through it" to understand organization (Schoeneborn et al., 2019, p. 476). CCO perspectives often attend to communication as the process to focus on when attempting to understand organizations (see Ashcraft et al., 2009; Schoeneborn & Vásquez, 2017).

In reviewing key aspects of CCO perspectives, Schoeneborn and colleagues (2019) explain that CCO perspectives have extended organizational scholarship in three ways: (1) they offer an process ontology of organization, (2) recognize the "fundamental embeddedness of organizations in communicative relations in the broader society" (p 477), (3) highlight the "artifacts in materializing the communicative constitution of organization" (p. 477). These benefits have evolved from many scholars (Ashcraft et al., 2009), and explicitly from three schools of thought which, in part, constitute the CCO perspectives (Schoeneborn, Blaschke, Cooren, McPhee, Seidl, & Taylor, 2014). Schoeneborn and colleagues (2014) review these schools of thought: Montreal School, the four-flows model, and Luhmann's theory of social systems. Each school of thought is explained in the following paragraphs.

The Montreal school of CCO thought posits that communication constitutes organizations through conversation and texts, and the interplay between conversation and text referred by proponents of the school as equivalence (Ashcraft et al., 2009; Cooren, Taylor, & Van Every, 2006). Putnam and Fairhurst (2004), understood that organizations are grounded in continuous flow of, "discursive conduct," (p.16). Thus, this school

emphasizes a unified modality through the co-construction of organization and communication through text, and conversation. That is, "Communication is organizing, and organizing is communication" (p.666). This interplay is described as "erratic, emergent, and negotiated" (Ashcraft et al., 2009 p. 21). Indeed, communication itself is understood as a dialectic between text and conversation within the Montreal School of thought (Cooren et al. 2006; Shoeneborn et al. 2019). Thus, this interplay between text and conversation is co-constitutive of organization which is an ongoing, "Processual" view (Schoeneborn, 2011, p. 666).

Conversely, the four flows, or structuration view of CCO narrowly within four aspects which constitute organizing, rather than casting a large net around all communication constitutes organizing and vis versa (Schoeneborn, 2011; McPhee & Zaug, 2008). Flows is a term used to represent the processual nature which structuration scholars use to understand the 4 aspects which are "essential for constituting organization" (Schoeneborn, 2011 p.667). The four flows which constitute organizations include membership negotiation, self-structuring, activity coordination, and institutional positioning (McPhee & Zaug, 2008). Membership Negotiation are understood as the tendency for "clear-cut distinctions between members and nonmembers" and the negotiation between (Schoeneborn, 2011 p. 667). Self-structuring is referred to as the tendency for organizations to continually distinguish themselves from loose forms toward tighter structures (McPhee & Zaug, 2008). Schoeneborn (2011), describes the tendency for organizations to follow paths toward "at least one manifest purpose, which serves as a template for communicative processes known as activity coordination" (p.667). Finally, the institutional positioning is the status of organizations being negotiated within

society—in part constituting society itself. Schoeneborn (2011) concludes that the "Four

flows, however, need to be seen as a soft set of criteria rather than a clear-cut definition

of what makes communication organizational" (p. 667). In this way the processual

understanding of organization and communication is maintained through both schools of

thought reviewed thus far.

     The final school of thought Luhmann's social systems perspective, considers the

processual nature of organization and communication paramount, as well as the

paradoxical nature which organizations attempt to continually "deparadoxify"

(Schoeneborn, 2011. p.682. see also Luhmann, 2003). This perspective of CCO stems

from Luhmann's perspectives of social system theory (Luhmann, 1995; 2003).

Luhmann's work seeks to theoretically position all social phenomena within a common

framework, positing that communication is the "most basic element in the social domain"

(Schoeneborn, 2011, p. 670). These fundamental elements of communication tend to

reproduce themselves in interactions with the human psyche, which Luhmann separates

from the communication, yet the reproduction inseparably connects them (Schoeneborn,

2011). In this way communication interactions create events. These continual events

ensure connectivity of organizations, which systematically reproduces organizations, and

societies (Luhmann, 2003). Schoeneborn (2011) articulates that Luhmann's

understanding of organization are fundamentally grounded in paradox, which

organizations themselves work to "De-paradox" (p. 672) hinging on decision

communication. Luhmann (2000) articulates that communication directed toward

decisions are also inherently undecidable, given the ongoing nature and processual aspect

of communication. Thus, reproduction of decision is more aptly descriptor of Luhmann's

understanding (Schoeneborn 2011). Schoeneborn articulates that this grounded paradox and reproduction, is constitutive of organizations, and centers the de-paradoxing, and reproduction as boundary negotiation between in and out groups.

Schoeneborn et al. (2014) articulates the similarities and differences between these three schools of thought. Schoeneborn and colleagues, describe the three school's main commonality is the communicative constitution of organizational reality. Other similarities include that organizations themselves are communicative phenomena, and are "invoked and maintained through communicative practices (p. 286). Schoeneborn and colleagues conclude that "Overall, the CCO perspectives are a rather heterogenous theoretical endeavor, although its main proponents subscribe to the basic theoretical premise that reality is communicatively constituted, which extends to organizations" (p. 286). For an expansive review on the differences see Schoenborn et al. (2014). These schools of thought, as well as other scholars (Ashcraft et al., 2009), have also given way to scholars who seek to understand the simultaneous organization, and disorganization, dis/organization. Scholars concerned with dis/organization also highlight tension as foundational to CCO perspectives (Putnam et al., 2016). Given this studies particular interest in the challenges facing organizations, and the explicitly constitutive tensions which founded the NPS (Winks, 1995), I will review these concepts.

Dis/organization and Tension

Some organizational scholars embracing CCO perspectives have called for scholars to not only look at how communication constitutes organization, but additionally view the communication that constitutes organization as a "messy process" that is both "organized" and "disorganized." According to Vásquez and Kuhn (2019),dis/organization

scholars seek to study the indeterminacy of meaning which simultaneously constitutes dis/organization. Vásquez and Kuhn (2019) explain that "Disorganization is the excess, the surplus and abundance of meaning, the "more than"; while organization, the "less than", is the attempt of reducing meaning, ordering it, controlling it." (p. 5). Dis/organization positions the excess/lacking as a simultaneous interplay between organization and disorganization. This interplay is itself centered in meaning-making processes of communication. Dis/organization, as centered in communication, emphasizes "the disordered, irrational, and chaotic features of organization by paying attention to the indeterminacy of meaning and to the negotiation and struggles of controlling and stabilizing it" (p. 6).

Dis/organization scholars argue that this conception of dis/organization enables CCO scholars to avoid focusing solely on organizing. Mumby (2019) argues that this singular focus on organizing is a blind spot within CCO scholarship (Mumby, 2019). Mumby argues that CCO scholars default assumption is that stability is the "optimal condition of everyday organizational life" (p.126). Recommending that organizational scholars should simultaneously attend to the disorganizing qualities of organizational life, Mumby articulates how attention to dis/organizing attunes scholars to the complexities of communication which constitutes dis/organization. Dis/organization scholarship also challenges other dualisms beyond the dualism of organization and disorganization, including the subject/object positionality.

Those embracing a dis/organization perspective within organizational communication reformulate common dualities often used to conceptualize organization (Kuhn, 2012). For instance, dis/organization scholars, have consistently argued that

organizational studies have too often used communication as the central navigating

feature between subject and object as well as micro and macro processes (Kuhn, 2012;

Mumby, 2019). Dis/organization scholarship dissolves these common dualisms that

organization scholars have regularly been attuned. Embracing the linguistic turn in the

social sciences, Kuhn (2012) explains how such an approach leads to:

> the questioning of assumed distinctions between objective (e.g., organizational
> structures and industry rules) and subjective (e.g., individual motivations and
> symbolic action) elements in the social world, based on an argument that
> language and communication constitute all meanings, experiences, and
> descriptions in social life. (p. 546)

In this way, CCO scholars embracing a dis/organization perspective reject and

reconfigure dualistic distinctions in organization studies, such as those between subject

and object, (Kuhn, 2012) "by investigating the intrinsic interplay and interdependence

between language and world" (p. 546). Thus, under a dis/organizing lens, communication

is a process of meaning negotiation through which these dualisms are constituted.

Elaborating this view, Kuhn captures the heart of a dis/organization perspective stating,

"communication as capable of producing that intersubjectivity and predictability, but

simultaneously as a process that is uncertain, ambiguous, paradoxical, fragmented, and

dilemmatic" (p. 549). In other words, communicating is *simultaneously* an ordering and

disordering practice. While some dis/organized scholars have sought to understand the

long-term institutionalized forms of dis/organization (Mumby, 2019), other scholars have

sought to understand the "moment to moment" forms of dis/organization (p.126).

However, both approaches to dis/organization are particularly interested in the

simultaneity between order and disorder.

Putnam (2019) argues that dis/order is a central feature of dis/organization scholarship, and positions dis/order as a dialectical tension. Putnam has routinely called for more focus on dis/order within organization scholarship focusing on dialectical tensions within dis/organizational contexts (Putnam et al., 2016). Despite the common theoretical connection of communication as constitutive of organization and the literature on organizational tensions (e.g., Putnam et al. 2016) and CCO perspectives (e.g., Schoeneborn et al., 2019), rarely have the two been combined to offer as a framework for studying dis/organization. Given the common theoretical approach, however, I ground this study in the moment-to-moment, tension-filled communication which constitutes dis/organization. Thus, I will next review how tension is central to dis/organization, and explore the notion of dialectical tensions as central to dis/order.

Putnam and colleagues (2016) review the organizational tension literature in which they position organizational tension scholarship within a CCO framework, and adopt a constitutive approach to understandings the tensions, paradox, contradictions, dialects and other forms of the "messiness" of organizational life (Putnam et al., 2016). Putnam and colleagues (2016) conducted an extensive interdisciplinary review of the tension literature, proposing that explicitly adopting the language of CCO perspective captures a unifying theme among scholars. Additionally, they define tension as the "stress, anxiety discomfort, or tightness in making choices, responding to, and moving forward in organizational situations" (p. 68). Tension in their view captures an umbrella term for a variety of related conceptions, namely: dualism, contradiction, paradox, and dialectics. Each of these concepts are inter-related, especially when embracing the messiness of dis/organization. These concepts of tension were reviewed by Putnam et al.,

who concluded that communication constitutes each of these conceptions. Putnam and colleagues end their review by calling for more scholarship on dis/order (Putnam et al, 2016; Putnam, 2019). Indeed, Vásquez and Kuhn (2019) have directed those interested in studying the simultaneous nature of order and disorder and thus focusing on communication as a dis/organizing phenomenon. Following this direction from Putnam and colleagues (2016; 2019), I embrace dialectical tensions as a useful frame for studying dis/organizing in the NPS (Putnam et al., 2016; Putnam, 2019).

Putnam positions dis/order as a dialectical tension between order and disorder, and the simultaneity of the interplay among order and disorder. Putnam and colleagues (2016) define dialectical tensions as "interdependent opposites aligned with forces that push-pull on each other like a rubber band and exist in an ongoing dynamic interplay as the poles implicate each other" (p. 75). This implication of opposites, is another frame for understanding the simultaneity of dis/order. Putnam et al. (2016) argue that dialectical tensions "has not been directly integrated into the study of paradox" (p. 75), and again call for more scholarship on the dialectical interplay of dis/order. Given this lacking adoption, Putnam et al. direct future studies on organizations toward communication scholarship on dialectical tension. Putnam et al. further direct scholars to adopt Baxter and colleagues (1996; 2011) conception of dialectical tensions to conduct studies on dis/order.

Baxter and Montgomery (1996) explain dialectical tension as "a dynamic knot of contradictions, a ceaseless interplay between contrary or opposing tendencies" (p. 3). For Baxter and Montgomery, the goal of focusing on dialectical tensions is not "smoothing out [life's] rough edges, but…a goal of understanding its fundamental ongoing

messiness" (p. 3). Baxter and Montgomery (1996) trace the ontological root of the larger

theory of dialectics from many different philosophies including the Greeks, Taoists, to

more modern philosophies of Hegel, Marx, and Bakhtin. Given Bakhtin's (1984) interest

in dialogism, Baxter and Montgomery root their communicative theory of dialectical

tensions in dialogism or as Baxter and Braithwaite (2008) later explain, "all meaning

making can be understood metaphorically and literally as dialogue, that is the

simultaneous fusion and differentiation of different systems of meaning, or discourses"

(p. 4). In this way, organizational scholars interested in dialectical tensions may look for

the simultaneity in the interplay between opposites as a means of understanding the

constitutive forces at play which constitute organization (Schoeneborn et al. 2019).

CCO scholars have centered communication as constitutive of organization, and

dis/organization (Schoeneborn et al. 2019; Vásquez & Kuhn, 2019). Tension and paradox

scholar have centered communication as constitutive of tension (Putnam et al. 2016), and

directed the central dis/ordering questions of organizational scholarship toward

understandings of dialectical tension (Putnam et al. 2016). Given the common theoretical

framework communication as constitutive of tension and organization, this study offers

one attempt to respond to the calls of scholars who direct attention toward the moment-

to-moment processes of communication as constitutive of dis/order and dis/organization

(Putnam et al., 2016, Putnam, 2019). This study of the National Park Service (NPS) is

especially relevant to a focus on dialectical tensions arising from CCO perspectives

because NPS is often described as a being a tension filled organization. In responding to

scholars who have called for social capital to address NPS issues in a review of social

capital, my dis/organization lens has lead me to review social capital scholarship, given

social capitals importance to the NPS (Miller et al., 2014). In adopting this dis/organized framework to understand social capital, I hope to offer new ways to explore social capital in organizations.

Social Capital Perspectives

The concept and theory of social capital has been conceptualized by an astounding number of scholars, yet much of the theoretical definitions of the concept stem from a few scholars (Lin et al., 2001)—particularly in the field of communication (Lee & Sohn, 2016). Indeed, Lee and Sohn found that communication scholars give "hegemonic," attention to scholarship espousing Robert Putnam's (1995, 2000) conception of social capital (p.743). After explaining the communication approaches to conceptualizing social capital, I will explain the scholarship which has inspired these communication efforts. This will begin with an explanation of Putnam (2000) conception of social capital as the exchange of goodwill, reciprocity, and trust within the interactions between people, associated with positive or negative outcomes for exchangers. I will then explain other conceptions of social capital. I will then review scholars continued call for a more unified definition of social capital, which tends to end up as a heuristic effort rather than a unifying interdisciplinary outcome (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Lee & Sohn 2016). That is to say there is not much agreement on the definition of social capital, which has caused many scholars to focus instead on the generation (creation) of social capital (Burt, 2001). I will also review how social capital has been studied by levels of social networks namely micro (interpersonal), meso (organizational), and macro (communities) (Halpern, 2005; Lee & Sohn, 2016; Ben-Hador, 2018). In completing this review, I will seek to answer the call of communication scholars for more inclusive approaches of studying

conceptions of social capital (Lee & Sohn, 2016), as well as develop an extension to the

way scholars think of social capital through a CCO perspective—argued in the next

section.

Lee and Sohn (2016) surveyed communication journals to understand how

communication scholars research social capital, and in doing so developed a

communication heuristic to understand differing conceptions of social capital. They

heuristically divided social capital theorizing into two camps. The first, a communitarian-

-or a macro view of social capital which looks largely at the generalized groups within a

society (e.g. Putnam 1995, 2000;). The second camp Lee and Sohn (2016) divided as the

social networks group of scholars (e.g. Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman 1988). This camp of

scholars understands social capital in a social networks—a mixed level view of social

capital (e.g. micro-macro) (Lee & Sohn, 2016). In other words, these group of scholars

embrace network analysis as a means of assessing the resources exchanged among

individuals and groups. The main difference between these two approaches, besides the

scaling of sociality, is that the mixed level view of social capital accounts for the material

conversion of sociality into capital, while the communitarian view espouses a

metaphorical use of economic principles (e.g. capital isn't literal conversion into monies,

but is representative of exchange of trust). Lee and Sohn (2016) found that a super

majority of communication scholars have used a communitarian view of social capital—

which ignores the micro-macro view, and the material conversion of capital. Lee and

Sohn (2016) argue communication scholars should embrace social capital conceptions in

both the communitarian and the social network approaches to better understand the

nuance which communication may offer social capital scholars broadly. The next pages I

devote to understanding the communitarian view, the social networks view, and the focus on generation of social capital.

Communitarian view of Social Capital

Robert Putnam's (2000) work on the decline of social clubs, organizations, and institutions through the last decades of the 21st century is a clear example of the communitarian view of social capital. Robert Putnam (2000) traced the idea of Social Capital to Alexis De Tocqueville's writings on American democracy's dependence on relational networks. Upon visiting America to understand the nature of American Democracy, Tocqueville commented on the fabric of American life which was sown through voluntary association (Frumkin, 2002). As argued by Robert Putnam (2000), the fabric of "moral association," was the first incantation of social capital expressed by Tocqueville (p.49), and later re-conceptualized by Robert Putnam as "norms of reciprocity" (p.21). Rather than focus on any one person's relational network, Tocqueville looked at the voluntary civic institutions and understood them as the main reason why democratic society was leading to more collective good in America than it was in Europe (Frumkin, 2002). For scholars espousing the communitarian approach to social capital, the early influence of Tocqueville on the theorizing cannot be overstated (R. Putnam 2000).

Robert Putnam (2000) defined social capital as social networks wherein social actors exchange trust and norms of reciprocity, which builds the foundation by which society organizes to address problems. To study social capital Robert Putnam (2000) identified bridging and bonding forms of capital which help shaped his conceptualization and subsequently the communitarian's approach to studying social capital. Bonding

social capital are the exclusive dimension where members of a community are excluded from others. Robert Putnam (2000) uses a country club as an example where norms are strictly enforced to exclude non country club members. Bridging social capital is an inclusive dimension where members of a community are included by the norms of a group. Putnam uses the civil rights movement as an example of bridging capital. Robert Putnam (2000) argued that both dimensions of capital can't be divided into neat categories, but rather both forms are utilized in social interactions. Thus, bridging and bonding dimensions of capital are largely used to understand how complex citizenries use their relational networks formed through norms of reciprocity, and trust.

Robert Putnam's (2000) approach encouraged macro societal level views of societal levels used the concept of social capital to understand growing polarization and disengagement of Americans in their communities and argued that the growing disengagement would have wide ranging effects in our community. Using data from surveys administered through multiple decades, Robert Putnam was able to portray growing disengagement through attendance numbers in meetings, and through his survey's seeking to understand engagement (e.g. how involved are you in city council meetings). Putnam showed that societal disengagement was on the rise in every facet of American life, from the Boy Scouts to bridge clubs. To make sense of this survey data, he used the concept of social capital (relational networks of reciprocity embedded in the organizing bodies of American society) to argue that Americans were growing apart thus resulting in a strained democracy. This macro-level view of society enabled Putnam (2000) to successfully supplant his communitarian views in many social science disciplines (Adler & Kwon, 2002), especially in studies of communication, where Robert

Putnam's view of social capital dominates 88% of articles published in communication journals (Lee & Sohn, 2016). The communitarian approach to social capital has not been without critique, however.

Though particularly useful to understanding how norms of reciprocity are used to understand collective action and inaction at the largest societal levels, scholarship espousing this communitarian view of social capital have been critiqued "for not adequately considering oppression, conflicts, and inequality that exist within smaller societal levels." (Lee & Sohn, 2016, p. 714; see also: Moore et al., 2005; Navarro, 2002). For example, Adler and Kwon, (2002) review scholarship which critiques Robert Putnam's view of capital; arguing formal institutions and governmental structures bound by legal rules often impede the emergence and maintenance of social capital among social entities. Scholars have attributed this lack of attention to the exclusive focus macro-views, when often the oppression, conflicts, and inequality are more evident in inter-level (micro) views of social capital (Moore et al., 2005). Given this studies interest in the experience of social capital in the lived experiences of national park employees, a micro—approach to social capital is suited to uncovering stakeholder experiences through their expressions.

Additionally, employing an alternative view of social capital would benefit the current communication discipline's "hegemonically dominate[d]" (Lee & Sohn 2016, p. 743) communitarian approach to researching social capital. The conceptual underpinnings of the social networks view of social capital, and how it is used in communication scholarship, is helpful in establishing micro expressions of social capital. However, in the next section a seeming contradiction between Lee and Sohn's (2016)

heuristic of communitarian/social network will be introduced through the work of Lin

and colleagues (2001). This review demonstrates the complexity incorporating

conceptions into a unified concept for study. Lin et al., (2001) provide a definition of

social capital which incorporates all conceptions of social capital which I will use in this

study and introduce at the end of this section which will enable the expressions of social

capital to be studied. I will further argue at the end of this chapter that attuning myself to

the expressions of participants allows these divergent perspectives on social capital to

emerge from the expressions of participants, which I will then interpret as expressions of

social capital in a CCO perspective attuned to tension.

Social network view of Social Capital

As an alternative to the communitarian view of social capital, some scholars adopt

both micro and macro societal levels of social capital exchange of resources (Lin et al.,

2001). This social networks approach to Social Capital is theoretically underpinned

within a larger framework of types of capital. Lin and colleagues (2001) emphasize two

large conceptual schemas of capital which influence the view of social capital. Lin and

colleagues review the communitarian view of social capital also, and position this view

within the social network framework. As such, the theoretical roots of social capital, are

positioned in two dominant views of capital itself, the Durkheimian view of capital, and

the Marxist view of capital. Lin and colleagues (2001) incorporate the communitarian

literature into their review, and thus will be cited in the following paragraphs.

One view of social capital is informed by the Durkheimian view of capital

(Coleman, 1988; Robert Putnam 1993; 1995; 2000) which posits social capital as a public

good available through the social relations of society. Because social capital is

understood as a public good (e.g. water), the use of the capital is dependent on the

goodwill of individuals within a collective (e.g. I live on a river upstream from one's

farm, I don't dam up the water knowing the river supports many downstream). Thus, the

positive use of social capital is dependent on the good will of those who populate a

society. Additionally, social capital as embedded in social networks is of particular

interest to social capital scholars as it's use as a public good is sustained by; norms, trust,

sanctions, and "other structural features" (Lin et.al, 2001, P. 25). Indeed, these features

become defining features in theorists' definitions of social capital. Coleman (1988) states,

> 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 social structure, and they facilitate certain actions of individuals who are
> within the structure. (p. 302)

Here Coleman illustrates social capital is defined by its function, and he expounds his

Durkheim informed view of capital as public good. Robert Putnam (1995) expounds

these two ideas. Putnam explains the public good as "features of social organization such

as networks, norms, and social trust" and the defining function of social capital as it is,

"facilitated…for mutual benefit" (p. 67). From these quotes a distinction between the

communitarian and social networks approach to social capital despite both approaches

ascribing to some degree to the Durkheim view of capital. The communitarian view (e.g.

Robert Putnam, 1995; 2000) breaks from the social networks Durkheim view of capital

(Coleman, 1988) as Robert Putnam (2000) focuses on the macro-societal social capital

(which Robert Putnam details in his definition as social organizations), while other

scholars maintain the potential of micro-, meso-, and macro- views of capital (e.g.

Coleman, 1988).

Another view of capital within social capital scholarship is the Marxist view (Bourdieu 1983; 1985), which posits social capital as a "privilege-good" (Lin et al., 2001, p. 25). A privilege-good exists in which a dominating class uses all forms of capital (including forms of social capital) to maintain and reproduce the dominant class. This view still espouses a collective asset conception of social capital, but the collective asset maintains the dominating class rather than exists as a public resource, as in the Durkheimian view. Thus, the features of social capital are the same, yet understood as privileging features rather than good-will dependent features (Lin et. al 2001). Indeed, scholars espousing this view of capital establish definitions of social capital which permeate a privileged-good view. For instance, social capital is "made up of social obligations ('connections'), which is convertible, in certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalized in the form of a title of nobility" (Bourdieu, 1985, p. 243). By adopting the aforementioned privilege-view of social capital, scholars are particularly interested in who lacks capital, embedded in social networks (e.g. Navarro, 2002).

Lin et al. (2001) approach to define social capital, combines the Durkheim view with the Marxist view of capital, and thus is helpful toward answering the call of a combined view of Lee and Sohn (2016). Lee and Sohn summarized the combined capital views and definition of social capital with a "simple and straightforward" statement that social capital is, "Investment in social relations with expected returns" (p. 6). This statement captures the research interest of scholars looking at the relationship between social and other forms of capital, the social network approach to understanding social capital, and leaves room to understand social capital in a communitarian view—this the

micro-meso-macro levels of society (Burt, 1992; Lin et al., 2001; Lee & Sohn, 2016). It definitionally allows room for the investment of 'capital' in social capital, to be understood more as a metaphor for our social world (Lin et al., 2001; Coleman, 1988; Bourdieu, 1986).

Generation of Social Capital

Many scholars have shifted their theoretical attention toward the generation of social capital as a means of assessing its function as a public good, or a privilege good (Burt, 2001). Thus, rather than a focus on what social capital is, these scholars focus on how social capital is created—operating under the assumption that the concept is a productive asset for accomplishing collective action goals (Burt, 2001; see also: Hamilton & Lubell, 2019). Communitarian scholars often maintain that the generation of social capital is functionally the same as its use as a public good. Within the communitarian view, Robert Putnam (2000) expresses the generation and use of social capital as the bonding and bridging interplay within a society. Robert Putnam's "simple argument" is that American society "needs to reconnect with one another" (p.28), and this reconnection happens as societal members bridge across their bonded groups and thus generate bridges of social capital. This positions the generation of social capital as simply connection. However, these social capital scholars attuning themselves to the communitarian view have rarely attuned themselves to the micro practices of connecting (Moore et al., 2006). Communication as a discipline positions connection as communicative relationships, processes, structures, and phenomena (Craig, 1999). Many social capital scholars have sought to position communication as a generative force of social capital.

Bourdieu (1986) theorized social capital to be the combined dichotomy between "Social" (a "phenomena of communication") and "Capital" (the "brutal fact of universal reducibility to economics") (p. 24). In this way, Bourdieu positions social capital as an interplay between communication and capital. Bourdieu positions capital as the inevitable pole of the tension, which has directed subsequent scholars toward understanding social capital in largely capital ways, ignoring the communicative phenomena (Lin et al., 2001). Ironically, even within the communication discipline, scholars have authoritatively designated other views of social capital, which ignore Bourdieu's (1986) theory all together—thus espousing a communitarian view which does not respond to Bourdieu's understanding of communication's function within social capital. Outside of communication scholarship, social capital scholars routinely understand the conversion of sociality into capital more than they do of the conversion of capital into sociality (Adler & Kwon, 2002)—that is scholars do not often understand the meaning-making which undergirds the relationships which scholars argue convert into capital. In Bourdieu's (1986) view, social capital is generated as a conversion between forms of capital. Beyond this converting view of social capital, scholars have bridged the communitarian view of bridging bonding generation, and the converting capital generation by attuning themselves to the network functions in which social capital is embedded—specifically the broker.

Burt (2001) focuses on Brokers as a means of generating social capital. The term 'Broker's' is a term used by Burt to identify individuals within a social network, who act as the bridging gatekeepers between bonded groups in a network. Burt (2001) conceives that social networks group around capital resources and exchange them amongst one

another—thus developing holes between groups which are not in exchange networks. Burt's (2001) conception of a broker emphasizes that a person who functionally operates as a gatekeeper, thus has access to privileged goods exchanged within a network and controls the spread of said goods between the networks. Thus, the generation of social capital exists as a broker works to negotiate social relations between groups who the exchange resources.

All of these conceptions of how social capital are generated revolve around the metaphor of "connection" within relationships and returns (which may include resources). These generative functions describe to varying degrees of coherency how connection functions to generate social capital. The communitarian view assumes connection, while the social network view assumes capital conversion. Bridging these two perspectives, the broker, and structural wholes generative framework uses sub-metaphors to describe the outcomes of social capital. Given these varying metaphors, communication scholarship demonstrates that connection within relationships, and groups is a messy process, and outcome—particularly messier than the social capital scholars seem to account for in their conceptions of generation. As such, in the next section, I argue that the generation of social capital should not be separate from the conception itself, and thus argue that a CCO scholarship offers a path forward to look at the complexity of investing in social relations and expecting returns. As such, I embrace the combined definition of social capital from Lin et.al (2001) that social capital is the "investment of social relations with expected returns" (p.6). From this perspective, the source of social capital "lies in the structure [processes] and content of the actor's social relations" (Adler & Kown, 2002, p.23). By embracing social capital in this way scholars

may also employ what Portes (1998) understood as inter-leveled views of social capital.

Portes argued that by studying social capital between social network levels scholars are

able to understand how consequential decisions made as a result of investments of

relational exchanges at the micro-level relates to the decisions at other levels of social

networks and vice-versa. To better understand the micro levels of social capital, I will

especially attune myself to the expressions of social capital. By adopting this view of

multi-leveled investments with expected returns, Lee and Sohn (2016) argued that

communication scholars would be better able to understand effects, experiences, and

results of social networks, and thus:

> prevent researchers from engaging in sociological or psychological reductionism.
> As such, describing and explaining communication processes and effects at
> multiple levels using the concept of social capital will contribute to formulating
> and testing a comprehensive and unifying theory (e.g., macro–micro and micro–
> macro theories) (p. 741).

A CCO view of Social Capital: Tension and Dis/organization

Ashcraft, et al., (2009) discuss how a CCO perspective changes the way

communication scholars who espouse a network approach to communication view the

networks themselves. Social capital was initially introduced within this network frame,

and communication scholars focused on networks often employed a container model to

understand social capital as contained within the networks (Oh, Labianca, & Chung,

2006; Nahapiet & Ghosal, 1998). This container metaphor continues to dominate the way

that social capital is understood within social networks, as well as in the communitarian

approach (Lee & Sohn, 2016). Lin et al. (2001) position social capital as a concept within

the neo-liberal view of social capital, and Mumby (2019) argues that neo-liberal views of capital are constituted in communication. As such, Mumby (2019) proposes adopting a framework whereby capital broadly is understood through a CCO lens, called Communication Constitutes Capital. Given that scholars embracing a dis/organized view of social capital have also attuned themselves to tension (Putnam et al., 2016), and have directed future scholars to study dis/order as dialectical tension (Putnam, et al., 2016, Putnam, 2019), a dis/organized CCO lens of social capital directs my attention to dialectical tension filled articulations of social capital. Embracing CCO perspectives and a focus on dis/organization, I aim to understand social capital as a communicative process with an interest in how communicative expressions of social capital might emerge in dialectical tension.

To study the dis/organization of social capital, I embrace tension as a fundamental quality of communication that constitutes social capital (Putnam et al., 2016), and attune myself to dialectical tensions. In extending the CCO framework to social capital, I intend to examine the dis/organizational experiences of employees in context. Indeed, Putnam (2006) argues that "context plays a critical role in thinking about the needs for future research" (p. 22). For this study, I examined the constitution of social capital through the expressions of employees within a big western national park. The following two research questions guided my exploration of the communication of social capital at a big western national park:

RQ 1: How is Social Capital expressed among members of a big western national park?

RQ 2: How do these expressions of Social Capital relate to tension?

Answering these research questions requires exploring how employees of this national park talk about social capital and then examining how these expressions of social capital relate to tension. Attending to the different expressions of social capital among the participants allows for differing conceptions of social capital to emerge. For example, a participant may express a broad-based communitarian norm of reciprocity or may also express a network of exchanged resources. Expressions are also commonly used as the qualitative basis for emerging data within studies on organizations constituted of tension (Putnam et al., 2016). As such, participant expressions allow for the exploration of the complexity between differing conceptions of social capital and how they might arise in tension. In the following chapter I review the qualitative-interpretive study (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011) of social capital.

CHAPTER 3:

Methods

To conduct this study, I use a qualitative approach to data collection and an interpretive approach to data analysis. Embracing a qualitative-interpretive approach I used semi-structured interviews to explore the expressions of social capital among participants at a national park amid the struggles they face. Lindlof and Taylor (2011) argue that researchers who use qualitative interpretive approach to interviews should seek to "generate credible knowledge by…extensive interaction with other participants" (p. 9). In this chapter, I will explain the qualitative-interpretive methodology and review the specific methods I used in collecting and analyzing data to respond to the research questions proposed for this study.

Methodology

For this study, I embrace a qualitative-interpretive methodology to gain insights into the ways NPS employees articulate their experiences in a national park. Qualitative approaches to communication research are intended to study the "performances and practices of human communication" (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011, p. 4). Those embracing qualitative approaches may attune themselves to the expressed experiences among individuals engaged in particular contexts. These experiences can be performances in the form of "creative, local, and collaborative interaction events" (p. 4) or practices in the form of "generic and routine dimensions of communicative acts" (p. 4). Embracing a

qualitative methodology orients this study toward understanding the rich, complicated, and contextually dependent expressions of national park employees' experiences.

Interpretive scholars embracing qualitative methods study the rich, subjective experience of "sense-making" (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011, p. 8) among research participants. Interpretive scholars acknowledge they are "inevitably positioned and partial" (p. 9) and thus embrace the notion that any interpretation is made from a particular subject position and offers only partial insights into the complexities of meaning-making and social interaction. Thus, a focus on subjective experiences of sense-making, interpretive scholars may be able to gain new understandings of the interpretive expressions of social capital by focusing on the sense-making processes—rooting their results in the expressed experiences of those sense-making processes. In this way, I embrace the main focus of qualitative-interpretive approaches by attending to organizational sense making seen in expressions as a way to understand local experiences, rather than make generalizable claims about all organizations (Croucher & Cronin-Mills, 2015). By approaching social capital from a combined qualitative and interpretive epistemology, I aim to reveal the ways national park employees talk about social capital by interpreting their expressions through a CCO lens.

Research Site

The site for this study is a big western national park in the United States which has been experiencing unique challenges in resources and other organizational issues resulting in a variety of expressed struggles in the workplace. For this study, I conducted interviews with 45 national park employees about their experiences working amidst the

challenging situations they face every day. I also took field notes from my experiences

participating in meetings and reflections during my six-week stay at the national park.

Participants and Data Collection

After receiving a grant from the National Park Conservancy affiliated with this

national park, I sought to study the organizational experiences of NPS employees. My

proposal for the grant focused on examining natural and cultural resource issues facing

national parks. In answering the conservancy's call for proposals, I secured funding for a

study exploring how experiences of social capital effected the organization processes in

this park. I was granted access to a big western national park and spent six weeks

interviewing employees and participating in meetings. I first used snowball sampling to

recruit employees from this national park to participate in one-on-one interviews. Lindlof

and Taylor (2011) recommend snowball sampling techniques to recruit "elusive, hard-to-

recruit" employees—which makes sense in this context given the time demanding

schedules of national park employees in this busy park. To recruit participants, a member

of a national park conservatory forwarded my e-mail request for participation to all

employees of this national park. As I received responses to this initial email, I scheduled

interviews and invited interested employees to recommend additional employees who

might want to participate. These recruiting methods resulted in interviews with 45

national park employees.

The majority (35) of the participants were employed full-time in the national park

in variety of positions. Specifically, I interviewed 12 executive upper-level managers in

charge of 'divisions' of the park, 12 mid-level supervisors, 11 other full-time workers and

10 seasonal employees who were on site during the busy summer months.. Given the

hard to recruit nature of NPS employees, the number of participants within each level of

the NP hierarchy is significant. While this study does include mostly full-time employees,

it is unique given the depth of the recruited participants amongst varying levels of the

hierarchy. The following table summarizes the participants by hierarchical level by role.

Table 1   Participant Types

Role	Participants	Role Description
Manager	12	High leveled managers within park organization. These employees oversee the overall operations of work groups.
Supervisor	12	Mid-level supervisors within park organization. These employee's supervising role ranges from multiple work groups, to one work group.
Full-time Employee	11	Full-time employees within park organization.
Seasonal	10	Low-level employees within park organization. These employees work temporarily at the park, many for multiple years.

To collect data for this this study, I engaged in semi-structured interviews with the

45 participants and collected field notes during my time at the national park. Lindlof and

Taylor (2011) argue that semi-structured interviews are typically used when interviewers

only have one chance to meet with a participant and are typically conducted in a way that

allows the conversation to develop based on individual experiences and priorities. This

style of interview was best suited to interviewing individuals for this study as I could

allow the participants to guide my inquiry into the experiences they felt most pressing or

important, and the sense-making nature of interviews (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). I

formulated a question protocol to guide me in answering open-ended questions, which

Lindlof and Taylor suggest would elicit rich data that could be later used to interpret the experiences of the stakeholders. Interviews ranged from 39 to 118 minutes.

I also captured field notes in which I reflected on my experiences in the interviews and on my observations made during my time at the park in meetings and other activities. To aid in the interpretation of interviews, and to better understand the context of the site (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011), I used field notes to ground myself in the national park context. I wrote about my observations and daily activities associated with the national park community where I lived. I took notes on meetings I observed, discussions I participated in, and other social events to which I was invited. My aim was to reflect on the expressions and everyday practices of the organization that were available to me. These observations offered a more robust perspective of the interactions occurring, which Lindlof and Taylor (2011) argue are one important use of field notes. These field notes became important as they helped me recall significant moments in my interviews and became helpful in my analysis of social capital expressions and tensions expressed. Upon completion of the 45 interviews, the audio recordings were transcribed resulting in 620 pages of interview transcripts and I had 160 pages of field notes. In an attempt to maintain the confidentiality of the interviewees, pseudonyms were used during the analysis and when presenting the findings.

Data Analysis

After being granted access to a national park, I engaged in a process of semi-structured interviews and observations at a big western national park. In order to answer my research questions, I engaged in both inductive and deductive analysis (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). Specifically, data analysis consisted of inductively coding the interview

transcripts for expressions of social capital, and then deductively coding for the salient types of social capital expressions for dialectical tension related to dis/order.

To respond to my first research question, I engaged in inductive analysis by reading and re-reading the interview transcripts (while consulting my field notes) to identify expressions of social capital. My unit of analysis were meaningful phrases as expressed by the participants in the study. These included short statements and longer articulations made during the interviews. In order to identify expressions of social capital, I used Lin et al.'s (2001) definition of social capital and searched for expressions by participants of an "investment in social relations" with "expected returns" (p.6). Specifically, I searched for statements and phrases that indicated an "investment in social relations such as indications that the interview was reaching out to other work groups, managers, supervisors, or other co-workers with a desire for a relationship of some sort. Similarly, I also looked for expressions of an "expected return" related to what the interviewee expressed as a benefit of the relationship. This could be an expression of hope of continued support, expression of accomplishing a task or assignment, expressed exchange of work information, email responses, and other expectations.

Using these operationalized terms from Lin et al. (2001) I continued engaging in inductive analysis by reading the interviews and identifying every expression of investment in social relations, with expected returns. I was able to identify social capital when both the investment of social relations and expected return were present in an expression. In identifying instances of social capital expression, I engaged in a process which Lindlof and Taylor (2011) refer to as "constant comparison" (p. 251). In this process, I coded each expression of investment in social relations with expected returns

and created a codebook. Through the process of constant comparison, I had found 60

initial codes. Taking these initial codes, I began engaging in a process of "axial coding"

(p. 252), wherein I explored for connections across the codes and began categorizing

these codes into particular emergent categories. I created a code book to organize how

initial expressions were categorized into larger types. Through this process, I interpreted

four salient expressions of social capital, as will be described in the findings.

In order to respond to my second research question, I engaged in deductive

analysis (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011) by assessing each salient expression of social capital,

identified through the process above, and examining how that expression related to some

sort of tension. To orient my analysis of tensions, I embraced Putnam, et al.'s (2016)

exhaustive review of tension in organizational literature with a particular focus on

dialectical tension. Putnam et al. (2016) define dialectical tensions as, "Interdependent

opposites aligned with forces that push-pull on each other like a rubber band and exist in

an ongoing dynamic interplay as the poles implicate each other" (p. 75). Based on this

definition, I reviewed each of the four categories of social capital expressions and

examined the context of the expressions for related tensions. Specifically, I re-read for

expressions of social capital (identified in the previous analysis) and assessed for 'poles,'

or interconnected opposites, and for the "rubber band like implications" of one another.

For example, within an expression of social capital, a supervisor named Arthur stated,

"We're very siloed in my opinion, like you hear 'we're one park, one mission' but it's the

mission to take care of things in my silo." In this case Arthur's statement demonstrates a

push and pull between the dialectic of "unity" and "division" as he explains how he seeks

meeting the park wide mission with others (unity) while also take care of his silo

(division). In this way, I examined the expressions of social capital seeking how they related to dialectical tension. In this process, I identified particular dialectical tensions associated with the expressions of social capital. Embracing a dis/organization perspective I payed particular attention to any dialectical tensions related to order/disorder.

During this process, I engaged in a process of "constant-comparison" to identify dialectical tensions in the expression of social capital. As Corbin and Strauss (2008) explain, data should be collected to a point of saturation—or the point where no new data emerges. Embracing this idea, I continued with this process of constant comparison until I reached a level of saturation (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011, p. 251) across the different types of identified expressions of social capital.

In sum, through a qualitative, interpretive approach, I was able to answer the research questions guiding this study. By analyzing the interview transcripts to first identify different expressions of social capital in the interview transcripts and then assessing the different types of expressions to see how they related to particular tensions, I was able to respond to both of my research questions. In the next chapter, I present my findings by reviewing each of the expressions of social capital and explaining the tensions associated with these expressions.

CHAPTER 4:

Findings.

After analyzing 45 interview transcripts for expressions of social capital, and their

relation to expressions of tension, I found that employees in a national park expressed

social capital in four main ways and that each of these expressions were related to

different dialectical tensions. The expressions of social capital included the following

four salient categories: (1) social capital maintenance, (2) lacking social capital, (3) chain

of command social capital, (4) social capital conversion. The social capital expressions

were centered in expressions of dialectical tensions. Grounded in Putnam, et al.'s (2016)

conceptualization of dialectical tension as "interdependent and mutually exclusive poles

are continually connected in a push-pull on each other, like a rubber band," (p. 75), I

investigated how these expressions arose in particular dialectical tension. I found that

these dialectical tensions are interconnected within a particular dialectical tension of

dis/order. In the following sections, I will explain each expression of social capital and

the underlying dialectical tension central to the different expressions of social capital.

After expounding these findings, I lay out a few unique expressions of social capital that

highlight the complexity of the underlying dialectical tensions of dis/order within

intersecting expressions of social capital. In uncovering these expressions of social

capital, I show that the expressions of tension in the form of dialectical tensions are

central to the dis/ordered expressions of social capital.

Social Capital Maintenance

The first salient type of social capital expression I identified was "social capital maintenance." Expressions of social capital maintenance emerged in the ways employees articulated a desire to maintain investment in social relations because they anticipated some form of expected return. Maintaining investment in social relations entails employees expressing their efforts to continue interaction with other individuals and groups within the national park. The quality of these interactions existed in a variety of ways and united into a common theme as expressed maintenance of the social relations in connection with expected returns. The use of the term "maintenance" presupposes an existing social network. This is as expected given that all employees are socially linked by the national park they work for. Further, the word "maintenance" describes an expressed desire for continued investment of social relations, in accordance with the employee expectations of some sort of return. Employees expressed many divergent expected returns, however what united these expected returns is the expressed desire to up-keep the returns on their investment in social relations. The following table offers the examples of the different expressions of social capital, which were categorized into social capital maintenance.

Table 2   **Social Capital Maintenance**

Code	Definition of Code	Expression of Social Capital Maintenance
Rely on Broker	Reliance on social relations with a specific person, maintaining expected returns.	Dallin (manager): People I used to work with come to me, trying to get me to do something for them, even though Becca is supposed to be doing my old work. They say "She's not doing it the way you did." I say, she doesn't have to do it the way I did it, rely on her.
Needed change	Investment in social relations given a need for a changed return, and the return changes resulting in renewed investment.	Lester (manager): To develop those relationships, I will work with them on a specific project, go on a lunchtime walks or, show that, "I really need your thoughts and advice." You know, like, that kind of thing works.
Adopted	An Employees adopts another's investment in social relations, and expected returns on investment.	Melony (manager): I try to make sure that my team is asking about each other, because if the two of us do it then it should spread around through the rest of the staff.
Expressed Collective Action	This expression of investing in collective social relations given expected returns.	Zach (manager) It's a mission to take care of things in my in my silo, and reminding people of our teams' mission together. We're team Big Western National Park. One park, one part of the mission, one goal.
Expressions for Desired	Employee expresses a desire for expected returns, thus continues investing in social relations.	Marge (supervisor): I hear this a lot, "But like, why did they not see it? They destroyed this thing." I'm like, "They're trying to get the road clean of snow." I'm just suggesting that, maybe it would be okay to kind of understand how there's other sides to a story. It's helped me to understand.

One supervisor, Jacqulyn, offers a salient example of an expression of social

capital maintenance. During the interview she had been reflecting on how often the

different work groups in the national park focus on their individual goals rather than

understanding the interconnection of goals amid different work groups lamenting their

view of division despite having a common vision. Jacqulyn expressed their desire to

invest in social relations in terms of helping another work group complete their job,

despite the work not necessarily falling into the supervisor's role.

> Honestly, I think we all know we're in the same boat. If we don't unite, then we're
> not going to be successful, you know. Like if we don't all, if I don't help [work
> group], then at some point it will come back and affect my job. It's like, if I don't
> work with [work group] to make sure that the water is good, well, there's water
> needs in [another work group] and there's water in my work group. So, I'm gonna
> hear about it if I don't work closely with them. You know? I think that's a
> motivation for friendship and teamwork, even though there are struggles. I mean,
> it is a struggle over here. So, we kind of have to band together for else nothing
> gets done.

Jacqulyn's comments illustrate a desire to maintain investment in social relations as the

supervisor expresses continuing to maintain their friendships amidst work groups. Social

relations are characterized in this statement by expressions of terms such as "teamwork,"

"friendship," "work-groups," the "same boat," and "band together." Jacqulyn expresses

the need to maintain an investment in these social relations in order to maintain the

expected returns. This demonstrates the maintenance of the social capital through the

expressed need for maintenance. Jacqulyn's expected returns include; success, getting the

job done, and avoiding effects of the job not getting done. The supervisor expresses that

these expected returns motivate the supervisor to invest in social relations as

characterized by the phrases, "band together and work closely with them." Within this

quote the employee also expresses a struggle of unity, and its dialectical interlocutor,

division. This is evident in the language of unity, such as, "unite," "we," and "band

together."

All of the expressions of social capital maintenance arose in dialectical tension

between unity and division. This may come as no surprise given that many scholars

identify bridging vs. bonding as two dimensions of social capital (Putnam, 2000) that are often characterized by unity and division. However, as employees expressed a desire for social capital maintenance, many employees expressed an interplay between unity and division.. Further, the dialectical tension in unity/division is illustrated in the following examples.

One example of this dialectical tension is seen as Jacqulyn further characterizes the struggle between division and unity. Initially she expresses her desire to not care for completing her job, yet this expression triggers an expression that she "can't [help] not car[ing]." These expressions demonstrate that she decides she must continue to expect caring for the park returns, which leads her to continue investing in social relations with fellow employees.

> but I can't not care. So, I end up just going through the cycle of instance after instance after instance of whether I should care or not…and I choose yeah, I need to stick up for my employees. I need to make sure my operations are operating and I can't do that if I don't care. So, I've decided no matter how many times they don't listen to me or don't communicate with me. I always end up doing the [park] mission. Because I care. I care about [this park], and I care about the visitor experience. And I definitely care about my employees and what they're, you know, experiencing out there. So, my relationship with employees and the park and the visitors, pushes me to try again.

In this statement, Jacqulyn struggles to continue her investment in social relations, and maintains an expectation that the communication with the work group that she struggles with may change. When asked why she does care, the supervisor begins an expression of unity, "We all work for [Big Western National Park], it's not he works for him, but she works for her, no it's we all work." Jacqulyn then pulls into an expression of division, and then pushes back to an expression of unity.

> Well, I mean, people have different motivations, you know, maybe some people are just working for the paycheck. Maybe some people are just working towards

retirement. Maybe they're just working here for the next stepping stone to get somewhere, you know. But it's like while you're here, it could be so wonderful if we could all just work to make [Big Western Park] better

Through this expression of maintenance of social capital initially, Jacqulyn's determination to continue investing in social relations are given with an expected return of caring. When asked why she cares, the employee expresses that she constitutes her caring because of the interplay between the unity of the park, and the division, which tempts her not to care. Unity is seen in the language of "the park, we, park mission." Division is seen in the language of them, they, my, etc. The interplay is seen as Jacqulyn expresses a cycle where-in she expresses exasperation at the throught of fellow employees within the park (unity) not communicating with her (division). She vacillates between desire to stick up for her team via the "I care about my team," (division), and then swings into a desire for seeking a park wide effort, "we all work for [Big Western National Park]" (unity). This employee concludes that she will continue the struggle "to care," yet persist in privileging unity (the mission) over division (competing with the other work groups by not communicating). Not all employees within expressed maintenance privilege unity over division.

This tension is also seen in other ways, as another supervisor, Heather, expressed sadness after a recent government shut down. During the interview, she talked about feeling deep hurt, even crying through the interview, at some of the comments that she had read online. In the end of our conversation, she attempted to summarize her complicated feelings which depicts a dialectical tension between unity and division.

A lot of us [Big Western National Park] employees have lived and worked within the park. Our community, our entire world, social world has been within this environment. A lot of us started as seasonals…literally moving from park to park, living and working. I didn't realize how much I identified myself with the work I

was doing until it was completely gone [in reference to the federal government shutdown of 2018]. And then I was reading these things…I had to stop reading them… about how this wasn't even valuable work. The public doesn't understand. But like I said, the thing that keeps me here is really the fact that I care about my staff, about the work we do. I care about my leader, my supervisors, because I know that they're trying to do something good, and I know that I can help. It has nothing to do with caring about the mission, the park anymore, which is really embarrassing for me to say. I really just can't feel a connection to it [the mission] anymore. I used to. That was the whole reason why I joined this agency. Honestly, I think we could if we were free of all that the arbitrary rules and stuff that made no sense and we were able to actually operate within the park as a whole, we could do a damn good job because we have really good and really smart people here. But under the crushing weight, the mission just doesn't…It seems like impossible.

In this excerpt, Heather expresses some intense feelings of unity, "a lot of us," and "I care about my staff" while admitting that under the "crushing pressure" she feels working at the park the unity she feels with her staff is what keeps her coming back. This expressed unity interplays with some intense feeling of division at multiple levels. While articulating a sense of unity, she simultaneously expresses feeling separated from the mission, the park "as a whole", and from the public whom she doesn't feel understands her. Heather expressed feeling "unconnected" to the mission which was the initial return which lead to her investment in social relations of being a park employee. Heather's expected returns shift through the narrative to be centered on her unity with her staff which continues to help her invest in the social relations of working in the park. Heather's back and forth between unity and division concludes with her continuing to maintain social relations with expected returns from her co-workers, yet she seems to conclude that park division is inevitable under the "Crushing weight" of the park's mission.

As the above examples show, expressions of social capital maintenance were expressed in employees' continued willingness to invest in social relations given the

continuance of their expected returns. Further, these expressions of social capital maintenance were articulated amidst the interplay of employees grappling with unity and division. While the interplay between unity and division in these cases constituted the expressions of social capital maintenance, they also demonstrate how expressions of social capital maintenance are dis/ordered expressions. Social capital maintenance was expressed by many of the employees as they sought to have order in their workplaces through expressions. Despite employees expected returns being expressed as ordering their workplaces, disorder abounded as the unity/division negotiations constituted employee attempts at ordering. Thus, expressions of social capital maintenance demonstrate dis/organization in how they simultaneously articulated unity/division and thus ordered and disordered investments in social relations and the expected returns.

Lacking Social Capital

I also discovered expressions of lacking social capital. These expressions of lacking social capital are defined as expressions of investment in social relations with an expected lack of returns. These expressions of social capital contain varying degrees of investment in social relations. They also contain an expected lack of returns. The term lacking is used to describe a detriment between the employees expected returns, and their expressed actual returns. The following table offers the examples of the different expressions of social capital, which were categorized into lacking social capital.

Table 3   **Lacking Social Capital**

Code	Definition of Code	Expression of Lacking Social Capital
I'm Busy	Continued investment in social relations, and lacking returns are excused with "I'm busy."	Joslyn: (Supervisor) "We're too busy," and every single one of us are guilty of like, sending that email where we're frustrated.
One Sided Exchange	Continued investment in social relations, and employee expresses returns aren't reciprocal	Jacqulyn: (Supervisor) "I have a volunteer who was cherry-picked because of her experience and passion, and is getting nothing back from the people in the park."
Past experience, automatically taints	Hesitancy of continued investing in social relations given lacking returns in past experience.	Dani: (Management) This is what's happened to me in the past outside of my job. I rented my house to a woman I could see us being friends, but I had to keep my distance from her, because she was a tenant. It was that bad of an experience
"The way it is"	Investing in social relations where returns are limited by one person involved in the network	Jared: (Seasonal) It just seems like I have to be at these meetings, and honestly I don't understand why I have to be there and that's the way it is.
"Care Less"	Investment in social relations where the return leads to a person in the network directing less investment.	Brennan: (Supervisor) So I'm trying the park together, and then I got told by my supervisor and I quote, "I needed to learn how to care less."
Hollow	Investment of social relations, where the lacking returns drive a depletion in investment.	Garrett: (Seasonal) That's just how they operate, and I get that now. But it was hard coming in being brand new, and like not knowing anybody and not feeling trusted or valued or anything like that. A lot of people were surprised I came back.

The following examples illustrate several moments when employees express an investment in social relations in some degree yet with varying expectations regarding the

returns on their investment. I will then explore underlying tension expressed through the following dialectical tensions which were present across the expressions of lacking social capital, open/closed, and control/resistance.

In this example of lacking social capital, a supervisor, Marge, expresses her investment in social relations with the park's management team and her expected returns on investment.

> I went to the management, and I complained that we couldn't get anything done without them supporting us…you know we can't do it unless they force all the divisions to work with us, like some people in divisions don't even believe in climate change. So, you know, so I mean, I was asking for help.

Marge invested in social relations with the management, by going to a meeting, accepting the lead role in the task. The expected return on the investment of going to a meeting, was that Marge was asking for help expecting to receive the help for the park project. She expressed that she wasn't able to complete the project unless the management team "forced all the divisions to work." She was asking for the management team to require investment of social relations.

Marge then expresses that there was a detriment between her expected return, and her actual return. In the expression she uses "then" as a way to signal when her expected return was met with a detrimental response.

> Then I quickly realized you never go to management and ask for help. You only go to suggest solutions to your problems. I felt kind of like after that I was a black sheep a little bit because I had asked for help rather then, I mean all they want you to do is go to them with a solution with what to do. I just, I just felt so dumb afterwards. So that was when I realized never again would I do that."

Marge expresses that she has now decided "to never" have that expectation. The supervisor expressed a lacking expectation from her initial expectation, to the actual

return on expectation. Indeed, in an interview, a member of the management team expressed his expected return, "I have an open door and that for me, is important. It's on there. It's like I have an open-door policy, *but* an expectation that I have is you come with a solution." Marge concludes that her new expectation on returns, "go to them with a solution," is different than her initial expected returns which demonstrates the lacking which is key in this expression of social capital. This open-door policy also demonstrates the first dialectical tension upon which expressions of lacking social capital is constituted, the open/closed tension.

Open/Closed

The first tension expressed as a dialectic underlying lacking social capital is the open/closed tension. Openness and closedness can be expressed in a variety of ways including the aforementioned example of the open-door policy. As mentioned above, a manager, Zach, expressed that he is open to investment in social relations with any employee, and signals the closed pole of the dialectic tension as he states, "But an expectation that I have is you come with a solution." Zach's investment of social relations, depends on his expected return of a solution. This example demonstrates the push and pull between the poles of open and closedness. Openness and closedness is the degree of willingness to invest in social relations with a lack of returns as expected.

A different manager, Jane, also expressed grappling with the open/closed dialectical tension which underlies the lacking between expectations of returns. "You know, we have an open door, but then there's this kind of piece of it where people can't…" At this point in the interview the manager expresses openness, through an open-

door policy. She then pivots to discussing when her door isn't open, and struggles to
manage this tension.

> Well, I think you have to, you know, listen without judgment, right? Because two
> sides to every story, and then I guess [pauses] if I really feel like people do feel
> like there is an open-door policy, even within leadership, to bring up things, but
> yeah, but that's hard to grapple with. Yeah.

Jane pauses contemplating the openness which she has expressed in investing in social
relations with her employees and affirms her expectation that the policy is returned by the
employees without expressing the times which her expression is lacking. In the end she
expresses "it's hard to grapple with," ending with a full stop expressing the difficulty of
grappling with openness and closedness.

Many employees grapple with this tension of openness and closedness underlying
the lacking social capital given previous history of investment of social relations with the
employee whom they expect returns from. George, (a full-time employee) expresses a
history of both openness and closedness while investing in social relations with a fellow
employee given a lack of return. He manages this tension by picking and choosing his
battles.

> If another employee frustrates me and it's no big deal, and on my mind. I have so
> many different things going on in any given day that I have to pick and choose my
> battles of what I need to pay attention to that moment. [pauses] Like I don't like
> the idea of kind of keeping score, but I think we can't help it as humans.

In this excerpt, George introduces the idea that he "pick and chooses" his battles with
employees as a means of deciding which battles he will fight, and which he won't. The
investment of social relations is expressed through a battle metaphor, the expected returns
of frustration are expressed, and the employee expresses he will keep score as a means of
managing this tension. George explains picking and choosing battles,

> So, for example, I've had a conversation with [employee], it's kind of semi-bonded us. So if [employee] needs something because something goes wrong one day, and I've got millions of other things going on, I'll remember to come back to that thing [employee] needed.

George expresses that he is picking openness and demonstrating willingness to return to a task for an employee whom he's "semi-bonded" with, which represents continued investment in social relations with the expected return of not being frustrated toward the employee, and meeting the expected return of the other investor by coming back to the "thing…needed."

> *But* when [employee] has frustrated me time and time again with no change in behavior or no changing results, I don't let it go. I'm just kind of like, [pretend dialogue with employee] "Well, I'm not gonna talk to you about that." I'm not gonna waste my time on that, because I don't have the time or the energy. I gotta focus on other things.

George demonstrates a swing to closed investment of social relations given the lacking of returns as expected from the other employee. To manage the tension between openness and closedness, the employee "keeps score" as a means of determining whether to be open or closed in a given exchange.

The interplay between openness and closedness is seen in this example which underlies this expression of lacking social capital. George begins by explaining his logic of how to determine the degree of willingness he has to invest in social relations with a fellow employee, given his return on investment has been mixed. George explains he "keeps score" as a means of determining whether he will be more open or closed in responding to the fellow employee's desire for returns on a potential investment in social relations. George explains his expected returns are violated, which he doesn't "let go" of given ongoing frustrations with the fellow employee. George uses past returns as a means

of determining the nature of his investment in social relations. In this way an interplay of openness and closedness underlies ongoing investment of social relations, and lack of returns as expected.

Control/Resistance

An additional tension expressed as a dialectic underlying the expressions of lacking social capital is an interplay between control and resistance. The interplay between control and resistance is the push and pull between dominance in an interaction, and attempts to deviate from the dominating interaction, which underlies lacking social capital. The following expressions demonstrate how control and resistance constitutes the lacking social capital.

In this example a seasonal employee, Geraldine expresses the push and pull between control and resistance which constitute her investment in social relations, vis-à-vis division wide meetings. The detriment between expected returns and actual returns was expressed by a member of the leadership team expressing control through dismissive language. Geraldine expresses common interest in "Getting a seasonal voice on the leadership team. Just so that our kind of like population of people are represented a little bit." Preemptively, the seasonal employee expresses resistance to domination as she introduces the manager to her narrative, "Last year, the topic came up of seasonal being represented on the leadership team, and I don't know what his title is. I don't care. That's terrible to say, But I lost a lot of respect for him that day because…" Geraldine acknowledges that previously she had respect for the manager which, given the lack of return as expected on her social relations investment, she subsequently addresses:

> I remember having multiple conversations, people about it after the meeting,
> because he said something along the lines of "Well, the topic came up of

seasonals being represented on leadership team. And I guess you guys want an answer", and he's like, "I'm just going to say because." I was like "Oh, just because," like, you don't answer like that! He was like throwing his weight around. He was just saying "I can say "cause," because I'm above you so I don't have to explain why."

Geraldine demonstrates the interplay between control and resistance through the dialogue she expresses between the manager and herself. She expresses the remark which caused a loss of respect and demonstrates control, "I'm going to say because," which she then expresses resistance to within her own reactive response, "Oh, just because...because I'm above you." Above indicates hierarchy while also expressing dominance. Resistance is seen as she expresses frustration and expresses her reasons for his expression, which uncovers his dominance—an act of resistance. This interplay demonstrates the push and pull between control and resistance, which constituted her expressed lacking social capital. She concludes her desire to continue working for a manager whom she respects, and the lack of return on her invested work relations, "I wish he didn't say that, you know, But it was just such an arrogance about it that it was like, It doesn't necessarily inspire you to work harder for somebody."

Another seasonal employee, Janessa, also expressed the control and resistance dialectic, which constituted her expression of lacking capital, in connection to her investment in social relations with a manager, "I'd have to go a meeting with higher ups who would just sit there and just talk, and then nothing would ever come out of it." Janessa also expresses her expectation that in meetings something "would come out of it," which caused her to invest in social relations of meeting. She then expresses the lack of return

I feel like they weren't listening to anyone who gave a fuck. Like nothing ever comes of it, and other permanents they've almost like they just have fallen into the

routine like they won't speak up, like someone higher up, would say a comment and the permanent won't speak up. The other permanents will just sit there, almost like "It is how it is. So, I'm not going to speak up," like it's just kind of like, you know. And I'm like, "Well, that is what it is and like nothing we do gonna change that for me.

Constituting the lacking social capital depicted here between the expectation for responsiveness from management, and the actual return on social investment of unresponsiveness, is the interplay between control and resistance. The seasonal employee expresses her frustration at the indifference of the management—a manifestation of control. Janessa also expresses taking cues from the permanent employees which leads her not to resist by caring. Instead she follows the lead of the "Permanents," and concludes her new expected return, detrimental to her initial expected return, "and I'm like well that is what it is and nothing we do gonna change that for me." The control, resistance interplay management is mimicked by the seasonal employee, thus demonstrating the constitution of the new expected return on investment of social relations with the management.

Employees also expressed control from the governing laws which the employees are regulated. One Supervisor, Dani, expresses that the, "Hatch Act…an actual act of Congress that says You can't discuss politics. This regulation on expected returns is constituted by the enacted control by the U.S. Congress on the lives of the employees. Dani further explains that the regulation.

Is a barrier that prevents people from connecting at work and I'm not. I'm just using politics is one example, but like. I think a lot of times people are afraid to break barriers because they don't want to get in trouble when they don't want break any rules that have been established.

Dani then demonstrates the interplay between the following of rules, as control, and the resistance. The tension is signaled by "but," which demonstrates the complexity of connecting at work for this supervisor amid the push and pull of the dialectic.

> But at the same time, it's like, well, we spend a lot of time at work. I mean, maybe there are friends, that you could make connections that you could make you don't even know about because you're afraid of breaking some sort of your credit rule, which is fair though, because there have been instances where you think you could, you know, trust people and have an honest conversation, and then you end up getting a complaint filed against you.

Dani alludes to experiences where employees have invested in social relations with the expected return of mutual trust, and instead have the actual return of a complaint filed against the investment. The employee concludes that she sees, "the whole picture on that." Which is an expression of the interplay which constitutes the lacking social capital. She then further expresses the tension which constitutes the lacking social capital by hypothetically imagining how she would handle the tension, weighing the poles of the dialectic.

> So, I get Well, I see the whole picture on that. Like, Well, if I was one of those people who had that happen, probably wouldn't be super willing to put myself out their work, you know? But at the same time, it helps.

Another supervisor, Henry, also grappling with this tension expressed hesitancy investing in vulnerable social relations, given his expectation that his control would be undermined. Henry initially expresses he is, "Overcautious, I need to show your vulnerability, and not give up that that business relationship." Henry further elaborates vulnerability in tension with the business relationship.

> Yeah, I don't know if I'm explaining it very well. Let's see. I mean vulnerability in the sense that, like you don't want to reveal too much like if you're on your personal time, one on one with somebody or hanging out with somebody off work, it's really hard to open up and be an open book with them, and then show

up at work and be like, "All right, get that done," and "I want a better quality product.". It's hard.

In this excerpt, Henry expresses the difficulty navigating the investment in vulnerable social relations given his expected return of obeying the boss. He expresses not wanting to "reveal too much," expressing it is hard to, "open up and be an open book with them." At first glance this reads as a tension between openness and closedness, however, we see the control as the supervisor expresses commands in an authoritative way. This example demonstrates how many of the expressions of dialectical tension are interwoven in constituting the expressions of lacking social capital.

As the above examples show, expressions of lacking social capital were articulated in employees' claims of investing in social relations with an expected lack of returns. Further, these expressions of lacking social capital were articulated amidst the interplay of employees grappling with openness/closedness and control/resistance. While the interplay between these dialectical tensions is evident in the above cases constituting the expressions of lacking social capital, they also demonstrate how expressions of lacking social capital are dis/ordered expressions. Lacking social capital was expressed by many of the employees as they sought to order their workplaces through expressions of investment, yet simultaneously expressing disorder through expectations of a lack of returns. These expressions of dis/order abounded as employees expressed attempts negotiating the dialectical tensions of openness/closedness and control/resistance which created the dis/ordering of the workplace. Thus, expressions of lacking social capital demonstrate dis/organization in how these expressed dialectical tensions ordered and disordered investments in social relations and an expected lack of returns.

Chain of Command Social Capital

This expression of social capital entail utterances which allude to the structural system of hierarchy in the national park, and the exchange of social resources within those hierarchies. Regarding the hierarchical system, these utterances involved allusions to the divisions (park wide work groups in which the employees work), as well as expressions of the supervisor-employee relationship. Employees expressed moments when they were able to exchange resources (returns) inside the system of hierarchal relationships, as well as expressions when they would break the chain of command and seek investment in social relations with expected returns from employees outside the designated chain of command structure. The following table offers the examples of the different expressions of social capital, which were categorized into lacking social capital.

Table 4   Chain of Command Social Capital

Code	Definition of Code	Expression of Chain of Command Social Capital
Inside the normed chain of command	Expressed investment in organizational hierarchy with expected returns.	Joslyn (supervisor): I asked my boss; can you find out what's going on with [specific issue]? You know, because the government is very chain of command, you know? So, I have to call my supervisor to say, "Can you talk to this person?" They relayed it up and so on until we got an answer. "Oh, yeah, [specific issue] won't be until the fall." And I was like, "What?" "Why didn't you relay the information to me sooner."
Outside the normed chain of command	Expressed investment in organizational hierarchy with expected returns which deviate from the normed system of hierarchal investment.	Janelle (supervisor): somebody would call up [an old boss] and report one of her employees. She would immediately go from her manager roll down to a seasonal worker bee, crashing him. I'd try to say, don't you think, maybe we're missing a few rungs here. Ricky (manager): A lower level will slip up and call me and tell me that there's a violation of rules happening. Then I just happen upon their supervisor, and then it gets that supervisors attention to stop what they're doing. Derek (supervisor): I try to work within that chain of command. But sometimes in order to get the job done, you go straight to the person you need to talk to, and you talk to them instead, and if they're uncomfortable with that, I would go to their supervisor.
Didn't want to get in the middle	Expression when employee limits their investment in social relations and expected returns with their bosses in the hierarchy	Larry (seasonal): I don't get too involved in anything with anyone whose up above my head. I just stick to my job, and whoever that involves.
Leader as Referee	Expression of S.C. when invests in social relations with	Sally (full-time): So, someone from management wants to come with me to observe what's going on. I think that's a good thing that needs to happen.

	a boss, expecting that the investment will result in a change with peer.	And one of the ones we recommended, they come with on is [work area] because it's important they see what's going on over there.

Within this category, the employees' expressions were made within articulations of dialectical tension between the centralized process of exchanging resources and the decentralized process of exchanging social resources. I will begin by elaborating on the social resources being exchanged by employees in and out of the hierarchy. I will then show how these exchanges are tension filled processes evident in the employee expressions.

What characterizes these expressions of social capital, is the employee's expressed connection of the exchanged social resource, and the structural hierarchy in the park. In this first expression, social capital within the hierarchal structure of the park is expressed by a park employee, Rachel, who supervises a few work groups in the park. Rachel describes the hierarchy and the division of labor norms which requires employees to seek approval prior to involving employees from other divisions—chain of command investment in social relations. Rachel characterizes an exchange of information (expected returns) with an employee in another division, and expresses the struggle of needing to gain permission for doing so (investment in social relations). Rachel expresses investing in social relations with expected returns with her boss "We're on the same page," which the employee uses as a way to make sense of tension.

> I feel like the park Service is a very hierarchal organization and, (pauses) all right, to me, it makes sense on the one hand. And then, on the other hand, it doesn't… like it does and it doesn't. If I have something that I need to talk this person over here in another division about, I feel like it's silly to go all the way up my division chain to get permission from each supervisor. Then my request goes over and then down to the person on my level, rather than ya know, just go straight across from

me to her. I feel like my supervisor is on the same page with me. She has a good sense of when you would need to go up and over, or when you can just go straight over, but there are certain divisions where they really don't want you to talk with the person who's maybe your equivalent, but or your grade level. So, whatever."

Rachel expresses a tension between a centralized "chain of command" system which is the norm of the organization, and a decentralized "Straight Across" system which this employee sometimes privileges. In order to make sense of this tension, the employee uses her expressed reciprocity with her supervisor, who enables her to understand when to operate in a centralized system vs. when to operate in a decentralized way, thus constituting chain of command social capital. It's clear this tension exists on a park scale in the view of this employee, because she seems to have developed norms depending on when to work with one division in the centralized way vs. working with others in the decentralized way. Indeed, employee social capital expressions of chain of command, were constituted in navigating the dialectical tension between operating in the centralized system vs. operating decentralized. These questions of how to operate in a tension filled system seemed to bewilder many employees.

One employee I interviewed Joslyn, had recently begun to supervise employees. This employee expressed feelings of lacking support from her supervisors regarding the hiring process. Instead of investing in social relations with her boss, for the expected return of support, she expresses operating out of the chain of command with similarly hierarchically positioned employees from other divisions. Thus, Joslyn privileges a decentralized approach to organizational structure constituting in the expression of an out of chain of command social capital:

I hired two people this year, and every step of the hiring process was a complete mystery because nothing was communicated. I relied a lot on my friends [from other divisions] who are experienced supervisors like, I'd say, "OK, I've done this

paper… I've done this form… I've done this… What else do I need to do… do you have a spreadsheet you can share with me that has all of my tasks." And, you know, because I have those working relationships, I could get those people hired.

Joslyn's demonstrated expression of outside the chain social capital was not a singular experience in the park. Indeed, all participants who expressed this chain of command social capital, would also express moments when they would operate outside of their chain of command in order to accomplish their goals thus privileging a decentralized approach to the dialectical tension which constitutes outside the chain of command expressions of social capital. In the following example an employee, Brennan, explains that the norm to work within the chain of the command is often counterproductive—despite it being the way he feels the organization should operate.

> The way I see it is if these people want to file complaints against me, I'm not going to communicate. Because if the relationship is breaking down, like it's easier to work through the chain of command, and you know, don't shed the chain of command is a big thing. I am a chain of command person, but if the chain is broken. If I go to my supervisor with some little need from another division, and he's supervising 20 something people, and two seconds later he's gonna get a call to respond to a really big thing. He doesn't have time to deal right? And so, you have to keep the wheels on the bus. You have to constantly find a workaround, and a workaround your workaround to get something done, and that really means you build good relationships. If I didn't have a good relationship to chat in there with that other guy, we'd be fucked.

In this case Brennan strings together a few instances of chain of command social capital. He begins by expressing how he has exchanged (investment of social relations) bad will(return) with an employee, who had responded by filing complaints (return), and had begun to expect bad will in return from this employee. These exchanges of bad will lead the employee to conclude that operating within the chain of command to work with the employee he had issues with would be the best strategy to move forward. Brennan then begins to think about the chain of command itself and when he should or shouldn't

operate within the chain of command. He expresses his view that the chain of command should be implemented often with the phrase "Don't shed the chain." He then contradicts the rule with the phrase, "but if it [the chain] is broke." The employee then illustrates how in his mind the chain is broke because his boss doesn't have time to exchange social capital with others in the chain, and thus the employee feels he has a need for a "workaround.' He expresses exchanges of social capital which has enabled him to continue his goals. Brennan expresses a decentralized/centralized interplay, which constitutes how this employee expresses chain of command social capital.

As the above examples show, expressions of chain of command social capital were expressed by employees when articulating an investment in the structural system of hierarchy in the national park with expected returns (social resources) connected to the investment. Further, these expressions of chain of command social capital were articulated amidst the interplay of employees grappling with centralization and decentralization. While the interplay between centralization and decentralization in these cases constituted the expressions of chain of command social capital, they also demonstrate how expressions of chain of command social capital are dis/ordered expressions. Chain of command social capital was expressed by many of the employees as they sought to have order in their workplaces through expressions. Despite employees expected returns being expressed as ordering their workplaces, disorder abounded as the centralization/decentralization negotiations constituted employee attempts at ordering. Thus, expressions of chain of command social capital demonstrate dis/organization in how they simultaneously articulated de/centralization and thus ordered and disordered investments in social relations and the expected returns.

Social Capital Conversion

Within the expressions of social capital, many expressions interplayed with expressions of other forms of capital. This is not surprising given that many scholars argue that social capital is convertible into other forms of capital (Bourdieu, 1986). Bourdieu explains that social capital is inevitably converted into other forms of capital. As I analyzed these different expressions of social capital, I saw that each expression of another form of capital were related to a tension between scarcity and abundance. Baxter and Montgomery (1996) argue that one pole of dialectical tension may be authoritative relative to another pole. In this case, I found that the conversion between social capital and other forms of capital were made within the dialectical tension of scarcity and abundance, with scarcity being privileged as an authoritative dialectic over abundance. Indeed, I determined that when financial, human, and natural resource capital were expressed in conjunction with expressions of social capital, the dialectical tension of scarcity/ abundance was related to the expressions of social capital conversion. In this section I will explain briefly explain how the scarcity dialectic is authoritatively privileged, and then demonstrate this scarcity within the expression's social capital conversion, and the following forms of capital which were expressed in the interviews: financial capital, human capital, and natural resources. The following table offers the examples of the different forms of social capital conversion found in employee expressions.

Table 5   **Social Capital Conversion**

Code	Definition of Code	Expression of Social Capital Conversion
Social Capital & Financial Capital Conversion	The converting relationship between expressions of financial capital and social capital	Stockton (manager): For example, this park wants to continue working on a road. I think that leads to people being somewhat fragmented on the budget, which is a big deal here. It wasn't at [a different National Park], and it makes sense to me. So, they're constantly they're fighting. No. actually they aren't constantly fighting. But they there's a small amount of money and they all need it.
Social Capital & Human Capital Conversion	The converting relationship between expressions of human capital and social capital	Martin (full-time): There are some pretty darn good rock climbers that aren't necessarily in their [big work group]. Like my people know ropes and knots and how to use all that equipment, right? But they're kind of not utilized. I think sometimes those things get missed because, you know, a certain group, thinks what we're just [work group], so we don't know.

Sally (full-time): I was able to step in and fill that role, you know? Yeah. You know, I'm pretty mechanical, able to build stuff, whatever. And pretty organized as well. I was just able to kind of just step in and help [employee] out use my skills. So that kind of got to the top, and I got the job. You know, that's part of cultivating the relationship. |
| Social Capital & Natural Resource Capital Conversion | The converting relationship between expressions of natural resource capital and expressions social capital | Angela (seasonal): Like I'm proud to say "I work for the park." Like I'm proud when I get in a conversation and say that I work for [Big Western National Park]. People are always just so excited to talk to you. People they want to come visit the park

Jennifer (manager): I have people who, this is their 18th year cleaning toilets. I mean they just love doing what they do in the park. And it may be an esoteric perspective but it's the park. It may be that simple. It's not their pay. They don't get lots of pats on the back. In fact, if anything you get less than that. They usually get berated by the visitor who storms out of the campground, and the first person they see in the green and gray. And they scream, "This is the worst I've |

		ever experienced in the park service." That's what my people have to deal with every single day, just nasty visitors. Why would they? The park.

Many employee expressions of social capital conversion privileged the pole of scarcity over abundance, within the dialectical tension. When an employee expressed a resource, (e.g. financial capital expression: "pay") it was connected with expressions of not enough. The following expressions of capital demonstrate the scarcity privileged over abundance. A manager discussing a budget decision, "when they come to the table and say they need money." A Supervisor expressing lacking skills, "We can't hire anybody because no one [with skills] wants to work." A seasonal expressing her views that they are viewed as work objects, "They think seasonals are dispensable here." Through these examples, scarcity abounds in not having enough. Scarcity is also seen in each of the following expressions of social capital conversion.

Expressed Social Capital and Financial Capital

Expressions of financial capital included a variety of financial expressions which were expressed in relation to social capital. Expressions of financial capital by employees were identifiable given common financial words which signify financial capital (e.g. budget, pay) (Lin et.al., 2001). When these expressions of financial capital were expressed in conjunction with the expressions of social capital, I highlighted the section of speech. In reviewing these employee expressions, I found that the presence of social capital and financial capital together signaled a converting relationship between the forms of capital. I will show these converting relationships in the following examples.

In this first example, a manager, Estelle, discusses the funding negotiations between divisions of the park. Estelle expresses a lack of funding within another division

and the effect on her division. She uses a pie metaphor to express how the financial

capital is used amongst the different divisions within the park. A budget is shared

amongst these managers, which requires managers to negotiate for the financial capital.

In the example below the manager expresses a conversion of social capital into financial

capital.

> It's easier for me to support his division if I understand why they're saying they
> need more funding, then I want to have him transparently share why. Because if
> you're asking for a bigger piece of the pie, it means the other divisions were
> getting a smaller piece of the pie. So, what's the justification? And his division
> basically can't pay their salaries anymore. So, I'm completely sympathetic and
> supportive. But that's where it's important for him to continue to be transparent,
> which he has, so that has helped build trust and empathy as I continue to support
> him.

Estelle expresses maintaining social capital with another manager. The manager

expresses that she continually invests in social relations with this manager, because her

expectation of transparency is returned. She expresses that the transparency return leads

to further trust and empathy with the other manager. These expressions of trust and

empathy are converted into financial capital as the manager expresses her continued

financial "support". As expected, the transparency return leads to further social

investment of trust and empathy—which Estelle expresses also has led to supporting the

manager's divisional need.

<u>Expressed Social Capital and Human Capital</u>

Expressions of human capital included a variety of expressions in relation to

social capital. Expressions of human capital by employees were identifiable by common

words which signify human capital (e.g. knowledge, and skills possessed by employees)

(Lin et.al., 2001). When these expressions of human capital were expressed in

conjunction with the expressions of social capital, I highlighted the section of speech. In

reviewing these employee expressions, I found that the presence of social capital and human capital together signaled a converting relationship between the forms of capital. I will show these converting relationships in the following example.

In this example a supervisor, Brennan, in a remote part of the national park expresses frustration at the strain he's under in his work. His first expression of human capital is "work". Work is used to capture the skills required to complete tasks, and this employee expresses a lack of anyone wanting to come and work. He concludes this expression of human capital by eluding to chaos. "We can't hire anybody because no one wants to work here." "Nobody wants to come to the park service and take a job living in the middle of nowhere, and have to deal with all this chaos."

After this expression of human capital, I asked follow up questions about the expressed chaos. Brennan gave an extended example wherein his patrol vehicle needed maintenance. After a week in the shop the mechanic said he didn't have the ability to give the maintenance required, another expression of lacking human capital. This supervisor also expressed pressure to be getting work done which he wasn't able to do because of the other tasks and because of a lack of employees. In the expressions of the employee, this series of lacking human capital in this employee's view lead to the following example which demonstrates conversion into lacking social capital:

> There was a call from a local County of an active shooter at a bar. The dispatcher said a guy was standing with a shotgun, firing into a crowd. We were like Fuck, and so we took off down the road in a regular truck. It was a fucking fake call. Some cheese dick in [town]. Apparently, that's a thing now, you call 911 with fake active shooter calls. That's how fucked up our society is. But from my perspective we're flying on the gravel road. I look at the guy next to me and I say "So what? We draw straws for the shotgun?" That's why I'm so pissed off at everybody by 9 a.m. every day. These big western parks we're doing way too much. We're long past our ability to sustain it. I mean, I got a million things to do, and can't, so I've been forced to put a whole bunch of crap in writing and just pass

it on to my supervisors who are too busy to care, and then you never get responses
on it cause they're just as busy. But at least if someone dies later it's in writing
that I can't do my job.

This expression elaborates the lack of human capital as, not being able to

complete the job, not having enough people to maintain the vehicle, and "doing way too

much." This lack of human capital is converted into a lack of social capital at the end of

the example. At the end of this example Brennan expresses a lacking investment of social

relations with his supervisors and fellow employees as seen in the phrase "Pissed off at

everybody". The supervisor expresses a lack of expected returns in the form of a lacking

response to his concerns written in emails. In summary, human capital, as seen through

an inability to complete tasks required by his job at the potential peril of his own safety,

this employee expresses that he lacks desire to continue investing in social relations,

especially given the lack of returns of those relations from his supervisors.

Expressed Social Capital and Natural Resource Capital

Expressions of natural resource capital included a variety of expressions in

relation to expressions of social capital. Expressions of natural resources by employees

were identifiable by words which signify natural resources (e.g. specific natural

landmarks in the park, the word natural resources). When these natural resources were

expressed in conjunction with the expressions of social capital, I highlighted the section

of speech. In reviewing these employee expressions, I found that the presence of social

capital and natural resources signaled a converting relationship between the forms of

capital. I will show these converting relationships in the following example.

In this example, a supervisor, Jacqulyn is explaining housing shortages that her

employees face while working at the park. She begins by explaining that the employees

who work for her are good "stewards" of the park, and really embody the mission while

also being "crammed" in their housing. Jacqulyn expresses her view that the national

park she works in is "magical" in comparison with other natural resource areas, and

explains that it is the reason people return to the park. The expressed natural resource

here is the "magical" natural features of the park which bring employees back season

after season.

> Another example would be housing. We have these people who have worked here many seasons, they do a good job, like they're stewards of this place, which is our mission. And they've been crammed in housing. Why? I don't think anybody would put up with this if it was another national park. I mean, other parks obviously have some sort of natural resource, but it's not magical, like here. Again, I'm not trying to offend anyone. But if you had the housing situation there that you have here, people wouldn't put up with managers cramming people into a tiny dorm room…and keep coming back. They love the park.

After expressing the "magical" natural resource, Jacqulyn pivots and begins to

discuss her view that upper management should be responsive to the housing shortage in

[Big Western National Park]. Jacqulyn expresses that the management should "value

these people," by listening to their concerns about housing.

> I feel like it's upper management's responsibility to say, "Oh my gosh, we need to value these people"…and how do you show that you value someone? I think it's listening. I mean, everyone in this park knows the housing situation is terrible. We've communicated that, but [pauses, and with feeling] they can't listen and not do anything about it or not try to do anything about it right? So I get very stressed out, not to mention all of the responsibilities I have to do, but at the end of the day, I go outside and I'm like, well, at least there's that [points out office window], like, at least there's [national resource]. That doesn't make their actions correct. In all of the meetings they start with, "Man, aren't we all so lucky to work in all of this?" Yeah, yeah, we are. But, at least put forth some visible effort to try and make it better.

In this example, the employee expresses a lacking investment in social relations

with the park management. The supervisor expresses her housing concerns, as well as the

concerns of others employees in the park, that they are not being listened to. The supervisor also expresses an expected return on investment through her expression, "they can't listen and not do anything about it, or not try and doing anything about it". The expectation is that the management "try". The conversion between expressions of natural resources, and expressions of lacking social capital occur as the employee expresses feeling "stressed out" the actual return on her investment of social relations with management. The supervisor then uses the natural resource as a means of continuing the investment in social relations through the phrase, "At least theirs [natural resource]". The expression of a natural resource is converted into a reason to continue investing in social relations with the joint expected returns of continued natural resources.

Through all of the expressions of conversion capital, a common tension existed in the form of a dialectic between scarcity and abundance. Scarcity is expressed as not having enough of a form of capital (e.g. not having enough housing, not having enough people to perform work, not having enough pay). Abundance is expressed by employees as having a plentiful amount of capital (e.g. having an abundance of natural resources to enjoy). The interplay between these poles of the dialectic are evident in the expressions of converting capital explored thus far. These interplays are centered in the conversion between capital.

In the each of the aforementioned conversions of capital, the interplay between poles of scarcity and abundance are evident, and are central to the conversion between expression of social capital, and other forms of capital. In the first example, a manager expresses scarcity around budget issues within the park. She expresses that another "Division basically can't pay their salaries anymore". The manager also expresses an

interplay between scarcity and abundance through the chosen metaphor of pie and the words bigger and smaller. She explains, "A bigger piece of the pie, means the other divisions were getting a smaller piece of the pie." This interplay between scarcity and abundance of budget, is managed by the conversion to the expression of social capital. The manager expresses financial capital, through the expression "Continue to support him." The manager also expresses that for the conversion to continue, "It's important for him to continue to be transparent, which he has, so that has helped build trust and empathy." The investment in social relations, "Trust and empathy," with expected returns of continuing support, is thus created through the tension between not having enough budget, and having enough budget.

In the second example, a supervisor expresses a scarcity of human capital in not having enough employees to do the work that's demanded. This scarcity of human capital is converted into an expression of lacking social capital, as the supervisor expresses he is not able to have responses with his supervisors when vital work is not being accomplished. These expressions of converting capital is centered in the scarcity aspect of the dialectic. The supervisor emphasizes "the million things" he can't do which demonstrates his focus on scarcity, while also telling the story of 1 incident which he responded to, which speaks to his ability to accomplish one "thing". Despite the deemphasis on abundance, it is nonetheless present in the expressed accomplishment of a single task. This example demonstrates how the supervisor's experience of expressed conversion of capital is centered in the scarcity/abundance tension.

In the third example, a supervisor expresses an abundance of natural resources, which she uses as a means of continuing to invest in expressed lacking social capital. The

supervisor expresses the "magic" of the natural resources, and also expresses an abundance of the natural resources through the phrase, "there's all that," while motioning out the window at the natural resources. The interplay between the dialectic is seen in the expression, as the employee expresses the scarce housing situation, and the lacking social capital. The employee grapples with the tension between the abundance of natural resources, and the scarcity of housing through the expression, "In all of the meetings they start with, "Man, aren't we all so lucky to work in all of this?" Yeah, yeah, we are. But, at least put forth some visible effort to try and make it better". The supervisor alludes to meetings where her managers appeal to an abundance of natural resources. She responds with a response of housing scarcity. The supervisor expresses her investment in social relations with the managers, with an expression of lacking returns deviant from her expressed expectation, of a "listening" manager. Central to the expression of lacking social capital, is the interplay between the scarcity of housing, and the abundance of natural resources.

As the above examples show, social capital conversion was expressed as social capital and other forms of capital are expressed in a converting relationship. Further, these expressions of social capital conversion were articulated amidst the interplay of employees grappling with scarcity and abundance. While the interplay between scarcity and abundance in these cases constituted the expressions of social capital conversion, they also demonstrate how expressions of social capital conversion are dis/ordered expressions. Social capital conversion was expressed by many of the employees as they sought to have order in their workplaces through expressions. Despite employees' social capital conversion being expressed as ordering their workplaces, disorder abounded as

the scarcity/abundance negotiations constituted employee attempts at ordering. Thus, expressions of social capital conversion demonstrate dis/organization in how they simultaneously articulated scarcity/abundance and thus ordered and disordered the social capital conversions in the workplace.

Dis/organized expressions of Social Capital

Of the four types of social capital expressions found in this study, many employee interviews were filled with multiple types of expression and underlying dialectical tensions. These expressions of social capital and underlying dialectical tensions interplay to demonstrate expressed dis/order. In the following example Heather, a supervisor, discusses working at Big Western National Park. In our discussion social capital expressions and underlying dialectical tensions interplay demonstrating dis/order in the national park.

> Sometimes I wonder what's the point. For example, I feel like wonder what's the point of like hiring more people. And this isn't necessarily a miscommunication between the different parts of the park. I mean, it's just a reality of our current administration. The way things are currently going in the Park Service is we don't have any money, and the money that we do have, is being directed to other places. Meanwhile we're getting more and more red tape and rules and regulations imposed on us. So, I think that is the what's the point attitude I was talking about. It isn't a simple case of this part of the park not understanding the other part. In fact, all of us think it would be nice, if it was; but, we don't know how to bridge between the parts of the park, given what we're going through…I don't even know who I would have that conversation with on this side of the park about these feelings. Like I don't I don't know who that would be with other than my supervisor, which I think goes back to the way that that's ingrained in us to do the hierarchy thing. But, could I sit down the management and talk about that? I don't know, right? Like, who is the best person for us, too share these ideas with?...Okay. And then are we supposed to share these frustrations and thoughts with the management, and then rely on them to go up the chain of command up and up until we're talking about park service wide? I don't feel like any of us know, like the path forward. Who do we talk to in order to get the results? Or are we just relying on chain of command to go up, up, up. But I feel like the problem with that is it's a giant game of telephone, you know, like if, if we're relying on hierarchy, I mean, my concern is gonna It's not anyone's fault, but it's not gonna

be the original concern by the time it gets to the, Secretary of the Interior like, Do you know how many times the story's been told at that point? So that's kind of ineffective, Um, and also there's no if we pass it up, no matter what level it gets, too, it's very rare that we hear it come back down. Rarely a closing of the loop on somethings.

In this excerpt, Heather begins by wondering why she should bother expressing her frustration about the hiring process to the headquarters side of the park. In this way, she questions her continued investment of social relations.

Sometimes I wonder what's the point. For example, I feel like. And the what's the point in this situation of like hiring more people is not necessarily a miscommunication between the sides of the park. It's just a reality of our current administration.

In this quote, Heather grapples with the complexity of the expectations of returns of investments in social relations amid many levels of the NPS, and other agencies and the executive branch of the Federal government. She then begins to unpack her "what's the point attitude." Heather initially converts the previous expression of lacking social capital into an expression of financial capital, "The way things are currently going in the Park Service is we don't have any money, and the money that we do have, is being directed to other places." The lacking expression of social capital between "the sides of the park" as aforementioned, is converted here into an expression of financial capital constituted in the dialectical tension between scarcity/abundance.

Heather then pivots to an expression of lacking social capital which is constituted via the control/resistance tension. Control is expressed as "imposed" rules and regulations. This expressed dialectic of control constitutes the "what's the point attitude," or the expression of lacking social capital. "Meanwhile we're getting more and more red

tape and rules and regulations imposed on us. So, I think that is the what's the point attitude."

Thus far, Heather has expressed lacking, and social capital conversion, while also constituting the expressions in an interplay between the scarcity/abundance dialectical tension, and the control/resistance dialectical tension. After these expressions, Heather pivots to an expression of social capital maintenance. "It isn't a simple case of this part of the park not understanding the other part of the park; In fact, All of us think it would be nice, if it was; but, we don't know how to how to bridge between the parts of the park, given what we're going through…"

Heather briefly expresses the common expected return of wanting a simple investment of social relations, which demonstrates social capital maintenance, and constitutive dialectical tension of unity/division. The interplay between unity and division is seen here as the expressed unity of "All of us think," swings into the division of "We don't know how to bridge between the parts of the park." The bridging here demonstrates the divisional interplay as described above. The employee expresses her desire for unity while also expressing a lack of knowledge of who to invest in social relations with. Heather continues to unpack the unity/division dialectical tension which begins to interplay with the openness/closedness dialectical tension in the following expression of lacking social capital. "I don't even know who I would have that conversation with about these feelings."

In contemplating the potential investment in social relations around the "what's the point…feelings," and underlining desire for unity, the employee pivots to an expression of chain of command social capital, and an underlying tension of

(de)centralization. "Like I don't I don't know who that would be with other than my

supervisor, which I think goes back to the way that that's ingrained in us to do the

hierarchy thing. But..." The employee signals an interconnected tension to the expressed

centralization of process which the supervisor is in, the openness, closedness tension. She

wonders, "Could I sit down the management and talk about that? I don't know, right?

Like, who is the best person for us, too share these ideas with?" Heather demonstrates the

interconnection between the openness/closedness tension and the

decentralized/centralized systems which she is grappling with in deciding with whom to

invest in the social relation of her feelings with. The employee then pivots back to the

centralized/ decentralized tension, wondering if she can rely on the chain of command

social capital for "the results" she expects.

> Okay. And then are we supposed to share these frustrations and thoughts with the management, and then rely on them to go up the chain of command up, and up until we until we're talking about park service wide? I don't feel like any of us know, the path forward. Who do we talk to in order to get the results?

Heather concludes that the expected returns, "the results" in her social investment is

lacking compared with the actual returns on the investment within the chain of command

which she expresses as, "rarely a closing of the loop on something".

> Or are we just relying on chain of command to go up, up, up. But I feel like the problem with that is it's a giant game of telephone, you know, like if, if we're relying on hierarchy, I mean, my concern is gonna It's not anyone's fault, but it's It's not gonna be the original concern by the time it gets two the, you know, Secretary of the Interior like, Do you know how many times the story's been told at that point? So that's kind of ineffective, Um, and also there's no if we pass it up, no matter what level it gets, too, it's very rare that we hear it come back down. Rarely a closing of the loop on something.

Overall, the previous example demonstrates interconnecting expressions of social capital,

and the intersectional dialectical tensions within which the expressions arise. The

supervisor begins by expressing a "What's the point attitude." As Heather unpacks the attitude, it becomes clear that this "attitude" is filled with interconnecting dialectical tensions, and expressions of social capital. Heather begins by converting the expression "What's the point attitude" into an expression of financial capital. The underlying dialectic of scarcity of financial capital, is pivoted to an abundance of "regulation, a manifestation of the control/resistance dialectic. The "red-tape," control dialectic constitutes an expression of lacking capital. Heather then expresses social capital maintenance constituted by unity. Unsure of how to "bridge", the expression of social capital maintenance becomes an expression of lacking social capital, as constituted by the interplay between unity/division and openness/closedness. Heather then expresses an interconnection of lacking social capital and chain of command social capital, which expressions are constituted though a dialectical interplay between expressions of centralization/decentralization, and openness/closedness. In short the dialectical interplay which constitutes the expressions of social capital is complex. This complexity of dialectical interplay represents the dis/ordered nature of expressing social capital. Thus, expressions of social capital are constituted in the dialectical interplays of employee expressions. Collectively, this findings section demonstrates that the employee expressions of dialectical interplay may be described as an interplay between order and disorder.

Response to Research Questions

These findings indicate that expressions of social capital are constituted in dialectical tensions. .Based on these findings, I can respond to my two guiding research questions. The first research question I sought to answer was "What are expressions of

social capital among members of a big western national park?" In response to this question, I found four types of expressions of social capital in the interviews with the employees at the park: social capital maintenance, lacking social capital, chain of command social capital, and social capital conversion. The first expression of social capital I found was a *social capital maintenance*. In these expressions, social capital maintenance was revealed in talk of maintaining investment of social relations, given expected returns. The second expression of social capital was the *lacking social capital*. A lack of social capital was expressed by employees in terms of making investments in social relations yet with returns being less than what was expected. The third expression of social capital was *chain of command social capital*. Chain of command social capital was expressed by employees in terms of hierarchical investment of social relations with expected returns. The fourth expression of social capital was *social capital conversion*. Social capital conversion included specific articulations of the converting relationship between forms of capital and social capital. The capital forms of natural resources, financial capital, and human capital were in an exchange with investments of social relations with expected returns. Together, these expressions of social capital were the most salient expressions of social capital among the employee interviews.

The second research question I sought to answer was "How do expressions of social capital relate to tension?" The findings of this study reveal that each expression of social capital arose in articulations of dialectical tensions. For instance, the first expression of social capital maintenance arose in expressed dialectical tension between unity/division. The second expression of a lacking social capital arose in the dialectical tensions of openness/closedness and control/resistance. The third expression of social

capital, chain of command, arose in the dialectical tension between

centralization/decentralization. Finally, the fourth expression of social capital, social

capital conversion, arose in the dialectical tension between scarcity/abundance. Because

each expression of social capital was made in dialectical tensions, these findings reveal

how in the disorder of organizational life emerges a type of order, and vice versa As such,

these employee expressions of social capital reveal the social capital as a dis/organizing

quality of organization. In the following chapter, I will discuss how the findings of this

study contribute to the literature in CCO and social capital.

CHAPTER: 5:

Discussion

This study's findings offer a dis/organized perspective of social capital which responds to recent calls among some CCO scholars and contributes to social capital scholarship in a number of ways. Each of the four expressions of social capital show how social capital expressions emerge in the tension-filled expressions of employees. A dis/organized perspective of social capital enables the view that social capital emerges in tension-filled social relations that constitutes both investment in social relations and expected returns. In this chapter, I discuss how the findings of this study respond to recent calls among CCO scholars to explore dis/organizing practices, and discuss how these the dis/organized expressions of social capital extend social capital scholarship.

CCO and Dis/order

A tension filled constitutive view of social capital contributes to the recent CCO research on dis/organization by responding to calls to study dis/order. Putnam et al. (2016) argue that most scholars privilege order over disorder, and have called for more scholars to study the tension-filled experiences of organizational disorder (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2015; Putnam et al., 2016). Putnam and colleagues position order and disorder in terms of a dialectical tension, and encourage scholars to explore the interplay between order and disorder. The findings of this study reveal dialectical tensions as constitutive of social capital, and recognizing social capital as a form of order (Putnam, 2000; Bourdieu, 1986; Lin et al., 2001) generated in tension, thus this study responds to Putnam and

colleagues' call for further exploration of organizational order and disorder. Furthermore, this study confirms Baxter's (2011) conception of dialectical interplay as a means of constituting dis/ordered social capital. The expressions of social capital emerging in the interplay of dialectical tensions demonstrate the ways of employee expressions of dis/organize social capital. Thus, this study demonstrates how dis/order is not a simple dialectical tension between order and disorder but is constituted in interplays of many dialectical tensions creating a flow of dis/order (Putnam & Fairhurst, 2015). Thus, the dis/ordered expressed experiences of employees' direct future studies focused on dis/order to seek understanding of the experienced interplay of many dialectical tensions. By embracing this approach to social capital, other scholars may be enabled to empirically test the theoretical connection between tension scholarship (e.g. Putnam et al., 2016), and CCO scholarship (e.g. Schoeneborn et al., 2019). Putnam et al. (2016) positioned tension as constituted in communication, which is the central tenant of many CCO perspectives (Schoeneborn et al., 2019). This study demonstrates how both CCO scholarship, and tension scholarship may be empirically bridged in attuning focuses toward the constitutive nature of communication in a studied context. Thus, I call on future scholars to further contextualize the constitutive link in these separate literatures through diverse methodological studies.

Dis/organized social capital

The findings of this study also inform social capital research. Social capital scholars have long espoused qualitative methodological commitments to study social and have typically attuned to the loose and tight relational investments which generate forms of social capital within contextual networks with expected returns (Lin et al., 2001).

These qualitative approaches have often led scholars to primarily examine the outcomes of social capital (Burt, 2001). The dis/organized view of social capital, as demonstrated in this study, however attunes scholars toward the communicative *processes* of the relationships which create the social networks and expected returns. The findings of this study reveal how expressions of social capital are constituted in dialectical tensions that constitute the dis/organization of the National Park. Thus, this study demonstrates that social capital exists in the dis/ordered processes that constitute organization; complicating the perspectives of social capital scholars by focusing on both the processes of tension-filled communication among the micro-expressions of social capital. As such, future social capital scholars attuned to the normative outcomes of social capital, would do well to consider the dis/ordered communicative processes that create social capital. This type of research may lead to a further bridging of the gap between generalized assumptions and network bound exchange of connection (Putnam, 2000; Lin et al., 2001) as well as place focus on how this connection is constituted in communication. Indeed, similar to how Coleman (1988) argues that the definition of social capital cannot be separated from its function, this study finds that dialectical tensions cannot be separated from the expressions of social capital. In short, this study reveals how social capital exists in the tension-filled expressions and thus extends social capital scholarship by directing attention toward the quality of expressions, which adds to the understanding of social capital as a dis/ordered process—beyond simply a relational outcome.

A dis/organized view of social capital also enables scholars to approach social capital in a few new and interesting ways. These ways include implications for the communitarian views of social capital, the social networks view of social capital.

Additionally, this study offers a new direction for a combined social network/communitarian view of social capital as argued for by Lee and Sohn (2016), and a new metaphor to understand the generation of social capital—tension. Each of these new directions are discussed below.

Within a communitarian view, a dis/organized approach to social capital extends this scholastic thinking on the bridging and bonding forms of social capital (Putnam, 2000). Communitarian scholars use bridging and bonding as the dimensions by which social capital is generated, and these terms are used to understand a macro level exchange of social capital (Putnam, 2000). However, dis/organized expressions of maintained social capital position bonding (unity) and bridging (division), as a dialectical tension, where dynamic interplays in expressions demonstrate the tension-filled process of micro expressions of social capital. This sense-making interplay may extend communitarian views of bridging and bonding as a dynamic interplay, as social capitalists seeking to manage the interplay between bonding and bridging in the micro and macro levels. Given that Robert Putnam's (2000), "simple argument," of social capital was that "Americans need to reconnect with one another," (p. 28) how Americans go about connecting through their relationships may be just as important as measures of meeting attendance used to argue disconnection. Future scholars seeking to extend the communitarian project might consider the quality of relationships which create the fabric of society. Micro expressions of social capital attune scholars to the dynamic and tension filled interplays which constitute the expressions of social capital, thus a communitarian social capital scholar could seek to understand the expressions of social capital, and the underlying dialectical tensions, interplay in the dis/organized bonding and bridging processes of relationships.

Such interplays in relationships have an extensive research in communication scholarship from which communitarian scholars may pull (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996; Baxter, 2011; Putnam et al., 2016).

Within the social network view, a dis/organized view of social capital, attunes social network scholars to new research inquiries. Lin et al. (2001), demonstrates that those espousing a social network approach to social capital, seek to determine "What outcomes and under what conditions a denser or sparser network might generate a better return" (p. 10). Thus, these scholars seek to understand the density and sparsity of networks as it relates to the expected returns. The density and sparsity of the relational network is often understood in relation to three aspects which social network scholars conceive of to identify social capital. Specifically, embeddedness of resources, accessibility within relational network of resource, and use of said resources (Lin et al., 2001). The findings of this study indicate that these aspects of social capital, as expressed by employees are constituted of dialectical tension. Thus, scholars espousing the social network view of social capital might consider focusing on the expression of social capital and consider how it relates to dialectical tensions to gain a more nuanced understanding of how experiences of social capital are expressed. This study also might encourage social capital scholars to ask how tension constitutes the experience of accessibility, embeddedness, and use of resources in sparse and dense networks of participants. Following in these lines, future scholars may seek other qualitative methods to understand the experiences of participants beyond the micro expressions of social capital.

This study also responds to the call of Lee and Sohn, (2016) for a combined communitarian and social network lens of social capital and organizations. In surveying

communication scholarship, Lee and Sohn (2016) found that a majority of social capital and communication scholarship conceives of social capital scholarship in the communitarian view, largely ignoring the social network conceptions, and thus call for scholarship which embraces both perspectives. This study embraced both perspectives of social capital, despite fundamental contradictions in the core assumptions of both perspectives through expressions of social capital. The divergence between the communitarian view—described by Coleman (1988) as uniting the function of social capital and its generation, and the social network view—which separates the function of social capital from its generation, was embraced through emergent expressions of social capital.

The dis/organized perspective of social capital from this study, however, reveal expressions enables a type of dialogic-dialectical coherence to emerge (Craig, 1999) among the seemingly divergent perspectives of social capital. Craig's concept of dialogical-dialectical coherence helps to recognize how the competing, contradictory theories of social capital may be positioned in conversation with one another. Craig argues that incompatible concepts may still have coherence in the ways that they are similar in some ways and contradictory in others. In this study, I bring the competing theories of social capital in conversation with each other through the qualitative analysis of tension-filled expressions.

In this way, different conceptualizations of social capital conceptually emerge in the expressions of the employees in this study. When an employee expresses communitarian aspects of social capital (e.g. norms of trust, reciprocity) without the requisite aspects of the social network conception of social capital (i.e. embeddedness,

accessibility, use), then a communitarian view was espoused, and vis-versa for a Social network expression. By embracing a definition of social capital which embraces both perspectives (Lin et al., 2001), the challenge became conducting an analysis which allowed for divergent perspectives of social capital to both emerge. Future studies may extend this approach to studying social capital beyond dialogical-dialectical coherence, by seeking dialogic connections between the social capital scholars' dialectical conceptions of social capital. By attuning myself to the expressions of social capital, I found that both perspectives of social capital emerged in conversations with employees and were constituted in dialectical tensions. As such, these findings direct future scholars who seek to embrace both conceptions of social capital to attune themselves to the expressions of social capital and allow the interplay between conceptions to emerge in their analysis.

Tension as a new Social Capital Metaphor

The findings of this study also extend social capital scholarship by means of offering a new metaphor to understand the generation of social capital—tension. Social capital scholars have argued that the generation of social capital can be understood by a number of metaphors (Burt, 1992; 2001) including connection metaphors of bridging and bonding, the interaction metaphors of having either dense or sparse networks. For instance, the communitarian view of social capital argues that the source of social capital is captured in *connection* among societal members (Putnam, 2000). In this communitarian sense, social capital's generation is captured as metaphor in *connection*. In the communitarian view dimensions of the connection metaphor are also described as *bridging* or *bonding*—a mixed metaphor to understand the generation of social capital.

Similarly, in the social networks view of social capital, the generation of social capital cannot be, "Divorced from its roots in individual interactions and networking" (Lin et al., 2001, p.9). In this sense *networking* is the root metaphor for understanding social capital within the social networks view, and is thus often described through the dimensions of *dense* or *sparse* networks of connection. In both these senses, connection is a metaphor used to understand the generation of social capital with metaphorical dimensions (i.e. bridging/bonding; density/sparsity) as a means of describing the connection. Another metaphor often used to describe the generation of social capital is the structural *holes* metaphor. The 'hole' metaphor is used to understand the dense networks, and those who *broker* loose, or dense network relations which generates social capital (Burt, 1992; 2001). This metaphor of *network* centers in connection, and uses a sub-metaphor of *broker*, to emphasize the accessibility, use, and embeddness as generative of social capital.

This study offers a new metaphor of *tension* enabling a potentially more complex view of social capital. With the findings of this study showing how social capital arises in dialectical tensions positions tension as an alternative metaphor to understand the generation of social capital. Tension subsumes the other metaphors by attuning social capital scholars to the quality of *connection, networks,* and positioning sub-metaphors as dialectical tensions: *bridging/bonding, density/sparsity.* For example, the tension between bonding and bridging in society, or the tension filled interactions between individuals networking. This tension metaphor complicates the *connection* metaphor used by both perspectives of social capital by drawing attention to the tension filled expressions describing the *connecting* relationships. Similarly, tension fills the expressions of social

capital describing the relationships between brokers and groups in dense and loose networks at micro levels. Thus, network holes are the result of tension filled expressions of social capital. Future studies on experiences of social capital which embrace a dis/organized view of social capital, may study how the management of tension results in the generation of social capital, thus extending this study beyond expression of social capital, in seeking to understand tension and social capital in other ways. Social capital scholars seeking to methodologically study tension as the generation of social capital may find Putnam et al. (2016) helpful in understanding the methodologies used in examining tension within relations.

Overall, the dis/organized perspective originating from this study of social capital expressions enables a view that social capital is not a neat investment in social relations with expected returns, but are dis/ordered tension filled social relations which constitute both investment in social relations, and expected returns. This study extended the dis/organization literature by showing how dis/order may be understood as the interplay between other dialectical tensions in the expressions of employees. This study also extended social capital scholarship by enabling social capital scholars to understand the connection foundational to the generation of social capital in a complicated way which richly describes the tension filled experience of expressing social capital. Tension, which was constitutive of expressed social capital may also be understood as a metaphor describing the complex and rich experience of connecting—foundational to the generation of social capital. Beyond these theoretical extensions, these findings have implications for the employees of the national park who contributed to this study.

Conclusion

In considering the various constraints, challenges, and mission tensions which NPS employees are under, park employees may better accomplish their mission in understanding social capital in a processual dis/organized conception, rather than simply as an outcome of their relational networks they need to accomplish their mission. Many employees I interviewed expressed the specific challenges I reviewed in the first chapter. Beyond these challenges, the employees expressed many others including conflicts with specific employees, park visitors, and the general public. One employee I interviewed used weight as a metaphor to describe the tension she felt. "Under that crushing weight, the mission just doesn't…It seems like impossible." The mission expressed by this employee may be more than the letter of the tension filled law which created the NPS (Winks, 1997). However, this study is grounded in scholarship which has studied the challenges facing national parks. These challenges reviewed in the first chapter, as expressed by the employee include the deferred maintenance, government shutdowns effects, climate change effect on natural resources, internal / external barriers stymieing efforts. In the words of employees these challenges were expressed as: "Literally fighting for base funding," "I didn't realize how much I identified with work until it was completely gone," "the fires!" "arbitrary rules, and stuff," "this [presidents] administrations view of the park." Miller and colleagues (2014) argue that these diverse challenges require social capital, which is often argued as a solution to collective action problems (Putnam, 2000; Hamiltion & Lubell, 2019). This outcome driven perspective of social capital becomes complicated when reviewing scholarship on social capital.

This attention to dis/organization is meaningful because it directs attention to the messiness of organizational life and reframes the ways scholars attend to social capital. While most social capital scholarship directs practitioner attention toward relational connection (Putnam, 2000; Bourdieu, 1986; Lin et al. 2001), delving into the dis/organization of quality communicative processes (Putnam et al. 2016) offers a broader focus when examining social capital. Specifically, using a dis/organized framework, researchers and practitioners are directed toward understanding the processes of communicating social capital while also attending to how these expressions arise in various tensions. With this focus, practitioners in the NPS working to address the various challenges facing the park, can recognize that social capital arises in tensions and thus attune themselves to the tensions which constitute expressions of social capital. By engaging in a perspective that embraces the notion that organizations are simultaneously ordered and dis/ordered results in a new way to understand social capital. In particular, tension becomes a new metaphor to understand social capital. In adopting this new metaphor, NPS employees can attend to experiences in which tension arise and seek opportunities to develop social capital. In this way, attending to "Stress, anxiety, discomfort, or tightness in making choices, responding to, and moving forward in organizational situations" (Putnam et al., 2016, p. 69) becomes a useful focus because these are the moments in which employees seek to generate social capital; potentially as a way to negotiate these tensions This awareness may lead employees to seek ways to manage these tensions together. If those interested in the processes of social capital formation embraced CCO perspectives focused on dis/organization, they may attend to organizations with people facing challenges comparable to the ones faced by the NPS and

pay attention to how employees attempt to invest in social relations and build social

capital. Perhaps employees could go one step further and begin to understand how

re/connection occurs in a dis/organization.

REFERENCES

Adger, N.W. (2003). Social Capital, Collective Action, and Adaption to Climate Change. *Economic Geography*, *79(4),* 387-404.

Adler, P.S., & Kwon, S., (2002). Social Capital: Prospects for a New Concept. *The Academy of Management Review*, *27(1*), 17-20.

Anderson, R., Baxter, L. A., & Cissna, K. N. (2004). *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Ashcraft, K.L., Kuhn, T.R., & Cooren, F., (2009). Constitutional Amendments: "Materializing" Organizational Communication. *The Academy of Management Annals*. *3(1),* 1-64.

Axley, S. R., (1984). Managerial communication in terms of the conduit metaphor. *Academy of Management Review*, *9*, 428–437.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1984) *Rabelais and his World*. Bloomington, IA: Indiana University Press.

Baxter, L. A. (2011). *Voicing relationships: A dialogic perspective*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Baxter, L. A., & Braithwaite, D. O. (2008). Relational dialectics theory: Crafting meaning from competing discourses. In D. O. Braithwaite & L. A. Baxter (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 349-361). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Baxter, L.A. & Montgomery, B.M. (1996). *Relating: Dialogues & Dialectics.* New York, NY: Guilfurd Press.

Ben-Hador, B. (2018). "Conflicts and Social Capital in Organizations,' In Boas, A.A.V., (Eds.), *Organizational Conflict* ed. London, UK. Intech Open.

Blau, P. (1955). *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Bourdieu, P. (1983). The Forms of Capital. In. Richardson J.G (Eds.), In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education.* (pp. 241-258) Westport, CT: *Greedwood Press.*

Bourdieu, P. (1985). The social space and the genesis of groups. *Information (International Social Science Council), 24*(2), 195-220.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In J. G. Richardson,(Eds) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. (pp.* 241-258.) Westport, CT: Greenwood

Burt R.S. (2001) Structural Holes versus Network Closure as Social Capital in Lin, N., Cook, K. S., & Burt, R. S.(Eds). *Social Capital: Theory and Research* (pp. 31-56) New York, NY: Walter De Gruter Inc.

Burt. R. S. (1992). *Structural Holes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Coleman, J. S., (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American journal of sociology*, *94*, 95-120.

Comay, L.B., & Vincent, C.H. (2019) National Park Service: Government Shutdown Issues. *Congressional Research Service.* Version 5. IF 11079. https://crs.gov.

Cooren, F., Taylor, J. R., & Van Every, E. J. (2006). *Communication as Organizing Empirical and Theoretical Explorations in the Dynamic of Text and Conversation*. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A., (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory.* 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication theory*, *9(2),* 119-161.

Croucher, S. M., & Cronn-Mills, D. (2015). *Understanding communication research methods: A Theoretical and Practical Approach*. New York, NY, Routledge.

Fairhurst, G. T., & Putnam, L. (2004). Organizations as discursive constructions. *Communication Theory*,*14*(1), 5-26.

Frumkin, P., (2009). *On Being Nonprofit: A Conceptual and Policy Primer*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gulati, R. & Gargiulo, M., (1999). Where do interorganizational networks come from? *American Journal of Sociology 105*, 177-231.

Gulati, R., (1995) Does familiarity breeds trust? The implications of repeated ties for contractual choice in alliances. *Academy Management Journal, 38*, 85-112.

Hamilton, M. L., & Lubell, M. (2019). Climate change adaptation, social capital, and the performance of polycentric governance institutions. *Climatic Change*, *152(3-4),* 307-326.

Halpern D. (2005). *Social Capital.* Cambridge MA: Polity Press

Jantarasami, L. C., J. J. Lawler, and C. W. Thomas. (2010). Institutional barriers to climate change adaptation in U.S. national parks and forests .*Ecology and Society 15*(4): 33.

Karl, T. R., Melillo, J. M., Peterson, T. C., & Hassol, S. J. (2009). *Global Climate Change Impacts in the United States.* Cambridge MA: Cambridge University Press.

Kuhn, T., (2012). Negotiating the Micro-Macro Divide: Thought Leadership From Organizational Communication for Theorizing Organization. *Management Communication Quarterly. 24*(4), 543-584

Lee, C. J., & Sohn, D. (2016). Mapping the social capital research in communication: a bibliometric analysis. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *93*(4), 728-749.

Lin, N., Cook, K. S., & Burt, R. S. (2001). *Social Capital: Theory and Research*. New York, NY: Walter De Gruter Inc.

Lindlof, T. R., and B. C. Taylor. 2011. *Qualitative communication research methods*. Third edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

McDowall, L., (2018) NPS Maintenance backlog: Deferred Maintenance and Operational Needs of the National Park Service. U.S. Department of the Interior: Office of Congressional and Legislative Affairs. obtained: August 31, 2019. https://www.doi.gov/ocl/nps-maintenance-backlog

McPhee, R. D., & Zaug, P. (2008). The communicative constitution of organizations: A framework for explanation. In, Putnam, L.L.& Nicotera, A.M. (Eds.), *Building Theories of Organization: The Constitutive Role of Communication* (pp. 21-47). New York, NY, Routledge.

Miller, M. L., Carter, R. W., Walsh, S. J., & Peake, S. (2014). A conceptual framework for studying global change, tourism, and the sustainability of iconic national parks. In: *The George Wright Forum 31(*3). 256-269.

Moore, S., Shiell, A., Hawe, P., & Haines, V. A. (2005). The privileging of communitarian ideas: Citation practices and the translation of social capital into public health research. *American Journal of Public Health*, *95*, 1330-1337.

Luhmann, N. (2000*). (Trans. Organization and Decision*). Opladen, Germany: West-Deuscher Verlag.

Luhmann, N. (2003). Organization. In T. Bakken & T. Hernes (Eds.), *Autopoietic Organization Theory: Drawing on Niklas Luhmann's Social Systems Perspective* (pp.31-52). Oslo, Norway: Copenhagen Business School Press.

Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social Systems*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Mumby, D. K. (2019). Communication Constitutes Capital: Branding and the Politics of Neoliberal Dis/Organization. In Vásquez, C., & Kuhn, T. (Eds) *Dis/organization as Communication: Exploring the Disordering, Disruptive and Chaotic Properties of Communication.* (pp. 125-147). New York, NY: Routledge.

Nahapiet, J., & Ghosal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. Academy of Management Review, 23, 242–266.

Navarro, V. (2002). A Critique of Social Capital. *International Journal of Health Services*, *32*, 423-432.

Oh, H., Labianca, G., & Chung, M.-H. (2006). A multilevel model of group social capital. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*, 569–582.

Portes, A., (1998). Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology, 24*(1), 1-24.

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

Putnam R.D. (1995). Bowling Alone, Revisited. *The Responsive Community*, Spring(5), 18-33.

Putnam R.D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Putnam, L. L. (2004). Dialectical tensions and rhetorical tropes in negotiations. *Organization studies, 25*(1), 35-53.

Putnam, L. L., & Fairhurst, G. T. (2015). Revisiting "Organizations as Discursive Constructions": 10 years later. *Communication Theory, 25*(4), 375-392.

Putnam, L. L., Fairhurst, G. T., & Banghart, S. (2016). Contradictions, dialectics, and paradoxes in organizations: A constitutive approach. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *10*(1), 65-171.

Putnam, L. L., (2019). Constituting Order and Disorder: Embracing Tensions and Contradictions. In Vásquez, C., & Kuhn, T. (Eds). *Dis/organization as Communication: Exploring the Disordering, Disruptive and Chaotic Properties of Communication.* New York, NY: Routledge

Schoeneborn, D. (2011). Organization as Communication: A Luhmannian Perspective. *Management Communication Quarterly, 25(4)*, 663-689

Schoeneborn, D., Blaschke, S., Cooren, F., McPhee, R. D., Seidl, D., & Taylor, J. R. (2014). The three schools of CCO thinking: Interactive dialogue and systematic comparison. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *28*(2), 285-316.

Schoeneborn, D., & Vásquez, C., (2017). Communication as Constitutive of Organization. In: C.R. Scott & L.K. Lewis (Eds.). *International Encyclopedia of Organizational Communication.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Schoeneborn, D., Kuhn T.R., Kärreman, D., (2019). The Communicative Constitution of Organization, Organizing, and Organizationality. *Organization Studies, 40*(4), 475-496.

U.S. National Park Service (2019). Retrieved (2019, December 23). from https://www.nps.gov/aboutus/national-park-system.htm

Vasquez, C., Kuhn, T. (2019). *Dis/organization as Communication: Exploring the Disordering, Disruptive and Chaotic Properties of Communication.* New York, NY: Routledge

Weick, K. E. (1979). Organization design: Organizations as self-designing systems. *Organizational dynamics*, *6(2*), 31-46.

Winks, R. W. (1997). The National Park Service Act of 1916: Contradictory Mandate. *Denver University Law Review*, *74(3), 575-624.