

Interactive comment on “Participative environmental management and social capital in Poland” by A. Hunka and W. T. de Groot

A. Hunka and W. T. de Groot

a.hunka@science.ru.nl

Received and published: 17 September 2010

We would like to thank the two anonymous referees for their insightful and constructive comments, they will certainly improve the paper. We will respond to the comments separately.

We agree with the first referee that the paper would benefit from clarification of its aims. Our goal was indeed to set up an agenda and directions for future research, as studies into participative environmental management are still scarce on Polish grounds, and we will point it out more clearly in the revised version. The same applies to improving section 2 by introducing examples of studies linking social capital and environmental management—thank you very much for the interesting references. We also agree that the specification of the “environmental management” term is necessary.

With regard to the use of the English language—it is a second language for both authors—but we have had the paper revised and corrected by a fellow academic who is a native English speaker. It would be very helpful for future revisions to get more specific examples of the English language difficulties we need to address.

In section three the employed examples have been chosen to show three different processes/options in Polish (environmental) decision-making that currently take place: (i) a nation-wide top-down implementation of an EU law, (ii) a bottom-up initiatives that successfully influenced political decisions, and (iii) attempts at communication between stakeholders at local level. They were chosen to illustrate the idea that was put forth in the previous section (of missing trust between the authorities and the general public). The paper was never intended to become a review of existing literature or an evaluation of case studies—therefore we are not entirely sure what kind of “analysis” the first reviewer refers to in the discussion of section 3 of our paper. We think that a better clarification of our aims will also help to address this comment.

We would like to thank the second referee for a very interesting and critical overview of our social capital presentation. We agree that the paper will benefit from introducing a critical approach to social capital concept, and we plan to address it in the revision, as advised.

A critical view on participative management and participation is another interesting point raised by the second referee. We absolutely agree that the whole concept and implementation of “participation” is neither flawless, nor without any drawbacks. Still, in our paper we have tried to address the reality of environmental management in Poland in times when governance and participatory approach is considered the state-of-the-art also on the EC level (European Commission, 2001). Polish authorities and the general public seem to have no other choice but to embrace the participatory way, and we think that discussing this issue briefly in the discussion will improve our paper.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

References

Commission of the European Communities: European Governance. A White Paper, Brussels, 2001.

Interactive comment on Soc. Geogr. Discuss., 6, 39, 2010.

SGD

6, C39–C41, 2010

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

