Social Capital, Civic Society & Democracy

API-412
Putnam Reading

- Making Democracy Work (1993) - Italy
- “Bowling Alone” 1995 Jnl of Democracy
- The strange disappearance of civic America (online)
- “Tuning In & Tuning Out” 1996 PS
- What’s Troubling the Trilateral Democracies? (forthcoming)
- Bowling Alone, the book (forthcoming)
Key issues

I. What is Putnam’s theory of social capital?

II. What is the evidence
   II.1. in Italy?
   II.2. in the US?
   II.3 worldwide?

III. What are the implications for civic society in new democracies?
Questions for discussion

1. Can you draw a simple schematic diagram explaining the links in Putnam’s theory of social capital?
2. Is there good evidence that social capital and personal trust are important for civic engagement and good government in the US and Italy?
3. Can Putnam’s theory be applied to civic society in transitional regimes?
4. How would you use the materials in this class in your project?
**Putnam’s Model I**

TV Entertainment

Social Capital and Civic Engagement

Political Culture

Social trust

Good Government
Social Capital

“Features of social life – networks, norms, and trust – that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives.”

Capacity building
Civic Engagement

“People’s connections with the life of their communities, not merely with politics”

Measures e.g.
- Referendum turnout
- Newspaper readership
- Cultural/sports club membership
- Trade union membership
Putnam’s Model II

Capacity/competence

Social Capital

Fidelity

Performance of Representative Democratic Institutions

Information/Media

Political Confidence

Evaluative Criteria
Evidence?

What makes government work?

- Italian local government
- Economic modernization?
- The civic community?
  - Civic engagement
  - Horizontal social/cultural associations
  - Honesty, social trust, law-abidingness
  - Public interest not patron-client
Italian local government
Measures of effective governance

• Making democracy work: Italian local government
  - Cabinet stability
  - Budget promptness
  - Information services
  - Reform legislation
  - Legislative innovation
  - Day care
  - Family clinics
  - Industrial policy
  - Agricultural spending
  - Local health spending
  - Housing development
  - Bureaucratic responsiveness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reform legislation, 1978–1984</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care centers, 1983</td>
<td>0.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and urban development, 1979–1987</td>
<td>0.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical and information services, 1981</td>
<td>0.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative innovation, 1978–1984</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet stability, 1975–1985</td>
<td>0.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family clinics, 1978</td>
<td>0.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic responsiveness, 1983</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial policy instruments, 1984</td>
<td>0.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget promptness, 1979–1985</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local health unit spending, 1983</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural spending capacity, 1978–1980</td>
<td>0.468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Scoring for cabinet stability and budget promptness has been reversed from that described in the text, so that a high absolute score corresponds to high performance.
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Economic Modernity and Institutional Performance

Economic Modernity
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FIGURE 4.5
The Civic Community and Institutional Performance

Performance

Civic Community
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