



Social Capital and its Impact on the Democratic Consolidation

Dr. Firaz Gorgees Azeez

University of Baghdad, College of Political Science, Baghdad, Iraq

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v11i01.023>

Paper Received:

29th January, 2021

Paper Accepted:

20th February, 2021

Paper Received After Correction:

27th February, 2021

Paper Published:

01st March, 2021



How to cite the article: Dr Firaz Gorgees Azeez, Social Capital and its Impact on the Democratic Consolidation, IJRSSH, January-March 2021 Vol 11, Issue 1; 382-416, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v11i01.023>

INTRODUCTION

Social capital is considered as one of the basic factors that contribute to cohesion and interdependence among the members of society, in addition to its role in determining the ability of the state and political system to overcome the crises and problems that facing the society. Then, it leads to stability and progress.

The term of social capital has become one of the widespread terms in recent years. Despite its appearance in the last two decades of the last century, especially in Western societies via numerous researchers and thinkers. The reason for this widespread is the positive effects and indicators that it contains such as trust, cooperation, and social ties. These civil society ties contribute to forming and strengthening democracy and social stability. These thinkers consider that community ties, specifically civil society ties have played a great role in the shaping of social capital, principally concerning standards of trust and cooperation. These researchers also believe that decreasing the number of these combined ties is evidence and an indication of the decline in the social capital as well as in a democracy. This has been raised much criticism by researchers and thinkers in the field of democracy who considered that the ties of

civil society and the increase in their number are not evidence of democracy. It becomes possible that the number of these ties will be increased while the democracy will be decreased. These researchers also emphasized that other factors play a fundamental role and affect the formation of the social capital in terms of its impact on the democracy such as the state, the type of political system, the nature of political institutions, elites of the social and political, as well as the role of religious values prevailing in society, and finally the role of social nurture institutions.

SOCIAL CAPITAL...THE ORIGINS...THE CONCEPT

First: The Historical Origins of the Concept of Social Capital

Researchers have differing opinions about the origins, the early indications, and the period for the emergence and use of this concept has differed. Despite the recent discussions about this concept, several uses for its return to the second decade of the last century. This was evidenced by the studies and research that refers to the concept of social capital in light of the practice of the cooperation relations between individuals who belongs to one of the social entities and the mutual participation among them (Serageldin & Grootaert, 1998, p. 27). Some attribute the

first roots of this concept to the economist (Adam Smith), in which he emphasized that the economic specialization depended on the division of work and the consequent exchange of commodities in the markets which is the source for the increased productivity. Hence, it increased the revolution of nations. Capital made specialization and exchange possible. Adam Smith defined capital as a balance of accumulated assets for productive purposes. Therefore, the greater accumulation of the capital, the more specialization it becomes possible. Thus, the productivity of society will increase (De Soto, 2009, p.41). Adam Smith also worked through his ideas to liberalize the term of capital from being limited to the monetary and financial capital to refer for other tools and purposes. In other words, all production requirements that achieve profit and portion of these requirements which are part of the capital can be represented in the appropriate amount of skills individuals possess who can efficiently employ these skills. This can be expressed in the concept of human capital which approaches the concept of social capital (Ritzer, 2005, p.75). Karl Marx also made a clear reference to the concept of social capital in his ideas. Marx was the first one who put forward the classic concept of the capital. He considered capital as an excess value that resulting

from the relationship of the exploitation of workers. This is because social capital is not only regarded as a method of production, but as a social relationship between the main classes of the bourgeois society. Also, an exploitation relationship between the owners of methods of production and workers (Lin, 2001, p.7). Through the ideas of Marx, it has been noticed that the concept of capital is a social concept because it requires social processes and activities. Meanwhile, the production process requires multiple social activities. For example, Marx describes the value of employment as dependent on the socially necessary work. Also, the exchange process in its essence is considered as a social process (Lin, 2001, p.8). By reviewing the roots of that concept, it has been noticed that the educational scientist John Dewey referred implicitly to the social capital. As he asserted that the permanent contact between individuals and society is dependent on the mutual reliance or influence and effectiveness between the individual and society (Nassar and others, 2010, p. 293).

However, most studies indicate that the first roots of this concept were found in the writings of Alexei de Tocqueville about democracy in the United States of America in the 19th century. Tocqueville attributed the development of democracy in America

to the social cohesion and the tendency of citizens to participate in life. Where, the latest one represents a core of the social capital (De Tocqueville, 1984, p.73). The social capital here means the mechanism that Tocqueville called the technique or the mechanism of interdependence. This mechanism works to create strong forms of mutual trust. Consequently, moral obligations and standards that connect the individuals are formed based on it (Abu Al-Douh & Leila, 2014, p.32).

Others referred that the actual beginning of the concept of social capital returns to the writings of the American reformer Lyda Judson Hanifan at the beginning of the 20th century. As it presented in her book (The Local Community Center), "By using the term of social capital, I do not want to refer to the usual concept of capital in its metaphorical sense. We are not referring to real estate, personal property, or cash. Rather, we refer to everything in life that tends to make these resources real and valuable in the daily life of individuals. I mean specifically, goodwill, collegiality, sympathy, and the social communication between individuals and families who comprise the social unit. Also, the rural society which the school is a logical center in most cases" (Hanifan, 1920, p. 78). In her writings, she also associated the social capital and social practices that take place within a specific social group (Putnam,

1993, pp. 48-50). Then, the concept is disappearing for some time to reappear again in the late 1960s and at the beginning of the 1970s of the last century through the writings of Jean Jacobs who is one of the researchers who used social capital in its contemporary shape in her book (The Death and Life of Great American Cities). In this book, she indicated that the neighborhood networks are the social capital. Also, she emphasized that the resources stored in the communications among people are an essential thing (Ulriksen, 2008, p. 6). However, this concept did not find widespread interest until the end of the seventies from the last century with the emergence of the writings of the French thinker (Pierre Bourdieu) about the cultural capital (Harker, 1990, p. 78). Bourdieu is the author of the first organized and contemporary scientific analysis of the concept of social capital and its different forms. He also emphasized that each society has its specific field of capital. In addition to that, individuals acquire several main forms of capital through education and learning. Also, Bourdieu focused on four forms of capital which are: social capital, cultural capital, emblematic capital, and economic capital. Besides, he emphasized that these different forms play the role of achieving discrimination in the context of class and

status. Furthermore, it affirms that the actors are organized in the social situations within the social space according to their economic, social, and cultural characteristics (Bourdieu, 1989 p. 7). Also, Bourdieu proposed his idea of social capital as "the total actual resources that the actor possesses through his property of a permanent network of the institutional relations or a group membership" (Bourdieu, the forms of capital, 1986, p.4). According to Bourdieu's ideas, social capital depends on the size of the individual's connections and social relations, or on the size and amount of capital that lies in possess such relationships. It also emphasizes that social capital is an asset and resource associated with the group. Likewise, the members of the same group are participating in it (Bourdieu, The Forms of Capital, 1986, p. 22). Bourdieu's ideas about social capital are depending on giving the members of the social actors an important prominent in its analysis. Especially concerning their important roles that are based on the cultural production and symbolic conformity in reproducing social structures of dominance (Bourdieu, social space and symbolic power, 1989, p. 33).

After that, James Coleman's writings on social capital during the 1980s showed in his attempt to connect the social phenomena with economic progress. This

was presented clearly through the theory of "reasonable choice" (Coleman, 1988, p. 98). But, most researchers believe that Robert Putnam's writings which appear during the 1990s are the basic reason this concept has gained widespread attention. However, the main factor in the spread of the social capital concept is represented in the vary-ranging social changes and transformations that witnessed in the last two decades which made this concept have the attention focus. In specific, when it was associated with other concepts such as democracy, good governance, and civil society. Especially with Robert Putnam's study's propagation that dealt with the fall down of the social capital in the United States of America. Then, the contributions of the number of international bodies such as the World Bank, universities, and research centers worked for developing the framework to study the social capital and its relationship to some variables like economic development and social development such as proceeds, health, education, poverty, unemployment and others (Putnam, 1993, p. 210). Accordingly, it can be said that the concept of social capital has numerous approaches from the series of philosophical and social assumptions and ideas of many thinkers which confirm the historical development of this concept.

Second: A Theoretical Framework for The Concept of Social Capital

Although the term of social capital is popular, its basic content depended on a long history of the concepts and investigations in the social sciences. Whereas, the topic of social relations and ties forms of participation in public life, forms of participation in different societies and their effects on the individuals and groups that existed in social sciences from the early date and in multiple forms. Therefore, we will study the concept and the types of social capital in this paper.

1. The concept of the social Capital

The concept of social capital includes two main parts; the first one is the capital, while the second is the social aspect. The first part is related to the (capital) indicates that social capital formed through the accumulation of social values and bonds over accumulated and different periods. Therefore, it is difficult to imagine that social capital is formed temporarily or rapidly to serve a sudden situation or an accident. As the society's stock of social values and bonds is the capital that accumulated over time which expressed in the concept of social capital. On the other hand, the second part (the social aspect) in the concept refers to the fact that social capital does not constitute an individual in itself. Rather than, it is formed within the

framework of a social group whose members accept joining it to profit from the benefits provided by the membership in this group. As well as through the individuals utilizing the values of commitment, trust and solidarity provided by the membership in this group. Also, the balance provided by the membership in the group is considered as a social capital generated by this group and its accumulation over time (Serageldin & Grootart, 1977, pp. 80-83).

Social capital can be defined as a set of the values or informal norms shared by members of the group that allow them to cooperate (Fukuyama, *Social Capital and Civil Society*, 2002, p. 4). James Coleman defines it as the set of social relationships and bonds that grow within a framework of the particular social network, governed by several values and standards such as trust, mutual respect, commitment and cooperation. All these values are mere values which difficult to quantify and also difficult to distinguish accurately (Coleman, 1988, p 97). It is also defined as the networks, shared norms, values and understandings that facilitate the cooperation within or between the groups (Nisbet, 2007, p. 528). The Encyclopedia of Sociology defines social capital as a form of capital that exists within an existing social relationship between individuals. These relationships include

the resources from which individuals can determine their benefits from it (Brgatta & Montgomery, 2000, p. 2637). Pierre Bourdieu defined it as a group of actual or potential resources linked to the possession of a permanent network of established relationships with a degree of more or less overlapping confessions and knowledge. In other words, the membership in a group, as a group of actors not only characterized by common characteristics, but it also united through useful and permanent ties. (Bourdieu, social space and symbolic power, 1989, p. 46).

2. The Resources of Social Capital

Social capital is formed through a group of resources that represented via belonging to the social system and its subgroups such as the family and neighborhood group to include the formal and informal institutions. So, the most important resources can be presented as follows:

The Family: It represents the first and main source of social capital because it is the basic unit of society that forms its social structure. Also, it is the one that lays the foundations of the relationship between an individual and the society through its role in developing the individual's confidence in other members. Also, the family contributes to providing the necessary mechanisms used to achieve economic prosperity by developing

informal ties and relationships, especially within the framework of the extended family to help and cooperate within it. This making it a social security network that provides services and supports to its members in periods of economic and social crisis. The role of the family is not limited to providing resources to its members, but also in accumulating the stock of the social capital which are available to the community (Michael & Edwards, 1997, p. 549).

Educational and technical institutions: it represents an important source for the formation, accumulation and development of social capital. These institutions have a role in implanting the principles of cooperative teamwork and the diversity of acquired information and culture through meetings that bring together various sectors, whether formative, educational, technical, or professional organizations. Consequently, it produces the social capital that connecting all these sectors (Ulriksen, 2008, p. 11).

Ethnic ties: are one of the sources of social capital. It affects the way of socialization for individuals and contributes to the formation of their awareness and ideas towards themselves and others. As a result, it helps to connect a group of individuals. Then, it connects or isolates individuals from society. Also, it contributes to

mobilization the resources and recruitment to serve specific goals. It also contributes to providing opportunities for its members to achieve common goals.

Civil Society: Civil society and its institutions are one of the most important sources of social capital formation, especially in the developed societies which characterized by a high level of public awareness among their citizens and high rates of participation in civic life. Also, it contributes to helping the community members in building the trust that connects the individuals to carry out the specific activity. Thus, it provides the opportunity to integrate with others to carry out important activities (Michael & Edwards, 1997, p. 522).

The public sector: it includes the institutions under the supervision of the state and its administrations. These institutions can strengthen confidence in the state institutions and agencies through their management of the relationship between their employees. These institutions also play an important role in the promotion of society, as we find the social capital among employees and within the composition of the public sector apparatus, and also between the sector and employees which considered the social capital as a link within the public sector and between its units and outside as well.

The strength and efficiency of the public sector depend on these links (Serageldin & Grootart, 1977, p. 88).

In addition to the resources mentioned above, there are other resources of social capital which represented by the neighbor groups, friends' groups and so on. These resources are equal in importance, but what distinguishes between them is the context in which they operate. In some societies, state institutions and civil society are equally important in forming social capital. This applies to the democratic systems of a government. (Serageldin and Grootart, 1977, p.100)

3. Dimensions of social capital

The literature on the study of social capital indicates the existence of several dimensions which the most important are:

- A. The obligations arising from the set of rules and standards.
- B. Confidence: It depends on the emotional tendency and spontaneity towards others based on trust.
- C. Networks and social ties. It includes the relationships between individuals and their unions in a form of networks. (Fine & Dimitris, 2010, p. 63).

Also, the World Bank has put forward a measure that includes several dimensions

of social capital which are: (Grootaert, 2004, p.5)

- Membership in the networks and groups.
- Trust and solidarity.
- Collective workers and cooperation.
- Media and Communication.
- Social cohesion and inclusion.
- Political empowerment and the work.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CAPITAL AND DEMOCRACY

The success of any society in forming and developing the stock of social capital affects positively or negatively in strengthening democracy. As for its review, it depends on the ability of this society to benefit from the networks of ties, social relations, values that available among its members, extend and develop these ties and relationships as much as possible that the social construction can achieve its goals. As a result, this matter will lead to strengthening its democracy. Therefore, in this topic, we will study the relationship between social capital and democratic consolidation.

First: Theoretical Contexts of the Concept of Social Capital and its Relationship to Democracy

Most researchers in the field of social capital confirm through their tracking of the contributions of thinkers and theorists to this concept, that the major and fundamental contribution which put the social capital in the framework of social and political sciences and linking it to the democracy which belongs to each of the sociologists (Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman, and Robert Putnam) who put the theoretical establishment of the concept of social capital and its relationship to democratic consolidation. Therefore, we will study this concept and its relationship to democracy in each one of them:

- 1. The relationship between social capital and democracy according to Pierre Bourdieu:** The intellectual thoughts of a French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu contributed to the development of the concept of social capital as a theory in sociology by transcending the traditional concepts of capital in an economic sense and linking it to the culture and social life. Whereas, he linked the social capital to class analysis and the study of the concept of the class. It also understood the social

capital as a social stock that interacts and overlaps with the rest of the assets that the individual possesses of economic and cultural capital to reinforce the social and economic inequality and reproduce stratification. This means that the building of social class according to Bourdieu, needs resources that stemming from three forms of capital which are economic, cultural and social (Bourdieu, 2009, p. 55). Therefore, we find that Bourdieu emphasizes these three forms of capital which are three main ways the resources accumulated to give the priority to individuals in the society. It contributes to the accumulation of resources but in different ways that depend on the ability of families, groups and classes to transfer the resources across the generations (Castiglione, 2008, p. 355). As a result, Bourdieu provided a definition of social capital which is "the set of current or potential resources associated with the possession of a solid network of relationships depended on the knowledge and mutual recognition, linked to the membership in a group of actors not only related through the common characteristics

but also connected via the permanent and beneficial ties (Bourdieu, the forms of capital, 1986, p. 37). He also defined it as "the group of actual and virtual resources that realized or achievable and accumulate in the individual or a group through the influence of a strong network of relationships depended on acquaintance and the mutual appreciation. They also differ in their form and function depending on the nature of the same relationship (Bourdieu, social space and symbolic power, 1989, p 93). According to this, we notice that Bourdieu's concept of social capital is depended on relationships, but he emphasizes that relationships are nothing but a form of social capital. It is not sufficient to have a relationship to form the capital. Rather, this relationship must be rallied to present the help for each member in the group if he needs the help (Kaban and his two sessions, 2010, p. 323). Bourdieu's approach depended on the theory that social capital is: A form of capital that exists alongside the cultural, symbolic and economic capital. The utilizing of these different types of capital has spread

over a different period of history, but the concept is applied separately according to each context. Bourdieu focused on the issues of class, the conflict, how the different types of capital are formed, and the way perform its role in reproduction and transformation. (Fine & Dimitris, 2010, p. 39). In other words, Bourdieu expressed the social capital via the size and intensity of the group and the network, and the size of the capital owned by the members. This expression makes sense if it is assumed that all members maintain the strength of mutual relations. Furthermore, these relationships do not enter into the computation of calculus (Lin, 1999, p. 33). While the number of connections is important for building social capital. The most important factor is the individual's association with those who possess a large amount of economic and cultural capital. Also, these types of capital are available to the individual (for Money and Evans, 2009, p. 165). In other words, social capital according to Bourdieu requires recognition of a minimum level of substantive harmony between the members of

the founding group (Boukhazir, 2013, p. 147). According to Bourdieu, social capital is combined from the network of social relations and the amount of capital owned by the members of this network. The interaction between these two components takes place through the symbolic and material exchange. It results in social relations which usable and alerts according to obligations, feelings, institutional guarantees to achieve benefits and advantages. Also, the nature of these relations and their cohesion among the group's members are positive affects the promotion of democracy in any society.

2. The relationship between social capital and democracy according to James Coleman:

Coleman: Coleman relied on social capital as a central concept in most of his studies. He included it in six topics which are: the social organization of the education, the performance and equality in education, the sociology of education and concept of social capital, the applied research in a field of social sciences and the foundations of social theory. (Jon, 1996, p. 40). The theoretical contributions of Coleman to the

concept of social capital came in the context of his approach to the theory of "rational choice" as an attempt to explain economic phenomena and their relationship with the social phenomena and their impact on democracy. Therefore, he believes that social capital is a method of introducing the social structure into the framework of rational action. He emphasized his aim to import the principle of economists which is "rational choice" to use it in the analysis of the social system without neglecting the social organization in this process. Also, he considered social capital as a supported way to achieve this thing (Coleman, 1988, p.93). In other words, the development of the concept of social capital via Coleman falls within the framework of a project to formulate the general theory of social action. Whereas, he was seeking to integrate the economic approach with the social approach. Coleman has indicated that there are two lines of thought to describe and explain social action. The first one is the social actor and action which are governed via the social norms, rules and obligations that

contribute to describing the action in the social context. Also, it clarifies how the action formed, obstructed, and redirected through the social context. While the other one sees that the actor has independent goals which are stemming from an independent and self-interest action (Coleman, 1988, p. 97). To overtake this and merge the social theory within the economic theory, Coleman relied on the concept of social capital. The aim was to transcend the division and build bridges to provide the analyzes of socio-economic phenomena. In other words, Coleman in his thesis depended on the social capital in an attempt to bridge the gap between the social and economic approaches to explaining the social action by asserting the rational choice for this is the social capital (Coleman, 1990, p.219).

Coleman defines social capital as follows: "it is not a single entity, but a diverse group of entities that share two main characteristics". The first characteristic that consists of some aspect of the social structure. While the second one that it facilitates the conduct of the certain actions of actors inside the structure. Like other forms of social capital have a

productive nature allowing the possibility of achieving the specific goals which are not achievable in its absence. Social capital is not completely substitutable, but it is exchangeable with the respect to specific activities (Coleman, 1988, p. 64). Also, he defined it as "a group of elements that exist in a structural framework, or a specific social structure. These elements are share two characteristics:

These elements exist within the social structure that extends from the family to the government institutions. Also, it includes a large number of other social structures.

These elements help the individuals to carry out the set of common activities to achieve the set of goals "(Coleman, 1990, p.217). In his study of social capital, Coleman focused on how the actors produce social capital, and how they have used it. Even as, Coleman was not interested in studying societal trust as one of the components of social capital. Rather than, he focused on the special trust that is formed among the members of the group as a result of direct interaction between them. Because it serves specific goals and it hasn't any importance outside the group. Moreover, he emphasized that the existence of social capital cannot be inferred except through the functions which perform. This has been proven by

the presence of some groups that enjoy the balance of connections and mutual trust between their members. Furthermore, it is not possible to determine whether this society possesses the stock of social capital or not, due to the lack of clarity of the goals that it contributes to achieving (Coleman, 1990, p.222). As a result, Coleman's social capital represents a real or potential resource obtained from the social relations, with a consideration that the adoption of any relationship as a fund depends on whether this relationship performs a function for the individuals. According to Coleman's approach, social capital is formed through three interrelated stages that greatly affect the extent to which democracy is strengthened and regressed:

Obligations: It is the first stage of the formation of social capital. It begins when the person helps others according to a full and decisive conviction that what he doing is a personal commitment to society.

Expectations: It is the second stage in which the person is expected to receive assistance from others when he needs it. This stage concurs with the first stage.

Reliability or trust: It is the last stage in the formation of social capital. It completed when the social relations between members of society are surrounded by the ambience of mutual trust. (Jon, 1996, p.

42). Coleman was not satisfied with presenting these three stages of the formation of social capital. It also presented a set of factors that affect a building or destruction of social capital. The most prominent of these factors are occlusion: which mean whether the social network is closed or not. Stability: that is the stability of the social structure. Because of that, social capital depends on stability. Any defect in the social structure or the relations of society can lead to the destruction of social capital. Ideology: It affects the building or destruction of social capital. The existence of an ideology which individuals concern about, agglomerate and believe in it makes the individuals ready to act for something or any idea, someone other than themselves (Coleman, 1990, p. 212). Coleman's approach in the mechanism of social capital formation and its impact on democracy is depending on two main components. The first one relates to the value aspect or criteria such as trust, reciprocity, and social obligations. While the second component relates to the structural aspect that is related to the closeness of networks, which mean the closed structure. It also related to their stability and the temporal continuity of the relationships inside it (Etcheverry, 1996, p. 41).

3. The relationship between social capital and democracy according to Robert Putnam: Putnam is considered as one of the most important scientists who promoted the concept of social capital. Also, he is responsible for entering the concept into the circle of political discourse and spreading it across wide areas. His work on the concept of social capital considered as an application of the ideas of a trend that deals with capital as a collective resource. As his studies led to the transfer of the study of social capital from an individual level to the social level. Furthermore, He tried to study a relationship between social values and political positions. In his first study, he relied on social capital as a core concept. Mainly, he examines the role of civil society participation in generating political stability and economic prosperity within the field research in Italy about the differential performance of institutional democracy in various regions of Italy, which is (Making Democracy Work: Civic traditions in modern Italy). Then, he turned his attention to the United States of America through his book (Bowling Alone:

America's Declining Social Capital), in which he presented assumptions about social capital and its relationship to civil interdependence. He emphasized the decline of the social capital in the United States of America since 1940. (Field, 2003, p. 29).

Putnam's studies rely on the central hypothesis that the size and extent of civic and community participation in unions, civil associations and social institutions determine the size of social capital in the society. Because such associations, institutions and unions consolidate and enrich the collective norms and social trust (Abu Al-Douh and Layla, *Social Capital: New Frontiers in Social Theory*, 2014, p.p 122-123). As a result, Putnam believed that social capital is characteristics of social organization such as the networks, the norms, and a social trust which facilitate the coordination and cooperation processes between the individuals to achieve mutual benefit (Abu Al-Douh, *Wasting Social Capital in Egypt*, 2009, p.520).

Putnam defines the social capital: "it embodies the fundamentals of social organization that represented in trust, networks and standards through which they can contribute to achieving the development and progress within a society,

whether at the level of individuals, groups or institutions" (Putnam, 1993, p. 210, p. 43). He also defined the social capital as "the characteristics of the social life (networks, norms, and trust) that enable the participants to work together more effectively to pursue the common goals" (Putnam, *Democracy in flux: the evolution of social capital in contemporary society*, 2002, p. 45). From the two definitions, it is noticed that three components (networks, norms, trust) have not changed, but what has changed particularly is the identification of participants as beneficiaries of social capital rather than the society. Therefore, Putnam later referred to both the community and the participants as actors. According to that, he defined social capital as "the aspects of social life which make the society more productive and related to the participation, trust and reciprocity (Putnam, *Democracy in flux: the evolution of social capital in contemporary society*, 2002, p. 47). Therefore, Putnam has classified the social capital into three types depending on the social connections and networks that is based on, which are:

Bonding social capital: It is formed between the groups of individuals who share the social, ethnic or religious bond.

Bridging social capital: It is formed within the framework of strong social groups in

which the relations are sophisticated and complex. As the individual does not find himself forced to join it, but he voluntarily organizes for it such as the civil society institutions. Moreover, membership in these groups does not mandatory. So, the individual can move from one group to another and also he can join more than one group.

Institutional capital: It is depended on the hierarchical relationships and different levels of authority such as in the governmental institutions, parties and companies. (Putnam, *Democracy in flux: the evolution of social capital in contemporary society*, 2002, p. 51). It should be noticed that Putnam emphasized the success of society in building and accumulating social capital is depends on the interaction between the three components which are the networks, norms, trust on the basis that the existence of one of these components depends on the other ones. Trust is borrowed through the reciprocity exchanges which is spread and transmitted through the social networks (Putnam, 1993, p. 212). Putnam believes that the main basis of social capital lies in the value which the social networks carry. This means that social capital indicates the societal value of social networks and the support and assistance between each other. (Putnam, *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of the American community*, 2002,

p. 23). On this basis, social capital resembles "civic recommendation." It also has a close relationship with political participation, but political participation must depend on the relations with political institutions. Also, social capital depends on the relationships between people (Hauberer, 2011, p. 53). According to the forms of the social capital presented by Putnam, he also classified the outputs of social capital into two main types:

A. Social outputs created by superficial or casual social relationships between individuals, which mean that the output of private capital is limited to individuals who seek to exchange information and news. Also, they pursue to form their social network of relationships through acquiring new friendships.

B. Social outputs created by the strong relationships that already exist between members of the same family or close friends, which mean that the outputs of associative social capital reflected in the efforts of the parties of relationship to exchange the opinions, personal and friendly feelings and various benefits in the manner that increases the strength of these social relationships. (Castiglione, 2008, page 355).

Putnam's social capital and its role in promoting democracy can be embodied in the group whose members are trustworthy.

Also, they put the mutual trust between them which results in the additional ability to accomplish in compared to other groups that lack trust among their members. It also embodies the fundamentals of social organization which are represented in trust, cooperation and networking which can contribute to achieving the development and progress within a society. Thus, it enhances the democratic values of individuals, groups, institutions and the political system.

Second: Resources and dimensions of the social capital and their role in promoting democracy

The roots of the relationship between social capital and democracy were found in the writings of the French thinker "Tocqueville" on democracy in the United States of America. He presented it in his book "Democracy in America" which presented the results of his visit to the United States of America in 1853. Tocqueville during this visit tried to identify the reasons about society like American society which its members enjoy a high degree of individual equality. At the same time, they can fully exercise their fundamental rights and freedoms without intervention from anyone, also without suppression or interference from the state (Toqueville, 1954, p. 34). After that, several studies appeared to confirm the

importance of social capital and its role in promoting democracy including the studies via Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman, and Robert Putnam which discussed in the first demand of this study.

The nature of the relationship between social capital and democracy is mutually reciprocal and exclusive. This means that a high balance of social capital of society will strengthen more democracy, and vice versa. The nature of this reciprocal and exclusive relationship can be set by three main determinants of the social capital which are mutual obligations, community trust, solidarity, social ties and networks.

1. Mutual obligations and their role in promoting democracy:

Mutual obligations are one of the most important dimensions of social capital embedded in the principle of citizenship. This means a relationship between an individual and a state as it defined by the law of that state, and the duties and rights contained in that relationship. It is linked to the freedom and responsibilities that accompany it. Citizenship is given the political rights for the cities such as the right to vote and hold the public office "(Oliver & Heater, 1994, pp. 3-7). Accordingly, the mutual obligations mean that all

components of citizenship which represented by the citizen, society, and the state are committed to a systemic or personal commitment to carry out the work, tasks and responsibilities entrusted to each one according to its position and role. Also, to achieve the goals of everyone depending on the national interest. A commitment means adhering to the social norms and values effectively prevailing in society and achieving the public interest (Darwish, 2009, p. 289). The actual implementation of these obligations requires supervision and follow-up of independent authorities that bind the parties of citizenship to carry out their duties and tasks. The most important of these powers are legislative, executive, judicial, as well as civil society institutions. Therefore, the commitment should be mutual between the parties, which means that the commitment of the citizen towards his country, and the commitment to the state towards the citizen. The commitment is represented in the form of reciprocal rights and duties between the parties of citizenship. These mutual obligations are embodied in three basic aspects:

The First aspect: The citizen's commitment to his country: This commitment includes several important aspects, which are (Darwish, 2009, pages 289-291):

The citizen's commitment to laws and regulations, respect the freedoms of others, implementing his duties towards the society and the state. This represents a social contract between the citizens, the state and society to achieve the private interest under the public interest of the nation. The commitment to the public interest, preservation of the environment and public property respect the rules of conduct and the requirements of public orders and morals.

The good representation of the state and society, and preserving its reputation in all circumstances and times. Commitment in its comprehensive concept has many forms which including the local product encouraging, saving the property in the banking sector, and behave well in economic crises and other emergencies.

Certainly, when every citizen performs his obligations towards his country, this means that there is a society that appreciates and performs national obligations in a civilized and automatic manner.

The second aspect: the obligation of the state towards the citizen. The state has duties and obligations that must fulfill it such as (Obaid, 2006, page 17):

- A. Providing a sense of comprehensive internal and external security in all fields.
- B. The commitment to achieving justice, equality and the rule of law when implementing laws and regulations. The ruling must also be depended on the approach that acceptable to the people.
- C. Commitment to satisfying the basic needs of the citizens and Provide the various public and social services that ensures a decent life for the members of society.
- D. Securing all freedoms for the members of society and in various areas of life.
- E. Commitment to adopting the principle of equal opportunities in all areas of the state's activities in the manner that the public achieves interest and works for the advancement and development of the nation.

As a result, it can be said that the mutual commitment between the citizen and state realizes the principle of effective citizenship and guarantees it for all

members of the society without any exception.

The third aspect: which means balance depending on the principle of responsible citizenship balance that achieves the private interest-based in achieving the public interest, or not dissenting it direct or indirect manner. Then, there will be a control and balance between the freedom and responsibility, the freedom and security, the private and public interest, or the rights and duties and other areas of all parties of the citizenship. The accurate preservation of this balance is the stone and fundamental value of citizenship (Marshall, 1950, p. 46). Therefore; we noticed that the mutual obligations reinforce the principle of citizenship which represents a fundamental pillar of democracy. It emphasizes several political, legal and social aspects. Politically, it affirms the right to effect political participation which leading to political equality among all citizens and their constitutional eligibility to hold public office. Legally, the principle is fulfilled when it constitutionally defined for everyone who holds the nationality of state without discrimination based on race, language, or religion. The exercise of citizenship rights ranges from mere legal equality to the real one when the citizen possesses the sources of political participation. The political and social

system gradually empowers every citizen with freedom of expression and association, and also guarantees a minimum income, wealth, alternative information; a social and cultural position that liberates his volition and allows him to participate depended on an equal basis with others in the process of making binding collective decisions (Janoski, 1998, p. 29).

2. Societal trust and its role in promoting democracy:

Most researchers who are interested in studying the relationship between social capital and democracy confirm the importance of societal trust between the individuals belonging to the social networks and ties. Social trust is the cultural dimension of social capital. While societal trust generally refers to the way people relate to one another. It also expresses the collective attitudes of the people towards their fellow citizens. It can be defined as the vested interest which makes it possible to maintain peaceful and stable social relations that represent the basis of group behavior and productive cooperation. It can pose dangers, but it also helps to transform the natural state from something repugnant, brutal and short to

something more enjoyable, effective and more peaceful. A social life without trust will be unbearable and completely impossible (Park & Shin, 2003, pp. 7-8).

Societies are classified according to the form of the social ties which prevailing in them into the family societies in which the family and links in its broader form such as the tribe and clan are the basic core for any social interactions. On the other hand, there are societies described as societies of high confidence. These societies are varied forms of social interactions. This can be allowing the individual to belong to more than one social structure at the same time. These two types of societies fall on a frequent line. Furthermore, the societies vary in proximity or distance according to the degree of existing societal trust which results in the marked disparities in the degrees of economic, political and social progress (Fukuyama, Social Capital, Civil Society and Development, 2001, p. 7). Societies are classified according to the power and influence of social capital into three types (Francis, 1995, pp. 87-90):

- a. Societies do not have the trust between the individuals with each other, and between the individuals and state with its various

institutions on the other hand.

- b. Patriarchal societies in which the only way to form the social tendency is the family. Also, the traditional values control the relationship of individuals with each other and their relationship with others outside the scope of this group.
- c. Societies in which the levels of societal trust are high. These societies are characterized by the presence of a strong and spontaneous tendency to communicate with others. It also has extensive networks of voluntary institutions and social structures in which the social relations deviate from the traditional patterns.

Many researchers put forward the opinions that confirm the existence of a dense network of associations and volunteer organizations to the citizens belong which helps in preserving the civil society and community relations in a way that generates trust and cooperation among citizens and a high level of the civic participation. Therefore, trust creates

circumstances conducive to social integration, awareness, public work and democratic stability. However, another group of researchers believe that these views are incorrect for several reasons. First, there is little evidence that the volunteer organization membership has much to do with the individual attitudes of trust. Second, the evidence shows that social trust among citizens is not closely related to political trust between the citizens and political leaders. Third, surveys indicate that the different types of individuals express social and political trust for different reasons. It follows that social and political trust has no common origins under the same social conditions. They are different things for different reasons (Newton, 2001, p. 201). Several variations on these topics can be found in recent writings about social capital. They are mainly derived from the social theory for Tocqueville and Mill who assert that trust has its origins in this vast, deep and intense network of voluntary associations and intermediary organizations that make up the civil society. Since that trust is the main component of social capital. Then, social capital is a necessary condition for social integration, economic efficiency, stability and democratic consolidation (Newton, 2001, p.202). The thing that should be mentioned here is the different forms of trust do not constitute the single

unifying syndrome, as the psychological approach to trust assumes because the relationship between the social and political trust is weak or non-existent between them. Also, there is nothing approximate can be expected about the person's trust in others from their trust in the government. These different forms of trust are largely independent of each other. In other words, evidence indicates that we should not treat a trust as a general character trait, but a distinction must be made between social trust and political trust. It recognizing that they are not different aspects of the same thing and not necessarily related to each other empirically (Gambetta, 1988, p. 69). Concerning political trust which is related to the theory of political capital as social trust that related to social capital. This matter explains the confusing relationship between them because there are many synonyms and different measures of social trust. There is political confidence represented by the mentality and civic participation, citizenship, political interests, participation, concern for the public interest, political tolerance, the ability to compromise and confidence in the political institutions. The idea of political trust and political capital is that the modern social science version of the traditional concept of brotherhood - along with freedom and equality represents a

necessary condition for democracy (Seligman, 1997, p. 49). Political trust and social trust are similar in some respects but different in others. Social trust between individuals can be depended on the direct experience of others. Whereas political trust is learned in general indirectly, remotely, and through multiple formal and informal institutions. However, social trust is necessary for social life. So, political trust is essential for democratic political life. For example, recent research shows that social and political trust greatly increases the chances of citizens paying taxes. Hence, trust improves practical possibilities of social cooperation and reducing at the same time the risks of free use of citizens and exploitative elites (Scholz, 1998, p. 398-417). Many researchers believe that there is a strong relationship between social capital and political discontent on the other hand. So, the decline in social capital is likely to cause a loss of confidence in political leadership and a loss of confidence in government institutions. The firm society in which a large number of diverse social networks exist is necessary to preserve the necessary civic virtues for the democratic government. Voluntary organizations are important forms of social networks. Also, the trust between citizens and their political leaders is a major expression of the civic virtues that contribute to the

consolidation and consolidation of democracy (Newton K., 2001, p. 2).

In general, social trust and trustworthy behavior which is depended on provides the social climate that affects everyone in society whether strong or weak, regardless of their personal tendency to trust or distrust (Meer, 2003, pp. 33-51). Trust is important because it is part, perhaps the most important part, of social capital. After all, that social capital is a "moral resource," and this is very important. Primarily, social capital reflects the value system, especially the social trust that promotes the establishment and existence of the civic networks in social life. This is called "social interdependence" (Uslaner, 2006, p. 2).

The relationship between democracy and trust is not a simple equation. Democracy leads to feelings of optimism, control, and confidence. Democracy can only produce a sense of optimism if people believe that they have a real opportunity to bring change. Trust also creates a vital society in many ways. It promotes cooperation and leads people to take active roles in their community, act ethically, and compromise. People who trust others are not completely ready to reject ideas that they disagree with it, enhance diversity and accept criticism. This is because they can't get what they want and they are ready to listen

to the other side. Societies with civic activism and ethical behavior that give other individuals what they deserve are more prosperous (Sides, 1999). Also, trust enhances solidarity among members of a community. While solidarity is used to describe the relationships within a specific group such as the community. These relationships usually exist because of a similar situation to shared life and values. Solidarity means help and support between the strong and weak, rich and poor, old and youth, and the willingness to defend each other. Often, this type of relationship exists within families, but most of the theorists of social democracy have called and demanded the expansion of this type of relations to a societal level (Bläsius, 2009, p. 33). Solidarity creates a kind of force that pushes people to help each other. This help is unrestrained and individual. It is the thing that keeps societies interconnected with each other. The idea of solidarity goes beyond the one of group self-interest. That is, it calls for the transcendence of individualism and concern for collectivism. Also, it expresses the way that the members of society operate which is depended on the principle of mutual joint responsibility. Furthermore, solidarity is a condition of equality. It is a feeling of closeness, familiarity, and interdependence that works to prevent the strong (the rich) from

overtaking the weak (the poor). It is also at the same time imposing equality in society to a certain extent. Equality in society is not the way to prevent others from caring and developing themselves. On the contrary, it means that helps individuals to develop themselves for the sake of community service (Ingvar & Anne-Marie, 2007, p. 32). Generally, solidarity is organized and strengthened through accepted the general rules and political institutions as the welfare state undertakes to organize and strengthen this process through a funded tax policy, the social insurance system such as protection from unemployment, health care, pensions, and education which is financed and common. They provide security to an individual, help to ensure equality of opportunity. This institutional is depended on solidarity (Ingvar & Anne-Marie, 2007, p. 31). The solidarity motives and common interests play a role in determining the behavior of the individuals. Cooperation and interdependence between the individuals in society generate mutual trust between them. Then, it enhances the individual's ability to act in solidarity. Instead, the individual will be fully prepared to employ his performance to preserve the public good in an event that it assumed several individuals in the society will act as solidarity as well. At the same time, it is not compulsory and does not rise to the

level of fulfilling a duty from the legal viewpoint. As solidarity denotes the ethical duty to deal depended on the mutual willingness to help individuals within their community (Bläsius, 2009, p. 36).

Finally, it can be said that trust contributes to building and disseminating the values of political and intellectual moderation and tolerance, accepting the pluralism in a field of thought and politics, believing in dialogue as a means of persuasion and conviction which is one of the most important paths of entrenched administration, citizenship, equality, and the rule of law. These conditions represented as conditions and components of the social capital that enhance democracy.

3. Social networks and their role in promoting civil society and democracy:

Since the end of the last century, a controversy has arisen over the relationship of social capital and democracy. This debate stems from a basic point which is the connection of some researchers between the extent of democracy in any society and the performance of intermediate organizations, i.e. the civil organizations that play various roles which contribute to

strengthening and stabilizing democracy. This is because the assets of social capital are related and connected to the social structure. At the same time, they must be linked to social action to achieve their goals. These resources are summarized in: First: the relationships, ties and networks that the individuals establish to achieve certain goals such as the unions, parties, associations of public benefit and networks, ties and other relationships that establish the civic life. Second: the value system contains a set of values which the foremost one is trust, transparency, solidarity, rationality, acceptance of others and many other values that contribute to building the civil society and enhance democracy (Coleman, 1988, p. 98). That is, civil society is linked to social capital. Regarding that, Fukuyama states that the "civil society is linked to social capital and rises as a result of social capital, but it does not constitute the social capital itself. The abundance of social capital is supposed to produce the intensive civil society which is a necessary condition for democracy "(Fukuyama, Social Capital and

Civil Society, 2002, p. 28) that respects the human rights, freedom of expression and association in society as a whole. This represents an essential asset for creating social capital. In contrast to authoritarian regimes, thus creating a type of capital is much more difficult. The essence of the civic participation process depended on voluntary participation and horizontal interaction as opposed to the vertical interaction between the authoritarian regimes and members of society. This participation appears in several social organizations such as clubs, societies, trade unions and popular organizations. The more intense work of these bodies, the greater ability of the community members to cooperate for the sake of mutual interest (Pamela, 2002, pp. 254-277). Many researchers have emphasized the importance of social ties and networks in promoting democracy such as Tocqueville. He emphasized that the existence of civil organizations achieves the balance between absolute individuality and equality. As the individual learns from an early age to join the civil societies to fulfill some of his needs. This is

due to his belief in the inability to meet his needs without the assistance of others which contributes to the formation of associations for all purposes that related to their life affairs, whether religious, entertainment or economic affairs. Thus, they achieve a balance between equality and individuality (Toqueville, 1954, p. 39). He said that associations are a school that learns the individuals within the art of bonding through renouncing selfishness. Also, it teaches them how to achieve their goals which do not affect the chances of others to achieve their interests and reflect their interest in the interests of the community (Hamid 2010, p. 62). Tocqueville distinguished between associations that established to defend political goals such as the associations for the defense of human rights and those that established to serve public goals and their names. Regarding the relationship between political and civil societies, the presence of civil societies and the practice of their activities pave the way to achieve its goals. Political associations according to Tocqueville belief, are the basis of any real democratic

system because the association of an individual with each other makes him more willing to interact with others and participate in activities and interests outside the circle of his interests. Also through political societies, the individuals learn how to integrate around a common goal or interest. Thus, contributing to breaking social and economic barriers prevent individuals from participating in public life. As for the civil societies, they are established to serve the purposes related to everyday matters which the existence is often linked to the realization of the direct interests of their members (Toqueville, 1954, p. 45). Therefore, Tocqueville emphasized that the relationship between these two types of associations is a reciprocal one that supports each other and none of them is indispensable for the other (Al-Hamid, 2010, p. 65). While other researchers consider that the mere existence of social networks and ties will lead to the formation of civil society institutions. They consider it as sufficient evidence that society enjoys a stock of social capital. Which is considered as one of the most important indicators of

the democracy of a society. Also, it is the point that Putnam focused on it when he referred to the importance of civil organizations for the effectiveness and stability of democratic systems. He believes that this is due to the impact which these organizations, networks and links play on members through the processes of political upbringing they carry out via using the set of mechanisms and by a set of principles in their pursuit of several public or private goals. The individual's joining any of these institutions also leads to the development of his confidence in those around him and outside his narrow boundaries, which is called "community trust" (Putnam, *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of the American community*, 2002, p. 63). Also, the individual's that joining any of these institutions leads to the development of his trust in those around and outside his tight boundaries. This trust is called the community trust (Putnam, *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of the American community*, 2002, p. 63). Other researchers emphasize that the social ties and networks contribute to the formation of the

civil group which contributes to achieving effectiveness and stability of the democratic government. Because of its effects on the individuals on the side and the system of government on the other one. In the terms of its impact on individuals, it finds that the civil group ingrain in its members set of customs and values such as cooperation, active participation, the promotion of collective action, sense of shared responsibility, and others. As for its impact on a system of the government, it affects the decision-making process, impressing the government system to work on expressing interests, gathering the common interests, expanding the political participation, enhancing confidence between the political system and members of the society, respecting the law, and communicating the citizens' willingness and needs to the decision-makers. This contributes to protecting them from misuse of the power and influence of those who can impact the decision-making and take it. Also, this can be strengthened through the social networks and ties which form the civil groups (Maloney & Others, 2001, p. 212). These civil

networks and social ties relieve the problems of collective action through the institution of social interaction, reduce opportunism, enhance trust, and facilitate political and economic transactions. Also, it increases the flow of information which is the basis for reliable social, economic, and political cooperation and public participation. All these social relationships and norms constitute the social capital that contributes the democratic consolidation. According to these researchers, civil society represents the non-governmental institutional arrangements in society. While, the social capital describes an underlying social relationship from these institutional arrangements (Knoke, 1999, p.9). Also, Fukuyama affirms that the existence of a strong civil society works to achieve the balance between powers of the state and rights of citizens to protect them from the state's abuse of its power. In addition to the absence of civil society, the state will have to play the role that the civil society utilized to play which is so impossible, resulting in a turbulent political system that cannot

respond to the citizens' demands. Here, the concept of social capital is important and vital in issues of democratization, political participation, and the issue of legality (Francis, 1995, pp. 87-90).

Democracy consolidation also requires the existence of a civil culture that believes in democratic principles and their values. Furthermore, the institutions which represent the people cannot function without the people having democratic values and believing in them. This civil culture cannot be in the form of institutions, constitutions, and laws, but in the form of a culture permeated in those institutions, constitutions and laws. Civil culture is also related to political culture. It defines the views and attitudes of citizens towards the political system and an entirely political process. It works to determine the patterns of the political behavior of citizens as well as their positions towards the political system in terms of support or opposition, and their vision of the effectiveness of that system (Kelly, 2003). Donald R. Kelly has identified the characteristics of democratic civil culture through that the impact and contribution of this culture in the formation of the social capital, and then to strengthen the

democracy as shown in the following (Kelly, 2003):

- A. The broad agreement among the citizens that there an existing society. This society is known to be a nation rooted in the state which brings together all elements of society despite the ethnic, religious and sectarian differences between these elements.
- B. Citizens' broad acceptances of the written and customary democratic rules including the freedom to vote, organizes, and assemble, and so on.
- C. The widespread acceptance of the existing form of the government. Also, the desire to change the form of government is implemented through constitutional rules.
- D. The widespread acceptance of the idea of government effectiveness. Which mean its ability to make authoritative decisions, collecting the public resources and taxes, and implementing the decisions.
- E. The general acceptance of the idea of citizen effectiveness. This meaning that they are independent and have their own political identity, and also their actions and activities may make a difference and have an impact.
- F. Popular tolerance to the political and social diversity, and the

acceptance of what this diversity has established within society.

- G. The widespread acceptance to the rule of law and committing to it.

CONCLUSION

A society cannot be democratic and believes in rights and freedoms. Likewise, it cannot adhere to the logic of the difference, the legitimacy of dialogue, tolerance and acceptance the others unless this society was prepared for the truly democratic and civil culture through behavior, action and implementation. This can only be achieved if society can create social capital through multiple institutions. These institutions carry out the education and upbringing processes that work to teach an individual the sound democratic and civil culture by utilizing the laws, standards, values and application. And democracy cannot consolidate in the absence of a social capital to ensure the necessary emotional and cognitive support for embracing the democratic principles and values. the social capital as a valuable social resource that is accumulated and developed via activities of civil society organizations: through reciprocal relationships as well as through relations with the domain of political power. Civil society, as the institutional actor of political participation, is in a relationship with social capital, which, to a great extent, improves the political, economic

and cultural aspects. The strengthening and development of civil society have a positive impact on the strengthening and development of social capital and vice versa. On the other hand, social capital lays a solid foundation and a base for the growth and strengthening of civil society,

thus raising citizens' awareness about political participation which is an indispensable ingredient of the development of democracy. By depicting norms, networking and trust, as well as by distinguishing bonding from bridging social capital.



REFERENCES

1. Almond A., G. a. (1965). *The civic culture ,Political attitudes and Democracy in five nations*. U.S.A: The Little Brown Series in Comparative.
2. Bläsius, J. a. (2009). *oundations of Social Democracy*,. (J. Patterson, Trans.) Berlin: riedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
3. bourdieu, p. (1986). *the forms of capital*. (j. g. richardson, Ed.) new york: greenwood press.
4. bourdieu, p. (1989). *social space and symbolic power*. *sociological theory*, 7.
5. Bourdieu, P. (2009). *Questions de sociologie*. Paris: les editions de minuit.
6. Brgatta, E. f., & Montgomery, R. J. (2000). *Encyclopedia of sociology* (Vol. 4). New York: miamian references .
7. Castiglione, D. (2008). *the handbook of social capital*. New York: Oxford university press.
8. coleman, j. (1988). *social capital in creation of human capital*. *american journal of sociology*, 44, 93.
9. Coleman, J. (1990). *foundations of social theory*. Cambridge: harvard university press.
10. Etcheverry, E. (1996). *social capital: A resource for the human capital development of university student*. canada: university of manitoba.
11. Evans Bryan and others, ,. (2012). *Social Democracy After the Cold War*. (E. B. Ingoan, Ed.) Canada: AU Press, Athabasca University.
12. Field, J. (2003). *social capital*. london: routledge.
13. Fine, B., & Dimitris, M. (2010). *theories of social capital*. London: pluto press.
14. Francis, F. (1995). *Trust: The Social virtues and Creation of Prosperity*. New York: Free Press,.
15. Fukuyama, F. (2001). *Social Capital, Civil Society and Development*. *Third World Quarterly*, 22, p. 7.

16. Fukuyama, F. (2002). *Social Capital and Civil Society*. international monetary fund.
17. Gambetta, D. (1988). *Trust: Making and Breaking Social Relations*. Oxford: Oxford university press.
18. Grootaert, C. (2004). *Measuring social capital: An integrated Questiooaire*. Washington: the word bank.
19. Hanifan, A. J. (1920). *The community center*. Boston: silver and burdett company.
20. harker, r. (1990). *an introduction to the work of pierre bourdieu*. new york: mac millan press.
21. Hauberer, J. (2011). *social capital theory: towards a methodological foundation*. sozialwissenschaften.
22. Ingvar, C., & Anne-Marie, L. (2007). *What is Social Democracy?* Sweden: Arbetarrörelsens Tankesmedja publisher.
23. Janoski, T. (1998). *Citizenship and Civil Society*. Cambridge University Press.
24. K, S., & C, S. (2013). *Four Interpretations of Social Capital: An Agenda for Measurement*. Retrieved from http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/four-interpretations-of-social-capital_5jzbcx010wmt-en.
25. Knoke, D. (1999). *Organizational Networks and Corprate Social*. In R. T. Gabbay (Ed.), *Corporate Social Capital and Liability* (p. 9). Boston: :Kluwer Academic Publishers .
26. Lin, N. (1999). *Building a network theory of social capital* (Vol. 22). international network of social network analysis.
27. lin, n. (2001). *social capital: a theory of social structure and action*. cambridge: cambridge university.
28. Maloney, W. A., & Others. (2001). *Social capital and associational life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
29. Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge University Press.

30. Meer, V. d. (2003). *Rain or fog? An empirical examination of social capital's rainmaker*. In M. H. Stolle, *Social Capital: Civil Society and Institutions* (pp. 33-51). Palgrave: Basingtoke.
31. Michael, F., & Edwards, B. (1997). *Escape from politics: social theory and social capital debate*. *American Behavioral scientist*, 40, 549.
32. Newton, K. (2001). *Social Trust and Political Disaffection: Social Capital and Democracy*. *Social Capital: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Exeter: the EURESCO.
33. Newton, K. (2001). *Trust, Social Capital, Civil Society, and Democracy*. *International Political Science Review*, 22(2), p. 202.
34. Nisbet, P. (2007). *Human capital vs Social capital: employment security and self-employment in the UK construction industry*. *international journal of social economic*, 34, 525-537.
35. Oliver , D., & Heater, D. (1994). *The Foundation of Citizenship*. London: Harveteror Wheats Leaf,.
36. Pamela, P. (2002, Apr). *Social Capital and Democracy: An Interdependent Relationship*. *American Sociological Review*, 67(2), 254-277.
37. Park, C.-m., & Shin, D. (2003). *Social Capital and Democratic Citizenship: A Comparative Survey of Democracy, Governance and Development*, 12, pp. 7-8.
38. putnam, r. (1993). *making democracy work: civic traditions in modern italy*. princeton, new jersey: princeton university press.
39. Putnam, R. (2002). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. U.S.A: Harvard university press.
40. Putnam, R. (2002). *Democracy in flux: the evolution of social capital in contemporary society*. london: oxford university press.
41. ritzer, g. (2005). *encyclopedia of social theory*. london: sage publication.
42. Scholz, J. a. (1998). *Trust and Taxpaying: Testing the Heuristic Approach*. *American Journal of Political Science*, 42(2), 398-417.
43. Seligman, A. B. (1997). *The Problem of Trust*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

44. Serageldin , I., & Grootart, C. (1977). *Defining social capital: An integrating review*. Washington D.C: the world bank.
45. serageldin, i., & grootaert, c. (1998). *defining social capital: an integrating review*. washington: the world bank.
46. Sides, J. (1999). *IT TAKES TWO: THE RECIPROCAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CAPITAL AND DEMOCRACY*. (California Digital Library) Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2z6534q2>.
47. Toqueville, A. D. (1954). *Democracy in America*. New York: Vintage Books.
48. Ulriksen, C. (2008). *The significance of social capital as a concept for understanding and analyzing community- based orgnization: lessons for chile*. Boston: Tufts university .
49. Uslaner, E. M. (2006). *Democracy and Social Capital*. In M. Warren, *Democracy and Trust* (p. 2). Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
50. Abu Al-Douh Khaled. Kazem. (2009). *Wasting social capital in Egypt*. Democracy Magazine.
51. Abu Al-Douh, Khaled. And Kazem Layla, (2014). *Social Capital: New Frontiers in Social Theory*. Cairo: ATRAC Printing and Publishing.
52. Hamid, Angie. Mohammed. (2010). *The role of civil society in the formation of social capital - a case study for NGOs in Egypt*. Cairo: Egyptian Center for Economic and Social Rights.
53. Bu Rakhays, f., (2013). *The concept of social capital according to Pierre Bourdieu and the limits of Arab reception*. Additions Magazine, Issue 14.
54. Darwish, A. M. (2009). *Globalization, citizenship and national belonging*. Cairo: Library Book World.
55. Obaid, M. M. (2006). *Citizenship: Concepts of the Scientific Foundations of Knowledge*. Cairo: International Center for Future and Strategic Studies.
56. Caban, F., & Dorothy, J. (2010). *Sociology from major theories to everyday affairs: flags, histories and currents*. (A. Hassan, Trans.) Damascus: Dar Al Farqad for printing, publishing.

57. lamuni, A., & Evans, B. (2009). *Globalization: Basic Concepts*. (A. Desouky, Trans.) Beirut: The Arab Network for Research and Publishing.
58. Nassar, S. M., & others. (2010). *History of Education - a silent revolution continuing from the dawn of civilization to postmodernity*. Cairo: El Mahrousa Center.

