

# Social capital rate

Sociology



Social capital rate High social capital rate is a key factor for a prosperous society, says Putnam. Society simply doesn't work without social relations, and social capital provides society with permanent social connections which are well established and work well in a horizontal perspective within a society. Further changes in a social life rest on social capital because they are alliances of individuals what make any initiatives work. Nowadays scholars Putman, Skocpol and Ganz report on trends which changes the way social capital work in American society, and in my life I observe most of those trends.

Putman and Skocpol speak on a general decrease of social capital in American society: there're less actually working communities, and less permanent connections between members. Belonging to some communities (primary, interest groups and education), I know the trend. Communities now are either too big (cross-state association), or too small (many clubs with few members) to make a real difference. More common thing is to turn with an initiative to family members, or friends rarely succeeding great changes. Often being poorly interested in your initiative themselves, family and friends are likely to use their personal connections to support your initiative this time, but there's no permanent scheme on every business.

Due to a natural limitation of personal connections, it's common to turn with an initiative to strange, but professional associations. Selling a car, or arguing for a new playground, there are selling organizations, and associations for the rights of children, working with different people for the same goal. Skocpol says, before 1960s-1970s other kind of associations dominated in society often consisting of members with permanent social connections meeting regularly for initiatives of a different kind. According to <https://assignbuster.com/social-capital-rate/>

Ganz, these communities were a natural form of social organization for Americans since making a state, and despite being (or not being) professionals in different areas of life, members made decisions (and later, were acting) relying on a common sense, trusting each other greatly. Putman defines trust as one of the main features of social capital, and when trusting less to members of community a social capital inevitably decreases. To my mind, it's what modern professional organizations lack. Their members stay strangers for a long time turning to them with initiatives. Similar thing is with politicians to whom citizens often turn with their initiatives. Ganz points that crisis of democracy has a digital origin, and that modern politicians stay powerful strangers. I can add that nowadays voters are dealing with media image of a party, or a politician, and despite relying on TV very much (what's the opportunity?), most of Americans understand that those images lack of trust, and therefore vote intuitively, or by force of habit.

Putman says, the results of new coming trends would only be measurable decades later, but I'd like to point on a mixed nature of a social networks social capital so commonly used nowadays. Combining features of personal connections with a traditional community, social networks bring a platform for civil discussions. There are interest groups, but there are also groups for one state (or town) citizens where different initiatives can be discussed. The trust among members comes from knowing a personal profile. In this way, some initiatives can be successfully realized. Yet social network communities lack of permanence and responsibility, and therefore, it's still hard to rely on them.