

Poli 680 Syllabus

**Social Change in Advanced Industrialized Democracies
Political Culture, Social Capital and Political Participation in Comparative Perspective
Winter 2012**

Prof. Dietlind Stolle

Office: 3610 McTavish, room 24-3; Phone: 398 4400, ext. 089513.

E-Mail: please use webCT mail

Course Hours: Wednesdays 9am- 11.50am, Leacock 429

Office Hours: Tuesday/Thursday 4.15-5pm or by appointment

Synopsis of the course content: In recent years an exciting, diverse, and rapidly growing body of research has suggested that the norms and networks of civil society have powerful practical effects in many disparate political and economic arenas. This research agenda centers on concepts such as social capital, civic engagement and political participation and their implications for such fields as collective action, social welfare, economic progress, and the effectiveness of democratic government in modern societies are paramount. This seminar will focus on political culture, social capital, civil society and political participation in the broadest sense. What is social capital and why is it important? How can we measure and observe it? How is social capital related to the concept of political culture? How do civic values and social ties resolve collective action problems? How can we produce and facilitate or destroy our valuable societal resources? How can we distinguish different forms of social capital that exist in a variety of cultures and across time? How has the engagement of citizens in public life changed and transformed over the last decades? And why? This course will explore this blossoming research agenda with a focus on the advanced industrialized democracies. Students with an interest in developing countries should come and talk to me and we can assign you some different readings at times.

Seminar Goal: The seminar is designed to introduce participants to an emerging and multifaceted research arena in political science and other related disciplines such as sociology, economics, anthropology, social work, and others. It will enable students to evaluate and to contribute original research (theoretical, empirical, and/or applied) in this arena. In addition, students will be able to discuss, propose and examine public policy that might facilitate or hinder the development of social capital, political participation or civic engagement.

Requirements:

Readings: Everyone is expected to read and reflect on all required readings prior to class (additional resources are indicated in case one section interests you in particular). It is clear that completing the lion's share of all assigned reading in a timely fashion is a necessary prerequisite for satisfactory completion of the course. I suggest reading the assigned pieces with four main questions in mind (take notes on them), as we will return to them constantly in class: 1) What is the author's argument or theory, and how does it compare to or improve alternative theories that might be proposed or have been proposed by others? It often helps to note down the definition of the "dependent variable," or what the author wants to explain and the definition of the main "independent variables" (causes, explanatory factors) the author thinks are important. In addition, I suggest thinking through the "story" that knits the independent variables together into a causal explanation. Such information on every article/book will help you to prepare for a successful class discussion and for a better understanding of the literature. 2) What evidence does the author provide, and how convincing is it? In particular, we will learn in this course to identify the research design of the authors, and we will learn how to examine the design critically. Often we will ask whether alternative theories were tested, and how variables and hypotheses were operationalized and measured.

Our concerns here include also issues of sampling, index construction, data gathering, analytical approaches, and other related questions. 3) How could the research be improved? A mere critique of the readings is only one side of useful criticism; learning how to improve one's and others' research is really the ultimate goal. And 4) Think about the public policy implications of the presented work. How can theoretical insights be transferred into useful policy? What are the complications in this process? Which type of research is necessary in order to give the best policy recommendations?

Class participation: is essential. There will be some lecturing in this class, but mostly we will have a discussion among all the students about the merits of the readings presented. Class participation will constitute a part of the grade, so your volunteered quality contributions to class discussion can only help, not hurt your grade. All students are expected to contribute to the discussion, and therefore you can be called upon at times. I strongly encourage all students to get in the habit of contributing early on.

Reaction Papers: You are expected to prepare three short reaction papers (750-max.1000 words) that critically synthesize and analyze the required readings for a given week. (Suggested themes are given for each week, but other themes are acceptable and encouraged.) In the "reaction paper" students should analyze (**not summarize**) the readings of a selected week. The papers should include a discussion of at least **three or more** assigned readings for the particular week. Since these papers will be short, you should not spend time on generalities or summaries, but should go quickly into the particulars, be specific and concrete. Papers should be well-structured, contain an argument about the readings, and should explore a theme rather than a collection of a number of smaller points.

There are three types of papers (academic, policy audience, general audience). Students are expected to complete one of each type. In *academic* papers, students should take issue with the author(s) on some particular question, discuss which potential problems arise from the research or arguments of the author(s), and/or propose research-related improvements. Paper themes could be various: e.g. an analysis of particular differences in findings or approaches amongst several authors, or a synthesis of how readings complement each other theoretically; a methodological, research-design or substantive critique of selected readings, even a proposition of new research ideas, etc. Papers for *policy audiences* should be written with a policy perspective in mind. Imagine yourself as a policy advisor in this moment, writing a report or policy brief for the government based on the literature for the particular week. The policy papers should discuss the public policies which could address the problems detailed in the readings in a country or region of your choice. In short, policy papers should show policy-makers in your chosen context how relevant the studied concepts of a given week are to policies in the realm of social issues, welfare, immigration, education, governance, etc. *General audience* papers are pieces that could be published in the *Globe and Mail* or *New York Times* on the issues relevant in a given week or as online blogs. Imagine them as Op-ed pieces or blogs for general audiences.

Discussion Questions: Students who prepare papers should also submit discussion questions to all students prior to the seminar at the end of the reaction paper.

Due Dates: The paper and discussion questions are due on **Tuesday at 4pm** (on webCT) before the course session on Wednesday morning. No late papers are accepted. You may choose which weeks to skip the papers, except that you should aim to write one paper in each of the first three sections of the seminar. You may also write reaction papers for more than three weeks and drop the least successful from your record. Indeed I encourage you to do so, because you will most likely learn a lot from your first paper feedback. The additional paper should be of the type which you want to drop from your record. In class

discussion, you may be asked to quickly summarize the readings and to begin the discussion on problems and improvements of selected readings. *However, timely completion of the reading and full class participation is expected even during the weeks in which you do not submit a reaction paper.*

Research Design Report: In addition, there will be one short summary of thoughts on Putnam's book *Making Democracy Work*. For this short paper, you can work in groups (up to three people), and you are asked to critically examine the research design in Putnam's *Making Democracy Work*, according to the research design language as well as to think about issues of internal and external validity. This short statement/report (2 pages) is due before class on **January 24 at 4pm**. The report is graded as pass or fail. Further instructions will be given in class.

Mini Oral Presentation: On **February 29** you are required to give a mini-presentation about one of the readings on our syllabus for that day. The class will read the same articles as a group, except for one. The article to be presented is chosen from a list of ten. The presentation will be short (dependent on class size) and includes the main argument, dependent and independent variables, measures and critique of the study. The purpose is to get a good overview of the fast moving literature on the internet and social capital and to train and exercise presentation skills.

Final Paper: You are also required to write a longer research paper on a topic of your choice related to the course content. The purpose of the research paper is to enable each student to apply the approaches we learned during the seminar to some theoretical or practical problem of special concern to him or her. Topics for the longer paper will be discussed in class on February 8 (see below). An initial 1 paged prospectus for this paper is due on Monday February 6 at 4pm (no other major readings are assigned, all students read all the proposals submitted). Between February 8 and March 7, every participant should meet with the instructor to discuss his or her research prospectus. A final proposal is due on **March 7**. On **April 18**, every student will present their research in a mini-conference format (10 minutes or more depending on class size) in a 6-hour session. **A first draft** of the paper needs to be circulated **three days before the presentation**, on **April 15**, because we like to receive feedback from the class participants (peer review principle), and so each presentation will have assigned discussants from class. *The final research paper should be submitted on webCT no later than 4 pm on April 30.*

Research Paper length: If you choose to write a research paper, it must be **15-20 pages, double-spaced** (add references outside this page limit). However, students are encouraged to collaborate.

Collaboration on Research Papers: Students are permitted--indeed encouraged--to work on their research papers **in pairs** (21-25 pages required), or maximum in **groups of three** (26-30 pages). Students who work with others **must** undertake some element of **original research**. **This might include the collection of your own data, materials, participant observation, interviews, content coding, or original data analysis of existing data sets, etc.** Note that for your own data collection you must obtain an ethics certificate from the university, which takes in minimum about two weeks to process and you need to talk to me well in advance. In case of collaboration, each member of the group will receive the same grade. Groups work most smoothly when responsibilities are clearly assigned. Each group **must** submit a signed statement confirming that all group members participated equally in the project (signed by everyone). All group members must identify their specific responsibilities.

Research Paper Proposal: As discussed above, you are required to write a short (1 paged) and a revised (2 pages plus references) research paper proposal for your research paper in this course. One session is

entirely dedicated to discussing your proposals on **February 8**. This will give you an early start and good feedback from everyone in the class, as class members will be assigned as discussants. The revised proposals are due on **March 7 at midnight** (there is no class that day). The research proposals will be worth 5% of your final paper grade (50% for each version of the proposal). More instructions will be discussed in class.

Role of Discussants: Discussants of research paper proposals or research papers will give constructive feedback. You should read the paper/proposal, think about their merits, highlight the strengths and weaknesses, and discuss how to improve the proposal/paper. Make yourself written notes (even ppt is encouraged but not necessary).

WebCT: If you're reading a hard copy of this syllabus, you should be aware that this course has its own website on webCT, which is updated several times per week. You are *required* to check our webCT course page regularly (several times per week). On the website, more information and materials are made available to you than we have time to cover in detail in class. The site is also used for posting of fellow-student papers and proposals, which will be shared in the class. You are also encouraged to post articles of interest to the course themes. It's also a good way for you to communicate with me and with each other.

Grading:

Reaction papers and discussion questions (3 @ 10% for each paper and question set).....	30%
Putnam Research Design (Percent awarded for pass)	3%
Oral Presentation of article.....	2%
Final Research Paper and Presentation at mini-conference.....	50%
Regular class participation and role of discussant	15%

Contact: Unless otherwise announced, I will hold office hours on Tuesdays and Thursdays between 4.15-5pm in my office 24-3 at 3610 McTavish. Appointments outside this time slot can be made over webCT mail.

Readings: for the course include the following books, which are available at Paragraphe bookstore or can be bought online. Readings not found in these books are available through url's or webCT.

Robert Putnam. (1993). *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton University Press.

<http://www.netLibrary.com/urlapi.asp?action=summary&v=1&bookid=79069>

Robert Putnam. (2000). *Bowling Alone*. Simon and Schuster (we will only read some parts of this book)

Integrity: MCGILL UNIVERSITY VALUES ACADEMIC INTEGRITY. THEREFORE ALL STUDENTS MUST UNDERSTAND THE MEANING AND CONSEQUENCES OF CHEATING, PLAGIARISM AND OTHER ACADEMIC OFFENCES UNDER THE CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT AND DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES (see www.mcgill.ca/integrity for more information).

Language Policy: In accord with McGill University's Charter of Students' Rights, students in this course have the right to submit in English or in French any written work that is to be graded (approved by Senate on 21 January 2009).

Short Course Outline

Part I: Fundamentals of Political Culture and Social Capital Research

January 11	Introduction
January 18	Methodological Issues & Political Culture Research
January 25	Social Capital—A new approach in Political Culture Research?
February 1	Measurements: Trust & Networks
February 8	Discussion of research paper proposal

Part II: Shifts and Transformations in Social Capital, Engagement and Social Values

February 15	The Decline Thesis and its Critics
February 22	Winter recess— no class
February 29	The generational argument: Young people—the problem or the solution?
March 7	No class: Revise research paper proposal
March 14	New Forms of Social Capital and Civic Engagement—Substitutes or Additional Tools? Political Consumerism, Internet Activism, Protests, etc.

Part III: Sources of Social Capital, Engagement and Social Values

March 21	Top Down Influences: The Role of Social and Political Institutions
March 28	Personality Traits and Biology
April 4	The puzzle of Diversity

Part IV: Presentations and Conclusion

April 11	No class, work on paper
April 18	Presentation of Papers and Discussion (6 hour session—mini conference)

SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT SEMINAR DATES

- January 17: First reaction paper due on Tuesday at 4pm. From now on every week.
- January 24: Tuesday 4pm. Special assignment on Robert Putnam's book.
- February 6: Submission of one paged Research paper proposal at 4pm.
- February 8: Discussion of all research paper proposals, reading of proposals of every student and discussion in class.
- February 22, March 7 and April 11: No class
- February 29: Mini-presentation in class
- March 7: Revised Research Paper proposal due at midnight
- April 15: Circulation of first draft of research paper on webCT
- April 18: Research Paper Draft Presentations in class & Discussions (6 hour session)
- April 30: Final Research Paper Due on webCT at 4pm.

January 11: Introduction: Organizational Meeting (No readings)**January 18: Methodological Issues and Political Culture Research****First Half of Seminar: Causality and Experiments in Social Science Research**

→ Trochim, William M. The Research Methods Knowledge Base, 2nd Edition. Internet WWW page, at URL: <<http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/>> (version current as of 2006). Read everything under the heading DESIGN.

→ Jennings, M. Kent. "Generation Units and the Student Protest Movement in the United States: An Intra- and Intergenerational Analysis," *Political Psychology* (2002). p. 303-324.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3792292>

Second Half of Seminar: Political Culture Research

→ Clifford Geertz. "From the Native's Point of view: On the Nature of Anthropological Understanding," In *Local Knowledge*. New York: Basic Books. Inc. (webCT)

→ Almond, Gabriel and Sidney Verba, "An Approach to Political Culture", ch. 1, p. 1-44. *The Civic Culture*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1963. (webCT)

→ Robert Putnam. 1993. *Making Democracy Work*. Chapters 1 & 4.

→ David D. Laitin, "The Civic Culture at Thirty," *American Political Science Review* 89, no. 1 (1995): 168-173. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2083085>

Background: → Manheim, Jarol B., Richard C. Rich, and Lars Willnat. 2002. *Empirical Political Analysis: Research Methods in Political Science*. 5th ed. New York, NY: Longman. Skim chapter 1 and read chapter 2. On webCT.

Potential Paper or Discussion Topics:

- (1) Can social science research use the logic of experiments? If so, how? If not, why not?
- (2) How can we apply the logic of quasi-experiments to Kent Jennings' study on protest movements? Discuss threats to internal/external validity.
- (3) Which different strands of political culture research can we distinguish and how do they build on each other (or not)?
- (4) Which questions in political culture research seem to change and which seem to be persistent?
- (5) What does the concept of civic community used in Putnam entail? And how does civic community in Italy's North differ from that in the South?

January 25 Social Capital—A new approach in Political Culture Research?

January 24 Assignment due: Examine Research Design in Robert Putnam's Book and use the notation by quasi-experimental design literature.

→ Robert Putnam: *Making Democracy Work*, (add chapters 3, 5 and 6). Draw Research design of Putnam's study and critique his internal and external validity. See webCT for more details.

→ Sidney Tarrow. 1996. "Making Social Science Work Across Space and Time," *American Political Science Review*, 90 (June 1996): 389-97. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2082892>

→ Lin, Nan. 2001. *Social Capital : Capital Captured through Social Relations*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 2: p. 19-28. <http://www.mylibrary.com?id=41690>

→ Jens Rydgren. 2011. "A legacy of 'unciviness'? Social capital and radical right-wing populist voting in Eastern Europe," *Acta Politica* 46, 132-157. Link to be announced.

Additional resources

→ Levi, M. 1996. "Social and Unsocial Capital: A Review Essay of Robert Putnam's Making Democracy Work." *Politics and Society* 24, 45-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0032329296024001005>

Potential Paper or Discussion Topics:

- 1) How can we distinguish different (disciplinary) approaches to social capital research (e.g. think about different measures or different outcomes)?
- 2) In what ways does the concept of social capital illuminate or obscure? Where is the frontier in social capital theory?
- 3) How could we apply the theory of social capital to your region/country of interest?
- 4) What is Social capital according to Putnam, and how does he measure it?
- 5) What is the value and contribution of Robert Putnam's Making Democracy Work?
- 6) What are the weaknesses of his study? Discuss the internal and external validity of his study and sketch his research design—is it indeed an experiment? Does he test counter-hypotheses?
- 7) Why do some authors take such a critical view of the social capital concept?
- 8) How important is social capital for institutional performance? Do we have a definite answer?

February 1 Measurements of Social Capital: Types of Trust & the Character of Networks

→ Uslaner, Ric. (2002). "Strategic Trust and Moralistic Trust," chapter 2 in *The Moral Foundations of Trust*. Cambridge University Press (webCT)

→ Delhey, Newton and Welzel. 2011. "How General Is Trust in "Most People"? Solving the Radius of Trust Problem," *American Sociological Review* 2011 76: 786
<http://asr.sagepub.com/content/76/5/786.abstract>

→ Freitag and Traumueller. 2009. "Spheres of trust: An empirical analysis of the foundations of particularised and generalised trust," *European Journal of Political Research* 48: 782–803.
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2009.00849.x/abstract>

→ Granovetter, M. S. 1973. The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 78, 1360-1380.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2776392>

→ Robert Putnam. 2000. *Bowling Alone*. Simon and Schuster: chapter 1, p. 15-28.

→ McKenzie, Brian D. 2008. "Reconsidering the Effects of Bonding Social Capital: A Closer Look at Black Civil Society." *Political Behavior* 30, 1: 25-45. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/g62kukn22536p0nw/>

→ If you have some additional time: CNN: James Fowler et al: Effect of Online Networks:

<http://ow.ly/JzOw>

Additional resources:

→ Hardin, R. 1993. "The Street-Level Epistemology of Trust," in *Politics and Society*, 21 pp.505-529.

<http://pas.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/21/4/505>

→ Stolle, D. 2001. "Getting to Trust," in Dekker, P and Uslaner, E. M. 2001. *Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life*. N.Y.: Routledge. pp.118-133 (webCT)

<http://www.myilibrary.com?id=5583>

→ Barbara Arneil. 2010. "Social Decline and Diversity: The Us versus the Us's," CJPS Special Issue on Diversity and Social Cohesion.

<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=7787139>

→ Ørnulf Seippel. 2008. Sports in Civil Society: Networks, Social Capital and Influence. *European Sociological Review* (24 (1): 69–80

<http://esr.oxfordjournals.org/content/24/1/69.full.pdf+html>

Potential Paper or Discussion Topics:

- 1) Which types of trust can we distinguish? Which types of assurance are used in various types of trust?
- 2) Why is trust so important, can society cope without trust? In short, what are the consequences of various types of trust? More specifically, which type of trust is most useful in dealing with strangers, for solving collective action problems, and to maintain a healthy democracy—and why?
- 3) How can we best measure generalized trust and what are some of the issues here?
- 4) What are the different types of social networks we can distinguish? Note that bridging (Putnam) and weak (Granovetter) ties are not necessarily the same (despite the use of "bridging" in Granovetter).
- 5) Do networks create trust and civic values? Why are they so important? How do they matter for democracy?
- 6) What are the common methods to measure social networks?
- 7) Policy: How should we measure social capital for policy purposes?
- 8) How would you design a study on the consequences of social networks for political outcomes? (some thoughts about research design here). What are some of the common methodological pitfalls when examining the effects of social networks?

February 8

Discussion of Paper proposals. Read all paper proposals submitted to webCT by Monday 6pm.

Discussant roles will be assigned. Timing of presentations and discussions depends on class size (TBD).

February 15 The Decline Thesis and its Critics

→ Putnam, R. D. 2000. *Bowling Alone*, section II (pages 31-180 with special focus on chapters 2-4, 6, 8 and 9). Note this is an easy and in part repetitive read, and does not require a lot of time.

→ Sarracino, F. (2010) "Social capital and subjective well-being trends: Comparing 11 western European countries" *Journal of Socio-Economics* 39, no. 4, pp. 482-517.

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053535709001383>

→Sander, Thomas H. Putnam, Robert D. 2010. "Still Bowling Alone? The Post-9/11 Split" *Journal of Democracy*, Volume 21, Number 1, pp. 9-16.

http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_democracy/v021/21.1.sander.pdf

→Inglehart, Ronald F. 2008. "Changing Values among Western Publics from 1970-2006." *West European Politics* 31 (1-2): 130-146. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01402380701834747>

→ Rothstein, Bo. 2001. "Social Capital in the Social Democratic Welfare State" *Politics & Society*, June 2001, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 207-242. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0032329201029002003>

Additional resources:

→Putnam, R. 2002. Conclusion, pp. 393-415 in *Democracies in Flux*

<http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/oso/public/content/politicalscience/0195150899/toc.html>

Potential Paper or Discussion Topics:

- 1) Is there a decline in social capital? Are some aspects of SC in decline and others not?
- 2) What are the common critiques against the *Bowling Alone* thesis and how much evidence is there to sustain them?
- 3) How has Putnam's approach to social capital changed in *Bowling Alone* compared to his earlier work?
- 4) Which factors are made responsible for the decline? Do they work?
- 5) Policy/General: Is there a need to address the decline in social capital and participation, if so, how?
- 6) How can Inglehart's and Putnam's arguments be reconciled, if at all?
- 7) Decline or Transformation?-- Where do you stand and why?

Note: no class Feb 22

February 29: Generations and New technology: How does Online Community change our Social Resources?

Everyone reads this (note some of the below are very short):

→Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone*, chaps 13-14

→ Fischer, Claude S. "Technology and Community: Historical Complexities." *Sociological Inquiry* vol. 67 no.1 Winter 1997: 113-118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1997.tb00433.x>

→Apply to effects on social capital: Van Alstyne, Marshall and Erik Brynjolfsson, 1996. "Widening Access and Narrowing Focus: Could the Internet Balkanize Science?" *Science* 274, Nov. 29, pp. 1479-1480. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2892208>

→Olken, Benjamin A. 2009. "Do Television and Radio Destroy Social Capital? Evidence from Indonesian Villages." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 1(4): 1-33. <http://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/app.1.4.1>

→Robinson, J. P. and S. Martin (2010) "IT Use and Declining Social Capital?" *Social Science Computer Review* 28, no. 1, pp. 45-63. <http://ssc.sagepub.com/content/28/1/45.short>

Choose one of the following for very short presentations (if you prefer a related article that is not listed, let me know one week in advance)—selection will be extended and adapted to class size

→Kittilson, M. C and R. J. Dalton (2011) "Virtual Civil Society: The New Frontier of Social Capital?" *Political Behavior* 33, no. 4, pp. 625-644. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/740r3560j640080t/>

→Tapscott, Don, and Anthony D. Williams (2006). "The Perfect Storm," in *Wikinomics: How Mass Collaboration Changes Everything*, chapter 2 (pp. 34-64), webCT

→Kaufman, Jason et al. "Tastes, ties, and time: A new social network dataset using Facebook.com." *Social Networks Volume 30, Issue 4*, October 2008, Pages 330-342. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=MIimg&_imagekey=B6VD1-4T3M686-1-3&_cdi=5969&_user=458507&_pii=S0378873308000385&_orig=na&_coverDate=10/31/2008&_sk=999699995&_view=c&_wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkzV&_md5=7f6bfaf90c1952b204d27e6cfd386f7e&_ie=/sdarticle.pdf

→Best, Samuel J., and Krueger, Brian S. 2006. "Online Interactions and Social Capital: Distinguishing Between New and Existing Ties." *Social Science Computer Review* 24 (4): 395-410. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0894439306286855>

→Tomai, M. *et al.* (2010) "Virtual Communities in Schools as Tools to Promote Social Capital with High School Students" *Computers & Education* 54, no. 1, pp. 265-274. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360131509002048>

→Pénard, T. and N. Poussing (2010) "Internet Use and Social Capital: The Strength of Virtual Ties" *Journal of Economic Issues* 44, no. 3, pp. 569-595. <http://mesharpe.metapress.com/app/home/contribution.asp?referrer=parent&backto=issue,1,14;journal,5,11;linkingpublicationresults,1:121382,1>

→Ellison, N. B., Steinfeld, C. and Lampe, C. (2011) "Connection strategies: Social capital implications of Facebook-enabled communication practices" *New Media & Society* 13, no. 6, pp. 873-892. <http://nms.sagepub.com/content/13/6/873.short>

→Lee, J. and Lee, H. (2010) "The computer-mediated communication network: exploring the linkage between the online community and social capital" *New Media & Society* 12, no. 5, pp. 711-727. <http://nms.sagepub.com/content/12/5/711.short>

→Cheung, C., Chiu, P-Y., Lee, M. (2011) "Online social networks: Why do students use facebook?" *Computers in Human Behavior* 27, no. 4, pp. 1337-1343. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563210002244>

→Valenzuela, S.; Park, Namsu & Kee, Kerk F. (2009). Is There Social Capital in a Social Network Site?: Facebook Use and College Students' Life Satisfaction, Trust, and participation. *Journal of*

Computer-Mediated Communication, 14: 875-901. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01474.x/full>

→ Williams, Dmitri. 2007. "The Impact of Time Online: Social Capital and Cyberbalkanization." *CyberPsychology & Behavior* 10 (3): 398-406. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/cpb.2006.9939>

→ Burke, M., Kraut, R. and Marlow, C. "Social Capital on Facebook: differentiating uses and users" *CHI 2011, Proceedings of the 2011 annual conference on Human factors in computing systems*. <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1979023>

→ Lewis, Gonzalez and Kaufman. 2011. "Social selection and peer influence in an online social network," *PNAS*, <http://www.pnas.org/content/109/1/68.full.pdf+html?with-ds=yes>

Potential Paper topics:

- 1) Is the younger generation today really any different from young people always? If so, how and why?
- 2) Is there a generational dimension to the decline thesis?
- 3) What can be done to foster the engagement of young citizens? (also Policy paper)
- 4) How does technology transform social interactions and social capital?
- 5) How does the internet affect social capital? What are the different arguments/hypotheses here?
- 6) Is there a spillover from online to offline social capital?
- 7) Can virtual social capital substitute for Face-to-face social capital?

March 7 No class—finish revision of proposal

March 14 New Forms of Civic Engagement—Substitutes or Additional Tools? Political Consumerism, Protests, Internet Activism, etc.

→ Stolle, Dietlind and Michele Micheletti. 2012. Reconfiguring Political Participation: The Rise of Individualized Political Responsibility Taking, chapter 2 in "Political Consumerism—Globalized Responsibility Taking, by Dietlind Stolle and Michele Micheletti. Forthcoming. (webCT)

→ Jan van Deth. 2009. "Is Creative Participation Creative Democracy?" In *Creative Participation: Responsibility-taking in the Political World*, edited by Michele Micheletti and Andrew McFarland. Boulder, Co: Paradigm Publishers. (posted on webCT).

→ Stefaan Walgrave, Lance Bennett, Jeroen Van Laer, and Christian Breunig (2011 forthcoming) "Multiple Engagements and Network Bridging in Contentious Politics: Digital Media Use of Protest Participants" *Mobilization*, 16(3). <http://www.m2p.be/publications/1289311269.pdf>

→ Michele Micheletti and Dietlind Stolle. 2009. "Vegetarianism - A Lifestyle Politics?" In *Creative Participation: Responsibility-taking in the Political World*, eds. Michele Micheletti and Andrew McFarland. Boulder, Colorado: Paradigm Publishers, pp. 125-145 (webCT)

--Something on Occupy Wall-Street and another article, TBD

Potential Paper topics:

- 1) Are “new” forms of activism substitutes for the declining “old” forms or not? Why or why not?
- 2) How can we study new forms of engagement and participation?
- 3) How should we define political participation? What is NOT political participation?
- 4) How can we distinguish political participation from social capital?
- 5) How effective are various forms of political participation?

March 21 Top Down Influence? The Role of Political and Social Institutions and Critical Communities

→ Berman, Sheri. 1997. “Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic,” *World Politics* 49.3: pp. 401-429 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25054008>

→Bo Rothstein and Dietlind Stolle. “Political institutions and generalized trust,” in D. Castiglione, J.W. Van Deth & G. Wolleb (eds.) *The Handbook of Social Capital*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 273-302. (webCT)

→Howard, Marc. “The Weakness of Post-Communist Civil Society,” *Journal of Democracy* (Vol. 13, #1, 2002), pp.157-169 http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_democracy/v013/13.1howard.html

→ Kaariainen, J., and H Lehtonen. 2006. “The variety of social capital in welfare state regimes. A comparative study of 21 countries.” *European Societies* 8 (1): 27-57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14616690500491399>

→Albano, R. and Barbera, F. “Social Capital, Welfare State, and Political Legitimacy” *American Behavioral Scientist* 53, no. 5, pp. 677-690. <http://abs.sagepub.com/content/53/5/677.short>

→ Traunmüller R./Freitag, M. 2011: State Support of Religion: Making or breaking Faith-Based Social Capital, in: *Comparative Politics*, 43: 253-269 <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/cuny/cp/2011/00000043/00000003/art00002>

Potential Paper or Discussion Topics:

- 1) Contrast the society-centered and the top-down approach to social capital. Can the two be reconciled? If not, for which argument is there more convincing evidence?
- 2) Can political institutions only have a beneficial or also detrimental effect on social capital?
- 3) Which institutional characteristics seem most beneficial to social capital?
- 4) Which institutional contexts have been overlooked by mainstream soc cap research?
- 5) Which research should be employed to disentangle the endogeneity in these models?
- 6) Policy: Can or should governments intentionally produce social capital?

March 28: Personality Traits and Biology

→Lykken D. and Tellegen, A. 7: 1996. “Happiness is a Stochastic Phenomenon,” in *Psychological Science*. pp.186-189. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=8563006&site=ehost-live>

→Genetic Variation in Political Participation,” 2008. By Fowler, Baker and Daws, in *American Political Science Review*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055408080209>

→ John R. Hibbing and Kevin B. Smith, "The Biology of Political Behavior: An Introduction," *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 2007; 614; 6
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0002716207305471>

→ David Cesarini, Christopher T. Dawes, James H. Fowler, Magnus Johannesson, Paul Lichtenstein, Björn Wallace. 2008. The heritability of cooperative behavior in trust games. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105 (10): 3721–3726
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0710069105>

→ Sturgis, P., Read S., Hatemi, P., Zhu, G., Trull, T., Wright, M., Martin, N. 2010. "A genetic basis for social trust?," *Political Behavior*, Volume 32, Number 2, 205-230,
http://genepi.qimr.edu.au/contents/p/staff/Sturgisetal_Pol%20Beh_June10.pdf

→ Oxley, Douglas R., Kevin B. Smith, John R. Alford, Matthew V. Hibbing, Jennifer L. Miller, Mario Scalora, Peter K. Hatemi, John R. Hibbing. 2008. "Political Attitudes Vary with Physiological Traits." *Science* 321:5896 (September 19, 2008): 1667–1670.
<http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/abstract/sci;321/5896/1667>

Potential Paper or Discussion Topics:

- 1) Are there genetic and biological sources of some aspects of social capital?
- 2) Why are political scientists so careful to touch the topic of biological and genetic sources?
- 3) How does the role of biology change our insights into the roots of social capital, participation and civic engagement?
- 4) What is the logic of twin studies? What are their advantages and disadvantages?
- 5) Are there certain personality traits that foster social capital or civic behavior?
- 6) How can we integrate the study of biology into the framework of social capital research?
- 7) If biological sources matter, what are the implications for social science models and social science research?

April 4 The puzzle of Diversity and Immigration

→ Robert D. Putnam, "E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the 21st Century: The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture" *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30 (June 2007): 137-174.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9477.2007.00176.x>

→ Savelkoul, M., Gesthuizen, M. and Scheepers, P. (2011) "Explaining relationships between ethnic diversity and informal social capital across European countries and regions: Tests of constrict, conflict and contact theory" *Social Science Research* 40, no. 4, pp. 1091-1107.
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0049089X11000378>

→ Tom van der Meer and Tolsma. Unpublished Manuscript. Review Article. 2012. See webCT.

→ Ruud Koopmans. 2010. "Trade-Offs between Equality and Difference: Immigrant Integration, Multiculturalism and the Welfare State in Cross-National Perspective," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36: 1, 1– 26 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13691830903250881>

→ Stuart N. Soroka, Richard Johnston, and Keith Banting. 2007. "Ethnicity, Trust, and the Welfare State," in *Social Capital, Diversity, and the Welfare State* by [Fiona Kay](#) and [Richard Johnston](#). UBC Press.
<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/mcgill/Doc?id=10203144>

→ Uslaner, E. M. "Trust, Diversity, and Segregation in the United States and the United Kingdom" *Comparative Sociology* 10, no. 2, pp. 221-247.
<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/brill/comps/2011/00000010/00000002/art00004>

Additional Resources:

→ Dietlind Stolle and Allison Harell. 2012. "Learning to trust in an Immigrant Society," Manuscript accepted for publication at *Political Studies*. See webCT.

Laurence, J. (2011) "The Effects of Ethnic Diversity and Community Disadvantage on Social Cohesion: A Multi-Level Analysis of Social Capital and Interethnic Relations in UK Communities" *European Sociology Review* 27, no. 1. Accessed December 11, 2011. <http://esr.oxfordjournals.org/content/27/1/70.short>

Savelkoul, M., Scheepers, P., Tolsma, J., Hagendoorn, L., 2010. Anti-Muslim attitudes in the Netherlands: tests of contradictory hypotheses derived from ethnic competition theory and intergroup contact theory. *European Sociological Review*. doi:10.1093/esr/jcq035.

Will Kymlicka. 2010. "Testing the Liberal Multiculturalist Hypothesis: Normative Theories and Social Science Evidence," *CJPS Special Issue on Diversity and Social Cohesion*.
<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=7787136>

Portes, A. and E. Vickstrom (2011) "Diversity, Social Capital, and Cohesion" *Annual review of Sociology* 37, pp. 461-479. <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-soc-081309-150022>

Lancee, B. (2010) "The Economic Returns of Immigrants' Bonding and Bridging Social Capital: The Case of the Netherlands" *International Migration Review* 44, pp. 202–226.
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2009.00803.x/full>

Potential Paper or Discussion topics:

- 1) How do immigration and ethnic diversity affect social capital? What is the causal mechanism?
- 2) Are there any conditions that might modify this effect?
- 3) How is bridging and bonding social capital related?
- 4) Which policies seem likely to solve the alleged negative consequences of diversity, and which policies might not contribute here?
- 5) What does the research imply for the future of social cohesion in multi-cultural societies?

April 11 no class

April 18 Mini conference 6 hours. Paper presentations and feedback.