



University of Huddersfield Repository

Walmsley, Jordan

Social Capital, Institutional Structures and Political Engagement

Original Citation

Walmsley, Jordan (2011) Social Capital, Institutional Structures and Political Engagement. Masters thesis, University of Huddersfield.

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/11788/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

SOCIAL CAPITAL, INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES AND POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT

JORDAN WALMSLEY

A thesis submitted to the University of
Huddersfield in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of MSc by
Research

The University of Huddersfield

July 2011

Copyright Statement

- i. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns any copyright in it (the "Copyright") and s/he has given The University of Huddersfield the right to use such Copyright for any administrative, promotional, educational and/or teaching purposes.
- ii. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts, may be made only in accordance with the regulations of the University Library. Details of these regulations may be obtained from the Librarian. This page must form part of any such copies made.
- iii. The ownership of any patents, designs, trade marks and any and all other intellectual property rights except for the Copyright (the "Intellectual Property Rights") and any reproductions of copyright works, for example graphs and tables ("Reproductions"), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property Rights and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property Rights and/or Reproductions.

Table of Contents

Title page	1
Copyright Statement	2
Table of Content	3
Figures	4
Abstract	5
1. Introduction	6
2. Democracy and citizenship	9
3. Political (dis)engagement in Britain	16
4. Social capital	23
5. Methodology	31
6.1 Aims and objectives	31
6.2 The literature review and developing the methodology	31
6. Results	40
7.1 Prior relationships and reciprocity (RP and reP)	40
7.2 Growth in relationships and reciprocity (RG and reG)	42
7.3 Continued relationships and reciprocity (RC and reC)	44
7.4 Decline in relationships and reciprocity (RD and reD)	46
7.5 Bridging and bonding social capital (BB and bb)	48
7.6 Themes table	51
7.7 Key for themes table	52
7. Discussion	53
8.1 Institutional structures	53
8.2 Normative structures	58
8. Conclusion	62
9. Bibliography	64
10. Appendix	69
11.1 Participant declaration	69
11.2 Interview prompt sheet	70
11.3 Participant biographies	72
11.4 Interview transcript example - Jane	76

Word Count: 21, 753

Figures

Table 1 – Themes Table	51
------------------------------	----

Abstract

For decades there has been a concern that citizens in Britain and other western democracies are disengaging from political processes. Furthermore, Robert Putnam (2000) argues that the decline in engagement is connected to a decline in social capital. Recent citizenship philosophies from authors such as Etzioni (2000) and Blond (2009) attempt to address this concern by arguing for the development of mutual and associative communities. Although Etzioni (2000) and Putnam (2000) argue that the state can help develop social capital and thus mutual and associative communities through government policy, other such as Field (2003) discussion some potential problems for this and argue that government policy focused on increasing social capital can be counterproductive. This project explores this problem using qualitative research methods conducting semi-structured interviews lasting between 30-70 minutes each. 16 people were interviewed from three different engagement groups categorised as formal, semi-formal and informal which allowed for comparing the affects of government policy, or institutional structures, on the respective engagement groups. This project concludes that whilst institutional structures do not necessarily impede social capital and thus engagement; institutional structures that dictate homogeneous engagement or institutional structures that only support bureaucratic normative structures were found to have negative consequences for social capital and political engagement. However, it is also argued that within the specific groups studied, institutional structures can also have positive effects on social capital and engagement when they do not crowd out individual exploration within communal and/or associative structures in the community. Finally, this project argues that the conclusions cannot be fully generalised throughout British society because of the nature of the qualitative methods used, and because social capital is a context specific social phenomenon. As a result, it is argued that the conclusions can and should be used as hypotheses for future studies into the effects of institutional structures on political engagement.

1. Introduction

“Achieving mass democracy was the great triumph of the twentieth century. Learning to live with it will be the great achievement of the twenty-first” (Stoker 2006; pp. 206).

Democracy is the governing principle for most of the west and many other countries throughout the world. Recently, we have seen the so called ‘Arab Spring’ starting in Tunisia and spreading to Egypt, Libya, Syria and other countries throughout Northern Africa and the middle east which is credited with being a grassroot movement seeking the freedom that democracy gives its citizens. But whilst democracy continues to extend its reach, long established democracies are noticing a crisis of democratic disenchantment and disengagement. A Guardian poll in 2005 showed that most of the 50,000 people asked in 68 different democracies believe that “government does not act according to their wishes” (Cited in Stoker 2006; pp. 1). Furthermore, as Hay (2007) notes, indices of formal political engagement are down to unprecedented levels (Hay 2007; pp. 1). In Britain voting in general elections has been in steady decline since 1950 and reached an all time low in 2001 at 59.4% (UKPolitical.info 2011). It is the same with membership of British political parties again reaching a high in the 1950s and declining quite rapidly up to 2008 (Marshall 2009; pp. 10-11). This decline correlates with declining political party membership throughout many European countries (Marshall 2009; pp. 25). Amitai Etzioni (2000), a communitarian thinker who influenced Anthony Giddens and with him, Tony Blair, argued that his “third way” was a partially developed road map to reach a society with a vibrant community based on mutuality and with it, a society whose citizens are engaged in decision making (Etzioni 2000). He argues this road map will reach a society in contrast to the disengaging society that, as noted above and as this project will explore, several authors believe Britain currently has. At the same time, Putnam (2000) found that alongside a decline in political engagement in America was a decline in social capital and he attributes the latter to the former in his book *Bowling Alone* (2000). For Putnam (2000) social capital is defined as “connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them” (Putnam 2000; pp. 19). Although Peter Hall (1999) showed no comparable decline of social capital in Britain, later studies have critiqued Hall’s analysis arguing that their research offers a less optimistic appraisal for social capital in

Britain (Grenier and Wright 2006). Whilst it was out of the parameters of this project to test whether social capital is in decline in Britain, this project views the decline in social capital in America as symptomatic of American society and the individualistic nature of capitalism under neo-liberalism. As neo-liberalism has for too long been the economic, and sometimes social philosophy driving Britain, this project argues that whilst Britain may not see the same correlation between engagement and social capital as America, a decline in social capital is, nonetheless, perceived as a problem for those that see a 'broken Britain' (Cameron 2009).

Although Putnam (2000) makes no secret of his views on the policy potential for increasing social capital and as a result increasing political and community engagement (Putnam 2000; pp. 412-414), many others from different political persuasions doubt the capacity and scope of political institutions to positively influence social capital (Field 2003; pp. 115-123). For instance, Fukuyama (2001) argues that government intervention can have serious negative impacts on the development and sustainability of social capital (Fukuyama 2001: Cited in Field 2003; pp. 119). Furthermore, government policies that focus on social capital can end up developing undesired social capital such as bonding social capital between the unemployed as part of work training programmes (Perri 6: Cited in Field 2006; pp. 122). Developing social capital between the long term unemployed to increase their desire for associative relationships and therefore a desire to work is counterproductive as the social capital that is developed will reinforce the norms on which it is built – norms that relate to long term unemployed. This debate, encompassing Etzioni's (2000) argument about a society based on mutuality, and whether government policy interventions can increase engagement through developing social capital is the investigation this project sets out to conduct. The structure of this project is as follows:

In the second chapter, democracy and citizenship in Britain is looked at; the dominant philosophy of liberalism is introduced before examining the philosophies of democracy and citizenship that have had the most influence in Britain over the last 30 years such as neo-liberalism, communitarianism and more recently, modern conservatism. In the third chapter, political engagement in Britain is evaluated introducing some traditional indices of engagement such as voting and membership of political parties, before discussing the citizen disaffection perspective and cultural displacement perspective in the context of studies such as Pattie et al (2004). In the fourth chapter, we introduce the concept of social

capital theory. The three authors most commonly cited for popularising the theory are examined, as well as introducing some of the types of social capital and some of the common used indicators that are employed to measure and test social capital. In the fifth chapter, we set out the methodology this project used to study political engagement setting out the projects ontology, data sampling methods, an introduction to the groups studied in this project and how the data was analysed. In the sixth chapter, we set out the results in thematic format accompanied by a table illustrating the themes of social capital that were identified by this project. In the seventh chapter, we discuss the results in the context of government policy, institutional structures and normative structures before concluding the findings in the eighth chapter.

2. Democracy and Citizenship

“In a democracy it is not a special class of citizens who rules over the rest, but the citizens themselves, coming together as political equals to give themselves their own laws and run their own governing institutions, guided by their respect for the common welfare and the equal freedom of all” (Keenan 2003 pp. 1).

Although there is no single theory of democracy, in fact there are a series of different theories that argue over concepts such as citizenship, freedom and priorities, democracy is widely seen as the ‘rule of the people, by the people’. Democracy in the twenty first century is now a widely accepted premise for governing with America and much of Europe conforming to democratic principles. Furthermore, many other countries in Africa, Americas, the Middle East and Far East are going through a period of democratisation. This premise of democracy that is spreading throughout the world is based on principles such as freedom, the right to vote and the right to be involved in the political process that ultimately rules over societies. However, although these principles are relatively simple, there are a variation of different theories of democracy, all with differing views on the definition of freedom, the extent that citizens should be ‘active’ and the extent to which the decisions should be made ‘by the people’. When we speak of democracy, specifically, when we speak of the relationship between the state and its citizens, we are referring to the concept of citizenship and here we look at the development of citizenship in Britain to paint a picture of the modern British citizens and their relationship with the state.

An apt way of viewing democracy is thus; “...an institutional instrument based upon actual or implied contracts, for protecting the legal and political rights of its citizens” (Stokes 2002). Although there are many different views of democracy, almost all would agree with the above statement. It is a way of protecting citizens’ rights based on the agreement of citizens themselves. However, this quote neglects to take into consideration any ‘responsibilities’ citizens might have in a democracy; to what extent do citizen’s have a duty or responsibility to be involved in the democratic processes of a given country (active citizenship) to ensure said country operates as a democracy? It is this balance between rights and responsibilities that is the focal point of citizenship and the following is a brief look at the development of

citizenship in Britain after which we will introduce the philosophy that is central to this project.

This idea of the active citizen can be traced all the way back to the ancient Greek's, specifically to Athenian politics in the fifth century BC. Athenian governance required its entire citizenry to be active thereby creating a system of rule by the 'whole people' and not just a minority (although not all humans were considered citizens). This form of Athenian democracy can be seen as direct democracy as citizens were encouraged, if not required to participate in all parts of a common life contributing towards all of society and not just contributing towards individual goals and desires (Held 2006; pp. 13). The Athenian governance shared many traits with the Republic of Rome. Both featured systems of citizen participation in politics and both emphasised a fundamental need for a sense of public duty of responsibility which is focus on this essay.

However, as much as Athenian and Roman systems of governance have shaped the way modern democracies operate, there has been a stark move away from republicanism which best resembles these earlier systems of governance, and towards a strong foundation of liberalism. Classic liberalism, one of many different variations of Liberalism and the foundation for citizenship in Britain, views the operation of governance as follows:

“Competitive elections create governments that can modify and uphold a legal order under which individuals can lead their lives with as little interference as possible from the state and minimal public obligations” (Crick 2007; pp. 244).

This concept views democracy as built upon the power of the voting citizenry. Everyone in society, with some restrictions such as age, has the right and the responsibility to vote in periodic election to decide who they believe should govern the country. They see the good citizen as someone who should vote in these elections, someone who obeys the law and acts as a responsible citizen. More importantly however, classical liberalism views the responsibilities of the citizenry as stopping there and does not advocate or encourage a more active citizenry (Stokes 2002; pp. 29-30). However, classical liberalism is not the variant of liberalism that the present form of democracy and citizenship best resembles in Britain. To understand British democracy and citizenship in the twenty-first century, it is important to first look at the twentieth century variations of liberalism; social liberalism

articulated by T. H. Marshall (1950) and neo-liberalism articulated by Hayek (1944) and Nozick (1974).

Described as social liberalism Marshall defined citizenship as “a status bestowed on all those who are full members of a community [and] all those who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed” (Biesta 2006; pp. 66). Marshall’s (1950) paper looks at the historical development of citizenship in Britain highlighting three main developments over a couple of hundred years; civil rights, political rights and social rights. Marshall’s social liberalism with its emphasis on social rights and the mitigation of inequalities inherent in capitalism (Biesta 2006; pp. 66) was very influential after the Second World War and was the theoretical underpinning for the pillars of consensus established under the Attlee government of 1945 which continued until the Thatcher governments (Dorey 1995). Whilst Marshall’s concept, with its emphasis on mitigating the ills of the market had little reference to the active citizen, it had a significant impact on the evolution of liberal theory and the perceived negative impact of social liberalism allowed for the birth of neo-Liberalism championed by the Thatcher governments of the 1980s and 1990s (Faulks 1998).

For neo-liberals like Thatcher and many others from 1970 onwards, the social rights that were articulated by Marshall and embedded in the pillars of consensus were an infringement on one’s civil liberties (that are deemed as pre-political and inalienable) and created a “culture of dependency” (Faulks 2000; pp. 63-64). This argument which gathered much momentum enabled the Thatcher governments to roll back social rights and put a much stronger emphasis on civil rights (or market rights) focusing on individual liberty. This emphasis on market rights and the assertion of individual liberty is very important when looking at the development of active citizens (or consumers) in this period. As Faulks (2000) argues, the assertion of individual liberty and market rights was about one’s power (or right) of consumption, an example of which was the “right to buy” council properties policy allowing citizens to consume a greater stake in society (Faulks 2000; pp. 67). By allowing the market to dictate citizenship, the active citizen became someone who could assert their market rights to gain economically as a result of being empowered by property ownership. Those citizens who did not own property were unable to assert their market rights and were thus unable to become active citizens and were viewed as second class (Faulks 1998; pp.

131). Furthermore, although the rhetoric of Thatcher argued for a more civically engaged citizenry, this tended to mean more self reliance and the support of charities rather than engaging in any political sense. “They [Thatcherite’s] wish to undermine citizenship as a status denoting the interdependence and collective nature of a political community” (Faulks 1998; pp. 145). This argument is supported when looking at the Thatcher governments’ approach to citizenship education, a subject seen as important for the development of politically active citizens (Crick 1998). Rather than agreeing with a report by Crick (1978) that argued for political education in schools, the Thatcher government decided to ban the promotion of partisan political education in schools (Kisby 2007). When a Conservative MP made it clear he was in favour of making citizenship education a compulsory subject in schools, Thatcher said “no” (Kisby 2007).

The development of New Labour under Tony Blair represented an opportunity for both Labour and citizenship. After Thatcherism had destroyed the social element of citizenship and instilled a strong sense of individualism into the citizenry creating a nation of a-political consumers, New Labour took up the notion of citizenship and with the intellectual backing of Anthony Giddens and Amitai Etzioni, argued for a third way. This third way for citizenship is seen by many as a variation of communitarianism which is best illustrated by Etzioni’s (2000) article called *The road to the good society*. Whilst he accepts that the third way is “not fully etched... nor is it a fully developed ideological road map” (Etzioni 2000), he argues that society relies on three pillars: a strong but lean government, a well developed but encapsulated markets, and most importantly a vibrant community. For Etzioni (2000), a healthy society is one where mutuality is central to all communities (Etzioni 2000). Mutuality can be seen as individuals and groups having the same relationships with each other that are built on mutual interest and reciprocity and can be seen as society’s responsibility towards itself. But he also argues that the state should “protect basic rights” which is “the states responsibility” (Etzioni 2000). By this view of society, what Etzioni, and therefore New Labour envisaged was a balance between rights and responsibilities – people in society should take some responsibility for themselves and the state should take responsibility for ensuring the people’s rights (human, political and social) are protected. This philosophy represented a shift away from, and an attack on, the neo-liberal version of citizenship articulated by the Thatcher governments, and a move towards a post neo-liberal

concept. This third way communitarianism illustrated, as Faulks (1998) argues for, the acceptance and protection of liberty and individual autonomy whilst acknowledging that individuals operate in a structural context (Faulks 1998; pp. 199). Therefore, the active citizen moved away from being an a-political consumer and became individuals and groups in society that actively engaged in their communities based on mutual relationships and reciprocity.

Whilst this project is concerned only with the philosophy of citizenship, it is worth pointing out that what New Labour articulated, and the policies it enacted, can be seen as quite different. As Landrum (2002) comments, “with New Labour, separating substance from rhetoric is difficult” (Landrum 2002; pp. 221). There are arguments to suggest that Blair continued with the positive elements of Thatcherism but incorporated a stronger social element more closely aligned with Marshall. Faulks (2006) argues that Labour have failed to implement a coherent citizenship education policy because the underlying concepts ignore social structures and thus adhere to very neo-liberal view of citizenship. Thus, if this is the case for citizenship education, one can infer this is also the case for New Labour’s view of citizenship on the whole (Faulks 2006). Furthermore, although Labour under Blair stressed both rights and responsibilities which was a move to fuse the best of the old left and new right, the responsible were deemed to be those who did the right thing based on individual choice and those deemed irresponsible were subject to varying degrees of authoritarianism (Powell 2000; pp. 49). Powell (2000) also comments that the citizenship contract was both one sided in that the government had more power and less accountability, and was also harsher to the poor in that they suffered from both the emphasis on individual responsibility and governments lack of responsibility for generating jobs for the responsible to take up (Powell 2000; pp. 50).

However, putting aside the criticisms and complexities of converting philosophy into policy, this third way communitarian variation of citizenship is central to this projects research. Furthermore, despite the critiques of the New Labour governments, there is evidence to suggest that British citizens agree with this notion of citizenship. According to a recent report by the Institute for Public Policy Research, citizens feel that we all should be active in our communities. This report illustrates a belief that the state should be responsible for enabling and providing citizens the means to be more active in society which highlights this

desire for active communities (IPPR and PwC 2010). Furthermore, it presents evidence that citizens in Britain want a balanced citizenship based on a partnership with the state providing rights and the means to be active, and individuals, groups and communities utilising these rights to fulfil their responsibilities of being more active in society.

Interestingly, whilst the current coalition government is criticised from the left for being neo-liberal (Balls 2010), the newly articulated modern or progressive conservatism of Phillip Blond harnessed by David Cameron shares many similarities with third way communitarianism. In a speech to launch his new think tank Republica, Blond (2009) argues that modern conservatism cares about and seeks to conserve “nothing less than society itself” (Blond 2009). In the same way that Etzioni (2000) spoke of “mutuality”, Blond (2009) argues that modern conservatism is about “the restoration and creation of human association” (Blond 2009) adding that the people want a society that is “more reciprocal, more mutual and more empowering” (Blond 2009). Mirroring the role of the state in this new conceptualised modern conservatism, Cameron (2009) in his speech on the “Big Society” argued the new role of the state should be “actively helping to create the big society; directly agitating for, catalysing and galvanising social renewal” (Cameron 2009). This philosophy of third way communitarianism and modern conservatism, with its balanced approach to rights and responsibilities, is the philosophy that, as mentioned above, is central to this project because it represents a harmonious relationship between the state and society that fosters greater togetherness and democratic legitimacy. The philosophy of community, mutuality, reciprocity, human association, and a balanced view of citizens rights provided by the state, and citizen responsibilities enacted by the people. Citizens have a responsibility to each other, and themselves, to be active citizens and the state can and should facilitate these responsibilities by providing more occasions for social gatherings and increasing people’s participation in decision making (Etzioni 2000).

Etzioni’s argument that the state should facilitate an increase in people’s participation in decision making is important; if citizens in society are not politically engaged, then a democracy lacks legitimacy. As has already been acknowledged, democracy is not the political elite ruling over the masses, but the people coming together to run their own lives and governing institutions (Keenan 2003; pp. 1). If we are to have a healthy communitarian, or even a modern conservative society, citizens must engage in political processes and

according to Etzioni (2000), the state should be responsible for facilitating this engagement. This poses two concerns that this project explores: are British citizens politically engaged? And, can the state actually facilitate political engagement? The first of these concerns is looked at in the next chapter. After political engagement in Britain has been explored, this projects primary research focuses on the state's role in facilitating political engagement because, as will be shown, converting this philosophy into policy is complex. However, without exploring this complex notion, Etzioni's "good society" remains only an idea.

3. Political (dis)engagement in Britain

Political engagement is fundamental to a democracy, however over the past 50 years there has been increasing anxiety that political engagement in many western liberal democracies, such as Britain, is declining which is to the detriment of democracy. Traditionally, political engagement has meant being involved in political parties, voting or standing for an elected political position such as a councillor or Member of Parliament but political engagement can include a variety of different activities such as the use of social media sites like Twitter and Facebook. Below we take a look at some of the indicators of political disengagement such as voter turnout, membership of political parties, and data on other modes of engagement that can be called 'traditional'. Second, we will look at Loader's (2007) theory and explore some of the perspectives that argue political disengagement is a myth and, rather than disengaging, citizens are simply shifting repertoires of engagement. Third we will discuss these two perspectives in the context of the question ask in the previous chapter: are British citizens politically engaged?

Before proceeding it is prudent to make a distinction between disenchantment and disengagement. Political disenchantment refers to the feelings of alienation, distrust and lack of faith in the political system of a given country, in this case Britain. For instance, Stoker (2006) argues that according to a variety of different survey's taken between 1983 and 2004, at best 1 in 5 British citizens had trust in politicians to tell the truth (Stoker 2006; pp. 34). Political disengagement on the other hand refers to the actions (or omissions) of citizens regarding politics. For example, the decline in voter turnout in Britain between 1945 and 2005 was 24.2% (Hay 2007; ph: 14). The difference between disenchantment and disengagement is important as almost all data shows widespread disenchantment in politics but data on disengagement is far less conclusive and can depend on the scope of the specific research. This essay will focus almost entirely on disengagement and what might become clear is that whilst there is disenchantment from politics in Britain; this does not necessarily mean the British people are disengaging. Before turning our attention to the arguments for and against an alleged disengagement from politics, it is important to take a look at the obvious decline in what can be described as formal or traditional forms of

engagement, that is voting and membership of political parties, as these are widely seen as the foundations of a democracy.

Voter turnout is often deemed, especially in western liberal democracies, to be the fundamental pillar on which democracies are built. Unfortunately, as illustrated above, looking at voter turnout in these western liberal democracies, the picture that unfolds is one of disengagement (with formal politics at least). In the UK, post war voter turnout for general elections hit a record in 1950 with 83.9% but has been gradually falling staying below 80% and reached 59.4% in 2001. This had climbed slightly from 2001 reaching 61.4% in 2005 and 65.1% in 2010 (UKPolitical.info 2011) but is still far below desired levels. Interestingly, in 2009, The Hansard Society conducted their Audit of Political Engagement, published in 2010, which showed that 76% of those surveyed believed it was their 'duty' to vote (Hansard Society 2010) illustrating a disconnect between voters beliefs and actions. Looking at voter turnout for local elections only makes this picture worse with many local authorities receiving less than 50% with some wards barely managing to attract 30% of the electorate to the voting booths (Kirklees 1, 2007). Hay (2007) demonstrates voter turnout using an OECD average showing steady voting decline from 1970 to 2005 (Hay 2007; pp. 13). He goes onto argue that the biggest predictor of voter turnout is whether or not a voter chose the vote the first time they could (Hay 2007; pp. 16) and illustrate the change in voting through generational cohorts showing a marked decline for younger voters (Hay 2007; pp. 17). This is also commented on by Stoker (2006) who shows that whilst in 2005, 4 out of every 10 eligible voters stayed away from polling stations, this figure increases to 6 out of 10 for voters between 15-25 years old (Stoker 2006; pp. 33).

Membership of political parties is also a good indicator of how a citizenry feels about formal national politics and since political parties are regarded as essential components of democratic regimes (Webb 2005; pp. 633), the status of their membership is important. Like voter turnout, membership of the three main parties in British politics has declined over the last half century. Figures are inconsistent, however, in 1970 membership of the Conservative Party was 3.1% of the electorate and membership of the Labour Party was 1.7% (total of 4.8%). In 1983, total membership of all three main parties (Conservatives, Labour and Liberal/SDP/Lib-Dem) was 3.8% where as in 2005 this had dropped to 1.3% (Marshall 2009; pp. 11).

One academic that has done extensive research into this area of political (dis)engagement is Robert Putnam (2000) who looks not only at a decline in formal political engagement, but also and a broader civic decline and, particularly important for this project, social capital. We will come back to the issue of social capital in the next chapter but for now, although his study is based in the US, it is worth taking a brief look at Putnam's (2000) verdict on political engagement and there are parallels to be drawn between this study and Britain. Like we have above, Putnam (2000) uses voter turnout to demonstrate a decline in formal political engagement. Although voting is more complex in America due to the north/south divide and issues surrounding civil rights, America at the beginning of the 20th century voter turnout of 80% (in the north) but by the beginning of the 21st century voter turnout was only just above 50% (Putnam 2000; pp. 32). And we see a similar story with political parties, albeit the situation in the US is slightly more complex than in Britain. Although he acknowledges that political parties can be seen as being stronger than they ever have been based on party finances (Putnam 2000; pp. 37) he goes on to say that party identification has declined since the 1960s and active engagement in local political election campaigns reached an all time low in 1996 (Putnam 2000; pp. 38). Putnam also uses political knowledge as an indicator for his argued decline in political engagement and unfortunately he concludes that relative political knowledge is falling (Putnam 2000; pp. 36). Similar to Hay (2007) and Stoker (2006), Putnam attributes some of this alleged decline in political knowledge to generational change. He argues the cohort of voters born after 1964 "are substantially less knowledgeable about public affairs" and are a third less likely to know which party controlled the House of Representatives than their elders (Putnam 2000; pp. 36). Whilst these modes of political engagement mentioned so far are what some theorists deem 'traditional', Putnam (2000) nevertheless illustrates that engagement in America is in decline showing that less people are involved in an array of activities from attending a public meeting, to signing a petition, to writing an article for a newspaper (Putnam 2000; pp. 45).

This trend is also found by Pattie et al (2004) and whilst they may have some convincing arguments about citizen's repertoires, the evidence nonetheless points towards a decline in more traditional modes of engagement. The Citizen Audit 2000 shows there has been a marked decline between 1984 and 2000 in signing petitions, contacting a politician, attending a political meeting/rally, and even taking part in a strike. According to this study,

the only activity to see a significant increase in participation is boycotting products for political reasons (Cited in Pattie et al 2004; pp. 81). It is interesting that Pattie et al (2004) goes on to show that what people would do, and what people actually do are quite different – evidence shows that, given the opportunity, a higher proportion of people would contact and MP, sign a petition and go on a demonstration (Pattie et al 2004; pp. 83), compared with actual levels of participation shown above. This is a reoccurring issue as we have demonstrated above with voting in elections. The Citizen Audit 2000 also illustrates damning results for political knowledge and political interest which, like the actual decline in engagement, can be compared with, and shown not dissimilar to, the data presented by Putnam (2000) (Pattie et al 2004; pp. 89-96).

Looking at the evidence above it could be argued that there is an issue with political engagement in Britain and other western liberal democracies. But the evidence above can be viewed in different ways by different people. Some argue that this decrease in formal political engagement is due to increasing voter apathy, others point towards a feeling of being disenchanted (see above) due to a variety of reasons, and others argue that research that looks only at formal forms of engagement don't illustrate the modern complexities of the political arena. Like other social sciences, there is little agreement amongst varying research projects with different parameters and ontologies but Loader (2007) attempts to simplify the current debate by setting out the two main allegedly opposing perspectives in this debate. He argues that within the academic debate of political disengagement, two different perspectives can be identified: *The citizen disaffection* perspective and *the cultural displacement* perspective. The citizen disaffection perspective is argued to be outdated as its scope of research, specifically what it defines as political engagement, tends to be more formal or traditional and therefore assumes if there is a decline in these activities, there must be a decline overall. The cultural displacement perspective has a much broader view of political engagement and argues that citizens are moving towards other, possibly more individualised forms of engagement and studies note that there is no clear decline in political engagement (Loader 2007; Pattie et al 2004; Marsh 2007). Whilst this is useful in that it sheds light on a complex internal argument, it can also be quite misleading if used to represent two opposing sides.

The Pattie et al (2004) study takes a critical view of the *citizen disaffection* perspective in favour of *Cultural displacement*. In this study they argue that previous research from the 1970s onwards has distinguished between “conventional” and “unconventional” engagement (attacking the *citizen disaffection* perspective) (Pattie et al 2004; pp. 84) and they, along with others, find this categorisation inadequate for two reasons: Firstly, whereas conventional engagement refers to actions such as voting and lobbying through established political groups and unconventional engagement refers to signing petitions and boycotting, research now shows that these are now quite the opposite and many actions that were deemed unconventional are now the most popular forms of engagement. Secondly, much research into political engagement until recently has focused on this outdated label of conventional engagement and is used to build the arguments that support the belief that British citizens are disengaging from politics. Pattie et al (2004) argue that this isn’t the case since rather than disengaging, citizens have simply expanded their repertoires of political activities showing that whilst the public maybe disenchanted about formal political activities, they are still very much political active (Pattie et al 2004; Marsh et al 2007; Norris 2003).

The argument that Pattie et al (2004) puts forward can be illustrated by recent events around the world in which the social networking site Twitter has been heavily used to support political engagement. Whilst political engagement and social media could make up several studies in their own rite, how Twitter has been used by the British public regarding civil liberties and human rights is a good example of how citizens have changed their repertoires. Twitter users have been expressing their disapproval about super-injunctions used by celebrities and the super rich to impose gagging orders on individuals who may have information that could rightfully discredit them. This issue is based on the politically philosophical arguments between privacy and freedom of speech and Tweepers, bloggers, and other social networkers have come down heavily on the side of ‘Freedom of Speech’ echoing that British citizens still care about our fundamental rights, and have now found to necessary digital tools to express themselves. As a result, this issue has shot up the political agenda resulting in an MP, John Hemming, using parliamentary privilege in the House of Commons to name an unnamed footballer showing his disapproval at the current state of affairs. This transfer to digital repertoires is illustrated by Pole (2010) in her book *Blogging*

the Political and she directly contradicts Putnam (2000) when she argues that America's are not "bowling alone", they are "Bowling differently" (Pole 2010; pp. 133). Throughout the book, Pole (2010) illustrates how blogging has transformed political participation and how digital participation has been responsible for election victories and defeats in America.

Whilst many recent studies and theorists (Pattie et al (2004), and Pole (2010)) support the cultural displacement perspective, including Hay (2007) and Stoker (2006) who point towards a realigning of political engagement to more informal modes within a greater social context, it is important not to assume that British political participation, and its affect on democracy, is healthy. Hay (2007) defends studies such as Pattie et al (2004) for rightly disproving the 'political apathy' argument but goes on to argue that just because citizens are still political active, albeit in different ways, it does not mean there is not a problem with political engagement (Hay 2007; pp. 71). Stoker (2006) takes a similar view:

"I too see changes in the forms of politics [referring to the expansion of political repertoires] ...But I see those changes as a complement to, rather than a substitution for, more traditional representative political processes" (Stoker 2006; pp. 201-202).

Although it is important to view positively the new repertoires of citizens, it is equally, if not more important to view the decline of formal or traditional forms of engagement as troubling and representing a problem for British society and democracy.

This argument is central to this project. Whether or not one accepts the argument that western liberal democracies are seeing a shift in repertoires rather than political disengagement is inconsequential because the fact that people are disengaging from formal or traditional forms of engagement illustrates an issue with formal politics that needs addressing. If accepted, and this project does accept, that democracy is not the political elite ruling over the masses, but the people coming together to run their own lives and governing institutions (Keenan 2003; pp. 1) then more petitions being signed and more projects being boycotted for political reasons is not a substitute for active engaging within the decision making mechanisms of our democracy. The conclusion this projects draws from the evidence above is that whilst British citizens can still be seen as being politically engaged, they are not sufficiently engaged in some of the important decision making processes that

are necessary for a healthy communitarian or modern conservative democracy as explored in the previous chapter. This conclusion creates two more questions that should be answered: Firstly, how do we get from where we are now (disengagement relative to what is desired) to where we want to be (more engagement in decision making processes)? Secondly, in light of Etzioni's argument that the state can and should facilitate engagement (Etzioni 2000), can the state help?

The latter of these questions will be the focus of this projects primary research but for now we must address the first question. Putnam (2000) argues that "nowhere is the need to restore connectedness, trust and civic engagement clearer than in our now often empty public forums of our democracy" (Putnam 2000; pp. 412). Firstly, Putnam was talking about American democracy but as shown above, British democracy and American democracy share many similarities. Secondly, in this quote Putnam (2000) recognises that there is a problem with political engagement but more importantly, he argues that the premise of his book is the cause of said disengagement, and fixing the cause is how we get from where we are now, to where we want to be. The premise of his book is that social capital has declined, and to increase engagement, we must first increase societies stock of social capital. We will now explore social capital theory which will then be used to analyse the primary qualitative data of this projects research.

4. Social capital

“Social networks have value” (Putnam 2000; pp. 19)

Social capital, in a nutshell, is the notion that relationships matter. Social relationships between individuals, groups, communities, even businesses and corporations, can generate capital, or have capital generated, that can be used by individuals, groups etc, to further their goals within society. There are, like so many other social science concepts, vast variations of this theory from a variety of different authors, all with different conceptualisations. Putnam (2000) argues that communities have declined and become more individualistic and self-serving and that for communities, political engagement, and other civic virtues to be revived, social capital must be revived first. We agree with Putnam and will use social capital theory to analyse the primary research of this project. However, it is important to note that Putnam (2000) was not the first author to theorise on the subject of social capital and although *Bowling Alone* is the most influential piece of work published in recent years, the history and conceptualisation of social capital can be attributed to three individuals: Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman and Robert Putnam. Before moving onto the primary research this chapter will initially give an overview of the three main contributions to the theory of social capital – those of Bourdieu, Coleman as well as Putnam. It is worth looking at these three because they share many similarities but they are also different in important ways. Second, some of the dimensions, types, and indicators of social capital will be identified and introduced. Finally, since social capital theory has attracted its fair share of scepticism and criticism, this project will briefly outline these criticisms in order to demonstrate a balanced and knowledgeable assessment of the theory itself.

Pierre Bourdieu was a French sociologist writing in the same vein as Marx about social inequalities. His theory on social capital was within the context of his wider work on capital, particularly what he termed as cultural capital and unlike Coleman and Putnam after him; Bourdieu saw social capital only as a negative. He defines social capital as:

“the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition - or in other words, to membership in a group - which

provides each of its members with the backing of the collectively owned capital, a “credential” which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word” (Bourdieu 1986; pp. 21).

He argued these relationships of mutual acquaintance are initiated by aspects of one’s identity such as family name, class, tribe, school or party and argued these relationships are sustained and reinforced through exchanges between individuals sharing such identities (Bourdieu 1986; pp. 21). In this work on capital over a number of years, he was concerned with the collection of said capital; economic, cultural and social capital, and how the stocking of these capitals can allow for their own reproduction and, more importantly for Bourdieu, the accumulation of economic capital. To illustrate this he uses the metaphor of different coloured chips in a casino referring to different capitals; you cannot necessarily swap one coloured chip for another (different values), but you can use your combined stack of different coloured chips to produce more chips in total (Field 2003; pp. 14) – if we imagine that economic capital is a black chip (£25) cultural capital is a red chip (£5) and social capital is an orange chip (£1), you could not swap an orange for a black but you could use your orange chips to generate black ones.

As stated above he saw social capital in a purely negative light because his view of capital was it reproduced inequalities in society based around the acquisition of economic capital. He argues that professionals such as doctors can use their connections and relationships with a variety of different citizens to gain popularity in order to succeed in arenas like politics whereas those that rely on purely educational credentials lack the stock of cultural and social capital that are important to compete (Field 2003; pp. 17). Although he is seen as bringing social capital theory into present day discussions (Claridge 2005; pp. 18) he only discussed social capital theory in papers described as ‘provisional notes’. Since his focus was more on cultural capital and how “capital” worked against the vulnerable, he offered very little conceptualisation and empirical evidence to support his theory (Claridge 2005; pp. 18). It is for these reasons that Bourdieu’s limited conception of social capital theory is rejected. This project does not see social capital through a Marxist perspective that argues it is only utilised by the bourgeoisie and thus favours only the elite, but instead it views social capital as a social phenomenon that does not discriminate against class, gender, creed, or any other

group of people. Having rejected Bourdieu's limited conception, this project will now explore other conceptions of social capital theory that have a broader view of its scope.

James Coleman, the second sociologist to offer a significant contribution to the theory of social capital focused his work around education and unlike Bourdieu who saw social capital as having a negative influence on society; Coleman recognised its potential benefit to poor and more vulnerable individuals within communities. Another difference between Bourdieu and Coleman is the level at which they saw social capital existing. Whereas Bourdieu saw social capital existing at an individualistic level, Coleman takes his conceptualisation further. Whilst he did argue that "social capital constitutes a particular kind of resource available to an actor" (Coleman 1988; pp. 98) suggesting an individualistic view of social capital, he does recognise that social capital is a "context-dependant aspect of social structures" (Claridge 2005; pp. 33) illustrating that he saw it existing at a level beyond mere individuals.

Rather than defining social capital in terms of what it is (like Bourdieu's comparison to casino chips being gambled and exchanged), Coleman chooses to define it as follows:

"Social capital is defined by its function. It is not a single entity but a variety of different entities, with two elements in common: they all consist of some aspect of social structures, and they facilitate certain actions of actors – whether persons or corporate actors – within the structure" (Coleman 1988; pp. 98).

Coleman (1988) used a few different examples to illustrate what he defines as social capital. In contrast with Bourdieu, Coleman's fourth example illustrates how market stall owners in Cairo can utilise social capital to their advantage. This is a good example in because it illustrates how poorer individuals and groups, of which market stall owners are, can use social capital for economic benefit. He also uses other examples to illustrate how social capital can be valuable in non-economic circumstances (Coleman 1988; pp. 99-100).

Coleman also went further than Bourdieu with his conceptualisation of social capital. Rather than Bourdieu's emphasis almost entirely on 'relationships' and the view of consciously or actively working to sustain social capital (work is put in to get something out), Coleman moved towards identifying indicators such as obligation and trust as well as mutually beneficial relationships (Coleman 1988; pp. 102) i.e. relationships between individuals and

groups generates trust and feelings of obligation which strengthens the relationships and therefore strengthens the social capital that is created. It is also worth pointing out that whilst Bourdieu saw social capital as something elites set out to attain, and continuously build for their own benefit, Coleman rejected these negatively implied connotations and instead argued that social capital was an unintentional result of social connections (Field 2003; pp. 25).

Although Coleman moved much further with social capital than Bourdieu, further conceptualisation and extensive testing was put forward by Putnam (2000) in his book that is seen as the most widely recognised piece of work on social capital. Unlike Bourdieu and Coleman, Putnam writes from a political science perspective and his work is particularly influenced by the political (both small and capital p) concerns about declining civic and political participation. In his 1995 paper also called *Bowling Alone* Putnam cites Tocqueville's work on the role civil society plays in democracy (Putnam 1995; pp. 65) which is appropriate since, although Putnam looks at issues within society such as religious participation, connections in the workplace and volunteering, his main motivating factor is political engagement. His emphasis on how social capital exists in and between groups of people puts Putnam's conceptualisation at the community level, following Coleman away from Bourdieu's class conception (Claridge 2005; pp. 33).

Putnam first defined social capital in his work published in 1995 as:

“...features of social organisations such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit” (Putnam 1995; pp. 66)

and later offered another definition in 2000:

“...connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them” (Putnam 2000; pp. 19).

Looking at the definitions above, he stays in the same vein as Coleman but progresses with essential dimensions such as ‘reciprocity’ and ‘trust’ and as Field (2003) points out, the latter of the two definitions gives two main indicators for social capital – social networks and norms (trust and reciprocity) (Field 2003; pp. 32). He argues that “networks of civic engagement foster sturdy norms of generalized reciprocity and encourage the emergence of

social trust” (Putnam 1995; pp. 67). Putnam (2000) views social capital as having two faces; “a private face and a public face” (Putnam 2000; pp. 20). He argues that whilst social capital can initially be generated by individuals networking for a reason such as gaining employment or advancing in other ways, but social capital can also have “externalities that affect the wider community” and thus distributing the benefits of the connections made. For this reason he argues that social capital is both “private and public good (Putnam 2000; pp. 20). However, whilst viewing social capital as essentially a public good, he also acknowledges that social capital can have negative implications for communities, particularly for individuals that find themselves outside the network (Putnam 2000; pp. 21). He goes on to highlight a couple of instances where social capital proved, and still does prove, to have a negative impact on society – such as in Timothy McVeigh’s instance, and instances where gangs have strong bonding social capital which results in detrimental consequences for those not a part of said gang (Putnam 2000; pp. 21-22).

Although there are clear differences between these three theorists regarding their conception of social capital, at what level it exists, how and why it is used, and the by-products of its use, there is common ground on which to build. “An intrinsic characteristic of social capital is that it is relational” (Narayan and Cassidy 2001; pp. 60). Relationships of mutual acquaintance, connections, networks and social structures (Bourdieu 1986, Coleman 1988, Putnam 2000, Fukuyama 2001, et al) are the founding dimension of any conception of social capital and all refer to the same thing; relationships, between individuals or groups, that create capital that can be used within said groups, communities, or wider society. Although a variety of different conceptualisations of social capital exist, the importance of ‘relationships’ seems to be a point of consensus through the theories history. As Putnam (2000) wrote “social networks have value” (Putnam 2000; pp. 19).

Another commonly perceived dimension for social capital, and one that many theorists regard as essential, is that of social norms. Fukuyama (2001) lists “honesty, the keeping of commitments, reliable performance of duties, reciprocity” as norms and stresses that, unlike other social norms, the norms that make up social capital must lead to and create co-operation (Fukuyama 2001; pp. 7-8). Putnam (2000) believes that the dimensions of relationships and norms are of equal importance and, whilst comparing social capital to civic virtue he argues that the difference between civic virtue and social capital is the latter “calls

attention to the fact that civic virtue is most powerful when embedded in a dense network of reciprocal social relations” (Putnam 2000; pp. 19). According the most theorists, reciprocity, and the trustworthiness of individuals within a group to be reciprocal are essential. Reciprocity and trust are seen as the two main norms essential for social capital. Reciprocity is best illustrated by Coleman (1998) who argues that social capital can be seen as a positive and beneficial part of trading life in a market place in Cairo. He argues that market stall owners would pass on custom to others within the market for specific goods that they might not sell but their fellow stall owner might. Without the trust that this act would be reciprocated, the stall owners would be less likely to work in this manner and would therefore work in a less efficient manner (Coleman 1988; pp. 99). Putnam (2000) makes the distinction between specific reciprocity and generalized reciprocity arguing that the former is “quid-pro-quo” between two individuals but the latter is more valuable and casual – I’ll do this now because someone else will surely do something for me in the future (Putnam 2000; pp. 20). Furthermore, he argues that past successful collaboration can lead to future collective actions and these collective actions develop the “I” into the ‘we’ which encourages further action (Putnam 1995; pp. 67).

Social trust is an interesting norm that, since Coleman, has been identified as fundamental to social capital. It is commonly agreed that trust “facilitates working with others on common issues” (Putnam 2004: Cited in Valenzuela 2009; pp. 877). Fukuyama (2001) conceptualises social capital quite differently to those such as Coleman and Putnam and makes the distinction between what he terms *in potential* norms and *instantiated* norms. Nevertheless, he put much emphasis on trust arguing that “all groups embodying social capital have a certain radius of trust” (Fukuyama 2001; pp. 8). It is generally acknowledged, despite different emphases, that trust is integral to social capital as in its absence, people would feel less incline to work with others to achieve a goal and would trust others less to contribute as much as themselves towards the collective good.

Within the literature, not only is there attention paid to the dimensions of social capital, but also the type of social capital that can be found. Although, as Claridge (2005) points out there are two main types of social capital; Structural and Cognitive, and bridge and bonding (Claridge 2005; pp. 34) this project means only to cover the latter – bridging and bonding. Putnam (2000) highlighted this distinction of social capital and argued that it was the most

important within the literature (Putnam 2000; pp. 22). He argues that “bonding social capital is good for undergirding specific reciprocity and mobilising solidarity. Bridging networks, by contrast, are better for linkage to external assets and for information diffusion” (Putnam 2000; pp. 22). Another way of putting it is bonding social capital is found within close knit groups and only aids those within said group to maximum effect. Bridging social capital is found between groups, possibly from different backgrounds, life styles, etc. It is bridging social capital that builds communities together using smaller groups thus bridging the gap between said groups. As Field (2003) argues, “bonding social capital tends to reinforce exclusive identities and maintains homogeneity; bridging social capital tends to bring together people across diverse social divisions” (Field 2003; pp. 32). As noted above, Putnam tends to view social capital as a positive aspect of community life but he also recognises that it can, in some circumstances, have a negative impact on communities and society. Local groups such as Parent and Teacher Associations are seen to create and sustain bonding social capital that has largely positive effects. However, some authors note that bonding social capital can also have a negative impact on social such as sustaining groups like the IRA (Field 2003; pp. 83) and the Ku Klux Klan (Putnam 2000; pp. 21-22) and these examples serve to demonstrate the dark side of social capital.

So far, we have briefly looked at the three main theorists of social capital, the dimensions they identify, and the types of social capital that can be found. For those that attempt to measure or test social capital, there is another important aspect to look at, the indicators of social capital. Whilst this project does not wish or aim to measure or test social capital theory, it is still important to appreciate what these are. Claridge (2005), in his extensive thesis on social capital, cited Putnam’s (2000) *Bowling Alone* and the indicators he uses in this book, which are as follows: Measures of Community or Organisational life such as the mean number of club meetings attended in the last year, Measures of Engagement in Public Affairs such as turnout of Presidential elections, Measures of Community Volunteerism such as the mean number of times an individual did voluntary work in the last year, Measures of Informal Sociability such as the mean number of times an individual or group entertained at home in the last year, and, Measures of Social Trust such as the percentage of individuals who agree that “most people are honest” (Claridge 2005 pp. 50). Such indicators, and others like those highlighted by Grootaert (2001) (Cited in Claridge 2005; pp. 48) are often used by

researchers and social scientists wishing to test or measure social capital in an effort to make the theory itself valid and reliable.

Although this theory gained a great deal of momentum after Putnam (2000), it is not without its critics. Claridge (2005) wrote an extensive thesis on social capital and natural resource management and found that there are serious problems with the conceptualisation and application of social capital theory across all social science disciplines, resulting in “questionable operationalisation” and as such, he found no appropriate framework of social capital that could be used for measurement or testing (Claridge 2005; pp. 71). For empirical social scientists working with social capital theory, this presents a problem. Without an appropriate framework, measuring or testing would be invalidated.

This problem itself presents a further problem: how can social capital theory be effectively studied, an understanding of its complexities gained, and this information used to increase political engagement? It is important to note that creating a sustainable conceptualisation of social capital theory and developing reliable methods and indicators for measuring and testing is not something which this project wished to attempt. This project moves away from attempting to quantify social capital towards an appreciation of its complex and context specific nature. This project argues that because of its complex and context specific nature, the best way of using social capital theory is by taking the concept back to basics, focusing on its key dimensions, and undertaking valuable qualitative community based research in order to understand how it may, or may not be used for increasing political engagement. The following chapter will now explain how this project achieves this by detailing the methodology for the primary research.

5. Methodology

5.1. Aims and objectives

The primary aim of this project was to develop a greater understanding of political engagement in the context of political disengagement in Britain. However, whilst this broad aim remained, the specific focus of the project developed through the initial literature review, the development of the research methodology, and the analysis of the data derived from the primary research.

The research question that the primary research aimed to answer is:

- Do institutional structures have a negative impact on the development of social capital that contributes towards political engagement?

As noted above this research question was not formed at the initial stage of this project. The following is a narrative explanation of how this question was posed, and how this project sought to answer it.

5.2. The literature review and developing the methodology

Having established the broad research focus, an initial literature review was started which influenced the focusing of the research towards to research question. Amongst this initial review, three books can be selected that had a significant influence on the project; Stoker (2006) *Why politics matters*, Hay (2007) *Why we hate politics*, and Putnam (2000) *Bowling Alone*, the latter of these provided a theoretical framework that created the objective of exploring the effects of social capital on political engagement.

A review of the literature on social capital was then started and this continued throughout the primary research and analysis alongside reviewing the literature on political engagement. At this stage a positivist approach (Crotty 1998; cited in Gray 2009; pp. 19) to studying social capital was rejected. As noted in the literature review, Claridge (2005) found no appropriate framework of social capital that could be used for measuring or testing the theory (Claridge 2005; pp. 71). It is argued that this is due to the nature of social capital

which, as Adam and Roncevic (2003) comment, is “highly context-specific” (Adam and Roncevic 2003; pp. 160). Thus, this project takes an interpretivist approach that argues the world is interpreted through the eyes of individuals (Williams and May 1996, cited in Gray 2009; pp. 21). As this project assumes that “reality is a constructed and shifting entity and... social processes can be changed by interactions among people” (Grbich 2007; pp. 71) it was deemed appropriate to conduct a qualitative piece of research aimed at achieving the above mentioned objectives in an exploratory manner.

Through the literature review on social capital and political engagement it was noted that institutional structures can have implications for the development of social capital. Field (2003) details that government intervention either based on social capital theory, or that includes the consideration of social capital, can have undesired and negative consequences (2003; pp. 119-123). He cites Frank Furedi (2002; pp. 24-25) who argued that policies designed to promote volunteering can subsequently have negative impacts on motivations putting self interest above altruism (Cited in Field 2003; pp. 119). Field (2003) also cites Perri 6 (1997; pp. 6) who argues that government job training schemes can foster what he calls “the wrong kind of networks” of unemployed people like themselves (Cited in Field 2003; pp. 122). These arguments partially contradict Etzioni (2000) who argues that the state can and should facilitate mutuality and enable citizens to be actively involved in their communities and decision making processes (Etzioni 2000). As Etzioni (2000) argues that the state should be involved in developing mutuality, which can be seen as communities with a wealth of social capital, yet others such as Furedi (2000) argue that this can be problematic and even have counterproductive consequences, it was decided that this contradiction provided an interesting and important focus for the primary research.

From this focus a theoretical framework was created based on political engagement, institutional structures and social capital theory. From this framework it was decided that a comparative case study would be conducted using three groups found on a spectrum of formality from formal, to semi-formal, to informal determined by the individual groups relation to government structures. The following is a description of the groups chosen and an explanation of why they have been duly categorised:

- Formal – Scrutiny Cooptee Scheme in Kirklees

Scrutiny Co-optee's sit on Overview and Scrutiny Panels as non-political members, alongside politically elected councillors. Overview and Scrutiny Panels look at Kirklees Council's performance, and the performance of other public sector services, to check how well they are doing (Kirklees, no date 1). These Overview and Scrutiny Panels can be seen as a local government equivalent to national government Select Committees. Co-optee's can have varying responsibilities from turning up to Overview and Scrutiny meetings to ensure the scrutiny process is effective, to completing a piece of research requested by the scrutiny panel the co-optee may sit on. It is important to reiterate that Scrutiny Co-optee's are in a non party political voluntary position. The purpose of the Scrutiny Co-optee's is to offer an objective opinion to the scrutiny process in order to reduce the possibility of party political points scoring, and gain an outsider's perspective. Furthermore, Kirklees Council are the employers of co-optee's (although they are volunteers) and they are managed by the Policy and Governance Department of Kirklees Council (due to service reviews in 2010/2011, co-optee's may now be managed under a different department). Whilst co-optees are specifically and intentionally not party political, due to the nature of their volunteering inside local government, this project views the Scrutiny Co-optee Scheme as being political in nature. The co-optee scheme is built into the structures of local governing at Kirklees Council as laid out in Kirklees Council's Constitution and, as mentioned, co-optees sit alongside councillors. They undertake a similar role to the elected councillors in councillor led scrutiny meetings which are usually formal in nature. Due to these characteristics and co-optees existence being constitutional and therefore legally required, this project views the Scrutiny Co-optee Scheme as a formal political engagement group.

- Semi-formal – Tenant Movement

The Tenant movement in Kirklees comprises several entities: Tenant and Resident Associations (TRAs), Kirklees Neighbourhood Housing Area Forums (KNH-AF), Community Voices (CVs), and Kirklees Federation of Tenants and Residents Associations (KFTRA). TRAs, KNH-AFs and CVs are all set out in Kirklees

Neighbourhood Housing's (KNH) Participation Charter, 6th Edition (KNH 1, 2011), and are all facilitated by KNH and Kirklees Council, whilst KFTRA is a separate organisation. TRAs comprise tenants and residents in the local area that come together to solve local problems and in-so-doing they receive access to a small budget. The types of issues tackled by TRAs tend to be local security problems and the acquisition of security lighting or fencing, maintenance of the local area including gardening, and generally giving local people a louder voice by facilitating them to speak with one voice. In the Participation Charter, KNH-AF are one level higher than TRAs in the structure and one or two members from each TRA are invited to sit on their local forum. These tackle holistic community issues and make decision on dividing budgets for each TRA. Community Voice's are similar to TRAs in purpose but are a single person, with no budget, doing their part for their community. These are used in areas where there isn't a TRA, or a TRA has failed – in other words, in areas where mutuality and association are not found in the community. KFTRA describes itself as an 'umbrella' organisation for TRAs in Kirklees and operates as a separate organisation to KNH and Kirklees providing support to TRAs and other tenants. This organisation is run by an elected Management Committee of local tenants which is supported by employed staff. These organisations operate in a similar manner and for the same purpose – to support tenants and residents within Kirklees with issues in and around their housing estates. Like with the Scrutiny Co-optee Scheme, many of these sub groups, except KFTRA, are structured and partially governed by an official policy, the Participation Charter 6th Edition that was partially written by tenants and residents, which puts these sub groups into a decision making hierarchy. KFTRA is separate and is governed by its official management committee. As a result of the work individuals within the tenant movement undertake at grass-root level, this project judges them to be political. However, in contrast to the co-optee scheme, these groups do exist apart from an official body and meetings and activities are planned, organised and run by the tenants and residents themselves. Therefore, although there is an official top-down structure, individuals interact in a bottom up fashion. Due to the nature of these structures, this project views the tenant movement as semi-formal.

- Informal – Retain Education at Castle Hall campaign (REACH)

The Retain Education at Castle Hall campaign was a grass-roots social movement based in Mirfield, West Yorkshire, and surrounding areas, set up to oppose a Kirklees local government decision to close Castle Hall High School as part of their Building Schools for the Future program. After the decision had been made by Kirklees in 2009 to close Castle Hall, parents, teachers and other local people got together and started a campaign to overturn this decision. According to their website, there were no educational grounds to close the school, Mirfield Free Grammar (the school which would take Castle Hall pupils) did not have physical room to expand, and all children being educated in Mirfield would suffer. The campaign held galas, made a petition with over 5000 signatures, held a 6 mile march, and members even took part in a bike-ride from Mirfield, West Yorkshire, to London to deliver their objections to the government. Although this campaign can be seen as more political than the Co-optee's and those involved in the tenant movement, this campaign group was founded on the peripheries of formal politics, against a formal political decision making institution. This campaign group did not operate directly within a political system or structures and nor did it exist due to any formal policy. Its founding members were normal, independent people acting as a collective against Kirklees Council and without the support of any political institution (although it should be mentioned that they did gain the support of Mirfield Councillors and Mirfield's MP at the time, Shahid Malik). Due to these characteristics, this project views the REACH campaign as an informal political engagement group.

It was decided that these groups would be studied by employing semi-structured interviews with an interview prompt sheet that would be used to keep each interview focused on a number of broad areas that were determined to be important for this project. These broad areas included how participants became involved, what their motivations were, how active they were within their group, what the participants individual roles and activities were within the groups, what if anything had they achieved, and whether or not they had benefitted or changed from the experience. Explorations of methodological theory lead this project towards grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss 1967; cited in Grbich 2007; pp. 71)

because of its concern relating to researcher bias. However, the broad dimensions of social capital; relationships, reciprocity and trust, as well as debates relating to political engagement were already known and understood at this point. Therefore, this project does not employ grounded theory but it was influenced by Glaser and Strauss (1967) concerns relating to researcher bias. As a result, an effort was made to exclude direct questions about social capital to avoid prejudicing the results. A pilot interview was conducted to test the prompt sheet and amendments were made accordingly.

Having decided on the methodology, chosen the groups to be studied and set loose parameters for the semi-structured interviews, individuals engaged in the groups were invited to be interviewed for this project. This was done through intermediaries employed by Kirklees Council and Kirklees Neighbourhood Housing, attending KNH Area Forums to directly appeal for volunteers, and by making contact with a core member of the REACH campaign who forwarded the request for volunteers onto other members of the campaign. Whilst the initial aim was to interview between 5-10 individuals from each group dependant on data saturation, this project was restrained by people volunteering. The number of individuals subsequently interviewed from each group was as follows:

- 8 individuals from the Tenant Movement
- 3 individual Scrutiny Co-optees
- 5 individuals from the REACH campaign

The interviews were carried out over a 7 month period each lasting between 30-70 minutes each. Throughout this period, the literature review into social capital theory and political disengagement continued and as the body of primary data was gathered, the theoretical understanding of that data continued to develop. It is worth noting that originally the project decided to study KNH Area Forums as a group rather than the tenant movement which was subsequently studied. This restricted focus on the KNH Area Forums developed into a broader focus on the tenant movement as a direct result of the interviews. It became clear early on that KNH Area Forums were only a minor part of a much broader community group and, given the tenant movement, as described above, could still be categorised as semi-formal, the semi-structured interviews allowed for wider exploration into the

individuals' engagement. All interviews were recorded on a digital Dictaphone to ensure all data collection could be analysed.

Once all interviews were complete, the recordings were listened to and based on the questions asked and the broad dimensions of social capital (relationships, reciprocity and trust) important sentences were transcribed. Manual content analysis was then used to categorise and re-categorise the data and through this, the following themes emerged:

Primary themes

- R – Relationships/networks
- re – Reciprocity

Secondary themes

- P – Prior to engagement
- G – Growth during engagement
- C – Continuous throughout engagement
- D – Decline during or after engagement

Types of Social capital

- bb – Bonding Social capital
- BB – Bridging Social capital

The primary themes that emerged from the data were based on the known dimensions of social capital; relationships, reciprocity and trust as outlined in the fourth chapter. It is important to note that trust was rejected as a theme after the content analysis was unable to differentiate trust from reciprocity in the data. There were no direct questions about trust in the interview as a result of the methodology outlined above. Data that was identified as demonstrating trust was data about trust in reciprocity such as entering into engagement groups and expecting reciprocity. It was therefore determined that trust as a separate theme did not add value to the data. The theme of relationships (R) was identified from the data as sustained connections between individuals and groups. As such, individuals within a group had relationships with each other if they connected with each other verbally or otherwise over a sustained period of time. The theme of reciprocity (re) was identified

from the data as acts within and for a group that were made with the expectation that others would also contribute towards that group.

The identification of secondary themes happen as a result of many instances of the primary themes being identified but demonstrating little about the participants nature of interaction within the groups. As such, these secondary themes were derived from the data in order to more accurately illustrate the nature of the primary themes. Prior to engagement (P) illustrates any of the primary themes being evident before the individual engaged in their respective engagement groups that were studied by this project. Growth in engagement (G) illustrates any of the primary themes increasing through the individual's engagement in their respective groups. Continuous throughout engagement (C) illustrates any of the primary themes continuing throughout their engagement up to the time of the interview. Decline during or after engagement (D) illustrates any of the primary themes declining or ceasing to be evident during, or after engagement. As such, the primary themes are considered to be evidence of social capital, whilst the secondary themes categorise the primary themes that allow narratives of behaviour to be drawn from the data. As such, "reD" represents a decline in reciprocity.

The types of social capital that have been identified from the data have also been outlined in the fourth chapter. Bonding social capital was identified from the data as relationships and acts of reciprocity that result in closer ties within the respective groups. Bridging social capital was identified from the data as relationships and acts of reciprocity from participant's respective groups that led to further relationships being built, encompassing reciprocal acts, outside their respective groups.

When designing the research methods, undertaking the interviews, and writing up the results, it was necessary to understand and act upon ethical issues which arose. It was important that potential participants were not directly contacted using means that are not available publically such as personal telephone numbers. As a result, intermediaries such as Kirklees Council employees were used to contact most participants, with some participants being invited to participate by attending KNH Area Forums. For the REACH campaign, an individual was contacted whose details were available on the REACH campaign's website and that individual offered to cascade the request for participants to other members of the

campaign. Further ethical considerations were undertaken regarding participant anonymity. Participants were advised that all information use for this project would be anonymous and this project has ensured this by using pseudonyms throughout writing up the project. Finally, all participants were informed about the nature of the project and what data collected would be used for. All participants signed a declaration confirming they understood what the project was about and how the data would be used.

6. Results

Below are the results of this project's content analysis of the primary research data. It is structured in thematic format presenting the primary themes ordered by the secondary themes. It is deemed that this provides a thematic narrative of how social capital can be identified and seen to affect interaction within the context of the engagement groups studied. First, any evidence of prior relationships and acts of reciprocity (RP and reP) participants may have experience before engaging in their respective groups that this project studied. This illustrates whether or not participants had previously experienced these themes in any engagement group other than the ones they were interviewed for. Second, any growth in relationships and acts of reciprocity (RG and reG) participants may have experienced during their engagement in their respective groups. This illustrates whether or not participants saw an increase in these themes whilst engaged in the groups they were interviewed for. Third, any continuation of relationships and acts of reciprocity (RC and reC) participants may have experienced during their engagement in their respective groups. This illustrates whether or not participants experienced these themes continuing throughout their engagement up until the interviews were conducted. Fourth, in contrast to any continuation in these themes, any decline in relationships and acts of reciprocity (RD and reD) participants may have experienced whilst engaged in their respective groups. This illustrates whether participants saw these important themes in decline whilst engaged which could lead to disengagement. And finally, any demonstration of bridging and bonding social capital participants may have experienced within, and from their engagement groups, are presented.

It is important to note that all names that appear are pseudonyms to protect the anonymity of the participants. Results are structured thematically according to the themes that were derived from the content analysis of the data.

6.1. Prior relationships and reciprocity (RP and reP)

Evidence of previous relationships within groups (RP) and previous acts of reciprocity within groups (reP) were drawn from all three groups but not from all participants. These themes were further subcategorised into "direct" referring to these themes being evident from their

respective groups that this project studied, and “indirect” referring to these themes being evident from other groups.

Jack, a Community Voice (CV) from the tenant movement demonstrated indirect RP and reP from the charity work he has been involved in since 1977 and also direct RP and reP from his engagement in his former TRA before it closed due to lack of resources and interest from others. Suzanne and Alex also from the tenant movement, only demonstrated direct RP as they already knew everyone in their local community that is confined to a specific living complex but they had not experienced reciprocity before founding their TRA, nor any indirect RP or reP. However, Donna and Jessica who are also from the tenant movement did not demonstrate any RP or reP before joining but incidentally, Jessica demonstrated the strongest bonding social capital relative to other tenant movement participants. Jane, who also demonstrated strong bonding social capital and bridging social capital, did not demonstrate any direct reP. As a result, it could not be argued that RP and reP, either direct or indirect, are necessary for initial engagement.

Whereas participants from the tenant movement demonstrated different experiences prior to becoming involved, scrutiny co-optees all demonstrated some indirect RP and reP before becoming a co-optee. Mark had volunteered as a Magistrate and been a school governor. At time of the interview he was still a magistrate. Charles sits on a Yorkshire and Humber War Pensions committee, had previously volunteered as a Responsible Adult for young offenders, volunteered to audit police cells and does ad-Hoc pro-bona work such as mentoring young journalists. Although Claire does not have the same voluntary experience as Mark and Charles, she does volunteer at a local church with her friend doing things like packing shoe boxes to send abroad as aid. Interestingly as equally as relevant; Mark, Charles and Claire have all had professional careers in which they gained experience of formal meetings and environments. Mark was a Finance Director; Charles had worked as a journalist for many years; and Claire had been a manager in her local college. These experiences demonstrate a wealth of prior experience encompassing both RP and reP that all co-optees interviewed shared.

Like with co-optees, a pattern emerged from the REACH campaign relating to RP, but unlike the co-optees it did not relate to reP as evidence of this was inconsistent. Sean and Ben

have both similar experiences of RP and reP. Sean demonstrated indirect RP and reP through his voluntary work with a group called Save Mirfield, a casual group that takes ad-Hoc action against issues they want to change in Mirfield. Sean also knew the person who later becomes the Chair of REACH through this group Save Mirfield demonstrating direct RP and reP. Ben demonstrates RP and reP through his experience of chairing the Huddersfield Friends of the Earth campaign group, chairing Mirfield's Sink the Link campaign, and for the leading role he played turning Mirfield into Kirklees' first fair trade town. However, the other members interviewed only demonstrated brief direct RP which manifested from attending meetings about the closure of Castle Hall School immediately before the REACH campaign was founded.

The data on RP and reP demonstrates no pattern that leads to engagement. However, it is interesting to note that the three co-optees interviewed all had experience of what can be seen as professional RP and reP from their lengthy careers before retirement.

6.2. Growth in relationships and reciprocity (RG and reG)

Whilst the growth in relationships within participant's respective groups can be identified as a theme on its own, it does share characteristics with continued relationships and reciprocity. The difference between them is growth can be followed by either a continuation in these themes, or a decline in these themes. For this project growth represents the development of these themes, whereas continued relationships and reciprocity and a decline of relationships and reciprocity illustrate what happens to these themes over the period of time leading up to the interviews. As such, almost all participants with the exception of the two CVs, Jack and Mary, all demonstrate RG and reG in some form.

Jane becomes involved in her TRA through her neighbour and fast becomes more involved in the tenant movement attending KNH Area Forums, being voted onto the management committee of KFTRA and even has discussions with different people about a possible future for in politics for her with suggestions she should become a councillor. Through this she met many new people such as others involved in KFTRA and councillors, and she worked with these people to achieve results for her community. As Jane says herself "if I didn't have the involvement of working alongside councillors and seeing what their about, and also working alongside KNH and KFTRA I wouldn't have felt that I wanted to go down that road". Others

that were founding members of their TRAs also demonstrate RG and reG such as Suzanne and Alex who had many active members in their TRA when it was founded. Furthermore Donna, who joined a failing TRA, demonstrated RG and reG with new community members of her TRA as a result of a marketing campaign she conducted. Others involved in the tenant movement did not demonstrate any RG or reG as noted above. Both Jack and Mary who are both CVs were unlike others in the tenant movement as the majority of their involvement was on an individual basis and thus not conducive to RG and reG. Mary, whilst an active CV only seemed to be active in-so-far as she did things for others in her community who were all elderly. These acts were not performed for reciprocity but out of altruism but as a result, did not generate any notable RG or reG.

Similarly, Mark, Charles and Claire who were involved as scrutiny co-optees all demonstrate evidence of RG and reG. For Mark, evidence of RG and reG was only evident after a period of time where he experience declining relationships and acts of reciprocity. He comments that after a new chair person was installed in his committee to replace the previous one, a good level of structure was instilled in the meetings which contributed towards progress being made. As he said “when he [new chair person] got involved he brought some structure to it and a feeling that you were getting somewhere”. Whilst this RG and reG can be seen as more professional than social, it nonetheless demonstrates an increase in relationships and reciprocity that were important for Mark.

For individuals involved in the REACH campaign, evidence of RG and reG can be seen from the start. Most of those interviewed attended the initial meetings where REACH was founded and most attended several REACH events which shows the building of relationships inside and outside of what became to be the core of the campaign group of which all individuals interviewed were a part of. For Ben, this growth in relationships and reciprocity is best demonstrated by a cycle event where several members of the campaign cycled down to London to give a petition to Ed Ball’s, the then Education Secretary. As Ben said “it was an excellent event and it really brought people together – and it has had a lasting affect”. The description of this event from Ben and from Lauren shows how relationships were sustained and strengthened by this event which led to high moral within the campaign. For Steven, specifically RG, but also because of the nature of the campaign, reG as well, is demonstrated

by his comments that he has “rekindled some old school friendships and made a lot of new friends through it”.

The data on RG and reG demonstrates that those who entered into a period of sustained engagement did experience a growth in relationships and acts of reciprocity; with the exception of the CVs from the tenant movement. For CVs, there is little evidence that they have any relationships within the tenant movement, and demonstrate no acts of reciprocity.

6.3. Continued relationships and reciprocity (RC and reC)

As mentioned above continued relationships and reciprocity share many traits with growth in these themes. However, RC and reC represent these themes continuing over a period of time leading up to, but not ceasing at, the interviews carried out for this project. Unlike growth in these themes which can largely be seen from all participants with the exception of CVs, RC and reC is only identified from those individuals that can be considered still involved, or involved up until their engagement was ultimately successful as seen in the REACH campaign.

For the tenant movement, several of those interviewed demonstrated RC and reC most notably Jane and Jessica demonstrated by their desire to stay involved in their respective TRAs, and for Jessica in KFTRA and her other activities, as a direct result of the people they engage with and the success they have had working with these people. Jane argues on several occasions that they have achieved a lot as a collective and she talks about her activities and successes as this collective, rather than just her. For Jessica, there are more obvious and clear demonstrations of RC and reC. The first thing Jessica said to the question of what has she achieved was “A community, and that’s my main thing”. And later she said “we’re a family. If anybody asks we’re not a community, we’re a family”. Almost everyone in the complex is still involved and they encourage new residents of the complex to become involved by holding pie and peas nights at different people’s flats. All those involved have their own roles within the TRA such as attending to the gardens or being the person who helps resolve repairs. Like with Jane, Jessica demonstrates no sign of a decline in relationships or reciprocity. Again, what is interesting is that Jack and Mary, the two CVs, do not demonstrate any RC and reC but continue to be involved regardless and do not comment that this lack of relationships and reciprocity makes them want to disengage.

For Mark, Charles and Jane, RC and reC are more subtle but are demonstrated by their continued involvement as scrutiny co-optees. For Mark, RC and reC is demonstrated by his continued involvement after a period of RD and reD relating to the previous chair person of his committee. After the RD and reD ceased, Mark continued to be involved and spoke about a feeling of making progress. He said that once others stopped listening to him and he felt he wasn't contributing he would stop which had not happened up to the point of the interview which demonstrates a good level of RC and reC. As Ben said, "as soon as I feel that I'm getting nowhere I'll pack it in". Since he has yet to pack it in, he does still feel he is getting somewhere with those he is working with. For Charles, RC and reC is demonstrated by his willingness to undertake ad-Hoc tasks outside of the committee room such as an observational task on Huddersfield's night time economy that he attended with other members of his committee.

For those interviewed that were involved in the REACH campaign, RC and reC is most notably demonstrated by their commitment to stay involved until they were successful, and this continued after their engagement which will be explained later in the bridging and bonding section. Many of those interviewed from REACH spoke about the campaign taking over large parts of their lives to the extent where this had an impact of Steven's own business. Many of them also spoke about the tasks others did in the campaign which continued relentlessly such as Gillian's letter writing to the local press to keep up momentum outside of the "core" of the campaign. Steven spoke about how the campaign might not have been as successful if it wasn't for those at the "core" being as committed as they were with the skills they had which demonstrates an abundance of reC. He did add that the campaign may still have been ultimately successful without them because of the passion and energy of many other people that were involved. Even outside of the "core", RC and reC is demonstrated by Steven when he says "100-150 people would regularly turn up to the weekly, or fortnightly, meetings".

What this illustrates is, whilst almost all participants experience a growth in relationships and acts of reciprocity, this only continued for some. Within the tenant movement, Jane and Jessica demonstrate this more so than others, whilst overall, the REACH campaign is the group that consistently demonstrates in abundance these themes continuing.

6.4. Decline in relationships and reciprocity (RD and reD)

A decline in relationships and reciprocity is seen as the opposite of continuous relationships and reciprocity. If relationships and acts of reciprocity do not continue or continue to grow, they decline. Therefore, by putting growth, continuous and decline together, these themes can be tracked and compared against engagement.

For those involved in the tenant movement, a decline in relationships and reciprocity appears to lead to disengagement – again with the exception of CVs. For Jack, RD and reD is demonstrated by the closure of his former TRA. Due to a lack of interest of resources, his former TRA closed leaving him on his own without others in his community being involved with him. He did, however, become a CV which has kept him involved even without others in his community being active. For Mary, the other CV, there is a similar story. Mary was the vice-chair of her TRA which closed 4 years ago due to lack of interest by other in her community. She comments that “people these days don’t want to be doing things for themselves”. She also said that more people would turn up to TRA meetings when something was happening in the estate like new kitchens being fitted – for her, this suggested they wanted the TRA to do things for them, rather than those people being active to do things for themselves. Both Suzanne and Alex demonstrated RD and reD from their TRA that was still running at the time of the interview. Both said their TRA use to be very active, with many members and they achieved a great deal. However, Suzanne commented that now only a handful of people still attend meetings and most people in their community are just not bothered about it despite their repeated attempts to engage more people. Alex said people just “come in, lock doors, not bothered”. Both Suzanne and Alex are considering stopping the TRA citing reD as the cause. Suzanne commented that “now a days the people who are coming to our meetings are people mainly coming to complain about things. They need some repairs doing or something. But really they should be phoning in themselves but they think that we should do it”. Alex did comment however that people in the community still call him the “caretaker” which suggests a continued level of relationships even in the absence of reciprocal acts. Donna’s demonstration of RD and reD is most interesting; after evidence of RG and reG due to her TRA marketing campaign, those she engaged and got engaged fell outside of her TRA catchment area and were forced to set up their own. After

this, Donna saw a rapid decline in relationships and reciprocity in her failing and unattended TRA and, at the time of the interview, she was about to step down.

Mark, a scrutiny co-optee experienced levels of RD and reD relating to the former chair person of his committee. He comments that the meetings were almost completely unstructured and run very badly and as a result, he almost quit. As he said, referring to the unstructured committees under the previous chair, “if it would have carried on I would have packed it in, I was ready to pack it in”. However, before he did quit, the chair person was replaced by another and with this new chair person, greater structure was brought to the meetings and with it, a feeling that they were making progress. Thus, after a period of damaging RD and reD, Mark experience RG and reG which appeared to keep him involved. Whilst Charles did not demonstrate any notable RD and reD, he did mention that some in the committee meetings “pole vault over mouse turds” demonstrating that relationships and acts of reciprocity were not evident from all those involved, but there was enough to keep him involved.

For the REACH campaign there was no evidence of declining relationships or acts of reciprocity at all. However, two of those interviews, Ben and Gillian, demonstrated anticipated RD and reD after the campaign had ended. Although this campaign subsequently created a type of Parent and Teacher Association (PTA) called Friends of Castle Hall, Ben argued that maintaining momentum after a successful campaign for possible future successes is more difficult and sites his previous experience of campaigns such as his success in turning Mirfield into Kirklees’ first fair trade town. This suggests he has doubts about whether relationships built through the campaign, and acts of reciprocity made in the campaign, could be sustained through the new PTA. Gillian mirrored this sentiment arguing that relationships and activities of the REACH campaign are not sustainable over longer periods of time because “we are all more individualistic and selfish” again casting doubt on whether RC and reC is possible through Friends of Castle Hall.

The analysis of declining relationships and acts of reciprocity is considered the most important analysis of this project. Most of those that experienced sustained RD and reD subsequently disengaged from their respective groups with the exception of CVs who continued to be involved but this involvement cannot be seen as encompassing social

capital – there is little evidence of the development of relationships based on reciprocity. Donna, experienced RD and reD as a result of the rules of the TRA and subsequently disengaged. Suzanne and Alex experienced RD and reD from their TRA and as a result, are considering stopping the TRA. Whilst no scrutiny co-optee experience sustained RD and reD, Mark did experience a level of RD and reD that almost led to disengagement. After an experiencing RG and reG again, he continued to be engaged. In addition, although there were no experiences of RD and reD from the REACH campaign, there was evidence of anticipated RD and reD relating to Friends of Castle Hall which could lead to a failure of this PTA – although this project has no data to support any assumption as the interviews were carried out after only one meeting had been held.

6.5. Bridging and bonding social capital

Evidence of bridging and bonding social capital can be identified from the data of the interviews. It is important to note that this project finds that bridging and bonding social capital can be found side by side, and it does not show that it is one or the other. Whilst bonding social capital is correlated with RC and reC, bridging social capital is identified by individuals expanding their relationships outside of their respective engagement groups.

For Jane, a member of the tenant movement, she displays bonding social capital with her commitment to acting as a collective within her TRA and her comments that she would not have been as committed and active if it wasn't for those she was engaged with. She also displays evidence of bridging social capital due to her engagement with KFTRA, the work she has done with councillors and other organisations such as Huddersfield Carnival and fundraising events she has been involved with. Jessica also displays bonding social capital, particularly with her emphasis on her TRA achieving a community and the way her TRA works together; "we love our pie and peas; we do try and have a 'do' so that when new people come we can get them all together and they get to know each other". However, whilst Jessica demonstrates stronger bonding social capital than Jane, Jessica doesn't demonstrate any bridging social capital, instead choosing to focus on her community. Importantly, whilst the CVs continue to engage, they demonstrate no evidence of bonding social capital. They can be seen as active within their communities to an extent, but engagement is not accompanied by relationships based on reciprocity. Even their

engagement in the KNH Area Forums does not show any significant relationships that can be viewed as bonding social capital.

For co-optees there is no evidence of bridging social capital. Furthermore, evidence of bonding social capital is limited but can be identified in Charles and Clair to an extent. Charles demonstrates a commitment to his committee doing work outside the meeting rooms on Huddersfield's night time economy which is interpreted as a type of bonding social capital; something which could be categorised as professional bonding social capital as a result of the environment in which it manifests. Similarly with Claire; she speaks of the "friendliness" of the meetings and speaks positively about them, but this does not appear to develop what could be described as close relationships. Again, this can be seen as a professional type of bonding social capital.

For members of the REACH campaign, bonding social capital is more apparent. All those interviewed were part of the "core" of the campaign and all demonstrated strong bonding social capital with fellow members of the "core". Events such as the cycle to London event demonstrated strong bonding social capital between those that were involved as well as comments from members such as Laruen about making many friends who they now see socially such as having drinks at the pub. Comments about the "core" from all members suggested very strong relationships within this core and consistent acts of reciprocity constitutes clear bonding capital. What is interesting about members of the REACH campaign is the bonding capital that they displayed was the catalyst for bridging social capital manifested in a new PTA they set up called Friends of Castle Hall. Friends of Castle Hall is a new PTA set up to bridge the gap between the school and other community actors such as other schools and businesses. "It's like a much broader support network for the school which involves the community, and businesses, and other people that can get involved rather than just parents. It's a money raising and social group... to involve as wider group of possible people with a possible interest in the upkeep of Castle Hall. For instance, Norristhorpe football club who do not have enough pitches of their own, can use Castle Hall school fields for training... or local businesses that are interested in sponsoring etc..." It was set up by key members of the REACH campaign and demonstrates how they have converted their bonding social capital into a group focused on bridging social capital. It is important to note, however, that at the time of the interview, Friends of Castle Hall had only had one

meeting and it was too early to tell whether this would be successful or not. As mentioned above, some of those interviewed had doubts about the future success of this group.

What has been found is that bonding social capital can be identified when individuals experience sustained periods of RC and reC like Jane and Jessica from the tenant movement and all members of the core of the REACH campaign. Similarly, scrutiny co-optees do experience a form of bonding social capital, but it is built on professional attitudes and relationships rather than close friendship. Furthermore, Bridging social capital can develop when individuals are enabled to explore the possibilities of their engagement outside their respective engagement groups without being constrained by the group itself.

6.6. Themes table

Person	RP	reP	RG	reG	RC	reC	RD	reD	bb	BB	Level
Jack	Indirect Some	Indirect Some	Little	None	None	None	Great	Great	None	None	CV
Jane	Both Great	Both Great	Great	Great	Great	Great	None	None	Some	Some	Very
Sue	Direct Some	None	Great	Great	Little	Little	Great	Great	None	None	Dis
Alex	Direct Some	None	Great	Great	Little	Little	Great	Great	None	None	Dis
Donna	None	None	Some	Some	None	None	Great	Great	None	None	Dis
Toby	Direct Some	None	Great	Great	Great	Great	None	None	Some	Some	Very
Jessica	None	None	Great	Great	Great	Great	None	None	Great	None	Very
Mary	None	None	None	None	None	None	Great	Great	None	None	CV
Mark	Indirect Great	Indirect Great	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Little	None	Eng
Charles	Indirect Great	Indirect Great	Some	Some	Some	Some	Little	Little	Little	None	Eng
Claire	Indirect Little	Indirect Little	Some	Some	Some	Some	None	None	Little	None	Eng
Sean	Both Great	Both Great	Great	Great	Great	Great	None	None	Some	Some	Very
Ben	Both Great	Both Great	Great	Great	Great	Great	Antic- ipated	Antic- ipated	Great	Some	Very
Gillian	Direct Some	Direct Little	Great	Great	Great	Great	Antic- ipated	Antic- ipated	Great	Some	Very
Lauren	Direct Some	Direct Little	Great	Great	Great	Great	None	None	Great	Some	Very
Steven	Direct Some	Direct Little	Great	Great	Great	Great	None	None	Great	Some	Very

Table 1

6.7. Key for themes table

- RP, reP, RG, reG, RC, reC, RD, reD, bb, BB – see methodology section
- Level – level of individual engagement
- Indirect – evidence of RP/reP not related to the group the individual was studied for.
- Direct – evidence of RP/reP related to the group the individual was studied for.
- Both – both indirect and direct found.
- Anticipated – Indicator is anticipated by the individual studied but no evidence found.
- CV – Community Voice; unique type of engagement explained in discussion
- Dis – Disengaged, or disengaging from the group in which the individual was studied.
- Very – Very engaged in group
- Eng – static unchanging/unchangeable level of engagement explained in discussion
- None, Little, Some, Great – normal meaning referring to evidence of themes.

Figure 1 is a table showing the identification of positive and negative social capital themes, bridging and bonding social capital, and individual levels of engagement. Whilst this project did not set out to measure social capital, this table is helpful in showing which individuals were active or disengaged, and whether those individuals had high or low levels of positive or negative social capital themes. This table is a visual simplified version of the narrative results for each individual studied and therefore both should be read alongside each other.

The above analysis of the primary research data and the themes table that has been presented illustrates social capital within the context of the engagement groups studied. Although prior experience of the primary themes does not show any relevance for engagement, the growth, continuation or decline of the primary themes does illustrate a pattern relating to engagement. This analysis will now be discussed in order to answer this project's research question.

7. Discussion

This project set out to study three groups categorised by their level of formal structures; formal, semi-formal and informal because of the implications that arise from Etzioni's (2000) argument that the state should facilitate engagement. The group categorised as formal is the Scrutiny Co-optee Scheme because it exists within the Kirklees Council Constitution and as such, co-optee's are a legal necessity and are government by formal legal structures. The group categorised as semi-formal is the tenant movement because whilst the necessary structures that the tenant movement exists within are laid out in the KNH Participation Charter 6th Edition, individuals are allowed and encouraged to operate at grass root or community level. Finally, the group categorised as informal is the REACH campaign because there are no formal structures within which the campaign existed as it was founded and run entirely at grass root or community level. The analysis of the data produced by interviewing individual members of these groups do illustrate that formal structures, or institutional structures, can have an impact on social capital development and, therefore, engagement. Furthermore, this projects analysis below uses normative structures to further explain the relationship between social capital, institutional structures and political engagement.

7.1. Institutional structures

The effect of institutional structures on social capital is discussed by several theorists and, like social capital theory itself, there is no universal opinion. Warner (2001) cites Etzioni (1993) and Fukuyama (1995) et al who argue that the state is not best placed to construct social capital. However, Evan (1996) and Skocpol (1996) et al argue that not only can government construct social capital, but that it should be one of its focuses (Warner 2001; pp. 188) echoing the argument put forward by Etzioni (2000). This disagreement is centred on whether institutional structures can be utilised to facilitate the development of social capital. The data produced by this project and its analysis does give contradictory messages in the context of this argument. Whilst, based on this projects research, one could argue that the REACH campaign had the capacity to develop stronger social capital overall compared with scrutiny co-optees or individuals within the tenant movement which could support the arguments by Etzioni (1993) and Fukuyama (1995), scrutiny co-optees can be seen to demonstrate stronger social capital than community voices within the tenant

movement. As community voices (CVs) present an anomaly within the research it is worth singling them out and analysing them within the context of the literature.

Crocker et al (1999) argues that for government to effectively build social capital it should stop being the “controller, regulator and provider” and instead be the “catalyst, convener and facilitator” (Crocker et al 1999; Cited in Warner 2001; pp. 189). In most cases within the tenant movement, KNH who can be seen as a local government institution, and other organisations such as KFTRA, do operate as a facilitator allowing individuals to operate on their own terms. However, the CV structure is a proactive intervention as it exists to keep individuals involved when social capital and with it, TRAs, have broken down or when they never existed. Although CVs are invited to attend KNH Area Forums and are therefore involved in the process of decision making with others, the structure does not facilitate community interaction outside the forums in any reciprocal sense. Rather than the structure enabling CVs to building relationships based on reciprocity for the purpose of making their community better, the structure instead restricts their reciprocal engagement to the Area Forums. As such, instead of decentralising engagement structures to neighbourhood level (Warner 2001; pp. 189) which would allow for the development of social capital, this structure provides a means for individuals to be involved in the absence of any community activism. It is important to mention that in this projects research, the CVs were as active as possible in their communities, but this tended to be doing things for others, rather than achieving things as a community. Whilst this structure succeeds in its short term aims – maintaining a level of individual engagement in communities – it fails in Kirklees Council and KNH long term aims of building stronger, more engaged communities (Kirklees, no date 2) – i.e. building social capital. According to Ostrom (2000), government actions can crowd out private investment in social capital (Cited in Carilli et al 2008; pp. 210) and this project argues that the CV structure does this – CVs have little need to develop and engage in an associative or reciprocal community, and therefore develop social capital, because they are already involved.

Additionally, this project found that the CV structure is not the only structure that crowds out private investment in social capital thus having a negative impact on communities and engagement. Donna illustrates how the application of the tenant and resident association (TRA) structure can also have negative impacts. Donna initially started an active marketing

campaign of her disengaging TRA building ties with a number of people who started engaging in her TRA. However they were informed by KNH that they lived outside of that TRAs catchment area and subsequently had to start up their own which, according to Donna is quite successful. As a result, Donna was left with a disengaging TRA and, at the time of the interview, was stepping down citing lack of reciprocity from others in her community as the cause. This homogenous application of the TRA structure prevented the development of bonding social capital for Donna, and bridging social capital between Donna and the newly engaged individuals. As Carilli et al (2008) comments

“...government’s focus should not be on directly intervening to manipulate the structure of social capital with the aim of increasing homogeneity. Instead, emphasis should be placed on creating an environment whereby social entrepreneurs can discover new combinations of social capital... It is imperative that social entrepreneurs have the freedom to discover and cultivate these combinations” (Carilli et al 2008; pp. 216).

This project does not argue that KNH intentionally set out to decrease or even develop social capital. However, what this illustrates is that government action, in this case the action of an arm’s length management organisation linked to local government, can have unwilling and unknown negative impacts on social capital (Ostrom 2000; cited in Carilli et al 2008; pp. 210) which leads to disengagement or engagement restricted to the peripheries relative to other engaged individuals.

Whilst this analysis demonstrates that institutional structures can crowd out social capital, it would be a mistake to assume that this is always the case. As Jane, Toby and Jessica show, the tenant movement structures can have very positive effects on social capital and engagement. Jane and Toby both show signs of bonding and bridging social capital and whilst Jessica does not demonstrate bridging social capital, she has built an abundance of bonding social capital within her TRA. Jessica comments that almost everyone in the complex is engaged in the TRA which has transformed the flats from an external building shell to a close and friendly community citing the creation of “a community” as her greatest success. Therefore, the tenant movement structure can be seen to be quite flexible if individuals are left to organise themselves within the structure as these three individuals are

all engaged: whereas Jane and Toby engaged in a manner that allows some bonding and bridging social capital to be developed, Jessica has engaged in a manner that has created very strong bonding social capital but no bridging social capital.

Since some individuals in the tenant movement continue to be engaged, some are disengaged which is argued is due to a lack of social capital themes such as reciprocity being absent from their communities, and some are disengaging or are engaged on the peripheries due to the institutional structures of KNH, the tenant movement can be seen as a diverse cluster of individuals with varying degrees of social capital and the capacity to develop social capital which effects engagement. Using the analysis above about the effects of institutional structures on engagement, comparisons will be drawn from the informal REACH campaign and the formal Scrutiny Co-optee group.

If the formal CV structure, and in some cases the TRA structure, can impede social capital and as a result have negatives effects on engagement as illustrated by this projects analysis, then an obvious conclusion would be formal structures should be avoided for social capital to develop – but can this claim be made? In his American study, Tocqueville (1835, 1840) found that flourishing social networks “were not the result of government design, legislation or intervention. Instead, civil society evolved through the individual ingenuity of self reliant, entrepreneurial actors” (Cited in Carilli et al 2008; pp. 217). Analysis of this projects data illustrates a positive comparison with Tocqueville’s work. The REACH campaign was categorised as informal by this project as it did not exist due to, or within, any formal structure by any institution. Rather, it existed as a grass root community movement founded and run by ordinary people. Individuals engaged in the REACH campaign were free to organise themselves as they chose and free to engage how they saw appropriate. The individuals interviewed for this project were all members of what most described as ‘the core’ of the campaign whom roughly 10 was a part of. As is greatly illustrated by the data of this project, all individuals that were interviewed as part of the REACH campaign showed high levels of all positive social capital themes and all showed at least some evidence for both bridging and bonding social capital. The latter of these findings are worth examining a little more. As shown in the sixth chapter, the strong bonding social capital that developed from the campaign produced a new group called Friends of Castle Hall (FOCH) which is a group much like a parent and teachers association (PTA) but with a difference. Instead of a

PTA that looks inwards, FOCH was founded to bring together different individuals and groups of the local community in Mirfield for the greater good. Comparatively, rather than the structure of TRAs that dictates their focus (as demonstrated with Donna), the REACH campaign was sufficiently informal to allow individuals to use their bonding social capital to extend their reach out into the wider community. Although it should be mentioned that FOCH is still developing and some individuals studied anticipate RD and reD, it is too early to comment on whether it has been successful. However, one could argue that the lack of formal or semi-formal structure has allowed this bridging social capital to be explored.

Before we can argue that formal structures can be said to impede the development of social capital in the groups studied, we must first look at the third group studied. The Scrutiny Co-optee Scheme is categorised as formal by this project and, as a result, can be seen as sharing similarities with the CV structure – both are formal interventions aimed at increasing individual engagement, albeit different types of engagement for different reasons. An assumption could be made that the arguments by Warner (2001) and Carilli et al (2008) will mean social capital development will be impeded by the formal structures governing co-optees and this will affect cooptee engagement. Based on this projects analysis of the data, this argument cannot be completely accepted. While the analysis shows no evidence of bridging social capital, it does show that social capital was developed, illustrated by the social capital themes of this project, that manifested as bonding social capital. All co-optees interviewed were categorised as being engaged in the group rather than being very engaged, disengaged, or some other variation (see Table 1). This lack of variation could be due to the nature of co-optees' purpose – they have a specific role within the scrutiny structure and there are few avenues for them to be more, or less engaged than each other. This in turn, could have implications for the interpretation of perceived social capital within the group and it could be argued that social capital isn't developed, rather the individuals are there for a specific purpose and this purpose keeps them involved, not the relationships and norms that make up social capital. However, if this argument was correct then negative social capital themes would also have little effect on engagement. On the contrary, this projects analysis shows that Mark almost disengaged from the co-optee scheme because of RD and more importantly reD between the committee and its former committee chair person. After the chair was replaced with someone who demonstrated reG and with it RG

Mark decided to continue. Therefore, even within formal institutional structures social capital is demonstrated as being important for continued engagement and as a result, social capital can be said to be developed within formal institutional structures.

With the analysis of the tenant movement and the REACH campaign both pointing towards formal institutional structures having the potential to be counterproductive for social capital development, the co-optee scheme poses as an anomaly. However, this only shows that analysis of social capital is highly context specific and so to understand the findings of this project in relation to institutional structures we need to look at the impact of normative structures that operate throughout society both within groups with institutional structures such as the Scrutiny Co-optee Scheme, and groups without such as the REACH campaign.

7.2. Normative structures

Reimer et al (2008) articulated a framework of social capital that illustrates what they define as four normative structures through which social capital is built and developed. They argue the four normative structures are “market, bureaucratic, associative, and communal” (Reimer et al 2008; pp. 261). They also argue that these four normative structures do not usually operate independently but can all operate within the same group but with one dominating at any one time (Reimer 2008; pp. 262). By using this framework, this project can more accurately analyse the effects of institutional structures on the development of social capital and explain the anomaly of co-optees demonstrating more social capital than some in the tenant movement. We have already seen that the institutional structures of TRAs and the institutional structure of CVs can have a negative impact of the development of social capital. Using Reimer et al (2008) we can identify four different scenarios of how the institutional structures relate to the normative structures of the tenant movement and what these relationships mean for social capital. This analysis can then be applied to the other groups this project has studied and this will more accurately illustrate the effects of institutional structures on social capital.

Jessica is heavily engaged within her TRA and can be seen to be engaging through a communal normative structure that Reimer et al (2008) describe as being based on a strong sense of shared identity (Reimer 2008; pp. 262) and an associative structure that exists due to shared interests and is found primarily in clubs, social action groups and hobby groups

(Reimer et al 2008; pp. 261). The residents of the TRA are almost all retired and live within an enclosed complex. They are all very active and act more like a family having pie and peas nights and being very close friends to everyone. At the same time, they all share a common goal of improving the close community in which they live. Within the structure of the TRA, the communal and associative norms are shared by all members, patricianly communal, and this aids the development of strong bonding social capital through similar views on what constitutes their relationships and reciprocal acts. What is important for the development of this strong bonding social capital is their shared norms.

Jane and Toby can also be seen to be engaging through an associative normative structure. Rather than a group where all members are very close like a family like Jessica; Jane and Toby engage because they share goals with other members of their TRA of making their local community better and they are interested in how the TRA can do that through collective action and decision making. Again, these shared norms based on associative relations are important.

Similarly, Donna engaged with those she got involved due to her marketing campaign because of similar associative norms like Jane and Toby. The different in this scenario is that the TRA structure disrupted their network and forced Donna to separate from those she shared the associative norms with resulting in no development of social capital and her subsequent disengagement. It is worth pointing out that Suzanne and Alex also operate through an associative normative structure, but unlike Donna who had this disrupted due to the TRA structure, Suzanne and Alex did not share these norms with others in the area which explains why few people are active within their TRA, and why they are considering disengaging.

Finally and crucially, the CV structure that Jack and Mary engage through is not as flexible in supporting normative structures. The normative structure through which CVs operate can be seen as bureaucratic rather than communal or associative because a CVs main form of engagement that is dictated by the CV structure is attending KNH Area Forum meetings and not engaging at a grass root level. Because their engagement does not operate at grass root level in the same way individuals involved in a TRA do, they are restricted to developing social capital based on bureaucratic norms which, as Reimer et al (2008) argue, is based on

the rules of the formal settings and the maintenance of legitimacy (Reimer 2008; pp. 261). Engaging through the bureaucratic norms they are able to build bonds with those also engaged in the forums but utilising these bonds for increased engagement is restricted to the specific time and location of the forums. As a result, these bonds do not equip them with the necessary stock of social capital to be more active within their community, and therefore, they are unable to be as active as individuals that do develop this stock. As a result of the research method and the focus of research on the tenant movement being on community activism rather than relationships within the Area Forums, the data illustrates little to no positive social capital themes. It is entirely possible that the bureaucratic normative structure facilitates social capital development within the confines of the Area Forums which could not be detected due to the above mentioned research focus. Anecdotally, CVs remain involved in the area forums which suggest some level of positive social capital within these forums.

The scrutiny co-optees, like CVs, can be seen as operating through a bureaucratic normative structure. They are able to develop social capital based on this normative structure that can be used within the confines of the committee meetings for the purpose of their engagement. The analysis shows that this social capital has little use outside the confines of the committee meetings which explains why none of the co-optees develop bridging social capital. Applying this normative structure to the analysis illustrates how co-optees are able to build limited social capital within the meetings that are restrained by its formal institutional structures. It can be noted from the results that co-optees do demonstrate positive themes of social capital whilst the CVs do not. As mentioned above, this is attributed to the focus of the research – for the co-optees, the research for specific at their interaction within the confines of the committee meetings which show limited social capital being built whereas the focus of individuals within the tenant movement was focused on community activism rather than within the area forums.

Finally, the REACH campaign can be seen to be operating primarily through an associative normative structure whilst encompassing some communal norms within the core of the campaign. In the same manner that Jane, Toby and Jessica were free to engage on their own terms through associative and communal normative structures because the tenant movement institutional structures did not interfere directly with their interaction with

others, individuals within the REACH campaign were free from any institutional structures allowing them to explore any avenue of interaction and engagement they chose through similar norms. These norms subsequently assisted in the founding of Friends of Castle Hall (FOCH) which is seen by this project as building bridging social capital.

From this analysis we can make four assertions about social capital, institutional structures, and engagement: One, communal and associative normative structures help develop social capital with greater community value than social capital developed through bureaucratic normative structures because the social capital that is developed through the former is at the community level. Two, bureaucratic normative structures can allow for limited social capital development and this social capital has little community value as it does not extend outside the context in which it is created. Three, social capital with community value can develop in groups with institutional structures if the individuals within a group are enabled to explore their networks through the same normative structure as those they are engaging with, without the interference of the institutional structures. Four, when no institutional structures are present such as the REACH campaign, individuals are able to explore their networks free from structural interference providing they share the same normative structures with others they are engaging with. This in turn develops social capital which can be utilised for continued for further community engagement. When semi-formal or formal structures are present and engaged through, one could argue that not only do individuals have to share the same normative structures as others, but this normative structure must be unimpeded by the institutional structures if social capital is to be developed as a community good. Furthermore, this analysis illustrates three examples of how institutional structures can interfere with normative structures which can have a negative impact on the value of social capital: One, when institutional structures separate an individual from community networks which share the same normative structures (as illustrated by Donna). Two, when an institutional structure inadvertently supports only bureaucratic norms which separate an individual from community arenas (as illustrated by Jack and Mary who are CVs). Three, when an institutional structure requires only bureaucratic norms for its only purpose (as illustrated by co-optees). These examples should not be seen as exhaustive but the only example that can be drawn from this projects analysis.

8. Conclusion

This projects conclusion can be seen as starting from the premise that democracy requires citizens to be engaged at all levels and throughout the decision making processes. As is argued in the second chapter, this projects philosophy of citizenship is centred on the philosophies of Etzioni (2000) and similarly Blond (2009) who view citizenship as; a relationship between the state and its citizens that is build on citizens taking responsibility for being active in their society with others, and the state facilitating this associative society. Furthermore, as was illustrated in the second chapter, Britain does not have a healthy level of political engagement - the citizen disaffection perspective was rejected but this project nonetheless argues that, based on this projects review, Britain does not have a healthy democratic society based on communitarian principles. Whilst this project does argue that political engagement can be increased, it does not argue that there is one solution to the problem of disengagement from important decision making processes. However it does argue that one part of the solution is the development of sustainable social capital that has community value. Social capital that has community value is seen by this project as social capital through associative, and to an extent communal normative structures. As can be argued from the analysis and discussion of this projects primary research, social capital developed through associative or communal normative structures at community level can best facilitate individuals in exploring community engagement.

This project argues that TRA institutional structures can be useful in facilitating the development of social capital through associative and communal normative structures and this social capital can be harnessed for community engagement increasing the number of people involved in decision making. However, this project finds that the institutions structures studied can also have negative consequences for social capital and can directly prevent its developed. Furthermore, these institutional structures can also be too inflexible and as a result, only allow social capital to develop through bureaucratic normative structures which has limited community value and it is restricted to the context in which it is developed. Based on these findings, one could also argue that associative groups that are allowed to explore their engagement on their own terms without the interference of institutional structures are best placed to developed social capital that has community value

– in this project, this led to the exploration of bridging social capital that the other groups seemed unable to do.

Therefore, this project returns to the research question: Do institutional structures have a negative impact on the development of social capital that contributes towards political engagement? This project, having studied three engagement groups with different levels of formal structures, argues that whilst institutional structures do not necessarily impede social capital and thus engagement; institutional structures that dictate homogeneous engagement or institutional structures that only support bureaucratic normative structures were found to have negative consequences for social capital and political engagement. However, it is also argued that within the specific groups studied, institutional structures can also have positive effects on social capital and engagement when they do not crowd out individual exploration within communal and/or associative structures in the community. Finally, this project argues that these conclusions cannot be fully generalised throughout British society because of the nature of the qualitative methods used, and because social capital is a context specific social phenomenon. As a result, it is argued that the conclusions can and should be used as hypotheses for future studies into the effects of institutional structures on political engagement.

9. Bibliography

Adam, F. and Roncevic, B (2003) "Social capital: recent debates and research trends" *Social Science Information*, 42, (2) pp.155-183

Balls, E (2010) *Judge me on my record as a champion of public services* [online] Available at: <http://www.edballs4labour.org/blog/?p=718> [Accessed on 20th June 2011]

Biesta, G. and Lawy, R (2006) "From teaching citizenship to learning democracy: overcoming individualism in research, policy and practice" *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36, (1) pp.63-79

Blond, P. (2009) *The Future of Conservatism* [online] Available at: <http://www.respublica.org.uk/item/SPEECH-The-Future-of-Conservatism-dqac-zjyf> [Accessed 30th June 2011]

Bourdieu, P. (1986) "The forms of capital" In: Richardson, J. G, eds. *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, New York, Greenwood Press, pp.241-258.

Cameron, D. (2009) *David Cameron: The Big Society* [online] Available at: http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2009/11/David_Cameron_The_Big_Society.aspx [Accessed 1st July 2011]

Carilli, A. M, Coyne, C. J, Leeson P. T (2008) "Government intervention and the structure of social capital" *The Review of Austrian Economics*, 21, (2) pp.209-218.

Claridge, T. (2004) *Social capital and Natural Resource Management*. Master's thesis, University of Queensland

Coleman, J. S. (1988) "Social capital in the Creation of Human Capital" *The American Journal of Sociology*, 94, (Supplement) pp.S95-S120

Crick, B. (1998) "Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools" London, *Qualifications and Curriculum Authority on behalf of the Citizenship Advisory Group*, pp.1-88

Crick, B. (2007) "Citizenship: The political and the Democratic" *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55, (3) pp.235-248.

Dorey, P. (1995) *British Politics since 1945*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers Ltd

Etzioni, A. (2000) *The road to the good society* [online] Available at:
<http://www.newstatesman.com/200005150021> [Accessed 2nd July 2011]

Faulks, K. (1998) *Citizenship in Modern Britain*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press

Faulks, K. (2000) *Citizenship*, London, Routledge

Faulks, K. (2006) "Education for citizenship in England's secondary schools: a critique of current principle and practice" *Journal of Education Policy*, 21, (1) pp.59-74

Field, J. (2003) *Social capital*, London, Routledge

Fukuyama, F. (2001) "Social capital, civil society and development" *Third World Quarterly*, 22, (1) pp.7-20

Gray, D. (2009) *Doing Research in the Real World*, London, Sage Publications

Grbich, C. (2007) *Qualitative data analysis: An introduction*, London, Sage Publications

Grenier, P. and Wright, K (2006) "Social capital in Britain: Exploring the Hall Paradox" *Policy Studies*, 27, (1) pp.27-53

Hall, P. A. (1999) "Social capital in Britain" *British Journal of Political Science*, 29, (03) pp.417-461.

Hansard-Society (2010) *Audit of Political Engagement 7: The 2010 Report*, London, Hansard Society

Hay, C. (2007) *Why We Hate Politics*, Cambridge, Polity Press

Held, D. (2006) *Models of Democracy*, California, Stanford University Press

Institute for Public Policy Research and PwC (2010) *Capable Communities: Towards Citizen-Powered Public Services*, London, Institute for Public Policy Research

Keenan, A. (2003) *Democracy in Question*, California, Stanford University Press

Kirklees Council (2007) *Local election 2007 results* [online] Available at:

<http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/you-kmc/kmc-howcouncilworks/votingandelections/election04/Results.asp?Chosen=2007&ward=23>

[Accessed 16th October 2010]

Kirklees Council 1 (no date) *An introduction to scrutiny in Kirklees* [online] Available at:

<http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/you-kmc/scrutiny/handbook/sections/1-Introduction-to-scrutiny.pdf> [Accessed 11th July 2011]

Kirklees Council 2 (no date) *Communities Together Grant* [online] Available at:

http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/answers/community-grants/communities_together_grant.shtml [Accessed 11th July 2011]

Kirklees Neighbourhood Housing (2009) *Tenant Participation Charter 6th Edition* [online]

Available at: <http://knh.kirklees.gov.uk/knhdocs/Doc.aspx?ref=wku0pc> [Accessed 11th July 2011]

Kisby, B. (2007) "New Labour and Citizenship Education" *Parliamentary Affairs*, 60, (1) pp.84-101

Landrum, D. (2002) "Citizenship, education and the political discourse of New Labour" *Contemporary Politics*, 8, (3) pp.219-232

Loader, B. D. (2007) *Introduction: young citizens in the digital age: Young Citizens in the digital Age*, Oxon, Routledge

Marsh, D. O'Toole, T. Jones, S. (2007) *Young people and Politics in the UK - Apathy or Alienation?*, Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan

Marshall, J. (2009) *Membership of UK political parties*, House of Commons Library [online]

Available at: <http://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons/lib/research/briefings/snsg-05125.pdf> [Accessed 19th September 2010]

Narayan, D. and Cassidy, M. F (2001) "A dimensional Approach to Measuring Social capital: Development and Validation of a Social capital Inventory" *Current Sociology* , 49, (2) pp.59-102

Norris, P. (2003) Young People & Political Activism: From the Politics of Loyalties to the politics of Choice? *In. Council of Europe Symposium: "Young people and democratic institutions: from disillusionment to participation"*, November 27-28 2003. Strasbourg, France, pp.1-32

Pattie, C. Seyd, P. Whiteley, P. (2004) *Citizenship in Britain*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Pole, A. (2010) *Blogging the political*, New York, Routledge

Powell, M. (2000) "New Labour and the third way in the British welfare state: a new and distinctive approach?" *Critical Social Policy*, 20, (1) pp.39-60

Putnam, R. (1995) "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social capital" *Journal of Democracy*, 6, (1) pp.65-78

Putnam, R. D. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York, Simon & Schuster Paperbacks

Reimer, B. et al. (2008) "Social capital as social relations: the contribution of normative structures" *The Sociological Review*, 56, (2), pp.256-274

Silverman, D. (2005) *Doing Qualitative Research*, London, Sage Publications

Stoker, G. (2006) *Why Politics Matters: Making Democracy Work*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan

Stokes, G. and Carter, A. (2002) *Democratic Theory Today: challenges for the 21st century*, Cambridge, Polity Press

UK-Political-Info (no date) *General Election turnout 1945-2010* [online] Available at: <http://www.ukpolitical.info/Turnout45.htm> [Accessed 4th July 2011]

Valenzuela, S. Park, N. Kee, K. 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, (4) pp.875-901

Warner, M. (2001) "Building social capital: the role of local government" *Journal for Socio-economics*, 20, (2) pp.187-192

Webb, P. (2005) "Political parties and democracy: The ambiguous crisis" *Democratization*, 12, (5) pp.633-650

10. Appendix

10.1. Participant declaration

Name.....

Post Code.....

Gender.....

Age.....

Ethnicity.....

Occupation.....

Household Income..... (Estimate)

Level of Education.....

I declare that I am happy for the above information to be used as part of Jordan Walmsley's research project in Political Participation.

I understand that my identity will be kept secure and all data used will be on an anonymous basis.

I understand exactly what the information will be used for and I have no problem allowing my information above, and information given in the interview to be used.

Signed.....

Date.....

Interview No..... (For interviewers use only)

10.2. Interview prompt sheet

- **Explain when and how you first became involved in.....**
 - Did you find there were any barriers or reasons that made it difficult to get involved
 - Did you already know people involved?

- **What was it that motivated you to get involved in.....?**
 - Did you already know people involved?
 - Did people encourage you to get involved?

- **Describe your involvement in.....**
 - Would you consider yourself an active member
 - Are you more / less / active than others or about average? Why?
 - What kind of things do you do whilst being involved?

- **What have you been able to achieve since becoming involved?**
- **Are you still involved? If so, Why? (REACH)**
- **What has kept you involved in.....? (Other two)**
 - Do you feel you are making a difference?
 - Are you still trying to achieve something you haven't yet been able to achieve?
- **Are you involved in any other voluntary group and if so, what?**
 - What about hobbies? How do you spend your social time / free time?
- **To what extent would you consider yourself more active in your Community now you are a part of.....?**
- **How do you feel you have benefitted from being a part of.....?**
- **Do you feel you have changed since being a part of.....?**
 - Do you meet with more people – socially or professionally?
- **Is there anything else you feel might be useful for the purposes of this Interview?**

10.3. Participant biographies

Jack

Jack is a 60 year old male who is a part time student in his retirement. He is an active Community Voice within the tenant movement in Kirklees attending KNH Area Forums and helping out as much as he can in and around his neighbourhood. He was previously a member of his local TRA until it closed and is now the only remaining active member. He has been involved in voluntary work for many years due to his socialist outlook and is currently an active member of the Salvation Army.

Jane

Jane is a 45 year old woman who is a qualified beautician and hair stylist. She is secretary and treasurer of her TRA, attends KNH Area Forums, a delegate on the KFTRA Management Committee and a very active member in her community. As well as being active within the tenant movement, Jane also volunteers for the Huddersfield Carnival, has undertaken several fundraising events for causes like Red Nose Day, and has a wealth of experience of working with young people. Jane had considered, and still is considering becoming a councillor one day.

Suzanne

Suzanne is a 77 year old woman who is a content retired housewife. She is one of two active members within her TRA and was one of the original founding members and she sits on a KNH Area Forum. Suzanne enjoys the work she does for the TRA and her community, but is disappointed by the lack of active involvement from others; with the exception of a close friend who runs the TRA with her.

Alex

Alex is a 75 year old man who is happily retired. He is one of two active members with his TRA of which he co-founded, and sits on a KNH Area Forum. Called “the caretaker” by those in his community, Alex enjoys the work he does in his community but feels too few people are involved anymore. He runs the TRA with his close friend but both are considering stopping due to lack of interest by others.

Donna

Donna is a 63 year old woman who is a retired nursing home worker. She is an active member of her TRA but feels that too few people are actively supporting her in her role. Donna is involved in the TRA because she cares for her community and those within it but is stepping down from the TRA committee because she feels she isn't supported enough. She also sits on a KNH Area Forum.

Toby

Toby is a 49 year old man who is an active vice chairperson in his TRA and sits on the KFTRA Management Committee and a KNH Area Forum. Having joined the tenant movement his confidence has grown and is now active in several aspects of the community, including a local school. He really enjoys his work within the tenant movement and believes it all about working together with community spirit.

Jessica

Jessica is a 73 year old woman who is a retired nurse. She was the founding member of her TRA, is currently the chairperson and is very active in her TRA and in her community. She attends KNH Area Forums and her TRA organises regular busy meetings and social gathering such as pie and peas nights. Her greatest achievement of the TRA is building a family like community, both physically and socially.

Mary

Mary is a 74 year old woman who is an active community voice in her community. Having been vice chairperson of her TRA which closed 4 years ago, she became one of 3 community voice from that TRA with Mary being the only one left. She attends KNH Area Forums and helps out in her community as much as possible assisting older residents with repairs, problems with planning or just a spot of shopping. She will continue to be involved because she cares for those in her community and wants to help where she can.

Mark

Mark is a 59 year old man who is a retired Finance Director and qualified accountant. He is a scrutiny co-optee, a sitting magistrate and former school governor. He sees his work as a scrutiny co-optee as interesting and as a “quick hit”. He views the private sector as being naturally more efficient than the public sector and feels his experience can help local government operate more effectively.

Charles

Charles is a 77 year old man who is a retired journalist and a former Royal Air Force serviceman. He is a scrutiny co-optee, a member of the Yorkshire and Humber War Pensions committee, a former Responsible Adult in the youth justice system and former auditor of police cells. He enjoys his role as a co-optee and feels that his life experience adds value to the scrutiny process.

Claire

Claire is a 65 year old woman who is a retired manager from within the Further Education system. As well as being a scrutiny co-optee she is an enthusiastic gardener with her friend enjoying the time she spends on their allotment. She enjoys her role as a co-optee and feels her life experience positively contributes towards to scrutiny process.

Sean

Sean is a 74 year old male who is a retired researcher who spent years conducting a research project on the use of PCs in secondary school education. Formally an active core member of the REACH campaign, Sean is also a leading member of Save Mirfield – a local campaigning group, a member of the local Labour Party, a former school governor and active community member who runs his own local history group. Passionate about local education provisions and he is very pleased the decision was made to save Castle Hall High School.

Ben

Ben is a 46 year old male who is a local government officer and family man. Formally an active core member of the REACH, Ben was also the former chair of Huddersfield’s Friends of the Earth campaigning group, a heavily involved member of the successful Sink the Link

Campaign, a key member in the campaign to make Mirfield a Fair Trade town and all round community activist. Having put two children through education at Castle Hall he was pleased the school will now stay open.

Gillian

Gillian is a 39 year old woman who is an admin officer and a former active core member of the REACH campaign. A mother of children within the school, Gillian was determined to ensure the survival of the school and having succeeded in keeping the school open, now feels she is more community minded and more politically aware.

Lauren

Lauren is a 46 year old woman who is a senior social worker and magistrate (justice of the peace). Formally an active core member of the REACH campaign, Lauren was in a state of disbelief when she heard Castle Hall was to close and was determined to do everything she could to prevent its closure. Having experienced success, Lauren subsequently fought an appeal against single status pay deals in Wakefield Council and won. Having put one child through education at Castle Hall and another in the middle of her high school education, she was delighted, but not surprised, about Castle Hall remaining open.

Steven

Steven is a 44 year old man and self employed franchise consultant running his own successful business. The former vice chairperson of REACH and active campaigner, he was determined to keep the school open as it would have affected one of his daughters. Having tasted success in the REACH campaign he went on to campaign to keep Batley and Dewsbury Magistrates Court open. Shocked by Kirklees Council's original decision to close the school, he was extremely pleased by their success.

10.4. Interview transcript example - Jane

*Bold text writing is questions from the interviewer. Other text writing is the interviewee.
Name of people have been changed to protect anonymity.*

Explain when and how you first became involved; specifically with KNH Area Forums first and then we can move onto the other things you do as well.

How I became involved working voluntary with KNH KFTRA is through the tenants that actually live on the premises' at Malham Court. One of my neighbours she actually talked about her job that she did years ago that was representing people in the community on the community that they did have a few years ago, trying to achieving and resolve any issues which the neighbours had. A gentleman called Anthony decided to set up the committee because of the issues that arose in Malham Court like anti social behaviour and other issues which came up. We had a meeting with a lady called Belinda which is our National tenant participation officer (MTPO) who works in 122 areas for KFTRA. They called it an umbrella organisation with 122 areas underneath this umbrella organisation. Belinda plays a big role with the members of the public because she actually goes out and talks about the federation (KFTRA); when it started and where it came from and how she can involve herself with the tenants and link the tenants up to the training and other people who can resolve the problems in the community. So how I got involved, going back to how I got involved, was through a gentleman called Anthony who is our chair of our TRA. My neighbour and Anthony actually thought through my previous experience that I had working as a shop steward for Tesco they thought the experience I have had with members of the public would be of great use to the members of the public in Yorkshire. So I moved forward onto the committee and became a committee members and then they actually thought I would do a good job being a secretary and a treasurer so I took those roles up and it started from there where I've worked with KFTRA and moved forward onto humorous amounts of training because they are never short of training and that help me keep in trim to work with people from KNH in partnership with them and the TRA to try and resolve any issues that members of the public have.

Sorry to go back, those two people that said you could be quite useful to the community, did you know them prior on a personal basis or did you meet them through the community? Or?

I knew them prior. You know before the committee was set up. One of them was my neighbour and we use to talk quite a lot of ladies do and we just got talking and she told me about the property, what it was like before, and the committee that they had before which resolved and said it would be good if another committee was set up and like I said, because of the issues that came up, Anthony thought there wasn't enough people around to help resolve the problems that arose so we all kind of decided to set up our own committee with Belinda the MTPO.

So, did you know Anthony through your neighbour or did you know him separately as well.

Oh I knew Anthony as my neighbours.

Oh as your neighbour as well.

Yes. Anthony as my neighbour. They nominated me to be a secretary. I had no idea about this they just said I think you'll be good as a secretary. I had a phone called from MTPO our office who actually said I was nominated by the tenants to take on that role as the secretary. So I attended a meeting at the church, I think it was the church, yeah I attended my first meeting and all the committee was there. And then we got to know each other a little bit better. Belinda told us about KFTRA and what KFTRA was all about. And then we moved on from there and had a meeting at the City Dogs Salvation Army New Hay Road and then we took it from there. We structure our committee by other tenants nominating the individuals roles like we had the chair but we still had to vote for the chair. So the chair was voted in, the secretary, the treasurer, and delegates were voted in to have a voice for members of the public or for the tenants that live on Malham Court.

So you were at the Area Forum. What were you at the Area forum as? Were you there as someone from this committee or...

Well we moved on from there and started training with KFTRA and when we went on the training we started to learn more about the KNH and what the partnership was all about; the link between KFTRA and KNH. The agreement was for us to work with them and move forward and resolve any issues. So how we became delegates was we got invited to the delegate meeting in the Town Hall and the management committee had to vote us in. So we had to be voted in by the management committee members and became delegates on the management committee team so we would have a bit more say in any issue which arose and that is how I got nominated to go on the working groups; like management and development, safer cleaner greener, and other groups which KFTRA run.

You've mentioned how you got involved; you got nominated etc. What were your motivations when you were told you have been nominated? Why did you think 'oh this might be a good idea'?

When I got nominated I was quite shocked because my neighbour said I'd be good at it but I didn't know they were going to throw me in at the deep end. I didn't know what I'd got myself into. I'd worked as a shop steward before but this is a totally different ball game. So when I got nominated I left over the moon because I didn't know people felt so highly of me to nominate me to do that job. I'd heard my neighbour talk about it but I didn't know she was going to put my name forward. Anyway, I was over the moon and thought well at least the tenants will have a voice and I will represent them in the best way I can.

So it was very much altruism towards the community there then?

Yeah my desire to play my part made me feel I was doing something great for the people in the community. At least I have a voice now and if we had any problems we can resolve them in partnership with KFTRA and KNH because that is what the agreement is – that we all work in partnership, not against each other but work together to resolve any issues that come up. But I mean I felt great knowing that we had a voice now for the people.

And community thought of you as well...

Yeah, well, it was good. It was a good feeling and it still is. We've achieved a lot for Malham Court and we've spoken up for KFTRA and we do speak up for KNH as well because they do work hard and if we don't give them the credit, who is going to give them the credit?

This question might end up you repeating some of the things you've talked about but; describe your personal involvement, not necessary the institutions involvement, but your personal involvement with the forum and the other community groups.

Well what I do on a personal level is go out there and, I'll take the minutes of the meetings for the TRA. We had 4 meetings a year for the TRA and these meetings need to be minuted, as a secretary I need to minute the meetings, type the meetings up and make sure the tenants get the minutes on time. My role is a pretty serious role as we have councillors there, we have the police there, we attend meetings with the chief of police, and other officers. Also we attend meetings with KNH management team, estate management officers. We have a pretty strong role to fulfil. My role is pretty serious. We have to work alongside them to resolve any issues. We might have new ideas and we have to bring them ideas forward for everybody to live in a safer place or work better as a team.

In comparison to the other people that sit on the TRAs, Area Forums, do you count yourself as a more active person as others, or the same, or where do you think you'd fit on that spectrum?

I definitely feel I'm very active.

It does sound like it to be honest.

I'm very active. If there is anything going, Jane wants to be in it. And if some of my tenants can't go because some of them are elderly then I'll go and represent the tenants the best way I can because I've got a mother myself and I know one day we'll all get to that age where we can't move out of a chair, or have hip operations or, hopefully never, but we have tenants that have cancer and for me, god will repay me for the work I'm doing now for these tenants. I get my kicks out of doing it because at least their smiling at the end of it when do we achieve.

You've mentioned that you have been able to achieve some really good things. Do you just want to describe or detail some of those things you've achieved?

We've achieved a lot of training which I never would have achieved. The knowledge and the experience of the budgets, how the budgets run,

More specifically achievements as in, what you've achieved for the community.

Yeah. Well we've achieved budgets for our area because if we wouldn't have gone to those meetings, we wouldn't have the budget to be able to provide nicer Melham Court. Like we've achieved a car park which they never had before. We should be getting some flower beds in soon so it looks nicer for when people are looking out of their windows. We achieved a bench for them to sit on on the grass area. And we have got a little flower pot so they can see the flowers. We are going to try and achieve more. Not only that but when tenants have got any repairs to do in their homes we work alongside estate management officers to try and resolve any issues that arise in the properties. It could be like from painting and decorating, the interior, walls, which need doing. It could be doors that are broken that need fixing. It could be internal work that needs to be done in the flats. As long as we're working alongside the estate management officers we cannot fail. Those jobs will get done and they will be done on time and that's what we're here to do to work alongside the estate management officers to make sure that we resolve the problems for the tenants to make sure that it's a nice place to live and a safe place to live.

It seems like you have a passion for the community. Would you say that is why you are still involved?

I'm very much involved with local community work and I always have been. Even when I lived in London I was very heavily involved in the work place environment in supporting and representing staff and resolving issues within the company without it getting out of hand. So I've always been like a people woman so I am a people's woman, I'd say very much, and I always like to see a smile on people's faces. Doing things, supporting the elderly, and the young people, trying to make them happy, trying to resolve the issues any issues they have internal in the flats, external in our environment I'd say I love to be there to help to help sort these problems and that's due to be my past experience of working with people – I'm just a people woman, I love working with people.

With the TRA and the Area Forum aside, what other things do you do for the community, what other things are you involved in – you might have already said some of this before...?

I do help with the Huddersfield Carnival when it comes up to carnival time. I have helped the Huddersfield carnival, make the costumes, and I've actually ended up taking part in it even though I've gone along to help with the young people I've actually taken part and felt good there. We came second last year. Yeah so with the consumes and the dancing.

So is that a competition?

Yeah it's a competition. We have people from all over like Birmingham, London, Leeds, Bradford, Manchester, and everybody is dressed up in these consumes and they have to compete to try and win the trophies and the awards. The best presented consume they're the ones that would come first, second or third. It's quite an entertaining day.

When is that?

It's on the 11th July. And black, white, pink with stripes, everybody is there and we all have a great time because it's like people from all ethnic groups taking part in the carnival and that is what makes it nice. Because that makes people realise that no matter what colour you are everybody can enjoy themselves and everyone can be involved in it. It doesn't matter that the carnival originated from the Caribbean it doesn't matter because at the end of the day, the people that are on the committee want to show people in our community, no matter what colour you are, all ethnic groups can be involved and have a great time.

Other things I've done: I've had things at the Deighton Centre they have different fund raising events – black history, I've taken part in black history day. They have a pamper day where they invite people along to be pampered. They have different types of things for people in the community to come along and enjoy. Charity events, fund raising events, we've raised money for the NSPCC. A few years ago we had a school reunion and we raised a few hundred pounds for the NSCPP. I've done fund raising events as well. And then we've done red nose day. That's when I use to do youth work in Wakefield college with a young lady called Sandy. That's who got me involved in young work to try and raise money for Red Nose Day with the young students. So, that was exciting and challenging because I had my red nose on and we were trying to raise money for red nose day with the other students which was very challenging and very exciting.

This is probably irrelevant for the interview but have you ever thought about standing to be a councillor or anything like that?

Years ago but sometimes I look at myself and think I'm too old but people have suggested it. A lot of people have said to be why don't you go to be a councillor but I guess if I had a little bit of force behind me I think I would I just need someone to just push me and say 'I think you're good enough to do it'. Maybe I'd go forward if I had the right people behind me. But it is something that I have thought about in my past but because I have my hands in so many baskets I guess you get put off but you just need the right people to put you on the right track.

What about hobbies. You've touched upon things you do in the community. Is that a hobby because you clearly have a passion for it? Are there any other things that you do for having a laugh?

Well at the moment my hobby is hairdressing. I'm on my level two now and I have 9 weeks to go. Doing hair because sometimes I have my friends and family round and they say 'can you do my hair'. I'd say like my hair and by beauty is my hobby because sometime I end up doing my families nails and manicures and pedicures because I'm a qualified beautician as well, so I end up doing all my family and friends so I think that is my hobby like pampering all the family and stuff like that. And my hair dressing. I think that's it really. Apart from attending the KFTRA galas and stuff like that. I like reading as well. I like to read a lot of books about the body and healthy eating and that as well. Because I'm a beautician I like to portray that I eat healthy. My cousin owns a restaurant in Huddersfield as well. He opened it a few years ago so when he opened it I use to give him a helping hand in there. I like doing the cooking and stuff because we were well taught, taught well how to cook nice meals and things so I guess that where he gets it from. And I use to jump him and help him out so now he's on his feet he's doing really well. He went on a show with Gary Roads, I don't know if you saw it, Road's around the Caribbean. They went to all these different countries to cook all these different types of Caribbean food and that was great. Cooking is one of my hobbies as well. That's due to my family being brought up as that type of a family. We're Caribbean cooks but we got taught to cook everything because my mum could cook English, West Indian, Chinese, so we got taught very well.

When did you first start to develop your people skills in the community?

I think when I was younger my mum use to cook and bake cakes and things for people, for weddings and christenings and things and I think I use to watch my mum doing all this cooking and baking and I use to like helping out preparing the things. So I'd say from a very young age because my mum use to work in an old people's home and she use to be a cook in there so I think I've got a lot of that from my mum like supporting people. And she use to being me along to the homes and I use to take part in what they were doing in the home so I think that is just something that is imbedded in me from year ago and growing up. It developed. And plus my dad was a van driver and he use to sit me in the van and take me all around so I always thought I'll be a person that gets around and likes to meet different people and learn new things so I'm glad he's helped me to be able to mix with different people from different ethnic groups. So I think that helped me have a broader vision on life and what life is all about.

Do you consider yourself politically active? Not so much community active like with the work that you do but politically active?

I'd say I'm a little bit of both. I'm a little bit political and I'm a little bit community. Because when it comes to politics sometimes you think 'where do I stand? Do I stand with Labour or do I stand with the Conservatives' because everyone is coming up with new ideas and everybody's ideas sound excellent but then you think 'where do you turn'. The only thing I can say is may the best man win because everyone's ideas sound good. For me on a personal note, as long as the people are getting the things that they want and everyone is happy – that is what makes the world a better place. They are not going to get everything they want but the most important things that people need are important. So I mean I class myself as a little bit political and a little bit community. I class myself as a little bit of both.

Do you feel that you have benefitted from being a part of the voluntary organisations you've been a part of?

I think I've benefitted in a great way with the organisation because they have given me a vision. And that vision I never really saw before. It's made me realise that there is a lot more in my than I thought. It's given me a scope. It's made me realise I can stand up and I can

represent a hell of a lot of people in our country and speak up for the rights of the people. I feel strongly about it but if it wasn't for the institutions KFTRA and KNH and wouldn't say I would feel as strong, I did feel strong about the needs of people but I feel even more stronger now.

Do you think the training has given you more confidence to think 'well do you know what, we can achieve more'?

Well the training has given me more confidence. It has given me more knowledge on a political level. I was interested before but I'm more interested now. And I look to what politics has to do with members of the public achieving what they want. The politics of the community is we all work together no matter what. To achieve one thing we have to work with the people and the community to achieve the goals for the people.

Do you feel that from being a part of these organisations you have met more friends or colleagues?

Definitely. I've had the opportunity to work with the councillors. I've had to opportunity to talk to them on a personal level and see where they are coming from and how they got into being a councillor. I've seen what they have achieved and I've realised that they come from normal backgrounds like myself. I've realise they are normal people and they have feelings as well. So, he might be a councillor but he's got a family to look after, or she's got a family, and they are just trying to achieve the best for the people.

So do you think your involvement has given you more insight into the political institution that is local government and possible made you feel more enthusiastic about becoming a councillor at a later date?

I think if I didn't have the involvement working alongside the councillors and seeing what there about, and also working alongside KNH and KFTRA I wouldn't have felt that I want to go down that road. But I can understand everyone's point of view and I've learned to work in partnership with all people because the important thing is to be able to put your point across fairly to everybody and be honest in everything that you say and what you do and you will achieve. As long as you go forward and put your points across and be honest you'll

achieve. But working alongside all parties I would say has helped me to move forward to be able to speak up even stronger for people.

Is there anything else that you'd like to talk about that you think we've maybe missed that could be important?

Overall I think being involved with the people and the public is very important. I think that they are important. I could work with Obama but even if I was working alongside Obama I'm representing the people and I think that is very important. Obama is a great man and I think he's a great role model for black people, and white people. He's a very good role model. Going back to slavery and what black people had to go through in those days, Obama has helped to support those people and make their lives better in a lot of way so I feel very strongly about role models like himself due to the changes that he's bringing along to the people in society. But he's a very good example for all groups, whether black or white, to follow. A black person can look at it and think it's good. A white person can also look at him and think, well slavery shouldn't have been going on. And he's making all different ethnic groups look at it and think well we all need to make it a better place regardless of whether we are black and white.

END