existence and flourishing of civil society, as it does in established democracies, it also often perceives and treats civil society as a rival. Consequently, it obstructs civil society activities and its expansion through regulation, while discrediting the NGOs ideologically as Western "imports" and "mercenaries."

With post-conflict civil societies vitally dependent on external support, the preoccupation of scholars and practitioners concerning modalities of assistance to effectively and constructively contribute to post-conflict reconstruction through civil society building including the openness to the diversity of local grassroots organizations has been a worthwhile effort. However, it also requires further understanding of "uncivil society" and its expansion in the post-conflict. In particular, more research is needed to generate understanding of its interaction and interference with peace building. The study of mechanisms utilized by "uncivil" society to achieve legitimation in local contexts, and effective ways of challenging such a distorted appropriation of the concept of civil society is long overdue.

The success of post-conflict reconstruction is dependent on mutually supportive state and civil society building. The asymmetric prioritization in either area is conducive neither to democracy nor to peace. The transnational post-conflict setting is permeated by forces both of progressive and regressive globalization. The ultimate challenge after a war and bloodshed is to create, expand, and reinforce the space of civility and tolerance. This cannot be accomplished satisfactorily, especially from the outside, without local knowledge and information, whose ultimate authority and conduit is local civil society in the variety of its forms.

Cross-References

- ► Civil Society, Violence and War
- ► Good Governance
- ► Government–Nonprofit Sector Relations
- ► Identity
- ► NGOs and Socio-Economic Development
- ► NGOs and Sustainable Development
- ► Peace and Conflict Resolution Organizations
- ► Social Capital, Definition of
- ► Uncivil Society

References/Further Readings

Brinkerhoff, D. W. (2007) Introduction – Governance challenges in fragile states. In D. W. Brinkerhoff (Ed.) *Governance in post-conflict societies: Rebuilding fragile states* (pp. 1–21). London/New York: Routledge.

Cohen, S. (2001) *States of denial: Knowing about atrocitities and suffering.* Cambridge: Polity; Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Duffield, M. (2000). Globalization, transborder trade, and war economies. In M. Berdal & D. M. Malone (Eds.) *Greed and grievance: Economic agendas in civil wars* (pp. 69–89). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Howell, J., & Pearce, J. (2001) *Civil society and development: A critical exploration.* Boulder, CO/London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Kaldor, M. (2006) New and old wars: Organized violence in a global era (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity.

Kaldor, M., Kostovicova, D., & Said, Y. (2007) War and peace: The role of global civil society. In M. Kaldor *Global civil society 2006/7* (pp. 94–121). London: Sage.

Muenkler, H. (2005). *The new wars.* Cambridge: Polity.

Pouligny, B. (2005). Civil society and post-conflict peacebuilding: Ambiguities of international programmes aimed at building "new" societies. *Security Dialogue, 36*(4), 495–510.

Pugh, M. (2005). The political economy of peacebuilding: A critical theory perspective. *International Journal of Peace Studies, 10*(2), 23–42.

World Bank (2005). Engaging civil society organizations in conflict-affected and fragile states. Report No. 32538-GLB. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank.

Civil Society Indicators and Indexes

V. Finn Heinrich
Transparency International, Melville, South Africa

Introduction

For most of its history, the concept of civil society has been confined to the realms of political theory and philosophy. From the thinkers of the Scottish Enlightenment via Gramsci's cultural hegemony perspective to the revival of the term by Eastern European dissidents in the 1980s, civil society was always used in the context of imagining a normative ideal-type society. In addition, these various philosophical traditions differed quite strongly in their definition of the concept and its boundaries, leading commentators to lament the conceptual confusion around the term and questioning its usefulness for contemporary sociopolitical analysis (Knight & Hartnell, 2001; Grimond, 2002).

Given this ideological and normative baggage, the operationalization of the concept for empirical research – a necessary prerequisite for the development of indicators and indices – is an extremely challenging undertaking. In fact, the applicability and relevance of civil society for empirical–analytical research is a contested issue: while there are scholars who regard the term as an essentially normative and theoretical construct (Tester, 1992; Foley & Edwards, 1998), there is a growing number of researchers who contend that civil society can and should be added to the repertoire of

macro-level concepts used for sociopolitical analysis (Edwards, 2004: vi; Anheier, 2004).

However, those looking for empirical data on civil society are likely to be confronted with a gaping hole. Due to the tendency of official statistical agencies to be preoccupied with either state or private sector institutions, the third sector – which is often used synonymously with civil society – largely remained empirical *terra incognito* (Anheier, 2004: 11). As a consequence, up to the end of the twentieth century one does not find any explicit quantitative empirical work under the rubric of civil society. This has changed quite profoundly because of a number of special research projects dedicated to analyzing "real existing civil societies," and due to several attempts at conceptualizing and measuring the concept by scholars working in the empirical–analytical research tradition.

Definition

While it is not a standing term used in the social sciences, *civil society indicators* can be defined as specific measures of pertinent aspects of the phenomenon, which lend themselves to operationalization and measurement and to tracking changes over time. A good indicator should meet the SMART standard, i.e., it should be (analytically) sound, measurable, accessible/available, relevant, and timely. A civil society index is a composite indicator, which combines the individual indicators (or variables) in a single measure. For the development of indicators and indices, an underlying theoretical framework which helps the researcher define and select the relevant indicators and organize them in a way that accurately reflects the assumptions about their interrelationships is of crucial importance.

Historical Background

Up to the 1970s, social science data were highly skewed toward economic issues. Despite the emergence of a social indicator movement in the 1970s, empirical information on civil society has remained scarce. The only quantitative aspect of civil society which has been covered by large-scale international surveys for several decades is the extent of the population's participation in voluntary organizations. When in the late 1990s civil society became one of the key buzzwords among the international policy and development community and academics alike, the dire state of civil society data triggered the establishment of a substantive number of international research projects on civil society and related issues. The following projects are the most widely known:

- *Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project* (http://www.jhu.edu/~cnp/), which analyzes the scope and economic contributions of the nonprofit sector in more than 40 countries. The project is also working with the UN statistical division to introduce basic indicators on the nonprofit sector in the official reporting system of national statistical agencies.
- *CIVICUS Civil Society Index Project* (www.civicus.org) – a participatory and multi-method approach to assess the state of civil society in more than 50 countries.
- *Global Civil Society Yearbook* (http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global/researchgcspub.htm), published by the London School of Economics, charts key themes and challenges for global civil society in an annual publication.
- *Civil Society and Governance Programme* at the Institute for Development Studies, University of Sussex (http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/civsoc/), which from 1998 to 2001 examined civil society's relations with government in 22 predominantly developing countries.
- *Citizens and Governance Project*, run by the Commonwealth Foundation in 2000 (http://www.commonwealthfoundation.com/uploads/documents/cg_global_synthesis.pdf), which used a participatory methodology to investigate people's conceptions of a good society and the role of civil society in governance in Commonwealth countries.
- *ARVIN Tool* (http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/ESSD/sdvext.nsf/PrintFriendly/C386845885F530EB85256EA700 64EB14?Opendocument) developed by the World Bank, which seeks to assess the enabling environment for civic engagement and has been applied in a number of developing countries.
- *USAID NGO Sustainability Index* for Eastern Europe and Eurasia (http://www.usaid.gov/locations/europe_eurasia/dem_gov/ngoindex/), which has been generated annually since 1998 by USAID to assess the sustainability of the NGO sector in the region.
- *World Value Survey* (http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/), a large-scale international public opinion survey, which includes questions on civic participation. The survey data forms the basis for a number of cross-national indices on civil society and social capital (e.g., Norris, 2002; Howard, 2003).

Key Issues

As a consequence of the increasing availability of cross-national data on civil society assembled via the projects listed above, as well as of the growing attention by comparative social researchers to issues of conceptualization, a vibrant debate about how to conceptualize, operationalize,

and measure civil society has ensued (e.g., Heinrich, 2005; Anheier, 2005; Sokolowski & Salamon, 2005; Howard, 2005; Kubik, 2005).

Conceptualizing Civil Society

Civil society is clearly one of the most contested and most challenging social science concepts to conceptualize and measure. On a basic level, one can distinguish between normative–theoretical approaches to civil society, which are preoccupied with developing a vision for what civil society should be like and empirical–analytical perspectives, which focus on analyzing real existing civil societies. A second distinction can be made between conceptualizations of civil society treating the phenomenon as synonymous with a "good society" and those defining it as a distinct sphere or sector within society at large (see Table 1).

Almost all studies which employ indicators and indices fall into the lower right-hand box in Table 1, with the notable exception of Putnam's civic community index, which measures the "civicness" of an entire community as opposed the characteristics of the nonprofit/civil society sector within a community (Putnam, 1993).

Civil Society's Boundaries: However, within the dominant empirical-analytical approach to the civil society sphere/sector, there is considerable diversity in terms of defining civil society's boundaries (extension) and core dimensions (intension). Regarding the extension of the concept, two different approaches can be distinguished. First, the structural-operational definition, which focuses on the following key characteristics of organizations to classify them as part of civil society: organized, private, nonprofit-distributing, self-governing, and voluntary (Salamon & Anheier, 1997). Second, a functional approach which puts emphasis on the nature of the activities performed in civil society, which are usually defined as the expression of interests in the public sphere (Heinrich, 2004, Uphoff & Krishna, 2004). The choice of "function versus form" concept has important downstream implications for the development of indicators. For example, while the structural-operational definition leads to a focus on organizational indicators, the latter approach implies a wider perspective, also including nonorganized civic behavior.

Civil Society Indicators and Indexes. Table 1 Civil society concepts

	Normative–theoretical	Empirical–analytical
Property of society (*a "good society"*)		
Object within society (*sphere/sector*)		

Civil Society's Core Dimensions: A further key conceptual choice concerns the identification of civil society's core characteristics, which are to be operationalized and measured via specific indicators. Here, the lacking consensus around the term's core meaning and the underdeveloped body of theorizing on civil society have proven to be crucial impediments for the development of a widely agreed operational concept. While a common operational concept is lacking, there is broad agreement about the multidimensional nature of civil society, requiring a composite index approach involving multiple indicators.

As regards the key dimensions of civil society, recent research has identified a convergence toward a two-dimensional conceptualization of structural and cultural features which mirrors a similar emerging orthodoxy in the social capital literature (Heinrich, 2005; Van Deth, 2003). While the structural dimension, which examines the extent of civic participation as well as the key features of organized civil society, is well-established in the literature, the cultural dimension is a rather new addition and remains still underdeveloped in terms of operational tools and measures. These cultural facets relate to the norms, values, and interests expressed in civil society; by focusing on the content of civic activities they complement the structural dimension, which is mainly concerned with the quantity and form of these activities.

Civil Society Indicators

There is a wide range of different civil society indicators in use, which can be classified according to their data type and data sources.

On the one hand, there are objective indicators which use information obtained from official statistical agencies or public opinion surveys. Some examples are:

- Share of paid employment in nonprofit sector (Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project)
- Percentage of population who is a member of at least one voluntary organization (World Value Survey)
- Percentage of people who trust others (LSE Global Civil Society Index)

On the other hand, there are subjective indicators which involve an intermediary step between the raw data and the indicator score. This step is usually undertaken by experts, who assign the indicator score based on the

available information and based on their own knowledge. There is an extensive range of subjective indicators, primarily generated by USAID's NGO Sustainability Index and the CIVICUS Civil Society Index.

Civil Society Indices

Due to improved data availability, there are a growing number of composite indicators on civil society. The following indices are available for a substantive number of countries:

1. The Global Civil Society Index developed by the Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project at Johns Hopkins University (Salamon & Sokolowski, 2004)
2. The Civil Society Strength Index developed on the basis of the CIVICUS Civil Society Index data (Heinrich, 2008)
3. LSE's Global Civil Society Index (Anheier & Stares, 2002), which measures the extent to which a country's civil society participates in global civil society
4. USAID's NGO Sustainability Index for post-Communist Europe and Eurasia
5. Marc Howard's measure of organizational memberships (Howard, 2003)
6. Pippa Norris' Social Capital Index (Norris, 2002: 150–151)

Research by the author has found moderately strong correlations among the first four indices, while the latter two measures, which rely on a limited number of indicators based on the World Value Survey, often yield substantively different results from the other indices (Heinrich, forthcoming). However, in general and different from composite measures in many other areas of the social sciences, such as democracy, there are considerable differences in individual country ratings and rankings across the entire range of civil society indices. To illustrate this with an example: The Czech Republic occupies a low position on Howard's measure and the Johns Hopkins Index, a medium position on Norris' Social Capital Index, but a relatively high ranking on the Civil Society Strength Index and the LSE index. These substantial differences cannot be attributed solely to the different sample compositions, but are likely to be a consequence of the vastly different operationalizations, scarce data as well as the limited validity of the available data sources.

Operational concepts range from using organizational membership as the sole indicator of civil society (Howard), to a focus on economic features (Johns Hopkins Index) or the NGO sector (USAID), while operationalizations which span civil society's multilevel nature of micro-level (individual behavior), meso-level (organizational characteristics) and macro-level (organized civil society) are rare (Heinrich, forthcoming). In addition, each index is plagued by a specific set of validity concerns, such as the subjectivity of expert assessments (CIVICUS, USAID), the doubtful cross-cultural validity of public opinion surveys (Howard, Norris, LSE), or the existence of a large gap between concept and indicator, such as in the case of the Johns Hopkins Index, which uses primarily economic indicators to measure the sociopolitical concept of civil society.

Future Directions

Empirical research on civil society has grown significantly since the turn of the millennium. The initial approach of using organizational membership as the sole indicator for civil society has been superseded by multidimensional composite indicators, which are designed to capture the various facets of this complex macro-phenomenon. However, in general, civil society indicators and indices are still a nascent area of research which has to rely on imperfect measures and limited data sources.

Future research should focus on a number of key challenges. First, existing indices rarely cover more than 50 countries with a strong overrepresentation of OECD countries. Thus, the development of larger and more globally representative datasets remains a key task for the future. While the process of including economic data on the nonprofit sector in the official reporting by statistical agencies is certainly an important step forward, the political, social, and cultural aspects of civil society are likely to remain outside of the remit of statistical agencies and therefore require additional private efforts to data collection. Second, the cultural dimension of civil society remains underdeveloped, conceptually as well as empirically: How civil societies differ in terms of the values, norms, and interests they espouse and promote is a question that has not been addressed by the scholarly community and for which valid indicators remain scarce. Third, developers of civil society indices need to pay more attention to their underlying concepts. Too often, the concepts of civil society, social capital, third sector, and associational life are conflated even though they relate to substantively different phenomena. In addition, researchers should specify which specific characteristic of civil society they intend to capture with their measure, since notions of civil society's strength, sustainability, quality, or capacity – while related – imply different choices in terms of the selection of indicators. Last, but not least, since the scholarly community is still far from having established a widely

accepted composite measure of civil society, ongoing engagement among researchers involved in the crucial, yet highly complex, task of measuring civil society is likely to be key to advancing the field.

Cross-References

- ► Civic Participation
- ► Civil Society, Definitions of and Approaches
- ► Social Capital, Definition of
- ► Values

References/Further Readings

Anheier, H., & Stares, S. (2002). Introducing the global civil society index. In H. Anheier, M. Glasius, & M. Kaldor (Eds.), *Global civil society yearbook* (pp. 241–254). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anheier, H. K. (2004). *Civil society: Measurement, evaluation, policy.* London: Earthscan.

Anheier, H. K. (2005). Measure for measure: A commentary on Heinrich and the state of civil society indicators research. *Journal of Civil Society, 1*(3), 241–246.

Edwards, M. (2004). *Civil society.* London: Polity.

Foley, M. W., & Edwards, B. (1998). Beyond Tocqueville. Civil society and social capital in comparative perspective. *American Behavioral Scientist, 42,* 5–20.

Grimond, J. (2002). Civil society. *The Economist, The World in 2002.* London: *The Economist.*

Heinrich, V. F. (2004). *Assessing and strengthening civil society worldwide. A project description of the CIVICUS civil society index: A participatory needs assessment & action-planning tool for civil society.* Johannesburg: CIVICUS.

Heinrich, V. F. (2005). Studying civil society across the world. Exploring the thorny issues of conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Civil Society, 1*(3), 211–228.

Heinrich, V. F. (2008). *What makes civil society strong? Measuring and analysing the strength of civil society across the world.* Ph.D. thesis. Hagen: Fernuniversität Hagen, forthcoming.

Howard, M. M. (2003). *The weakness of civil society in post-Communist Europe.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Howard, M. M. (2005). Conceptual and methodological suggestions for improving cross-national measures of civil society: Commentary on Heinrich. *Journal of Civil Society, 1*(3), 229–234.

Knight, B., & Hartnell, C. (2001). 'Civil society – Is it anything more than a metaphor for hope for a better world?' *Alliance, 6*(4), 16.

Kubik, J. (2005). How to study civil society: The state of the art and what to do next. *East European Politics & Societies, 19,* 105–30.

Norris, P. (2002). *Democratic Phoenix. Reinventing political activism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work – Civic traditions in modern Italy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Salamon, L. M., & Anheier, H. (1997). *Defining the nonprofit sector. A cross-national analysis.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Salamon, L. M., & Sokolowski, S. W. (2004). Measuring civil society: The Johns Hopkins Global Civil Society Index. In: M. Salamon & S. W. Sokolowski (Eds.), *Global civil society. Volume 2. Dimensions of the nonprofit sector* (pp. 61–92). Bloomfield: Kumarian Press.

Sokolowski, W., & Salamon, L. (2005). Mirror, mirror on the wall? Commentary on Heinrich. *Journal of Civil Society, 1*(3), 235–240.

Tester, K. (1992). *Civil society.* London: Routledge.

Uphoff, N., & Krishna, A. (2004). Civil society and public sector institutions: More than a zero-sum relationship. *Public Administration & Development, 24*(4), 357–372.

Van Deth, J. W. (2003). Measuring social capital: Orthodoxies and continuing controversies. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 6*(1), 79–92.

Civil Society Theory: Aristotle

MARTY SULEK
Indiana University Center on Philanthropy, Farmland, IN, USA

Aristotle's Life

Aristotle (384–322 BCE) is one of the most important philosophers of antiquity, and a founding figure of Western philosophy. A student of Plato and a teacher of Alexander the Great, Aristotle founded the Lyceum, one of the earliest and most influential philosophical schools of the ancient world. By some accounts, he also invented political science as a distinct academic discipline (Strauss, 1978: 21). There is a rich biographical tradition on Aristotle in ancient sources, of which Düring (1957) provides a useful scholarly inventory. One of the most extensive extant ancient accounts is provided by Diogenes Laertius ("DL") in the fifth book of his *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*, written sometime in the second century AD. In the introduction to his translation of Aristotle's *Politics*, Lord (1984) also provides a speculative biography, extrapolated from the biographical record, that traces the philosopher's likely, though for political reasons never explicitly stated, political activities.

Aristotle was born in 384 in Stageiria, a Greek colony on the Chalcidice peninsula, on the Gulf of Strymon, in the northern Aegean Sea. He remained a citizen of Stageiria his entire life, despite living elsewhere for most of it. Later in life, he performed great services for his home *polis*, including drafting its written code of laws. His mother, Phaestis, originally hailed from Chalcis, on the island of Euboea, and his father, Nicomachus, was an Asclepiad, retained as court physician by King Amyntas II of Macedon. Aristotle thus received his early education in an aristocratic setting at the Macedonian royal court. His mother died when he was still very young, and his father died when he was ten. Thereafter, he was brought up under the guardianship of Proxenus of Atarneaus, the husband of his sister, Arimneste.

At the age of 17, Aristotle moved to Athens to pursue his advanced education. He may have initially enrolled in