

## **Study of the Relationship between Different Types of Capital (Economic, Social and Cultural) and Social Indifference (Case Study: Young People Aged 18-29 in Sanandaj)**

Yaghoub Ahmadi<sup>\*1</sup>  
Aboalghasem Heidarabadi<sup>2</sup>

Received 10 March 2020, Accepted 21 June 2020

### ***Abstract***

Social indifference is in fact a sign of the failure of the processes of cohesion and integration in the connection of individuals with society. The severity and pervasiveness of social indifference will undoubtedly lead to social disintegration and, in a way, to underdevelopment. Accordingly, the importance of the study of social indifference in its adverse consequences on the path of development and the existence of a significant volume of this situation among young people will cause more concerns and concerns. In this regard, the present article is a sociological look at the study of the relationship between the existences of three types of capital between young people (economic, cultural and social) with social indifference. The present research method was non-experimental descriptive correlation using survey technique. The statistical population of the study was young people aged 18-29 years in Sanandaj in 2019. The sample size was 374, which were studied based on multi-stage cluster sampling method. The results of the hypothesis test show that there is a significant and inverse relationship between the existence of different types of capital and the degree of social indifference of young people. In other words, as the number of young people's three assets increases, so does their indifference. The most severe relationship was the existence of social capital (0.564). Also, the result of regression analysis shows that different types of capital explain about 38% of the variance of social indifference of the youth and in this model, the most important factor whose effect is more determinant than other factors is the variable of social capital that up to 52% explains the variations of the dependent variable.

***Keywords:*** Indifference, Social capital, Cultural capital, Economic capital.

---

<sup>1\*</sup>. Associate Professor of Sociology, Payamnoor University, Iran, yahmady2001@yahoo.com (Corresponding Author)

<sup>2</sup>. Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Babol Branch, Islamic Azad University, Babol, Iran heidarabadi@baboliau.ac.ir

## 1. Introduction

The process of formation and continuity of societies based on a kind of interactive and cooperative social relations a prerequisite for the society. In addition, the process of transition from the status quo to the desired status quo or the same development without the above prerequisites will be practically unsuccessful and incomplete. From this perspective, it is said that the process of achieving development without the presence of citizens will undoubtedly lead to imbalance and the formation of unbalanced development. Accordingly, citizens are considered as important pillars of the development and dynamism of societies in the contemporary period. In fact, the process of achieving communities achieving balanced and sustainable development is impossible without considering the category of the citizen and his authority and duties. Thus, in contemporary societies, the relationship between sovereignty and citizenship has been redefined and is of great importance. The most important element in introducing a citizen, according to most sociologists, is "participatory focus". Many thinkers in the field of social issues believe that the only way to control crises and social problems in contemporary societies is to turn to participatory policies and lay the groundwork for real citizenship in the true sense of the word or the participation of community members in social institutions.

From this perspective, many thinkers interpret the duality of development-underdevelopment with the duality of participation-non-participation or social indifference. Indifference is the opposite of conflict and participation. Social indifference expresses insensitivity, pessimism, carelessness; or in other words, a kind of social depression. From a pathological point of view, indifference in society is considered a kind of social disease, just as, on the contrary, any social attention and altruism in individual and social life is a sign of dynamism and social health.

Indifference is often cited as a pathological phenomenon, an obstacle to political and social participation, and national development. If the broad participation of citizens in different spheres of social life is considered an important condition for social, economic and political development, the non-participation of citizens and the prevalence of indifference can be considered as an influential factor in development (Masoudnia, 2001, p. 152). Sydney Verba

---

considers the formation of society and the processes of data and communication associated with it to depend on the existence of individuals who are known to be agents of society. The discouragement and dissatisfaction of each individual or group in society due to social alienation, feelings of ineffectiveness, dissatisfaction, and distrust of others will cause fragility in the social structure. Gradually, these same factors will make the members of the social network, who are considered to be the constituent elements of the same society, pessimistic about all social processes and will cause a so-called disease in relation to any social connection. Therefore, disregard for the individual or group ability of social elements will cause the collapse of any structure or environment.

In addition, many thinkers believe that social indifference is one of the examples and consequences of the transition of societies from the traditional to the modern. Such societies, which face rapid social changes and socio-political confrontations, are generally more prone to negative epistemological phenomena, such as passivity and social indifference, and this general rule of thumb applies to Iran, which is a clear example of it in a modern form, and in this historical transition, it has faced and continues to face various political, economic, cultural, and social events and issues. In addition, the historical experience of the last three decades in Iran shows that social attention and public participation, which is the opposite of social indifference, has been one of the important factors in the victory of the Islamic Revolution and resistance in the eight-year war with Iraq. To the referendums two decades after the Islamic Revolution, it clearly shows a kind of indifference on the part of a significant percentage of Iranians (MohseniTabrizi & SedaghatiFard, 2011, p.1). Also, regardless of political participation, in national research, the majority of respondents (more than 75%) have shown little social (association) participation in organizations and social associations (Shukuri, 2005), which indicates a kind of social indifference.

In this regard, many components are introduced as determinants of social participation and social indifference, the most important of which are the types of capital available to individuals, which can be divided into three categories of social, economic and cultural capital. The existence of these three types of

capital, especially among the youth, will lead to significant changes in their behaviors, attitudes, and values, and the youth of Sanandaj are no exception. Both the fact that Kurdistan Province, as one of the provinces with significant cultural and social contexts and differences with other parts of Iran, suggests that the issue of indifference can be important in the province, especially among the youth. Have considerable. From this perspective, the present paper seeks to answer the question of the level of social indifference among the youth of Sanandaj, and more importantly, which of the three types of capital are affected by this situation.

## **2.Review of Literature**

### **2.1. Experimental Background**

In domestic research, Ahmadi (2005) has concluded that by increasing empathy, increasing the sense of social responsibility and reducing the cost-reward analysis of material can reduce indifference and increase altruism; The results of Naderi et al., (2009) study show that there is a significant relationship between the dimensions of social variability (feeling powerlessness, meaninglessness, anomaly, social isolation and self-loathing) and social indifference. MohseniTabrizi (2011) has concluded in his research that the five variables of civic commitment, individualism, abnormality, social satisfaction and relative deprivation affect the degree of social indifference of individuals. Also, Ahmadi and Majidi (2012), in a study entitled "Study of social and cultural factors related to social indifference among students of Kurdistan University and Payame Noor University of Sanandaj" between the variables of social alienation and the degree of social indifference. There is a significant and inverse relationship between the variables of effectiveness, social trust and social satisfaction and the degree of social indifference of students. The rate of difference between male and female students is higher than female students and also no relationship between field variables (marital status, place of residence and university of study, ethnicity and job status) of students with social indifference (Ahmadi & Majidi, 2012).

Noah et al., (2014) in a study entitled "Study of factors affecting social indifference (Case study: citizens of 18 years and older in the city of Dezful" to

investigate the prevalence and factors affecting social indifference and measure its correlation with age and sex variables and five independent variables were used to determine the effect of each on social indifference. The findings showed that there was a significant correlation between independent variables of socioeconomic status, feeling of alienation, feeling of empathy, feeling of insecurity, and social capital. Regression analysis found that about 30% of social indifference changes were explained by the five variables of empathy, feelings of alienation, social capital, feelings of insecurity, and socioeconomic status, which are the most influential factors on the social indifference of Dezfoul citizens, respectively. Zahirinia et al., (2015) in a study entitled "Study of identifying the effective factors of social indifference among students of Mohaghegh Ardabili University" showed that among the variables of age, educational group and socioeconomic status with indifference socially, there is a significant statistical relationship. There is also a significant relationship between social alienation, social effectiveness, relative deprivation, cost analysis of reward and perception of justice and social indifference (Zahirinia et al., 2015).

As the youth in this poll had a higher percentage. He attributes this to the fact that young people, depending on their level of education, are attracted to different jobs or get married, or engage in other activities, and then withdraw from decision-making on socio-political issues and pay less attention. They show their social issues. Of course, it should be noted that these people become interested in socio-political issues both nationally and locally after reaching an older age (Sutol, 2013). Winstock (2009) in a study entitled "Study of the relationship between strategies, goals and skills and their impact on deviant behaviors among young people" showed that there is a negative relationship between strategies, goals and skills that prevent deviance and deviant behaviors. In other words, the more active the strategies, goals, and deterrent skills than the deviant leads the less likely they are to engage in deviant behavior (Vinsok, 2009).

In a study titled "Studying the relationship between the bureaucracy and citizens in Saudi Arabia", Al-Mujjaji (2011) showed that citizens' indifference in general is a fact that has hindered all efforts by the administrative and

governmental system for development in Saudi Arabia. In fact, one of the most important issues facing this social, economic and educational development is the general indifference mentioned by Al-Mizjaji (2011). The results of Winstra's 2003 study in Canada show that interpersonal trust, social solidarity, social influence, as well as effectiveness and type of community are directly and positively associated with the difference or participation of individuals in the study. Winstra, 2003, p. 547). In a study in 2003, Joseph Klasner states that indifference to political participation is influenced by the effectiveness of individuals and variables such as age, gender, income, etc. (Klenser, 2003, pp. 19-24). In a study entitled "Social Class and Political Behavior during a Period of Economic Recession: Indifference and Radicalism in the Netherlands in 1985", Van Snipeenberg and Schippers (1991) cited an increase in social indifference in the Netherlands in 1985 as a major political protest. They have been hit hard by the recession (Vinasnipenberg and Schippers, 1991). Finally, Russia (1975) identifies the main reasons for indifference to social and political issues as the coordinates of ethnic minorities. Ahmadi (2005) in his doctoral dissertation entitled "A Study of Indifference in Social Relations and the Causes and Factors Affecting It" stated that in the process of daily social life, a series of sudden emergencies (troubles and troubles) occur suddenly. The help of others (witnesses) is needed to solve the problem. But when such emergencies occur, the reaction of many witnesses is indifferent.

## **2.2. Theoretical Foundations**

In explaining the social indifference that is often expressed in the interpretation of social alienation in the view of classical sociologists, Simmel describes the modern urban life (Mumtaz, 2000 and Karib, 1999), Durkheim's phenomenon of anomie<sup>7</sup> and normative weakness, and normative 13 in modern society. Tavassoli, 2003), Tunisia and Weber to the expansion of actions based on modern rationality (Conman, 2002 and Weber, 1995), Marx (1994) to the isolation of workers due to the nature of capitalist and feminist production and Thomas in the theory of social rupture system to the problem weaknesses of norms (Tavassoli, 2003) have been mentioned.

But contemporary theorists have identified effective factors in the emergence of indifference in society in the form of relatively more empirical theories. Sterlin provides an economic and demographic explanation of the difference, arguing that tendencies and trends in relation to political indifference are to some extent a function of generational change in welfare and economic well-being (Massoudnia, 2001). Dahl (1983) also identifies four groups of people in society; The powerful, the political class and the non-political or indifferent class. According to Dahl, since man is naturally a political animal, it is important to study the origin and cause of indifference. In explaining the differences in new societies, he proposes similar theories to exchange sociology; that is, just as in the relationship between individuals, substances are exchanged, so processes such as social interests and friendships are exchanged (Mayer, 1988). In another theory, Vilensky believes that indifference may be a function of the aging process (quoted in Massoudnia, 2001).

Latane and Darley (1968), by performing a series of varied and extensive experiments, explain indifference and altruism in terms of a five-step decision-making process. In their view, these stages of the journey include understanding the situation, interpreting the situation, taking responsibility, providing solutions, and making the final decision (quoted by Kalantari et al., 2007: 28). These thinkers believe that indifference or empathy depends on the type of response that observers provide to each of the above steps. Daniel Buttson (1981, p. 295) interprets indifference based on the ability and level of empathy of the observer with the person in need. Wiggins et al. (1994, p. 327) consider social indifference and empathy to be dependent on the internalization of social norms of confrontation, fairness, and responsibility. In the framework of the theory of social exchange, Piliavin (1990, p. 32) proposes a five-step process in explaining social indifference, the foundation of which is based on the cost-reward theorem. According to him, the most important factor influencing empathy or indifference in different matters is the output of individual calculations in the case of cost-reward.

Another factor that thinkers have emphasized in explaining indifference is the types of social and cultural assets and their dimensions. Bourdieu (1986)

argues that capital is any origin in the social realm that is effective in the individual's ability to benefit from the particular benefits that result from this scene. He believes that capital is basically seen in three ways: economic capital (financial and material); Cultural capital (goods, skills, symbolic and rare titles) and social capital (resources that are given to the individual only for membership in the group). (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 335)

The concept of social capital was first used in 1920 by a man named Henry Fann. Social capital is a relatively new concept in the social sciences, and in a nutshell it means "norms and networks that allow people to participate in collective action for mutual benefit." And it can be measured by methods such as the level of social trust and the level of membership in formal or informal civic associations. Social capital is a compound concept that describes the "inventory" or amount of these norms and networks in a society and at a particular time. Mutual relations, non-selfish behavior, trust are examples of these norms. These networks may be formal or informal. From this perspective, social capital is one of the important elements of the power of "civil society" or the capacity of society to manage itself through the activities of informal, voluntary, non-governmental and non-profit groups (Tajbakhsh, 2003).

Social addiction is a major component of social capital, which Ellison and Firestone (1974) see as the transfer of resources to others, expecting them to act in a way that minimizes negative outcomes and achieves goals (Mistall, 2011). Melinger (1956) sees trust as a two-dimensional concept that includes: - Confidence in the intentions and motives of the other party; - Color and intimacy in the actions and speech of the other party. Schleger, Helm, and Tedishi (1973) believe that interpersonal trust consists of three elements: "position of risk, communication, and reliance on information." According to them, interpersonal trust is a person's reliance on information obtained from another person (the other party). George Simmel sees trust as a kind of faith and belief in society (ibid, p. 11). Fukuyama refers to a generalized notion of trust, which he defines as expected issue within a normative community based on cooperative behavior and shared norms. Anthony Giddens sees trust as the prelude to the foundation of social life, without which individual and social life will be overwhelmed by worries and anxieties. Zatomka (1999) has given



special attention to the issue of social trust among contemporary sociologists. In his view, "the new society has unique features such as futurism, the intensity of interdependence, the breadth and diversity of societies, the increase of social patterns and distinctions, the expansion of the electoral system, the complexity of institutions and the increase of ambiguity, uncertainty and anonymity." "And being a stranger to the social environment has made paying attention to social trust and its role in social life a serious reality." In addition, according to Zetomka, in the field of social sciences, we are witnessing the growth of a kind of cultural-oriented orientation, which in itself has a kind of rotation from hard concepts to soft concepts. Such a shift has led to a deeper focus on the concepts of trust, and over the past two decades we have seen a new wave of trust issues in the concepts of the social sciences, especially sociology. In his view, "trust is a prerequisite for cooperation and a product of successful cooperation." And he considers it a kind of conditioning for the possible actions of others in the future (Azkia, 2004, p. 308).

According to Putnam, social trust is the most important component of social capital, and "voluntary cooperation and collaboration takes place easily, where there is a fundamental reserve and accumulation of social capital in the form of exchange rules and civic commitment networks." Seligman (1997) developed a dual conception of trust that refers to different contexts for the relationship between individuals in the personal sphere and the institutionalized forms of trust in public space. According to Seligman, trust in the process of transferring from personal and informal relationships between individuals to institutional and public forms is confined to a space accumulated by contract, law, and mutual exchange (ibid, p. 283). In the combined model, Anneer and Kendall have used three types of thinking in sociology, political science, and economics, or the right to choose rationally, to focus on social networking, individual connections, and civic virtue. Pointing to the importance of interpersonal trust and membership in voluntary organizations, they consider the following three approaches: Economic studies rely on trade and exchanges in the market as an effective mechanism of trust. Reducing transaction costs through economics; In sociological studies, the main source for studying trust is social order, which relies on the reliability of social order and the previous

assumption of this process. In this study, trust has been considered as the ability of individuals to accumulate appropriate motivations and behaviors to communicate with others, and finally the main source in the field of political science is social capital in the form of networks related to social connections. (Anir and Kendall, 2002, pp. 347-352).

Cultural capital is also a sociological subject that Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Pasteur first used to describe cultural and social reproduction (Harker, 1990, p. 130). Bourdieu argues that the class structure of advanced societies is not only determined by economics, but also by the economic capital. In order to analyze classes in these societies, cultural and social capital must also be considered. In fact, the concepts of pre-Bourdieu economic and social capital have been used by others, but all scholars agree that the concept of "cultural capital" of the French Shenshire community preceded Bourdieu. For Bourdieu, cultural capital is the recognition and perception of sublime culture and art, having good taste and appropriate practices. In fact, Bourdieu's goal was not only to show that different classes have different cultural capital in (they are type and volume), but also to show that social classes reproduce themselves by creating cultural capital in children (Fazeli, 2003, pp.47-48).

### **2.3. Theoretical Framework**

Given the points raised in the theories presented in this study, it seems that none of the theories and sociological approaches alone can be sufficient to explain the issue of social indifference, because each of them has specific aspects of the subject and its causes are established and it has its strengths and weaknesses. Each of them covers specific variables and has limited explanatory power. Therefore, the theoretical framework of this study is a combination of the views presented based on the following trend.

According to Melvin Seman's theory, in order to scale and introduce the social alienation index, McDill and Ridley's view on the relationship between the individual's socioeconomic status (economic capital) and social indifference has been used. The relationship between trust (social capital) and social indifference has been exploited using the intellectual perspective presented by Putnam, Bourdieu, Jeffrey Page, Abrahamson, and Aldrich. The

Clark and Akok component can be used for internal and external effectiveness in this study. The views expressed by social trust theorists, especially Catherine Ross, Anneer, and Kendall, have received considerable attention. In the field of cold and cultural indifference, Pierre Bourdieu's theories are also important. Therefore, according to the proposed issues, the hypotheses are formulated as follows:

- There is a relationship between economic capital and the level of social indifference of young people.
- There is a relationship between social capital (especially the level of trust) and the level of social indifference of young people.
- There is a relationship between cultural capital (and its three dimensions) and the degree of social indifference of young people.

### 3. Research Method

The present study is a descriptive survey in terms of method; In terms of the relationship between the variables, it is a correlational type and in terms of time, it is cross-sectional. The statistical population of the study includes all young people aged 18-29 years in Sanandaj (246850 people). The sample size was 374 people and the sampling method was multi-stage cluster sampling according to the variance between classes. A researcher-made questionnaire was used to gather information. Cronbach's alpha method has been used to ensure the reliability of the variables. The results of which are significant in the table below.

**Table 1. Sustainability of dimensions and indicators**

The concept	Dimensions	Number of items	Reliability of dimensions and indicators
Social Indifference	Total	9	0.875
Economic Capital	Total	8	0.853
Cultural Capital	Visual cultural capital	4	0.648
	Objectified cultural capital	5	0.746
	Institutional and regulatory cultural capital	4	0.814
	Total	13	0.902
Social Capital	Social Networks	5	0.886
	Collective norms	5	0.907
	social trust	5	0.901
	Total	15	0.942

Accordingly, the analysis unit of the present study is the youth and time domain of the research, the second six months of 2019. The basic features of which are as follows:

**Table 2. Characteristics of the respondents' cognitive population**

Variable	Dimensions	Percent
Gender	Man	51
	Female	49
Marital status	Single	76/5
	Married	24/5
Job status	Employed	31/7
	Unemployed	68/3
Ethnicity	Kurd	90
	Turk	4
	Fars	4
	Other	2

#### 4. Findings

The research findings are presented in two parts. In the first part, descriptive indicators of different dimensions of indifference and three types of capital are presented, and in the second part, research hypotheses about the effect of variables on social indifference are examined.

#### 4. Description of the Main Variables

The main variables in this study, as mentioned, include the three types of economic, social and cultural capital, as well as the social indifference described below.

**Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the main research variables and their dimensions**

variable	Average	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Scope of changes	Number
Social indifference	29/68	3/011	9	45	15	374
Cultural capital	46/28	7/52	22	110	88	374
Visual cultural capital	22/029	5/84	8	40	50	374
Objectified cultural capital	12/358	4/26	5	25	19	374
Institutional cultural capital	11/896	3/520	4	20	15	374
Economic capital	14/94	3/006	7	35	16	374
Social Networks	24/42	5/24	11	55	28	374
social norms	16/26	4/507	7	35	16	374
Interpersonal trust	12/46	3/235	6	30	25	374
Trust in strangers	13/43	2/566	6	30	17	374
Trust in the official institutions of the country	16/93	3/932	5	25	25	374

As shown in the table, the level of social indifference of young people is reported to be moderate and this situation is somewhat worrying, especially for the young strata of society. In addition, the economic capital of young people surveyed was 14.94 out of a minimum of 7 and a maximum of 28, indicating that the status of accountable youth economic capital is declining to an average.

Also, the results show that the overall level of cultural capital of the studied youth and the three dimensions (embodied, objectified, institutional and regulatory cultural capital) have been low. Finally, in terms of the dimensions of social capital, the results show that the average of social responsive youth networks is below average, the average of normal norms is moderate, and finally the dimension of social trust with three sub-categories (interpersonal trust, trust in strangers and trust to the official institutions of the country) is also below average.

## 5. Hypothesis Analysis

As explained in the theoretical framework, the degree of social indifference and its severity and weakness can be due to changes in the types of capital among young people studied. From this perspective, the relationship between social indifference and the types of capital and their subsets is measured.

**Table 4. Hypotheses and communication tests of the research variables**

	Social Indifference	
	The severity of the Correlation	Significant level
Economic capital	-0.214	0.000
Visual cultural capital	-0.412	0.000
Objectified cultural capital	-0.421	0.000
Institutional and regulatory cultural capital	-0.318	0.000
Cultural capital	-0.442	0.000
Social capital	-0.564	0.000
Social Networks	-0.454	0.000
Collective norms	-0.178	0.214
Interpersonal trust	-0.526	0.123
Trust strangers	-0.486	0.094

The results indicate that all three types of capital (economic, cultural and social) have a significant and inverse relationship with the social indifference

of the young people studied, and among these, the intensity of the relationship between social capital (-0.564) is stronger than others. Also, the different dimensions of cultural and social capital have a significant and inverse relationship with social indifference to different events.

#### Model of fitting factors explaining social indifference

In this study, multivariate regression analysis was performed using step-by-step method. The coefficient of multiple correlation is 0.642. ( $0.642R =$ ) and its sum, ie. the coefficient of determination, is equal to 0.383, so the variables of various types of capital clearly explain 38.3% of the variance of social indifference of young people studied in the equation.

**Table 5. Statistics of multivariate regression analysis of health-based lifestyle based on effective variables**

Multiple correlation coefficient	Explanatory coefficient	Corrected coefficient of explanation
0/378	0/383	0/642

The results of the analysis in the health-oriented lifestyle fit model according to the value of F obtained ( $f = 53.421$ -sig: 0.000) showed that the corrected AR explanatory model is significant.

**Table 6. Statistics on independent variables left in the rest of the model**

Variable name	B	Standard error	Beta	T	significance
	78.4	6/4	-	13.887	0.000
Economic Capital	1.025	0.052	0.318	5.255	0.000
Social Capital	1.346	0.057	0.446	6.362	0.000
Cultural Capital	1.014	0.227	0.286	4.675	0.000

As can be seen from the table above, among the variables included in the final model, the dependent variable is influenced by the social capital component, then the economic capital component, and then the cultural capital variable. In other words, the indicators of social capital, economic capital and cultural capital explain 44.6, 31.8 and 28.6 percent of the dependent variable changes, respectively.

Also, based on the width values of the origin and slope of the line, the regression equation of the dependent variable can be compiled as follows:

$$\text{Social Indifference} = 78/04 + 1/3025(\text{economic capital}) + 1/346(\text{social capital}) + 1/014(\text{cultural capital}) + e_2$$

## 6. Conclusion

Social inequality is one of the contemporary social ills that many societies face. Indifference is a form of withdrawal or, in extreme cases, a form of isolation that can pose many risks to society, and therefore, in recent years, thinkers have paid much attention to this area. This study, considering the importance of social indifference in preventing participation, seeks to evaluate this category and identify its determining elements.

The results of the present study are compared with the results of the theories presented on this subject. In the most important finding of this study, namely the significant and high relationship between social capital and social indifference, it can be noted that this finding is in agreement with the theories of many thinkers in the field of social capital, including James Coleman and especially Robert Putnam. It emphasizes civic participation, coordination and overlap. In addition, this finding, with the view of Anheer and Kendall, that the body of relations between trust and social capital is directly related to the legitimacy of the political system of social structure and is indirectly related to the level of participation of individuals and Jeffrey Pitch in The relationship is consistent with the effect of trust and a sense of effectiveness among individuals on the emergence of indifference.

The author's theory is based on the principle that in their exchange relationships, actors exchange resources with each other, and that the valuable results and consequences of this relationship can be amplified in a holistic, commodity, or intangible way. If the expected results appear positive in the exchange relationship, it will cause satisfaction and continuity of the exchange relationship. Otherwise, if the exchanged relationship appears negatively, it will terminate the exchange relationship and people's dissatisfaction. This raises the possibility of indifference, and the results obtained from this research also show that these intellectual views are compatible with the results of the present study and it can be said that the above theories can be applied in the

statistical community of the present study. Finally, the results of this study regarding the link between cultural capital and social indifference also confirm Pir Bourdieu's theories about the effect of cultural capital on the various activities of individuals, especially social and political participation.

### References

- Abramson, P. R., & Aldrich, J. H. (1982). The decline of electoral participation in America, *American Political Science Review*, 76, 502-521.
- Ahmadi, C. (2005). *A Study of indifference in social relations and the causes and factors affecting on*. Isfahan: Isfahan University.
- Ahmadi, Y., & Majidi, A. (2013). Socio-cultural and social ignorance components (Case Study: students of Kurdistan and Payame Noor Universities, *Journal of Social Studies and Research in Iran*, 2(30), 17-27.
- Al.Mizjaji, A. (2001). Public apathy towards bureaucracy as a constraint on the development of Saudi Arabia, *Public Administration Quarterly*, 25(3), 22-33.
- Anheier, H & Kendall, J. (2002). Interpersonal trust and voluntary associations: examining three approaches. *British Journal of Sociology*, 53, 343-362.
- Chen, Jie, & Yang, Z. (1999). Mass political interest (or Apathy) in Urban China. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 32( 3), 281-303.
- Dahl, R. A. (1983). *Modern political analysis*. New Delhi: Yale University.
- Dean, D., G. (1960). Alienation and political apathy. *Social Forces*, 38,3, 185-189.
- Habibzadeh, A. (2005). *The political difference of workers and its impact on reducing their political participation in the Islamic Republic of Iran*. Tehran: Islamic Azad University.
- Kaplan, H. & Benjamin, S. (1996). *Comprehensive dictionary of psychiatry and psychology*. Tehran: Badr Publication.
- Klesner, A. (2003). Political attitudes, social capital, and political participation: The united States and Mexico Compared. *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos*, 19(1), 29-63.
- Mansourfar, K. (2000). *Nonparametric tests (Textbook)*. Tehran: University of Tehran.
- Masoudnia, E. (2001). Sociological explanation of citizens' indifference in social and political life, *Monthly Political and Economic Information Monthly*, 15( 11), 152-165.
- Mohseni Tabrizi, A. (1991). Alienation of conceptualization and grouping theories in the fields of sociology and psychology. *Social Sciences Letter*, 2 (2), 30-45.
- Paldam, M. (2000). Social capital: One or many? Definition and measurement, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 14(5), Pp.629-651.
- Ritzer, G. (1998). *Theories of sociology in contemporary period*. Tehran: Scientific Publications.
- Rosenberg, M. (1955). Some determinants of political Apathy. *The public opinion Quarterly*, 18 (4), 349-366.
- Rush, M. (2002). *Society and politics: An introduction to political sociology*. Tehran: Samat Publications.
- Sarai, H. (1993). *Introduction to investigation in research*. Tehran: Samat Publications.
- Sarmad, Z. (2000). *Research methods in behavioral sciences*. Tehran: Agha Publishing.
- Sharepour, M. (2000). *Experimental test of social category Theory among Iranian Children in Australia*. Tehran:
- Sotoudeh, H. (1999). *Social pathology*. Tehran: Avae Noor Publication.