

Al-Hikmat: A Journal of Philosophy
Volume 45 (2025) pp 69-87

The Concept of Institutional Performance and Its Relationship to Social Context and History: Exploring Philosophical and Historical Traces

Qamar un Nisa

Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy
Government Queen Mary Graduate College, Lahore
Email: dr.qamarunnisa.qmc@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper presents a comparative examination of different philosophies that explore the concept of institutional performance (the effectiveness of a government) and its relationship to the underpinning factors of social context and history. In today's academia, the success of a government is widely associated with social context and history. Many research studies have examined the relationship between institutional performance and social context and history. However, the debate of the effective government and its underpinning factors is ancient. It consists of a series of different philosophies presented by different schools of thought and philosophers at different times. These philosophies evolved over the ages, explaining diverse factors that affect institutional performance, including social context, history, legal and constitutional frameworks, institutional design, and socio-economic factors. These philosophies are divided into two categories of traditional and modern approaches, which explain the descriptive, normative, and methodological aspects of the relationship of institutional performance with these factors. Throughout this paper, the historicity of these approaches is delved into and traced to explore the intricate and intertwined relationship between institutional performance, social context and history, and to analyze their underlying assumptions. A comparative analysis of social context and history with other factors e.g. legal, institutional design and socio-economic factors is also presented. The core contribution or basic argument presented in this paper is that historical survey of different philosophies that explain the relationship of social context, history and institutional performance helps in strengthening the modern studies relating to institutional performance and its underlying assumptions.

Keywords: Institutional Performance, Social Context, History, Effective Government, Comparative Philosophies, Traditional Approaches, Modern Approaches.

Introduction

The debate on institutional performance focuses on the factors, principles, methodologies, and formal parts of state organizations that affect the effectiveness of government. This debate formally emerged in ancient times in the political theories of Confucius, Plato, Aristotle, and Kautilya. They discussed various elements that may work behind a government as rudimentary constituents and affect its performance, such as social structure, citizens' morality, customs, constitution and legal design, socio-economic factors, and values and principles. In the Roman Empire, the debate had been moved around the rule of law, administrative efficiency, and power balance. Later on, the debate in the medieval period evolved towards the necessity of divine commandment, the legitimacy of monarchical rule, and an institutional design approach (particularly regarding the importance of local government design and structure). Apart from these, group solidarity, community ties, and the brilliance of civilization were also considered in this era to make monarchical rule effective. During this period, the major work was done by St. Augustine, St. Aquinas, John Duns Scotus, William of Ockham, Ibn Khaldun and Machiavelli (North, Wallis and Weingast 2009).

In the modern era, the debate of institutional performance entered new horizons. A dire need for a legitimate government was felt, in which the will of the governed would be prioritized. The works of John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Thomas Hobbes introduced the idea of political participation as a necessary element for the success of a government. Montesquieu's theory of effective government counted on the need for power distribution among the executive, legislative, and judiciary for making a government work. John Stuart Mill later on furnished an extensive work on the institutional design approach, maintaining the position that institutional structure and design are the underpinning element that makes the government work effectively. Adam Smith's concept of the free market shaped the debate over institutional performance and made it necessarily associated with economic growth (Malook 2024). Max Weber's later work created the possibility of the emergence and rise of bureaucracy. Now, effective bureaucracy was fundamental to an effective institutional performance (Voegelin 1944, 746-54; North, Wallis, and Weingast 2009).

Contemporary philosophies on institutional performance are dynamic and multifaceted. These philosophies rest on the view that a methodological reform is also required finding out the underlying

descriptive, normative, and principled factors working behind the effective institutional performance. Anyhow, diverse elements are now considered necessary that shape the institutional performance. These elements are social structure, civic virtues, history and past choices, habits, values, morals, institutional design, legal structure, behaviour of an actor within state, sentiments, civic capacity, networks of civic engagements, trust, collaboration and cooperation.

Most recent and significant research on the topic of understanding and explaining institutional performance has been presented by Robert D. Putnam, an American political theorist. He, in his study *Making Democracy Work*, established a relationship between institutional performance, social context and history. He argued that a substantial stock of social capital in a community guarantees the effectiveness of the democratic government. According to his findings, a community can be more or less civic. Once a social context (*civic or less civic*) is established in a community, it will set as equilibrium over a long period of time. So, history is sustainable and path-dependant. It then follows that institutional performance (used as proxy of performance of a representative democratic government by Putnam) is dependent on the factors like social context and history (Putnam 1993, 90-105, 177-182; 2000, 125-127).

The relationship between institutional performance, social context and history is now turned as a global debate. It is now considered as the solution of most socio-political ills. However, this relationship is intricate and intertwined rather multi-layered. It requires a thorough intellectual scrutiny from the different fields of philosophy e.g. social and political philosophy, economic thought, philosophy of history and philosophy of science etc. This relationship consists of theoretical evolution across historical periods as mentioned above; hence an examination of comparative philosophies is required to better understand the theoretical evolution over long period of time and its underlying assumptions and conceptual framework. Comparative philosophies underpinning these ideas are divided into two categories of traditional and modern approaches.

Traditional approaches consist of the comparative philosophies that emerged in ancient times and predominated till 2nd world war. On the other hand, modern approaches include all late 20th century's and contemporary philosophies (Blondel 1999, 152-60; 2013). Anyhow both kinds of approaches vary in their methodologies and characteristics.

Traditional approaches include descriptive and normative philosophies that are aimed at to study principles, norms, values, customs, character and morals, legal and institutional design, socio-economic elements as the basic factors behind the state, governments and different parts of state organizations (Blondel 1999,165). These philosophies include socio-cultural approach, formal legal approach, institutional design approach, socio-economic approach and historical approach.

On the contrary, modern approaches assert that the concept of institutional performance can be better understood by studying empirical, observable, and quantifiable data. Such philosophies are aimed at explaining institutional performance by studying factual factors like environment, actors in the state, actors' behavior, and their demands to and expectations from the government (Blondel 1999, 190). These modern approaches include the behavioral and structural-functional approaches.

Socio-Cultural Approach

Socio-cultural approach to institutional performance emphasizes that the effectiveness of a government is deeply interwoven with pre-existing socio-cultural context, societal structures, norms and values, and cultural beliefs. The propagators of this school of thought stress upon the need of "human elements" involved in shaping the quality of a government. This approach moves around the elements like customs, traditions, culture, morals, norms, habits, sentiments, political behaviour of the actor in the state, community ties, group solidarity, civic-engagement, trust, norms of reciprocity and associational life of citizens etc to ensure the effectiveness of a government. In general, this approach shows the connection of the socio-cultural structure with the policy processes and policy implementation, and the interaction of citizenry with government institutions to postulate its demands and expectations of the fulfilment of those demands from the government (Nisa 2023, 56-57).

In this scenario, any specific socio-cultural order prevailing over the society e.g. individualism or collectivism, masculinity or femininity, collaboration and cooperation, and uncertainty- avoidance can determine the preferred government-citizen relationship (horizontal or vertical) that shape the institutional performance. For example, if the social context of individualism prevails in the society, then it would protect individualistic interests and would hardly secure the collective well-being and common good (Malook 2018). In this way a vertical pattern of

government-citizen relationship shall be developed where social-exploitation, corruption, bad law and order and weak writ of government shall prevail (Nisa 2021).

On the opposite, existence of a socio-cultural context of collectivism, collaboration and cooperation, social trust, norms of reciprocity and networks of civic engagement is more likely to lead to collective well-being and the common good. Moreover, presence of a horizontal pattern of government-citizen relationship can help in achieving good institutional performance including transparency, honesty, tolerance, a better law and order and a strong writ of government, leading to cleaner and safer environment, better schools and health care, paved roads and lower crimes, etc. (Nisa 2023, 99-103; Putnam 1993).

Different philosophers from the antiquity to date have had been pondering over different socio-cultural elements that impact and shape the institutional performance. Plato, in his seminal work *The Republic*, presented a comprehensive and idealistic perspective on the socio-cultural context of an effective government. His philosophy is a thorough examination of the connection of habits of the citizens with the structure and functioning of the state, suggesting that a just and harmonious society is a reflection of well-ordered citizens. Plato's political system that he refers as the *ideal state* is reducible to his ethical system. He resembles three classes of the societies (philosopher ruler, auxiliaries and masses) with three virtues of human soul namely wisdom, courage and self-control. He states that the three fundamental principles of the society (representing three classes of the societies) that are reason, force and labour work behind the effectiveness of government and are conjoined with the three virtues of wisdom, courage and self-control. He believes that the fourth virtue of justice emerges in the society when two classes of society, auxiliaries and masses which are respectively linked with two principles of the state (force and labour) come under the rule of a philosopher ruler who represents first principle (reason) of the state (Stace 1920, 320-321).

In this ideal political system, Plato is exploring socio-cultural aspects of an effective government as the normative principles of the morality and justice prevailing in the society. In this context, Plato's socio-cultural approach emphasizes that the good institutional performance is entirely associated with a good moral character of its citizenry (Plato 1963). The idea of effective government is then not merely associated with political structures or laws, but with the moral framework prevailing in the

society and the moral character of its citizens. It follows that a society's culture, shaped by the virtues of its people, directly determines the quality of a government.

Similarly, a great 14th-century Arab philosopher, Ibn Khaldun, presented the concept of *Asabiyyah* (community ties, group solidarity, and collective will) in his famous work, the *Muqaddimah*. He described a strong connection among effective government, praiseworthy leadership, community ties or group solidarity, and collective will (*Asabiyyah*) and civilization brilliance (Abdullah 2018, 1321-1325; Malook 2023).

The concept of *Asabiyyah* in Ibn Khaldun's socio-cultural philosophy is a central, nuanced idea, essentially a framework for community ties, group solidarity, and collective will. Community ties or group solidarity refer to the unity among citizens, shared goals, and social cohesion. These elements make citizens feel connected, tie them together, and prepare them to work for the common good and shared goals, and to prioritize common interests and shared goals over individual interests. These elements of *Asabiyyah* are the supporting constituents in Ibn Khaldun's political system. These supporting constituents of *Asabiyyah* represent a particular format of civilization brilliance (Sulastri 2019, 143).

According to Ibn Khaldun, *Asabbiyah* is the first principle that ensures the existence of an effective government, and without which a government cannot be made and sustained. This bond of organization among community members helps them stay protected from internal conflicts and external attacks by invaders. It helps them choose a ruler (Kalipha). *Kalipha* is a praiseworthy ruler who is the second principle of ensuring effective government, and without him, the government cannot be sustained. *Asabiyyah* creates a strong sense of faithfulness or loyalty among community members, ensuring the rulers' power. Such a powerful ruler, then, can guarantee effective government, its stability, law and order, and economic growth and prosperity (Abdullah 2018, 1321-1325).

Asabiyyah is a rudimentary element that builds the brilliance of civilization in communities, and without which the best civilization cannot be achieved. Khaldun further argues that *Asabiyyah*, a socio-cultural template, is involved in the formation of states, dynasties, and

civilizations over long periods of time through the best man sovereignty. This is the only way to achieve a greater purpose of establishing the best civilization in communities' lives (Khalidun 2005, 33-49).

Edmund Burke's concept of good institutional performance is deeply rooted in his socio-cultural philosophy of conservatism. He in his work *Reflections on the Revolution in France* emphasized on the role of established traditions, values and associations among people of a community as necessary constituents for the good institutional performance. He rejected the idea of the "state of nature" given by Rousseau and asserted that man can live a just life only by being the member of associational life. Different organizations like church, family and local community work as rudimentary structure of community to establish the good morals of the people and the community. These good morals established by the associational life of people in a community lead to good institutional performance and effective government. Organizations of church, family and local community that help in building good morals of the people actually work under the established traditions, values and presumptions. Burke asserted that natural aristocracy (a group of people having good morals, wisdom and wealth) ensures the preservation of associational life, common good and welfare of all citizens (Burke 1790, 9-10).

The connection between socio-cultural structures and institutional performance is propagated by Alex De Tocqueville also. He in his seminal work *Democracy in America* examined the intricate relationship between socio-cultural factors of a society and effectiveness of the government. He asserted that "mores" of a society determine the quality of the institutional performance. The mores (custom, habits and beliefs) are more important than the laws and other institutional design to determine the success of a democratic government. He believed that the presence of a large number of associations in a society indicate the "whole moral and intellectual condition" of citizens that ensures the success of a government. These associations in a society reinforce the "habit of heart" that lead to good institutional performance. Tocqueville visited America in 1830s and found the most striking aspect of American society which was a widespread proclivity of people to form voluntarily associations. He called these associations as "intermediate institution" between people and the state that guarantee the good institutional performance (Tocqueville 1969, 488-494).

Max Weber, who is an influential sociologist and political theorist, embraces Tocqueville's socio-cultural approach in connection with institutional performance. He asserted that civic structure (culture and values) is the chief source of both economic growth and effective democracy. He mentioned three civic virtues of the citizens in a community, which are passion, a sense of responsibility, and judgment. These civic virtues of citizens help them in building the courage to sacrifice their lives for a greater political purpose, to address the day-to-day challenges, and to confront the conflicts of emotions. These civic virtues then make a strong civic-political character of the citizens that ensures the good institutional performance (Weber 1919, 77-101).

Robert A. Dahl also explored the connection between socio-cultural factors and good institutional performance. He asserted that socio-cultural elements such as trust, tolerance, and active citizen participation are crucial for effective democratic government and its stability. Although different institutions of the government provide a framework for the functioning of the democracy, these societal and cultural mores are the underlying principles that ensure effective institutional performance. Dahl emphasized the evaluation process of active participation of citizens, voting equality, and accountability of elected officials. He argued that civic associations and interest groups together actualize the evaluation process (Dahl 1971).

Likewise, John Dewey's concept of institutional performance is deeply connected with the mode of associational life in a society. He analyzed the underlying principle between citizens and government and found that neither the form of government nor the administrative design ensures its success; rather, a strong associational life makes effective institutional performance. He stressed the significance of the socio-cultural mores of active citizen participation, cooperation, community engagement, critical thinking, and shared problem-solving to ensure that the government serves the common good and that overall institutional performance is effective (Dewey 1927).

Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba also claimed that socio-cultural templates in a society, which they name as civic culture, have a strong relationship with institutional performance. They examined the relationship between civic culture and institutional performance in five democracies: Great Britain, the United States, Italy, Germany, and Mexico. In their examination, they emphasized the crucial role of

citizens' attitudes and beliefs in shaping and sustaining institutional performance. According to them, civic culture has three types, which are parochial cultures, subject cultures, and participant cultures. These three types of civic culture are composed of the constituents, such as political attitudes, behaviors, habits, and sentiments of the actors in the state that affect institutional performance. Political awareness and political participation of the citizens are the two rudimentary factors that help in stability of a government. These two socio-cultural factors help the citizens to measure the demand-supply ratio between the government and them that leads to the success of institutional performance (Almond and Verba 1963, 1-50).

Almond and Verba's work was a systematic study that presented a behavioral analysis of society, culture and actor's role in making government work. Through this analysis they asserted that the relationship between citizens and government is complex. It does not just require a study of institutional design but a rigorous scrutiny of the civic culture to fully grasp this relationship (Almond and Verba 1963, 1-50).

Robert Putnam, a political theorist, presented his deep theoretical analysis and a thorough behavioral-structural study of the nuanced relationship between socio-cultural context and institutional performance. The central argument of the study is that a substantial stock of *civicness* in a society leads to the effective institutional performance. Putnam argues that social capital is the "key to making democracy work". Social capital consists of networks of civic engagement, norms of reciprocity and trust in a society. A substantial stock to social capital in a society determines the quality of its government. Dense networks of voluntary associations, norms of generalized reciprocity and social trust among citizens have a propensity to have more effective government (Putnam 1993).

Putnam also presented a quasi-empirical analysis to prove his argument about the relationship between socio-cultural context and institutional performance. He studied the twenty regional Italian governments and found a disparity in the performance of northern Italian regional governments and southern Italian regional governments. Regional governments in the northern region were more effective and responsive due to their rich fabric of social capital as compared to the regional governments in the southern region (Putnam 1993).

Putnam further found that these differences in institutional performance were sustained over a millennium in both of the regions. Northern regions were found to be dense and rich in social capital across the 11th century, the 19th century, and contemporary times, compared to the southern regions. Putnam asserted through his analyses that it is the social context of the society sustained as an equilibrium over a long period of time that ensures the effective performance of a government (Putnam 1993; 2000).

To summarize, the above historical survey suggests a profound connection between socio-cultural contexts and institutional performance. It has been deeply analyzed that from antiquity to the present day, there is a long trail of political philosophers who have considered this connection crucial and profound. Moreover, Putnam's structural-functional analysis that he used to find the connection between social-cultural factors and institutional performance supports the core argument of this paper that the contemporary methodological approaches are deeply rooted in traditional, normative, descriptive and analytical philosophies explaining the connection between socio-cultural factors and institutional performance. The survey further suggests that effective institutional performance cannot be fully explained by only taking into consideration the factors of legal or constitutional design, institutional design and economic growth. The explanation of the concept of institutional performance comprehensively depends on its relationship with more dense fabric of social contexts.

Historical Approach

Historical approach proposes a strong connection between histories, past events and occurrences, and past human choices to the institutional performance. The main thesis of this approach is that all present occurrences in politics are linked to the past times. History is the accumulation of records of past occurrences, human choices, autobiographies, profiles, descriptions and writings about what had been happening in societies across time (Carr 1963, 25-35). To understand and examine the concept of good institutional performance in a society, it is mandatory to study it with its links to past events. This approach suggests explicitly that the study of socio-political institutions and environment that had been prevailing in a society in the past helps in understanding and examining the socio-political institutions and environment in the present. Hence to achieve effective institutional

performance it is crucial that all socio-political happenings in present must be understood and analyzed with their link to the past or history.

History provides the foundational basis for the present institutional performance by shaping its socio-culture tendencies, political culture and institutions, and economic development across centuries and millennia. The influence of the history on present political games is so subtle and overt that once a particular socio-political structure is established in a society it sustains as equilibrium across time. This approach stresses upon the view that what comes first affects what comes next (Putnam 1993, 8).

Ibn Khaldun's concept of *Asabiyyah* (community ties, group solidarity and collective will) that asserts a profound relationship between social context and institutional performance is historical. Khaldun claimed that the prevailing *Asabiyyah* in a society is ancient, nomadic, and sustained across millennia. He explained that *Asabiyyah* is not just a socio-cultural context; it is a rudimentary principle that explains the changes and long-term patterns established in society. It is inherently historical (Abdullah 2008, 1321-1330; Khaldun 2005). So, according to Khaldun, *Asabiyyah*, as a social context, is sustained in equilibrium over a long period of time. Hence, social context and history are interconnected to affect institutional performance.

Niccolò Machiavelli was the first modern Western political theorist to embrace the historical approach to explain institutional performance. He proposed the idea that knowledge of *prior histories* is necessary for the success of a government. According to Machiavelli, an effective institutional performance (effective rule of a monarch) is an ordered state, which is free from internal chaos and external threats. The ordered state makes the "prince" so powerful to achieve an effective institutional performance. He asserted that the possibility of an ordered state rests upon the history and past time occurrences (Machiavelli 2019, 33-50, 62-74). Unlike classical and medieval socio-cultural approaches, Machiavelli believed that history alone (apart from social context) is the fundamental principle that ensures the effective institutional performance in terms of monarchical rule. However, he argued that the success of the democratic government requires special characteristics (morals) of its citizens (Machiavelli 2019).

Similarly, Edmund Burke's good morals established by the associational life of people in a community leading to good institutional performance

are sustained in society over a long period of time. According to Burke, the good morals and associational life is historical. They do not emerge suddenly in a society but are built in centuries and sustained over time. The good morals and associational life of people sustained over a long period of time lead to effective institutional performance (Eaves 1979, 126-129). So, Burke's analysis shows that the elements of social context and history together achieve effective institutional performance.

G. Sabine and W.A. Dunning both embraced a historical approach in order to explain institutional performance. They, like Machiavelli, believed that history is the sole principle that ensures effective institutional performance. They both argued that without knowing what had happened in the past societies, politics, and institutions, it is not possible to understand and measure present institutional performance in a society (Voegelin 1944, 746-754; Sabine 1973).

Like Ibn Khaldun and Burke, Putnam found a profound relationship between social context, history, and institutional performance. Throughout his study, he established a deeper connection between social context and history. He argued that history sustains social context. Once it is established, either civic or *uncivic*, it is sustained as an equilibrium across centuries and millennia. History is path-dependent and based on the principle that what comes first affects later. According to him, the fate of a government can be predicted from past historical trajectories (Putnam 1993, 177-180). To conclude, the above historical and philosophical scrutiny suggests that the long-term socio-cultural context has a deep impact on institutional performance.

Formal Legal Approach, Institutional Design Approach, and Socio-Economic Approach

Formal legal approach maintains that it is the duty of the state to maintain an effective law and order system and to make the citizens knowledgeable and law-abiding in order to ensure good institutional performance. Aristotle studied the functions of a polity (city-state) by using empirical observations and developed six forms of government based on different socio-economic contexts and constitutions. Three forms of governments were bad / corrupt while the other three forms of governments were good. From these classifications, there arose an ideal form of government, a 'constitutional republic', which formed the basis of the legal approach in the debate of institutional performance and good governance. For Aristotle, the objective of the state is to ensure equality

and fairness among its citizens. The proponents of a formal legal approach as a factor to attain the best politics and effective government include Cicero, Hobbes, Bodin, John Austin, Henry Maine, and Dicey (Aristotle 2017, 85-110; Malook 2017).

Institutional design approach explores the connection between rules and structures of political organization and institutional performance. It consists of formal political design and structure including constitution, legislature, judiciary, executive, political parties, bureaucracies and interest groups that have an impact on institutional performance. John Stuart Mill, in his treatise *Consideration on Representative Government*, argued that a representative government works better when it is in good formal legal structure with proper arrangements (Mill 1861, 17-86). Similarly, Arthur F. Bentley in his *The Process of Government* maintained that the legislature, the executive, the judiciary, the elections, the political parties and the pressure groups have profound effect on institutional performance (Bentley 1908, 434-446). The proponents of institutional design approach include Bryce, Bagehot, Harlod Laski, Walter and Elinor Ostrom.

Socio-economic approach maintains that economic success plays an important role in achieving good institutional performance. Increased commerce, trade, industry, urbanization and modernization are the key indicators of economy that depict good institutional performance. According to Aristotle, wealth generation and accumulation is directly associated with effective government and good institutional performance. Political capital embeds economic capital that helps in achieving moral actions and bringing happiness for the citizens that is the ultimate objective of the state (Aristotle 2017). Dahl, Lipset, Cutright, Arturo Israel, and Robert Putnam are the main proponents of socio-economic approach. But Putnam believes that socio-economic factors do not fully explain the institutional performance (Putnam 1993, 169-171).

Modern Approaches

Modern approaches on the debate of the institutional performance are yet evolving and moving apart from the traditional approaches. Where traditional approaches are found descriptive, normative and more principle based, the modern approaches are more data driven—empirical, observable and quantifiable data is taken as base to find out the relationship between socio-cultural and historical factors and institutional performance. The main purpose of these approaches is to

prove the critical and philosophical inquiry on empirical bases. These approaches focus on to study “human elements” involved in shaping institutional performance. Modern analyses are more keenly observing and studying factors such as citizens, political participation, society, culture, demands postulated by the citizens, and the behaviour of the actors in the state. These approaches are mainly studying the “behavior of the actors” in the state to examine the influences of political parties, community leaders and interest groups and civic environment on the behavior of the voters. These approaches consider what is happening in the actual lives of citizens and governments (Krickpatric 1962, 12; Dahl 1961, 763-772). Behavioral approach and structural functional approaches are included in modern approaches.

Behavioural Approach

The behavioral approach to the debate of institutional performance emerged in the 20th century and is considered the contemporary method to explain the effectiveness of a government. It is the application of system analysis. System analysis was first presented in the 1920s by Ludwig von Bertalanffy to understand institutional performance. The term post-behavioral was first used by David Easton as an extension of the behavioral method. The reason behind the discovery of this new method of behavioral analysis was that the pure empirical methods may not explain the intricate and intertwined relationship between institutional performance and citizens, so a complete, critical, and philosophical method was needed to explain the connection between institutional performance and citizens of a society. For which, such critical and philosophical inquiry was conjoined with the empirical analysis of the behaviour of the actors in the state (Easton 1962, 8-25).

The main focus of the behavioral analysis is to study the behaviour of the actors influenced by the formal parts of society, e.g., political parties, community leaders, and the overall civic environment. The analysis further examines what impact can be imprinted on the policy processes (indication of shared problems and their possible solution) and policy implementation (decision making for solving shared problems) by the behaviour of the voter, once shaped by the social contexts and other influences. Behavioural analysis of the actors in the state rests upon the idea that the behaviour of the actors in the state cannot be based on rigorous rationality, rather it is based on more intricate, nuanced and actual elements found in the overall environment of the society, that need to be thoroughly studied (Easton 1962, 8-25).

Different elections studies have also been conducted as part of the behavioral analysis. Arturo Valenzuela and Guillermo O'Donnell used economic growth, voting and demographic data and public opinion survey to examine the causes of poor institutional performance in Latin America. Similarly, Jr. V.O. Key in 1955 did election studies to explain the change in voter's opinion and party affiliation. S.M. Lipset has used statistical and historical data in his *Political Man: The Social Base of Politics* to exhibit that social class has an impact on political behavior and institutional performance.

Almond and Verba in their work *Civic Culture* have used behavioral studies to study the institutional performance of five countries. Putnam in his work *Making Democracy Work* has also presented behavioral analysis using different indices like economic modernity index, voting turnout, civic indices data and public opinion surveys to determine the differences in institutional performance of twenty regional Italian governments.

Structural Functional Approach

Structural-functional approach is the next advancement in application of system analysis. This method of explaining institutional performance rests upon the view that the social structures are the rudimentary factors that affect the functionality of a government. Therefore, all the political processes are the structures of interactions that perform the function of input and output activities. This method views the society as an organism whose all parts (social structure and institutions) are interconnected and work together to bring effective institutional performance.

Almond stated about the structural-functional approach that all the political systems in the world have structure of interaction that perform the duty of input and output tasks. He proposed that interest integration, interest articulation, political recruitment and specialization and political communication are the input devices of a government. He stated that input functions of a government have three fold classifications that are rule making, rule application and rule adjudication (Almond and Verba 1963, 1-35).

Putnam has used twelve indicators of success to measure and explain institutional performance in his study *Making Democracy Work*. Most of the contemporary researches on explaining institutional performance are

being conducted by using structural-functional method to make it more evident that the theoretical inquiries behind the relationship of institutional performance and its social context are closer to the state of affairs (Putnam 1993).

On the whole, the comparative analysis undertaken above between traditional and modern approaches determined that modern empirical, data-based, behavioural and scientific analysis is largely based on the traditional, normative, descriptive and analytical philosophies that explain the connection between social context history and institutional performance.

Relationship between Institutional Performance, Social Context and History

Above historical survey, theoretical scrutiny and comparative analysis of all philosophical assumptions (traditional and modern approaches) regarding the relationship between institutional performance, social context and history found a profound relationship between institutional performance, social context and history that can be traced from the antiquity to date in different philosophies of various political theorists. The relationship is intertwined and intricate but had been observed in different periods of time in different forms of government. However, the scrutiny entails that social context and history together affect institutional performance the most and are relatively better variables to understand and explain the idea of effective institutional performance as compared to the other factors like formal legal, institutional design and socio-economic elements.

Traditional philosophies present logical justifications and profound reasoning behind the assumption that social context and history determine the effectiveness of a government. Yet, modern approaches are focused to provide empirical evidences of these logical justifications and reasoning underlying the debate of the relationship between institutional performance, social context and history (Nisa 2024). However, the concept of the relationship between institutional performance, social context, and history is a dynamic debate reflecting upon the changing societal norms, values, expectations and new emerging challenges. It is a continuous search for the common good and collective welfare.

Conclusion

The debate over institutional performance and its relationship with social context and history is a continuous philosophical and historical idea. The historical and philosophical scrutiny of this relationship asserts that the success of a government rests upon the elements of social structure, dense fabric of civicness in a society, substantial stock of social capital, associational life, mores of citizens, norms and values opted by the citizens, attitudes, sentiments, habits, behaviour, and political participation of the citizens. These elements of social context do not emerge in a society all of a sudden, but are the strict and rigorous historical trajectories that have prevailed for centuries and millennia. Hence, the success of a government may be predicted by understanding these two factors. The above philosophical and historical examination also suggests that the socio-cultural factors that have prevailed over a long period are the rudimentary factors that ensure good institutional performance.

In short, the above historical survey suggests a profound connection between socio-cultural contexts and institutional performance. Moreover, the philosophical and historical scrutiny of traditional and modern approaches entails that the modern empirical, data-based, behavioral, and scientific analysis that explains the relationship between social context, history, and institutional performance is largely based on the traditional, normative, descriptive, and analytical philosophies presented by different philosophers in different periods of time from antiquity to date.

References

- Abdullah, Suhaila. 2018. "Ibn Khaldun's Theory of Good Governance in Achieving Civilization Excellence." *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences* 9 (8): 1321-1333.
- Almond, Gabriel A., and Sidney Verba. 1963. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitude and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Aristotle. 2017. *Politics*, trans. William Ellis. Enhanced Media Publishing.
- Bentley, Arthur F. 1908. *The Process of Government: A Study of Social Pressures*. USA: The University of Chicago Press.
- Blondel, Jean. 1999. "Then and Now: Comparative Politics." *Political Studies* 47 (1): 152–60.
- Blondel, Jean. 2013. *Comparative Government: An Introduction*, 2nd Edition. NY: Routledge.
- Burke, Edmund. 1790. *Reflections on the French Revolution*, 3rd ed. London: J. Dodley.
- Carr, E.H. 1961. *What is history?* Vintage Books.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1971. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dewey, John. 1927. *The Public and Its Problems*. Athens, Ohio: Swallow Press.
- Easton David. 1962. "The Current Meaning of 'Behavioralism' in Political Science," *The Limits of Behavioralism in Political Science*, ed. J.C. Charlesworth. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Sciences.
- Eaves, Richard Glen. 1979. "Edmund Burke: His Enduring Influence on Political Thought." *Journal of Thought* 2 (14): 122-131.
- Khaldun, Ibn. 2005. *The Muqqadimah*, ed. N.J. Dawood. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Krickpatric, M. Everon. 1962. "The Impact of the Behavioral Approach on Traditional Political Science" *Essay on the Behavioural Study of Politics*, ed. Austin Ranny. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò. 2019. *The Prince*, ed. Quentin Skinner and Russell Price, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malook, Saad. 2017. "The Post-Rawlsian Political Philosophy: A Critique of the Realist Standpoint". *Al-Hikmat*. Vol. 37 (1): 45-60.

- Malook, Saad. 2018. "Debunking the Spectre of Terrorism: A Social Capital Approach." *Al-Hikmat: A Journal of Philosophy* 38: 77–92.
- Malook, Saad. 2023. "Ibn Khaldun as a Social Holist Philosopher". *Al-Asr Research Journal*. Vol. 3 (2): 87-98.
- Malook, Saad. 2024. "The Politics of Invisible Hand: Individual Actions, and the Emergence of Macro-Level Social Phenomena". *Journal of Social & Organizational Matters*. Vol. 3 (1): 133-150.
- Mill, John Stuart. *Considerations on Representative Government*, 2nd ed. UK: Parker, Son, and Bourn.
- Nisa, Qamar un. 2021. "Collective Action Dilemmas and Social Capital: With Reference to Robert Putnam's 'Making Democracy Work'." *Al-Hikmat: A Journal of Philosophy* 41 (3): 23-35.
- Nisa, Qamar un. 2023. "Robert Putnam's Theory of Social Capital and Vibrant Democracy: A Critical Analysis." PhD Dissertation, Department of Philosophy, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.
- Nisa, Qamar un. 2024. "Social Capital, Political Engagement and Vibrant Democracy: A Critical Examination of Linkage and Mechanism." *Al-Hikmat: A Journal of Philosophy* 44 (2): 21-34.
- North, Douglass C., John Joseph Wallis, and Barry R. Weingast. 2009. *Violence and Social Orders: A Conceptual Framework for Interpreting Recorded Human History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Plato. 1963. *The Republic of Plato*, ed. James Adam. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Sabine, G.H. 1973. *A History of Political Theory*, 4th ed. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Stace, W.T. 1920. *A Critical History of Greek Philosophy*. Macmillan & Co.
- Sulastri, Neneng. 2019. "The Concept of state and Government in Ibn e Khaldun's Thought." *International Journal of Nusantara Islam* 2 (7): 143-149.
- Tocqueville, Alexi de. 1969. *Democracy in America*, ed. J.P. Mayer. NY: Anchor Books.
- Voegelin, Eric. 1944. "IV. Political Theory and the Pattern of General History." *American Political Science Review* 38 (4): 746–54.
- Weber, Max. 1919. "Politics as a Vocation," *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, eds. H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills. NY: OUP. 77-128.