

SOCIAL CAPITAL

「社会関係資本」

M.G. QUIBRIA AND SHAMSUN N. AHMED*

要約

ソーシャル・キャピタル（「社会関係資本」と仮訳する。以下 SC）の既存の定義を俯瞰した後、SC は互いに全く異なる様々な概念の寄せ集めであると結論づける。SC がキャピタル（資本）の名に値するかどうかを吟味した結果、より適切な「コミュニティ」という語を使用したほうが良いと考える。

SC は往々にして正の側面ばかり注目され、負の側面に光が当たっていない。SC の負の効果として 4 点挙げられる。参入障壁の形成、フリーライダー、モラルハザードの形成、画一性の強要、個人の自由の制限、創造性の封殺、コミュニティ内の悪習、悪い規範への盲従を生むこと、である。

SC をめぐる研究状況には困難が伴っている。特に分析の厳密性を確保しにくい。その理由は SC が明確な定義を持たないこと、数量化が難しいこと、SC の影響とそれ以外のものの影響を分離できないことなどが原因である。

SC の概念は厳密な実証分析に堪えないことが多いがこのことは、SC として言い表されるものの重要性を否定するものではない。現に援助機関はそのプログラムに SC の考えを組み込んできている。

ここからさらに前進するには SC を単一の概念として捉えるのではなく、例えば信頼、規範、文化、コミュニティ、ネットワークといった従来 SC として一くりにされてきた個別の概念の、明確な定義をもって研究を進める必要がある。

SC の概念の一部を使用したプロジェクト、例えばコミュニティの関与が強いプロジェクトが進行中である。コミュニティの関与の高いプロジェクトがそうでない場合よりも成功率が高いと予測されていたが、実際は世銀の最近のレビューにもあるように必ずしもそうとはいえない。

なお本文には付録として SC に関する有益なウェブサイトの紹介を載せた。

（筆者であるキブリア氏はアジア開発銀行のアドバイザーであり、シャムスン氏はダッカ大学経済学部教授である。）

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of social capital has been applied to explain a wide variety of social and economic phenomena, ranging from the growth tragedy in Africa to the mortality crisis in Russia; from the successful group lending programs in Peru to the flourishing township village enterprises in China. This concept, which highlights the importance of nonmarket social interactions in socioeconomic outcomes, seeks to fill a lacuna in the traditional neoclassical economic framework. It has been argued by sociologist Mark Granovetter that the neoclassical framework posits an “undersocialized conception of man” that views man as atomized, anonymous, and bereft of any social influence through social relations. In other words, the neoclassical framework ignores the role of nonmarket social interactions in determining individual and collective behavior and shaping economic and social outcomes. In the real world, individual and collective behavior is continuously shaped by nonmarket social influences in the form of culture, norms, and social structure. An individual’s taste for books, restaurants, and movies is often largely determined by what is considered fashionable. Similarly, one’s educational aspirations, decision to smoke or take drugs, and bear children out of wedlock: all these decisions are significantly affected by the behavior of one’s peer groups, role models, and norms and values of the community.

This essay provides a synoptic review of the burgeoning literature on social capital. This review makes a critical assessment of both conceptual and empirical issues as well as proffer suggestions for future work.

II. DEFINITIONS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL

Different writers have defined social capital in different ways. Sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, who has provided an early exposition of the concept, views social capital as “the aggregate of actual and potential resources which are linked to the possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition—or in other words, to membership in a group.” This definition highlights the network aspect of social capital. An early reference to the concept of social capital in the economics literature is to be found in the work of economist Glen Loury, who highlighted a social network perspective.

The author who has done the most to popularize the concept, particularly in sociology, is Robert Coleman. His definition of social capital is however astoundingly vague. To him, “Social capital is defined by its function. It is not a single entity but a variety of different entities, with two elements in common: they all consist of some aspect of social structures, and they facilitate certain actions of actors—whether persons or corporate actors—within the structure.” Coleman’s work has opened up the way for a whole plethora of new definitions that often emphasize different and contradictory aspects of social capital. Indeed, Coleman himself has been a leading contributor to this potpourri of confusion.

The above individualistic perspective of social capital differs from the aggregate/community perspective that seems to have emerged as the dominant paradigm in the literature, particularly in the hands of political scientist Robert Putnam. Putnam, however, offers an even more expansive definition of social capital than Coleman. According to Putnam, “social capital refers to features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit.” According to this aggregate perspective, social capital—or its absence—is a property of a group or a community or even a nation as a whole, although there is less than unanimity among authors what this property is. Different authors have highlighted different aspects. Political scientist Ronald Inglehart equates social capital with “a culture of trust and tolerance, in which extensive network of voluntary associations form.” And to him, culture is “a system of attitudes, values, and knowledge that is widely shared within a society and is transmitted from generation to generation.”

Francis Fukuyama equates social capital with “trusts” and highlights its role in reducing transactions costs and increasing economic efficiency. These transactions costs are salient in day-to-day economic activities like finding the appropriate buyers and sellers, negotiating contracts, complying with government regulations, and enforcing contracts in the event of dispute or fraud. According to Fukuyama, social capital is: “an instantiated set of informal values or norms shared among members of a group that permit them to cooperate with one another. If members of the group come to expect that others will behave reliably and honestly, then they will come to trust one another. Trust acts like a lubricant that makes any group or organization run more effectively.”

Echoing a similar theme, economists Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis define social capital as: “trust, concern for one’s associates, a willingness to live by the norms of one’s community and to punish those who do not.” This definition highlights trusts and norms to bind the members of the group/community to cooperate. Development economist Yujiro Hayami also emphasizes a social structural perspective. To Hayami, social capital is shorthand for “community” that generates a number of positive social externalities. The trust and social harmony that glues a community can help overcome the opportunism and moral hazard in interpersonal relationships.

The above sampling of definitions suggests that social capital has become an umbrella concept that holds many disparate notions. For some, social capital is an individual asset that comes from access to networks and social connections, while for others, it is a shared asset that resides in a homogenous collective entity—such as a community with common interests and shared values. Some have focused on trusts and tolerance, while others on the degree of civic and social engagements. Still others have highlighted issues of culture and social norms.

Given this heterogeneity, social capital throws up a serious measurement and aggregation problem. It requires one to count and aggregate incommensurable objects, such as beliefs, behavioral rules. This has led economist Partha Dasgupta to suggest that these different notions of social capital should be studied separately to understand how they are interrelated.

III. IS SOCIAL CAPITAL REALLY A FORM OF CAPITAL?

Proponents of the concept of social capital have devoted considerable attention to explaining why it should be considered a form of *capital*. Its current conceptualization draws on the early work of Pierre Bourdieu, who differentiates between different forms of capital such as economic, cultural, linguistic, scholastic, and social capital. Subsequently, Bourdieu aggregates these different types of capital into three categories —economic, cultural, and social—and discusses their interrelation and ways to convert one form to the other in order to maximize accumulation. Putnam on the other hand takes a different tack and draws a taxonomic distinction between bonding and bridging social capital. Bonding social capital connects people of similar backgrounds and fosters denser social networks while bridging social capital connects people of dissimilar backgrounds and creates larger networks.

At first blush, social capital would seem like a natural complement to physical and human capital. However, analytically this extension is far from straightforward. To Nobel Laureate economist Robert Solow, “it is an attempt to gain conviction from a bad analogy.” And another Nobel Laureate Kenneth Arrow calls for an outright abandonment of the capital metaphor and the term social capital. To him, capital has three important characteristics: (i) a time dimension; (ii) the deliberate sacrifice of the present for future benefit; and (iii) “alienability”—that is, its ownership can be transferred from one person to another. According to Arrow, social capital may have a time dimension similar to physical capital—for example, reputation or trust takes time to develop and hence it satisfies (i). However, social capital does not necessarily entail any material sacrifice, and hence does not generally satisfy (ii). And finally, in most cases, it is difficult—as with human capital—to change the ownership of social capital, and hence does not satisfy (iii). Thus, conceptually, social capital falls short of being a form of capital. This conceptual criticism applies as much to social capital as a notion as to its taxonomic refinements, such as bridging and bonding social capital. Moreover, it has been suggested that metaphors such as “bridging” and “binding” social capital are infelicitous as they are “more suited to a metaphor around ‘ties’ than around ‘capital.’”

Solow highlights some measurement problems. While physical and human capital can be measured and their rate of returns calculated, such measurements are difficult for social capital. Solow cites the East Asian miracle economies and argues that the total factor productivity estimates of East Asia seem to suggest that either there is no special social capital story underlying the Asian success or that social capital is precisely what accounts for the ability of these societies to accumulate capital and to mobilize skilled labor effectively. He concludes that “either way, there is something to look for that is at least capable of being found.” Given these conceptual and measurement problems, many economists are reluctant to label social capital as capital. In other words, although there is a general consensus that social interactions have important influences on economic outcomes, there is less of a consensus that these influences can be—or should be—meaningfully codified into such a metaphor as social capital. The dilemma has been nicely summarized by Bowles and Gintis who note, “Perhaps social capital, like Voltaire’s God, would have to have been invented if it did not exist. It may even be a good idea. A good *term* it is not.” They go on to argue that, as with other trendy expressions, “social capital” has attracted so many disparate uses that it is better to drop the term in favor of something more precise like community.

IV. ADVERSE IMPACT OF SOCIAL CAPITAL

Much of the existing literature defines social capital in a circuitous way that often confuses its sources with consequences and its existence with functions. This roundabout reasoning leads to an exaggeration of the benefits and underestimation of costs. Indeed, social capital is not an unmixed blessing. It can lead to such adverse effects as exclusions and market distortions, moral hazards, restrictions of individual freedoms, and perpetuation of backward norms. The following further elaborates these points.

First, social capital can open up economic opportunities for the members of the network. However, these networks—often based on race, ethnicity, religion, language or the simple confluence of economic interests-- can at the same time act as barriers to those outside the network. Studies have revealed that entry into jobs in construction and service industries in New York City is highly restricted with little or no opportunities for poor blacks as they lack of access to the ethnic networks controlling the recruitment process. Similarly, in many developing countries the rural poor are often excluded from publicly provided services as the rural elite capture the local government. This capture is facilitated by their social capital that works through “the multiplex interlocking social and economic relationships (that exist) among local influential people”. Finally, Adam Smith was the first to suggest about the harmful influence of social networks of merchants on markets. On this, Smith famously noted “people of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices.” In a similar vein, Mancur Olson argues that the network of interest groups leads to collusion for unproductive rent seeking that is harmful to economic development

Second, while social capital can induce innovation and entrepreneurship, it can also lead to individual lethargy and slothfulness. On one hand, social capital can help an entrepreneur in his effort to mobilize the much needed capital and information, it can on the other hand dilute one’s personal incentive to work hard. Social capital can lead to free-rides, moral hazard, and the creation of welfare haven. The resources and hard work of those who succeed often need to underwrite the indolence and economic insolvency of those that fail. Social capital can thus be a safety net that penalizes successes and rewards failures. Sociologist Clifford Geertz wrote about such behavior in Bali, Indonesia, where he observed that

unsuccessful job-hunting and money-seeking kinsmen were constantly draining and taxing successful entrepreneurs. Social capital, in conjunction with the redistributive social norm of traditional societies, may present a serious obstacle to accumulation and successful entrepreneurship.

Third, while community has its advantages, it often enforces strict conformity, infringes individual freedoms, and creates pressures for submission to mediocrity. Many independent-minded individuals find these aspects of a community life suffocating—and yearn for the freedom of a more impersonal urban life. These traditional customs and norms, it may be noted, can have a dampening effect on the tempo of economic development.

Finally, social capital can be as much a cause as a cure for poverty. Certain social and ethnic groups often find themselves entrenched in bad norms and values that are inimical to individual and collective development. An environment of bad values, once established, is sustained by role model and peer group influences. Adhering to such a value system is individually rational: it is optimal for individuals to subscribe to such group norms because any deviation results in social opprobrium and group retribution and hence lower individual welfare. However, the group—as well as the society as a whole—is worse off because it produces socially suboptimal behavior (behavior that is either destructive or risky). Teenage pregnancy, group crime and drug addiction are examples of such behavior. When a network or group sustains socially harmful norms and values, the society as a whole would then be better off without such a network or group.

V. THE EMPIRICAL DEVELOPMENT LITERATURE AND SOME ISSUES

A high-profile work that has brought social capital to the doorstep of the wider policy community, particularly in developed countries, is Robert Putnam's much-celebrated book, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. In this book, Putnam attributes a whole variety of social ills in the US today—from declining voting participation to increasing crime rates to shrinking philanthropy—to lack of social capital. While the book culls together an impressive body of evidence, its empirical analysis remains rudimentary and its discussion of policy somewhat cavalier. Notwithstanding these deficiencies, the important contribution of this work has been to stimulate research on social capital and its role in redressing social and economic problems.

Social capital has in recent years gained popularity as a concept for analyzing development issues. The emerging literature follows three major strands. The first strand deals with the link between economic growth and social capital. These studies confirm, in the context of cross-country growth regressions, the relationship between economic performances and trust in people. Some of them also demonstrate that ethnically heterogeneous societies (reflecting lower level of social capital) are slow to growth or to adjust to external shocks.

The second strand deals with the issue how social capital can substitute for missing capital and insurance markets. Some of these studies highlight the role of existing social capital ties in improving the poor's access to capital. Social ties among borrowers can help reduce transaction costs of screening, monitoring, and enforcement in group lending schemes. Some studies highlight the role of social capital as a social safety net in developing countries and identify the factors that help shape the social connection that underpins the insurance mechanism.

The third strand deals with the issue how social capital can help circumvent the collective action problem in the provision of local public goods. Some of these studies analyze how social capital has been helpful in eliciting cooperation among farmers evolving a common norm of behavior, and circumventing

collective actions problems, particularly in irrigation. Others analyze the importance of social capital in the management of community resources, such as community forestry in developing countries.

The empirical literature on social capital is quite diverse in terms of methodology and the degree of analytical sophistication. Some of it is descriptive—and does little beyond suggesting the importance of social capital. Some of it is more quantitative, often involving regression-type analysis. However, a large segment of this quantitative literature suffers from various technical, econometric problems.

Recently, economist Steven Durlauf has provided a critical review of the estimation problems with the empirical social capital literature. While many of these problems are endemic to a wide body of the empirical studies, they seem to be particularly serious for the social capital literature. In particular, he highlighted issues such as vague definitions of the concept, poorly measured data, absence of appropriate technical econometric conditions, and lack of information to make identification claims plausible. These problems are particularly serious as social capital arguments depend on underlying psychological and sociological relations that are difficult to quantify, let alone measure.

Further discussing these problems, Durlauf highlights three sets of estimation issues. First, social capital studies often fail to distinguish between social and nonsocial-capital effects that arise from group membership. However, this problem of identification is not resolved by incorporating a full range of alternative group influences; it requires a clear definition of social capital and the underlying causal process. Second, social capital proxies are often endogenous and require the use of instrumental variables based on ad hoc exogeneity assumption. However, constructing credible instrumental variables in this type of regression requires a theory of the determinants of social capital. Third, social capital regression exercises rely on untenable comparability assumptions. That is, the analysis assumes that the regression uses comparable objects as observations. This problem is particularly serious in aggregative growth regression studies.

VI. SOCIAL CAPITAL AND DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

The conceptual ambiguity and measurement issues notwithstanding, aspects of social capital—in the form of generalized trust, network and community—can be important in economic development. In a poor country where the government is weak and poorly organized, the community may play a pivotal role in the provision of local public goods. Similarly, in a developing society, where formal legal institutions are weak and the reach of government is limited, the efficiency of economic transactions can only ensue in a context of a culture of generalized trust.

In recent years, these social dimensions associated with the notion of social capital have been incorporated by donor agencies as well as nongovernmental organizations in designing their development interventions. These efforts have proceeded in three fronts. First, donors now regularly undertake, in connection with their development interventions, social institutional analysis to identify the stakeholders and their power and political interests. Second, it is now standard for donors to ensure local level participation in project design, implementation and evaluation. This is to ensure that projects and policies at the local level are congruent with local needs and foster support and ownership even when the project is completed. This has been the basic impetus for the community development projects of the World Bank. Finally, to enhance its understanding of the poverty issue, the World Bank has in recent years begun employing participatory method of research and data collection to elicit direct information on the experience of the poor. In addition to the direct interventions, donor agencies have also provided support to civil society organizations to assist in the provision of local public goods and foster greater community cohesion and generalized trust.

A wide variety of investment projects have been funded by the World Bank and other donor agencies that utilize elements of social capital in their design. The World Bank distinguishes two types of such community projects. Community-based development (CBD) is an umbrella term for projects that actively include beneficiaries in their design and management while community-driven development (CDD) refers to CBD projects in which communities have direct control over key project designs and management of funds. Such community development projects, which have reached \$7 billion of the World Bank

assistance portfolio, cover a wide diversity of areas such as poverty alleviation, social funds, rural water and sanitation and governance. (A recent list can be found in the World Bank website: <http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/ESSD/sdvext.nsf/09ByDocName/SocialCapitalOperationalStocktakingWorldBankProjectInventoryByTopic>).

Many such projects are ongoing and their outcomes are not known yet. However, on a priori grounds, one expects that given their informational advantage, empowerment and participation of the poor, and reliance on civic cooperation, these community projects would be generally more successful in their outcomes than those superimposed from above by the donors/the government. However, the actual outcomes seem to be mixed. An earlier World Bank study (Deepa Narayan: Participatory Evaluation: Tools for Managing Change in Water and Sanitation: http://poverty.worldbank.org/files/14789_Participatory_Evaluation.pdf), which examines the evaluations of 121 completed rural supply projects in forty-nine developing countries, finds that beneficiary participation contributed significantly to project effectiveness as well as to building local capacity, after statistically controlling for the effects of other factors. But this finding should be juxtaposed against a more recent and comprehensive review of the community projects that offers a much less optimistic picture (http://econ.worldbank.org/files/33025_wps3209.pdf). According to this review, (i) the projects that relied on community participation have not been particularly effective in reaching the poor; (ii) though the projects have created some effective community infrastructure, there is no evidence that suggests a causal relationship between the outcome and participation; (iii) these projects are dominated by the elite; (iv) project quality tends to get worse, the more unequal the community. Those who are familiar with the history of the earlier wave of community development projects, pioneered by the US AID in the 1950s and 60s, this litany of shortcomings would bring a distinct sense of *déjà vu*.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

Given the wide diversity of notions associated with social capital, the concept has remained largely amorphous and lacks the clarity and precision of a concept for rigorous empirical work. However, this should not be construed to denigrate of the importance of social harmony, a sense of community, generalized trust or network in the development process or of taking cognizance of these social dimensions in designing development interventions.

Recent years have seen a mushrooming of a literature that applies many different notions of social capital to analyze many diverse economic and social issues. Despite its exaggerated claims, much of this literature does not go beyond calling attention to the individual and family benefits of social interactions or a nuanced understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of networks and communities. The policy conclusions are often very banal. Some critics have gone so far as to assert that these empirical social capital studies have done very little to establish the empirical significance of social capital in various socio-economic outcomes.

To move the literature forward, it would be useful first to get the concept right. It should begin with the acknowledgement that there is no single entity called social capital, but many distinct notions—such as trusts, norms, culture, community, and networks—highlighting different aspects of nonmarket social interactions. It is heartening to note that recent works in this area, particularly in economics, seem to reflect this heterogeneity of perspectives, focusing on different aspects of social interactions and drawing distinctly different analytical and policy implications. However, to avoid confusion and to achieve greater analytical traction and empirical understanding, social capital studies need to proceed with a clear definition of the specific notion of social capital being applied.

Despite the recent proliferation of studies in social capital, this has not been accompanied by a commensurate increase in analytical rigor. Analytical rigor does not necessarily mean heavy reliance on quantitative methods. Historical and qualitative studies can be as much rigorous and informative about the underlying social capital mechanisms as the regression studies that are the bread and butter of economists.

Indeed, there are certain questions that are better addressed qualitatively than quantitatively. However, the success of quantitative studies depends on the availability of relevant and reliable data.

Measuring social capital, which often means trust, community, peer pressure influence, role models and networks, is difficult. The task becomes doubly difficult if this measurement needs to incorporate both quality and quantity. Data on social capital have been sourced in a number of different ways. First, surveys of perceptions can be a major source. However, they are often an imperfect source, as the respondents to surveys have no incentive to answer honestly or carefully. Second, the standard practice in empirical social sciences including economics is to infer the nature of economic and social interactions from observations of outcome data. However, such outcome data have limited ability to discriminate among alternative hypotheses regarding the underlying processes. Finally, economic experiments can be an important source of data on social capital. As social capital concepts relate to social interactions involving subjective processes, it is therefore natural that social capital studies rely considerably on experimental and subjective data. However, this is something that until recently, with perhaps the exception of social psychologists, aroused very little enthusiasm among economists and other social scientists.

Notes

* The authors are respectively Advisor, Asian Development Bank and Professor, Department of Economics, University of Dhaka, Bangladesh. The opinions expressed here are strictly personal. The write-up is drawn from a larger paper by one of the authors, entitled, "The Puzzle of Social Capital: A Critical Review," *Asian Development Review*, Volume 20, pp.19-39. Elaboration of many of the arguments in the present write-up as well as detailed references can be found in the aforementioned paper (Website: http://www.adb.org/Documents/Periodicals/ADR/ADR_Vol20_2.pdf).

Some useful websites on social capital:

Social Capital for Development: This is the World Bank's website on social capital. This website, which features a large collection of articles from different social sciences, intends to be the World Bank's link with external partners, researchers, institutions, governments and others interested in understanding and applying social capital for sustainable social and economic development

(Website: <http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/scapital/>).

Center for Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector (IRIS), University of Maryland: IRIS has been working with The World Bank's Initiative on Defining, Monitoring and Measuring Social Capital (Website: <http://www.iris.umd.edu/default.asp>). The working papers from the Initiative are available at Website: <http://www.iris.umd.edu/adass/proj/soccapubs.asp>.)

[Inter-American Initiative on Social Capital, Ethics and Development](#) This is the [Inter-Development Bank's website on social capital](#). The Initiative is intended to strengthen ethical values and social capital in the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean.

(Website: <http://www.iadb.org/etica/ingles/index-i.cfm>)

The Saguro Seminars: Civic Engagement in America: This is an initiative of periodic seminars by Professor of Robert Putnam at the John Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. This initiative focuses on how to increasingly build bonds of civic trust – and social capital–among Americans and their communities

(Website: <http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/saguro/>)

Capitale Sociale.it: It contains useful materials for researchers interested in social capital and in its relationship with economic development. Fabio Sabatini, at the Department of Public Economics, University of Rome La Sapienza, is the editor of **Capitale Sociale.it**

(Website: <http://dep.eco.uniroma1.it/~soccap/eng-index.htm>)