

(ONS)



Social Capital: Problems of its conceptualization and measurement in transforming societies¹⁾

Petr Matějů

Institute of Sociology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic
and Anglo-American College in Prague

One of the most recent OECD publications symbolically titled "*The Well-being of Nations: The Role of Human and Social Capital*" (OECD, 2001b) proves that the capacity of economists to explain cross-national variation in economic growth and well-being of nations is improving year by year. It is equally true that sociologists are better able to explain increasingly higher proportion of variance in various dimensions of inequality (wage and income inequality, educational inequality, career mobility). In both cases progress has been made possible because, among other things, both economists and sociologists have gradually achieved an important agreement that in order to understand factors driving the growth of national economies as well as factors determining success in life, **various kinds of capital should be brought onto the agenda of social and economic research.**

Some forty years ago, the role of human capital was recognized alongside physical capital in contributing to economic output. Though the idea that social relationships and networks play an important role in economic success both at the micro and macro level has been hanging in the air for decades, it was only as late as the eighties and early nineties when Pierre Bourdieu (Bourdieu 1985) and James Coleman (Coleman 1988) formally distinguished and named a new form of capital: **social capital.**

Similar to the pioneering researchers in the role of human capital, who started from loose measurement instruments and rather weak models designed to assess the true contribution of human capital to economic growth, well-being of nations, and life-success of individuals, proponents of social capital have gradually realized that the explanatory power of models being developed to assess the role of social capital will depend not only on their complexity and sophistication but also on the validity, robustness (reliability), quality and comparability of indicators used to measure social capital in sociological and statistical surveys. Apparently we are at the very beginning of this process.

The most recent comparative research projects on adult literacy and life-skills coordinated by OECD (IALS, SIALS, PISA, etc.; see e.g. OECD 2000, OECD 2001a) show how rewarding, though difficult and costly, has been the endeavor to switch from a 'proxy variable' (formal education) to more direct indicators of human capital stock (e.g. various dimensions of "adult literacy"). We can expect the same development in research in social capital. There are at least three stages in this process:

- a. theoretical elaboration of various approaches to the concept;

¹ This paper has been prepared as a contribution to the OECD-ONS Conference on Social Capital Measurement held in London, September 26-27, 2002. The author wishes to thank Joshua White for his help in reviewing extensive economic literature, Simon Field from Centre for Educational Research and Innovation OECD and Rosalyn Harper from ONS UK for their comments on the first draft of the paper, and Tony Ozuna for assistance in editing the final version of the paper.

- b. reaching a consensus regarding the latent variable(s) to be measured;
- c. development of the set of indicators and instruments of measurement.

Though there has been an enormous effort of individual scholars (Putnam 1993, 1995, 2000a, 2000b, Portes 1998, Woolcock 1998a, 1998b, 1999, 2000, Woolcock and Narayan 2000, Narayan 1995, 1997, 1998, 1999, Narayan and Cassidy 1999) as well as institutions (World Bank, EBRD, OECD) to show the potential of the concept of social capital for understanding differences in economic growth among nations and in life-success among individuals, the true cross-national and "cross-system" comparative research in this area is still in its very initial stage, especially as far as its measurement is concerned.

This paper aims to show that in order to reach a consensus on what social capital actually is and what role it may play in social and economic development, one has to elaborate on the links between (a) conceptualization of social capital (b) particular circumstances of its operation in different social systems and (c) measurement issues arising from these differences.

The problem is that there are at least two significantly different approaches to the conceptualization of social capital. Advocates of the most influential stream define social capital primarily as an attribute of societies, as a specific characteristic of social environment (trust, participation) facilitating people's cooperation. Adherents of the other stream emphasize the role of social capital in achieving particular goals of individuals through informal networks (mutually beneficial exchanges). The former approach prevails in "western" countries, while the latter prevails in the study of social change in post-communist societies, where the potency of social capital drawing from general trust seems to be rather weak. By contrast, social capital stemming from informal networks and exchanges allowing people to develop coping strategies facilitating their success, may hinder effective functioning of market mechanisms and, consequently, economic growth. In other words, in post-communist societies the two differently defined social capitals may work against each other. That is why the measurement of social capital in Eastern European countries needs to take into account the rather different factors operating there.

What follows is an assessment of conceptualization and measurement of social capital in post-communist societies in East Central Europe arising from specific historical and social circumstances of its operation during a period of rapid social transformation.

Different approaches to the concept of social capital

Compared to the development of human capital theory, which was based on a relatively strong consensus as regards to its nature and principal 'proxy' (formal education and skills), building a consistent theory of social capital is still obstructed by the existence of two different, equally useful and theoretically rewarding approaches:

- a. Social capital defined as mostly an **attribute of an individual**, as a person's potential to activate and effectively mobilize a network of **social connections** based on **mutual recognition** of proximity (in a social space) and maintained by symbolic and material **exchanges** (Bourdieu). In this context, social capital has the properties of the **private good**, which individuals accumulate and use to achieve their own goals.
- b. Social capital defined as mostly an **attribute of a society**, as a quality of networks and relationships enabling individuals to **cooperate** and act collectively (Putnam). Within this framework, social capital is based on the high degree of interpersonal **trust** as well as on the **trustworthiness** of public and political institutions that establish and uphold the **rule of law**, making all kinds of exchanges transparent and safe. For these reasons social capital has the properties of a **public good** facilitating achievement of higher levels of efficiency and productivity.

There are two difficulties in reconciling these two concepts of social capital and proceeding to the measurement issue. First of all, it turns out that **economists**, who are searching primarily for the factors accounting for differences in economic growth and well-being of nations, often tend to prefer Putnam's interpretation of social capital, while **sociologists**, striving for an explanation of reproduction of inequality, incline to Bourdieu's and Coleman's conceptualization. Though there are departures from this rule, as far as the measurement through proxy variables is concerned, economists are more likely to use the level of trust and social participation, while sociologists apply variables assessing a person's social esteem (prestige), his/her position in power structures and involvement in informal networks and exchanges. This holds largely,

and independently on whether a particular approach is elaborated or applied in the empirical research in an advanced capitalist, transition or developing country. Needless to say, however, neither of the two measurement strategies are satisfactory.

Secondly, there is another dividing line that makes the synthesis rather difficult, namely the line between the wealthy democracies of North America and Western Europe and countries emerging from communist past (**transforming** societies hereafter). It seems to mostly be due to the fact that social capital based on trust and cooperation in achieving **common goals** may contribute to the explanation of economic performance and growth of a relatively stable society with well established institutional and political frameworks. In transforming societies, where these frameworks are only being constructed and changes in the political situation affect quite strongly the trust in institutions, the trust may vary significantly without showing a clear patterns of relationships to the quality of institutional settings and economic performance.

On the other hand, increased inequality and deep changes in the social structure in transforming countries have brought scholars to give attention to mechanisms that have generated changes in social stratification and inequality: social mobility (especially towards economic and political elites), growth of income and wealth differentiation, changes in factors determining life-success, etc. Therefore, the theory of various forms of capital has been applied within a different context and research framework.

For example, Eyal, Szelényi and Townsley, who have made one of the most important contributions to the research of the post-communist transformation, argue that **pre-communism, communism, and post-communism are three different stratification regimes defined by the dominance of different types of capital (see table 1)**. Post-communism, in their view, is a historically unique system of stratification in which cultural capital (represented by higher education providing a person with greater flexibility) is dominant. However, the transition to post-communism is quite a complicated shift from the socialist rank order system, in which social capital institutionalized as political capital (represented by a person's position in the Communist party hierarchy) was dominant, to a capitalist class stratification, where economic and cultural capital play strategic roles in life-success. (Eyal, Szelényi and Townsley, 1998, p. 7)

Similarly to other students of social stratification in East-Central Europe, Eyal, Szelényi and Townsley argue that during a transition, people try to convert devalued forms of capital into new, more valued forms. This is the preferred way individuals cope with changes in social structure. "In a post-communist transition, for example, those who are well endowed with cultural capital may be able to convert their former political capital into informal social networks, which can then be usefully deployed to take advantage of new market opportunities" (Eyal, Szelényi and Townsley, 1998, p. 7). Table 1 depicts the role of different forms of capital in different types of societies.

<Table 1 about here>

Analyses based on comparative surveys (Eyal, Szelényi and Townsley: 1998, Hanley, Matějů, Vlachová and Krejčí: 1998) corroborated the hypothesis that the real winners of the transformation have been those who have been able to combine political capital of the past (nomenklatura cadres, communist technocrats) with cultural capital (education, knowledge). **Political capital has made it possible to build social networks and maintain useful ties (social capital)**. Cultural capital has lead to higher flexibility and capacity to put all these assets at work under the new conditions.

It should be clear from what has been said above, that in transforming societies the concept of social capital is one of the key issues for research aiming at understanding the process of social change and its consequences for peoples' career mobility and life chances, while in advanced countries, the same concept, though defined differently, is being used to contribute to the explanation of cross-national variance in economic growth and overall well-being.

Therefore, the debate on measurement strategies for social capital should begin with an elaboration and operationalization of the two different concepts of social capital (attribute of individuals and factor determining life-success vs. attribute of societies facilitating cooperation and contributing to economic growth), each drawing from a different social and political situation and thus focusing on different processes and relationships. Ignoring this important distinction in building measurement strategies might, particularly in transforming societies, conceal potentially very strong explanatory variable(s), while measuring theoretically (as well as historically) less grounded variables with potentially lower explanatory power. Solving this problem should in fact precede the debate on the cultural dimension in measuring social capital, which, by all means, would also require attention.

Does the "synergy view" offer a solution?

There have been attempts to solve the problem of duality in the conceptualization of social capital. In recent years, research at the World Bank has sought to combine these two approaches and create a new way of viewing social capital. Work by Woolcock (1998) has produced a new definition that combines the universal trust-based social norms of Putnam, with the individual accumulation aspects of Bourdieu and Coleman. Called the **synergy view of social capital**, it examines what Woolcock calls '**bridging**' and '**bonding**' social capital. Bonding social capital (also known as 'defensive' social capital) is generated by strong close ties between individuals that allow them to meet basic needs in the face of negative externalities. These strong ties are most often formed within families, clans, or close groups of neighbors. They serve mainly to provide 'backup' to the members, providing food or money if a member is laid off, for instance.

Bridging social capital (also known as 'offensive' social capital) is defined by large groups of people from various levels of society. These groups (most often taking the form of a professional organization) work to further the goals of the members, often acting to find jobs or increase the dispersion of knowledge within the organization, allowing members to achieve their goals and improve their socioeconomic status. In addition, Woolcock includes formal institutions, arguing that they stem from a **universal social capital**, a network that comprises all members of a society. This network serves a role separate from either bonding or bridging social capital, in that it creates institutions that allow society to function. The participation in the creation and maintenance of these formal institutions is **civic participation**, which requires trust in the government and its agencies. While complementarities exist between these three definitions, each can exist separate from the others, and Woolcock argues that it is necessary to have high levels of all three for a society to properly function.

Woolcock's view of social capital offers a plausible **theoretical** solution. However, the problem of different approaches to the measurement remains. In order to begin cross-national comparative work we should be able to develop measurement strategies for **two distinct forms of social capital** - one operating beyond reproduction of inequality and strategies which individuals and families develop to succeed in life (particularly during the times of social change), while the other explaining why in some societies people cooperate more easily and more effectively than in others. This is a principal problem which has to be discussed before we turn our attention to "cultural problems in measuring social capital". Deeper dimensions and fine-grained problems of measurement will occur when we start phrasing questions and items for questionnaires. It seems, however, that this stage of the project is still far ahead.

Measurement strategies applied in transforming societies

There is a general agreement that, at least at this stage, the measurement of social capital can only be indirect. Depending on its definition, different proxy measurements are used, and many organizations have developed their own measurements for social capital. However, in almost all cases the measurement of various levels and dimensions of trust and community participation prevails. This has been the case of a majority of comparative surveys carried out both in advanced and transforming countries. This fact determines which research questions can be addressed by the analyses.

As far as transforming societies are concerned, there are only a few empirical studies focusing on social capital and its role in economic growth. Richard Rose (Rose 1998a, 1998b) and David O'Brian (O'Brian 1998) have studied social capital in Russia to show the role of informal networks in peoples' strategies to cope with a social system in which formal organizations fail to operate in a fair manner. In such a situation, the position of an individual in a given social hierarchy is one of the most important factors in obtaining needed services. Only a few members of the lower classes are thus able to obtain needed goods and services. Since bribery is a fact of life, one can never trust that one's neighbor is not going to out-bribe one for some needed service (Rose 1998a).

O'Brien, similarly to Rose, also attempts to determine what methods are used by Russians when faced with negative externalities (shortage of elementary goods and services, paralyzed market, pervasive corruption, etc.) and to what extent Russians participate in community wide activities. His survey is constructed to provide data on the levels of trust between individuals and the varying levels of social networks. His study shows that failing infrastructure systems in the Russian countryside have pushed individuals towards closer family ties. Since the government is not taking direct action to create functional social institutions in these areas, cooperation among the villagers on an informal basis remains a key coping strategy. Despite the fact that there is evidence that stronger bridging social capital would benefit these villagers greatly in the form of increased access to markets, they would rather concentrate on their profit making enterprises than risk expending energy for the common good and receiving nothing (O'Brian 1998).

Russia certainly is an extreme case among transforming countries. As far as East-Central Europe is concerned, there is a study addressing the role of social capital in economic growth based on recent comparative surveys. Raiser, Haerper, Nowotny, and Wallace (2001) in their paper *Social Capital in Transition: A First Look at the Evidence* use a variety of measurements to determine the levels of social capital in transforming societies and show how the available primary data sources² can be used to address the question of the role of social capital in economic growth. Their analysis is limited by the fact that each of these surveys measures a different aspect of trust and form of social participation.

By combining slightly different views of the three data sets, the researchers build groups of indicators and test their robustness and potential biases. The sets of available indicators are displayed in Table 2. It is clear at first glance that indicators measuring formal dimensions of social capital (general trust, civic mindedness and participation, political interest, confidence in formal institutions, etc.) prevail, while the informal dimension (participation in informal networks and exchanges) is underrepresented. That is why the main results of the analysis contribute to the debate on the role of formal social capital in economic growth, while its role in the transformation of social structure and determination of life-chances has had to remain out of the scope of the analysis.

<Table 2 about here>

As far as the principal findings are concerned, by running a series of regressions, the authors find out that there is no aggregate correlation between the level of anonymous trust (trust between two individuals who do not know each other) and the GDP growth of a particular country. This result contradicts the conclusions from studies focused on developed Western countries. Their analysis shows however, that civic participation is positively correlated with GDP growth. The authors argue that civic participation generates knowledge externalities, lowers transaction costs, and provides better enforcement. In addition, consistent with the data from Russia, trust in public institutions is positively correlated with growth. The analyses also show that higher levels of civic participation lead to higher levels of public trust. However, since both of these are positively correlated with GDP growth, it is hard to determine causality between the three variables. Due to the lack of variables that can be used to measure the informal dimension of social capital consisting in interpersonal networks, the first comparative analysis of social capital in transforming societies examines only its formal aspects.

What should be the next step?

In order to proceed further in the analysis of social capital and its role in social and economic development and to overcome existing problems especially as regards its measurement, the effort should concentrate, in general, on four issues:

1. to trace the use of potentially suitable indicators of various dimensions of social capital in existing comparative surveys;
2. to create scales representing distinct dimensions of social capital and to assess their reliability in different social and cultural systems;
3. to analyze the relationships between the main dimensions of social capital in different systems;
4. to assess relationships between the main dimensions of social capital and other relevant variables (e.g. political efficacy and other relevant political attitudes, one's position in class structure and social stratification, etc.) .

As for post-communist countries the research agenda should begin with an attempt to develop measures of social capital allowing to assess the degree of involvement of "weak social ties" (networks in Bourdieu's sense) in shaping peoples' life-chances (job and career mobility, access to highly valued resources, etc.). To achieve this goal, two sets of indicators should be developed:

- a) indicators of social capital stemming primarily from a current and/or past position in the social stratification and power structures (positional social capital);

² World Values Survey -WVS, New Democracy Barometer - NDB, and the EBRD's Business Environment Survey BEEPS.

- b) indicators of a person's active involvement in building networks based on mutual recognition of usefulness and various kind of exchanges.

Research in this direction has not been very well developed as yet, though some indicators have been developed and applied. For example, in order to assess the feasibility of measuring a person's participation in networks based on informal exchanges (in Bourdieu's definition) a set of questions was developed and used in the Social Stratification Survey carried out in 1993 in five post-communist countries: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Russia and Slovakia (see Table 3 for the wording of these questions).³ Variables created from these questions proved the existence of a latent variable representing relevant dimensions of social capital strongly related to one's position in the social structure (social status, prestige, esteem) and political capital (party membership, political participation). At the same time, social capital assessed by this particular measurement strategy proved to be a significant predictor of the respondents' adaptive strategies during the first years of transition and, consequently, also the change in his or her income between 1989 and 1993 (Mateju and Lim, 1995, see Table 4 for results). As for the role of social capital, the authors conclude: "...social capital plays quite a significant role in improving life-chances both within the "bureaucratic" segment of the labor-market, and particularly in the private sector. The convertibility of social capital seems to be quite an important element in the transformation. It is a significant instigator of both functional advancement and the two major types of entrepreneurial strategies (part-time and full time-entrepreneurship). The convertibility of social capital increases, to a considerable extent, the possibility of the former cadres maintaining their income privileges." (Mateju and Lim, 1995, p. 132-133). See

<Tables 3 and 4 about here>

For the above reasons the same questions have been added to the most recent ISSP survey on Social Networks (only in the Czech Republic). It will make it possible to assess the existence of this particular dimension of social capital in the later stage of transformation and its relationships to other dimensions measured in this survey.

At the same time, we should assess whether the indicators developed to assess social circumstances facilitating peoples' cooperation (social capital in Putnam's definition) actually measure similar phenomena in post-communist (transforming) and advanced countries (the question of validity and reliability of measurement scales in cross-national perspective). One of the international comparative research projects that can be exploited in this process is the aforementioned project ISSP - International Social Survey Programme (see www.issp.org and Table 5 for the list of modules).⁴

<Table 5 about here>

Two modules of the ISSP project can be used to develop and test latent variables and scales for the analysis of social capital: *The Role of Government* (1985, 1990, 1996) and *Social Networks* (1986, 2001). While the former can be used particularly to elaborate measurement scales for trust in various types of institutions, the latter has been designed to depict the role of various kinds of networks people participate in. The international data file from *Social Networks II* (2001) will be available later this year for at least 30 countries. The main groups of variables related to social capital are presented in Table 6.

<Table 6 about here>

Conclusion

Social capital research is in its early stage and much work needs to be done on designing proper instruments for its measurement. There is no doubt, however, that research already conducted has proven that social capital has two important characteristics: it has a capacity to contribute to the explanation of economic growth (especially in advanced countries), and to shed light on determinants of life-success (particularly in transforming societies).

The problem of transforming (post-communist) societies consists in essentially contrary effects of the two forms of social capital. Social capital in Putnam's interpretation is essential for social cooperation allowing

³ The questions assessing subjective evaluation of respondent's involvement in exchange networks were finally asked only in the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

⁴ Countries currently involved in the ISSP project: Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Flanders, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, USA, Venezuela.

the emerging market to function. As George Kolankiewicz put it "It is essential as the non-contractual element in the contract when the legal underpinnings to the market are far from completed or remain (necessarily) ambiguous. Trust provides the element of predictability which is absent given the low stock of formal rationality in the system" (Kolankiewicz 1996: 447). Paradoxically, the potency of this particular form of social capital drawing from general trust seems to be rather weak in post-communist countries. By contrast, the "strength of weak ties" (Granowetter 1973), or - in other words - social capital which stems from informal networks and exchanges allowing people to develop coping strategies facilitating accumulation of capital and class structure formation, may hinder - at least temporarily - effective functioning of market mechanisms and, consequently, economic growth.

This is why, particularly in transforming societies, it will be important both to evolve research strategies and to improve significantly the measurement of both forms of social capital. Therefore, before we attempt to draft questions and modules for social capital, the key issues of its conceptualization have to be sorted out and available survey data should be used to assess the reliability of scales which can be created from already existing variables from international comparative surveys.

References

- Bourdieu, P. (1985). "Forms of Capital", in: J Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research in the Sociology of Education*, New York: Greenwood Press.
- Coleman, J. (1987). "Norms as Social Capital." In Gerard Radnitzky and Peter Bernholz, eds., *Economic Imperialism: The Economic Method Applied outside the Field of Economics*. New York: Paragon House Publishers.
- Coleman, J. (1988). "Social Capital and the Creation of Human Capital", *American Journal of Sociology*, 94 (supplement): 94-120.
- Dasgupta, P. and I. Serageldin (eds.), (1999). *Social Capital. A Multifaceted Perspective*, Washington D.C., The World Bank.
- Easterly, W. 2000. "Happy Societies: The Middle Class Consensus and Economic Development." World Bank, Development Research Group, Washington, D.C. Processed.
- Eyal, G., I. Szelényi and E. Townsley. (1998). *Making Capitalism Without Capitalists. The New Ruling Elites in Eastern Europe*. Verso, London, New York.
- Granovetter, M. (1973). "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78:1360–80.
- Hanley, E. , P. Matějů, K. Vlachová and J. Krejčí: *The Making of Post-Communist Elites in Eastern Europe*, Institute of Sociology, Working Papers, 4/1998
- Knack, S. and P. Keefer, (1997). "Does Social Capital Have an Economic Payoff? A Cross-Country Investigation", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. CXII (December 98): 1252-1288.
- Kolankiewicz, G. (1996). "Social Capital and Social Change", *British Journal of Sociology*, 47 (3): 427-441.
- Marody, M. (1997). "Post - Transitology or is there any Life after Transition", *Polish Sociological Review* 117/1, p 13 - 21.
- Mateju, P. and Nelson Lim (1995). "Who has gotten ahead after the fall of Communism? The case of the Czech Republic." *Czech Sociological Review*, Vol 3, pp. 117-136
- Narayan, D. (1995). "Designing Community-Based Development." Social Development Paper 7. World Bank, Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Network, Washington, D.C. Processed.
- Narayan, D. (1997). "Voices of the Poor: Poverty and Social Capital in Tanzania." Environmentally Sustainable Development Monograph 20. World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Narayan, D. (1998). "Social Capital Survey in Ghana—Preliminary Results." World Bank, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network, Washington, D.C. Processed.
- Narayan, D. (1999). "Bonds and Bridges: Social Capital and Poverty." Policy Research Working Paper 2167. World Bank, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network, Washington, D.C. Processed.
- Narayan, D. and M. Cassidy. (1999). "A Dimensional Approach to Measuring Social Capital: Development and Validation of a Social Capital Inventory." World Bank, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network, Washington, D.C. Processed.
- O'Brian, D. (1998). *Social Capital and Community Development in Rural Russia*. The World Bank, Working Papers. 1998. p. 12
- OECD (2000). *Literacy in the Information Age*. Final Report of the International Adult Literacy Survey (SIALS). Paris, OECD.

- OECD (2001a). *Knowledge and Skills for Life*. First Results from PISA 2000. OECD, Paris, 2001.
- OECD (2001b). *The Well-Being of Nations. The role of human and social capital*. OECD, Paris, 2001.
- Portes, A. (1998). "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Contemporary Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24:1–24.
- Putnam, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work*, Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. (1995). "Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (December):664–83.
- Putnam, R. (2000a). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Putnam, R. (2000b). Considering the Empirical Evidence for the Economic Impact and the Broad Social returns to Human and Social Capital. Paper presented at OECD conference 2000
- Raiser, M. (1999). "Trust in Transition". EBRD Working Paper, No. 39, London.
- Raiser, M., Ch. Haerpfer, T. Nowotny and C. Wallace. (2001). *Social Capital in Transition Countries: A First Look at the Evidence*. EBRD Working Paper, 2001.
- Róna-Tas, A. (1998). Path-Dependence and Capital Theory: Sociology of the Post-Communist Economic Transformation. *East European Politics and Societies*, Winter 1998 12(1), pp.107-131
- Rose, R. (1998a). "Getting Things Done with Social Capital: New Russia Barometer VII". University of Strathclyde Studies in Public Policy, No. 303.
- Rose, R. (1998b). "Getting Things Done in an Anti-Modern Society: Social Capital Networks in Russia." Social Capital Initiative Working Paper 8. World Bank, Social Development Department, Washington, D.C. Processed.
- Rose, R., W. Mishler and C. Haerpfer (1997). "Getting Real, Social Capital in Post- Communist Societies". University of Strathclyde, Studies in Public Policy, No. 278.
- Rose, R., W. Mishler, and C. Haerpfer (1998). *Democracy and its Alternatives: Testing the Churchill Hypothesis in Post - Communist Countries*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smolar, A. (1996). "Civil Society After Communism: From Opposition to Atomization", *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 4 (1): 24-38.
- Stark, D: (1997). "Recombinant Property in East European Capitalism", *Restructuring Networks in Post-Socialism: Legacies, Linkages, and Localities*, G. Grabher and D. Stark, Oxford University Press.
- Tardos, R. (1998). "Ways of interpretation and the uses of the social capital concept." Paper presented at the INSA Sunbelt conference.
- Woolcock, M. (1998). "Social Capital and Economic Development: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework." *Theory and Society* 27(2):151–208.
- Woolcock, M. (1999). "Learning from Failures in Microfinance: What Unsuccessful Cases Tell Us about How Group-Based Programs Work." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 58(1):17–42.
- Woolcock, M. (2000). "Managing Risk, Shocks, and Opportunities in Developing Economies: The Role of Social Capital." In Gustav Ranis, ed., *Dimensions of Development*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale Center for International and Area Studies.

Woolcock, M. and D. Narayan. (2000). Social capital: Implications for development theory, research. and policy. The World Bank Research Observer; Washington; Aug 2000.

Table 1: Determinants of social structure in different types of societies

Type of Societies	Type of Capital		
	ECONOMIC	CULTURAL	SOCIAL
Baseline model 'ideal type' of modern capitalism	+++	++	+ (Rational social network)
Pre-communist Eastern Europe (before 1949)	++	++	+++ (Traditional status honor)
Classical (Stalinist) model of socialism (mid 1949s - mid 1960s)	-	+	+ (Institutionalized as political capital)
Reform model of socialism (mid 1960s - 1989)	+	++	+ (Institutionalized as political capital)
Post-communism (1989 -	++	+++	+ (De-institutionalized and rationalized as social networks)

Source: Eyal, Szelényi and Townsley, 1998, p. 23

Economic capital: economic and financial assets

Cultural capital: education and skills

Social capital: participation in various kinds of networks

Table 2: Formal and informal social capital (data, definitions, and sources)

Description	Source	Indicators	Type
Generalized trust	WVS	Percentage of respondents that say they trust other people (alternative response: can't be too careful about others)	Formal
Civic mindedness	WVS	Mean score (1 = always, 10 = never) of frequency of immoral actions (fare dodging, tax cheating, buying stolen goods, accepting bribes)	Formal
Altruism	WVS	Percentage of respondents who say they think about others (alternative response: only think about oneself)	Formal
Civic participation	WVS	Percentage of respondents who are active in civic organizations (alternative responses: members but inactive; not members)	Formal
Ascribed trust	WVS	Percentage of respondents who value family a lot (alternative responses: rather, not at all)	Informal
Process-based trust	WVS	Percentage of respondents who value friends a lot (alternative responses: rather, not at all)	Informal
Political interest	WVS	Percentage of respondents who frequently discuss politics (alternative response: politics not frequently discussed)	Formal
Confidence in formal institutions	WVS	Mean score (1 = low confidence, 4 = high confidence) for each institution	Formal
Trust in institutions	NDB	Mean score (1 = no trust, 7 = great trust) for each institution	Formal
Confidence in legal system	BEEPS	Mean score (0 = low confidence, 3 = high confidence)	Formal
Quality of investment climate	BEEPS	Mean score of obstacles to investment (0 = high obstacles, 3 = low obstacles) formed over 10 dimensions, including policy instability, inflation, exchange rate, finance, taxes and regulation, infrastructure, judiciary, corruption, street crime, organized crime	Formal

Source: Raiser, Haerpfer, Nowotny, Wallace. Social Capital in Transition Countries: A First Look at the Evidence. EBRD Working Paper, 2001.

Table 3. The questions asked in the Social stratification survey (1994) and in the Social networks II survey (2001)

<p>Q1: <i>How often because of your job, the office you hold, or contacts you have, do other people (relatives, friends, well-known people, etc.) turn to you to help them solve some problems, cope with difficult life situations, or apply your influence for their benefit?</i></p>	<p>(1-Never, 5-Very often);</p>
<p>Q2: <i>And what about you? When you are in a difficult situation (need a good doctor, lawyer, help to get a good job, good education for children, intercession with some office, etc.), do you think there are people who could intervene on your behalf?</i></p>	<p>(1 - No, nobody, 5 - Very many);</p>
<p>Q3: <i>How important a role do these useful contacts play in your life?</i></p>	<p>(1 - Essential, 5 - Not important at all)</p>

Source: Social Stratification in Eastern Europe 1994 (Czech Republic), ISSP: Social Networks 2001 (Czech Republic).

Table 4. The role of social capital among determinants of career strategies for Economic Success - Czech Republic 1994

Variable	Upward managerial mobility		Part-time entrepreneurship		Full-time entrepreneurship	
	Slope	Exp (slope)	Slope	Exp (slope)	Slope	Exp (slope)
Male	0.331	1.392	0.725**	2.065	0.969***	2.635
Cadre status in 1989	0.336	1.400	0.151	1.163	1.243***	3.465
Member of the Communist Party in 1989	-0.195	0.823	0.044	1.045	-0.477	0.621
Functionary of the Communist Party in 1989	0.118	1.125	0.167	1.181	-0.403	0.667
Vocational education	0.776	2.174	0.947	2.577	0.932	2.539
Secondary education	1.839*	6.290	0.958	2.606	1.037	2.822
University education	2.370**	10.697	1.193	3.298	0.346	1.413
High cultural capital	0.042	1.042	-0.095	0.909	0.186	1.204
High economic capital	-0.169	0.844	0.768**	2.156	0.274	1.315
High social capital	0.869***	2.385	0.570*	1.768	0.633*	1.883
Entrepreneurial social origin	0.057	1.059	0.178	1.195	0.459	1.583
Received restitution in 1989	-0.586	0.557	0.318	1.374	0.378	1.460
Constant	-4.039***		-4.332***		-4.408	
-2 log likelihood	621.915		498.16		460.32	
Sample size	1039		1039		1039	

Statistical significance: *** p<0.001; ** p< 0.01; * p<0.05

Source: Mateju, P. and Nelson Lim (1995). "Who has gotten ahead after the fall of Communism? The case of the Czech Republic." *Czech Sociological Review*, Vol 3, pp. 117-136

Table 5: Modules of ISSP surveys

Year of the survey	Module
1985	Role of Government I
1986	Social Networks I
1987	Social Inequality I
1988	Family & Changing Gender Roles I
1989	Work Orientations I
1990	Role of Government II
1991	Religion I
1992	Social Inequality II
1993	Environment I
1994	Family & Changing Gender Roles II
1995	National Identity I
1996	Role of Government III
1997	Work Orientations II
1998	Religion II
1999	Social Inequality III
2000	Environment II
2001	Social Networks II

Table 6. ISSP - Social Networks: groups of variables related to social capital

Question-content	Comment
Contact to family members	Used also in ISSP-1986 (with minor modifications)
Number of close friends at work-place, in the neighborhood, other friends	New Questions; (ISSP-1986: total number of close friends)
Contact to closest friend	Used also in ISSP-1986
Membership in associations or groups	Adapted from GSS, WVS, ISSP-1998
Whom would you ask for help in situations of need	Used also in ISSP-1986 (with minor modifications)
To whom would you give help in situations of need	New questions
Sources of information about jobs	Adapted from various surveys
Characteristics of a close friend	Adapted from GSS
Obligations towards relatives and friends	New questions
Responsibilities of the government	Used also in ISSP-1996
Demands from relatives	New question
Trust in people	Adapted from Danish proposal + ISSP-98
How long lived in the city	ISSP-1986, ISSP-1995
Feeling of political efficacy in local and national government	Adapted from various surveys
Discuss politics with friends	Adapted from various surveys