
abstract Three theoretical issues should be addressed to understand the multiple facets of social capital: its conceptualization, its effects on social life and society, and its causes. This article starts by suggesting that social networks are the core of social capital. What differentiates between various theories of social capital is how they add other elements to the social network core. The article then shows the importance of four aspects of social capital: the goals and utilities of actors who employ social capital, levels of definition, the coverage of social capital, and types of social capital. After the theoretical argument, the article reviews literature in the field to explore the causes and effects of social capital. It then examines criticisms of the concept, finally proposing two new directions: (1) systematic studies of the relationship between components of social capital and the utility functions of actors, and (2) the study of social capital in relation to local concepts expressing similar meanings.

keywords norms ♦ social capital ♦ social networks ♦ trust ♦ utility function ♦ values

Major theoretical approaches

Three theoretical issues should be addressed in order to understand the multiple facets of social capital (Portes, 1998). The first and most important issue is the conceptualization of social capital. What is social capital? How should it be defined? Answering these questions is the first step to utilizing social capital as an analytical tool in sociological studies. A second issue is the effects of social capital, and a third issue is the causes of social capital. The first issue is discussed in this section, and the second and third ones will be explored in the second section.

Conceptualizing social capital is a very difficult task. This is because, as Coleman (1988, 1990) points out, social capital exists between actors; it is not attributable to an actor like human and economic capital are. A variety of definitions have been proposed to capture the concept of social capital. I would argue that each of these definitions implies that social networks are at the core of social capital. This is to be expected as social capital emerges and is maintained between actors. Thus what differentiates between definitions of social capital is the way each definition adds other elements to the social network core.

Putnam (1993: 167), for example, defines social capital as ‘features of social organization, such as trust, norms, and networks, that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions.’ Obviously, he adds trust and norms to the social network core. Inaba (2007, 2011), a leading scholar in the study of social capital in Japan, adds externality of mind to the three elements of Putnam’s definition. Externality of mind, according to Inaba, means that the good will of a person has positive effects on other people. In contrast to Putnam and Inaba, Lin (2001a: 29) adopts a more individualistic view of social capital, adding resources to the social network core. He defines social capital as ‘resources embedded in a social structure that are accessed and/or mobilized in purposive actions.’

I would not say that any one of these definitions is better than the others; each definition captures an important aspect of social capital. My point is that social networks are common to all the definitions because social capital exists between actors. This theoretical position is in line with Lin’s (1999) emphasis on social networks in the conceptualization of social capital. We now need to examine four aspects that are

important to the understanding of social capital: (1) the goals and utilities of actors who employ social capital, (2) levels of definition, (3) coverage of social capital, and (4) types of social capital.

An example would illustrate the first aspect. Coleman (1988, 1990) argues that social closure among the parents of high school students increases the efficiency of parents' supervision of their children. This is because social closure promotes exchange of information on the children between parents. Thus social closure, which is a kind of high density social network, becomes social capital for parents who are concerned about the behavior and academic performance of their children. However, this social closure hinders children who want to play with their friends. Thus social closure is not social capital for such children. Entrepreneurs, according to Burt (1992), should also avoid social closure for two reasons. First, information on new business opportunities rarely comes to entrepreneurs who are embedded in high density social networks; they are only likely to receive information that is redundant. Second, if an entrepreneur has ties with actors A and B, who do not have a tie between them, he/she can act as an intermediary and thus will have a higher level of control. Entrepreneurs should therefore try to avoid social closure.

These examples show that the same social network becomes social capital for some actors in some situations, while it does not become social capital for other actors in other situations. This is a source of confusion in the conceptualization of social capital. To solve this problem, the goals and utilities of actors should be clarified (see Lin [1999] for the same argument on the importance of utilities of actors in the study of social capital). Social closure becomes social capital for the parents of high school students because they want to supervise their children by exchanging information on their behavior. However, it does not become social capital for the students because they do not want to be supervised by their parents. It does not become social capital for entrepreneurs, either. This is because entrepreneurs want information on new business opportunities and to avoid redundancy in the information coming to them. Entrepreneurs also want to maintain control over their partners.

Identifying the goals and utilities of actors also helps to clarify proposed definitions of social capital. Lin (2001a), for example, clearly defines social capital as resources embedded in social networks, as mentioned above. However, something becomes a resource for some actors, but not for other actors. For example, Lin's book on social capital is an important resource for specialists in the study of social capital, but it is not a resource for researchers in particle

physics. This is because reading his book does not increase the utility of particle physicists; they are not interested in the study of social capital.

Understanding the different levels of social capital is the second aspect of its definition. Social capital has been defined at the individual, the meso, and the societal level. Identifying the level of a particular definition is a way to avoid confusion related to its usage. Bourdieu (1986), Burt (1992), and Lin (2001a) define social capital at the individual level, while Coleman (1988, 1990) and Putnam (1993) define it at the community (meso) and societal levels, respectively. Bourdieu (1986) defines social capital as 'the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition ... which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectivity-owned capital, a "credential" which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word' (Bourdieu, 1986: 51). He clearly focuses on individuals as holders and recipients of social capital. According to Burt (1992), who has extended the theory of the strength of weak ties (Granovetter, 1973), an entrepreneur with sparse social networks (i.e. social networks rich in 'structural holes') has better opportunities in business. Lin (2001a), as mentioned above, defines social capital as resources for actors. One of his examples makes the implication of his definition clear; in the status attainment process, an actor who has a tie with another actor of a high status is more likely to get a higher status than one who does not have such a tie. In this example, a tie with an actor of a high status becomes social capital for a person who pursues a higher status.

Coleman (1988, 1990), in contrast, defines social capital at the meso level. The social capital that increases the utility of the parents of high school students from the above example exists between the parents. Coleman (1988: S98) emphasizes the meso level of social capital when he says, '[s]ocial 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 aspects of social structures, and they facilitate certain actions of actors – whether persons or corporate actors – within the structure.' The World Bank, a major player in the aid of developing countries through community development, adopts this definition. For example, the Social Capital Initiative, a working group in the World Bank, has reported the effects and causes of social capital at local levels in developing countries (Grootaert and Van Bastelaer, 2002). The World Bank's website on social capital (web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/EXTTSOCIALCAPITAL/0,,conte

ntMDK:20642703-menuPK:401023-pagePK:148956-piPK:216618-theSitePK:401015,00.html) provides rich information on its projects.

Putnam (1993) compared social, economic, and political performance between northern and southern Italy. He explains the higher performance in northern Italy by the higher level of social capital in the region. In contrast to the meso-level social capital evident in Coleman's example, Putnam shows that high social capital exists at the societal level in northern Italy.

The different levels of social capital are clearly captured by using the concept of goods. Inaba (2007, 2011) says that social capital is comprised of three types of goods: private goods, club goods, and public goods. Social capital as private goods is exclusively consumed by people and/or organizations like a commodity, while social capital as public goods is accessible to anybody. Social capital as club goods is an in-between type. Only members of a particular group, like the parents of high school students in Coleman's example, are allowed to enjoy club goods.

A third aspect that distinguishes between definitions of social capital is coverage. A useful categorization is global (or societal) versus local social capital. Global social capital covers a whole society, while local social capital covers a smaller society within the whole society. An example makes this difference clearer. As mentioned above, Putnam (1993) argues that social capital in southern Italy is lower than that in northern Italy. However, families and intimate groups in southern Italy enjoy high social capital within them. This difference is understandable if we make a clear distinction between global and local social capital. Putnam points out the low level of *global* social capital covering southern Italy, but he omits to mention the high level of *local* social capital in groups of familiarity there. This distinction is critical when we study effects of social capital. We will get back to this point in the next section.

A fourth aspect of social capital is types of social capital. This article focuses on two major approaches to the categorization of different types of social capital, although many other approaches have been proposed. The first approach categorizes social capital into cognitive and structural forms (Uphoff, 1999). The structural form of social capital comprises roles, rules, precedents, procedures, and social networks, whereas the cognitive form includes norms, values, attitudes, and beliefs. As Uphoff points out, these two forms interact with each other. The structural form creates the cognitive form, which in a cycle then reinforces or recreates the structural form.

A second approach focuses on the functions of social capital; that is, how social capital connects actors. A famous categorization distinguishes

between bonding and bridging social capital (Gittel and Vidal, 1998; Putnam, 2000). Literally, bonding social capital bonds actors covered by it, while bridging social capital bridges actors with other actors outside. This contrast between the two types of social capital is illustrated by the differences in the conceptualization of social capital between Coleman (1990) and Burt (1992). Some specialists in the study of social capital, such as Woolcock (1998, 2001), add linking social capital to these two types. This type links citizens to formal institutions, enabling them to access institutional resources.

Although the second approach is useful for the study of the effects of social capital, I argue that it should not be included in its conceptualization. This is because focusing on the functions of social capital in its definition causes conceptual confusion.

In summary, four aspects should be considered when conceptualizing social capital: the goals and utilities of actors who employ social capital, levels of social capital, the coverage of social capital, and types of social capital. If we explicitly consider these aspects when we conceptualize social capital, we can avoid a situation where we conflate different utilities, coverage, levels, and/or types of social capital. Furthermore, these aspects raise two interesting research questions on the dynamics of social capital. The first research question concerns how and why social capital is converted from one type to another. For example, it is worth asking how structural social capital at the community level enhances cognitive social capital at the individual level. A second research question concerns the relationship between local and global social capital. As mentioned above, people in southern Italy enjoy local social capital within their closed groups and organizations, which lower the level of global social capital. Is it possible to reconcile the former social capital with the latter? How can this reconciliation be achieved? Applying the four aspects of social capital to these research questions would deepen our understanding of the concept.

Empirical evidence

This section concerns empirical evidence that shows the effects and causes of social capital. There is a huge, growing body of literature on the effects of social capital. As it is impossible to cover all the literature in this article, several representative studies are mentioned here. The positive effects of social capital are discussed first, followed by the negative effects. Then the relationship between positive and negative effects is explored.

Positive effects of social capital on political

performance, education, status attainment, health, and development are discussed here. As mentioned above, Putnam (1993) compares northern and southern Italy and shows that the former enjoys higher social capital and higher political performance than the latter. In northern Italy, according to him, networks of civic engagement such as sports clubs and choral societies solve problems of collective behavior and, therefore, contribute to higher political performance. Family networks, which are influential in southern Italy, also help to solve problems. However, such networks do not cross familial boundaries. Borrowing the categorization mentioned above, northern Italy is rich in globally bridging social capital, whereas southern Italy has strong locally bonding social capital.

Education has also been a focus of specialists of the study of social capital. Coleman (1988) compares dropout rates between 10th and 12th grade students from public, Catholic, and other private schools. He shows that the dropout rate of students from Catholic schools is much lower than those of students from public and other private schools. He attributes this to a high level of social capital in the form of social closure among parents and students of Catholic schools. Although they are critical of Coleman's finding, Morgan and Sørensen (1999) admit that social capital is important under some conditions.

The study of status attainment process used to emphasize strong effects of education and family backgrounds on first and current job (Blau and Duncan, 1967). These variables reflect human capital and cultural capital (and economic resources), respectively. However, structural sociologists who argue the analytical importance of social networks point out that social capital also facilitates upward social mobility. Lin and his colleagues, for example, show that a tie with a person in an upper segment in the social hierarchy leads to a better job (Lin, 1990; Lin et al., 1981).

Social capital has also been of interest to social epidemiology. A collection by Kawachi et al. (2008) houses some reviews of the literature on the relationship between social capital and health. Many findings show the positive effects of social capital on health, but it is also possible that, for example, being embedded in a dense social network of intravenous drug users is damaging to a person's health.

The World Bank is the strongest proponent of the application of social capital to economic development. Three types of capital have been thought to be necessary for sustainable economic development: natural capital, physical or produced capital, and human capital. However, these have been found to only partially determine the process of economic

growth. Grootaert (1998), a leading economist in the World Bank, argues that social capital is a missing link. Economists now regard social relations as important and use the concept to capture relationships among actors involved in the process of economic development. Thus the World Bank has conducted massive campaigns to promote the study of social capital and its application to development since the 1990s.

There are two groups within the World Bank that study social capital (Sakata, 2001). The first group held a workshop on social capital at the World Bank in April 1997. Papers presented at the workshop are published as a book edited by Dasgupta and Serageldin (2000). The book is more academic than practical; its various authors approach social capital from different perspectives.

The second group is the Social Capital Initiative, a working group started in 1996 by a fund provided by the Government of Denmark. (The Social Capital Initiative's website is at web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/EXTTSOCIALCAPITAL/0,,contentMDK:20194767~menuPK:401035~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:401015~isCURL:Y,00.html.) Participants in the initiative write working papers, some of which are included in an book edited by Grootaert and Van Bastelaer (2002). Some chapters of this book examine the positive effects of social capital on economic development. For example, Krishna and Uphoff (2002) study the effects of social capital on common land development in villages of Rajasthan, India. An interesting finding of theirs is that social capital measured by 'western-born' scales such as the voting percentage, newspaper readership, and the number of associations did not affect village development. Rather, the positive effects were related to social capital that concerned questions like who is responsible for the treatment of a crop disease (individuals or the collective), who looks after common pasture land (from 'no one does anything' to 'we all discuss and jointly decide what is to be done'), and who would resolve a dispute between two villagers. In other words, bonding social capital among villagers rather than bridging social capital positively affected common land development in villages in India.

While the many positive effects of social capital on individuals, communities, organizations, and societies have been reported, some studies have examined its negative effects. For example, although bonding social capital among transnational migrants generally promotes their success in their host country, Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) point out that it also has negative effects, including their free riding on community bonds and norms, restrictions on

individual freedom, and leveling pressures. They cite a case of a successful Vietnamese electronics manufacturer who had around 300 employees in his plant (Portes and Rumbert, 1990). He ‘anglicized his name and cut most of his ties to the immigrant community’ (Portes and Sensenbrenner, 1993: 1340) because other Vietnamese would have made various demands on him if they had recognized him as Vietnamese. In other words, they would have exploited Vietnamese community bonds and norms and become free riders.

A second negative effect of bonding social capital is that it restricts the freedom of people in the community (Portes and Sensenbrenner, 1993). If an immigrant is deeply embedded in his/her community, he/she can enjoy various benefits from it. However, this also means that he/she is trapped by community norms and values. As Portes and Sensenbrenner explain, ‘[t]he greater the social capital produced by bounded solidarity and community controls, then the greater the particularistic demands placed on successful entrepreneurs and the more extensive the restrictions on individual expression’ (1993: 1341).

A third negative effect is that other members of a community try to drag down successful members. They would do so to prevent the norms and values of the community from deteriorating. Members fear the breakdown of a community if successful members leave to explore better opportunities. As Portes and Sensenbrenner explain, ‘[t]he mechanism at work is the fear that a solidarity born out of common adversity would be undermined by the departure of the more successful members’ (1993: 1342).

Putnam (2000) and Fukuyama (2000) share the same concern. Putnam devotes a chapter to a study of the dark side of social capital. He argues that a community becomes sectarian, like ‘Salem with “witches”’ (Putnam, 2000: 355), if high social capital is linked to low tolerance in a community. Fukuyama (2000) points out the negative externalities of groups rich in bonding social capital. He says, ‘[b]oth the Ku Klux Klan and the Mafia achieve cooperative ends on the basis of shared norms and thus have social capital, but they also produce abundant negative externalities for the larger society in which they are embedded’ (Fukuyama, 2000: 4).

Fukuyama’s argument leads to another interesting research question: what is the relationship between local and global social capital? He proposes the concept of the ‘radius of trust’ (Fukuyama, 2000: 4). In traditional cultures, groups have a narrower radius of trust than groups in modern culture. Traditional groups cultivate in-group solidarity, which in turn reduces their ability to cooperate with outsiders. This contrast is like the contrast that exists between local

and global social capital. Thus his argument on negative externalities can be interpreted as a conflict between local and global social capital. Local bonding among members of the Ku Klux Klan, for example, has positive effects for them, but negative effects (externalities) on the global social capital that is held by people outside the organization.

This conflict is made clearer if the utilities and goals of the actors involved are considered. Dense social networks and strong norms and values shared by members of the Ku Klux Klan are converted into social capital for members because they fit their goals and utilities. However, they do not become social capital for non-members of the organization because they do not fit (and actually decrease) the utilities of non-members. This analytical perspective can be applied to broader contexts where there is a conflict between social groups. Conflicts between gangs and local people in the same community and conflicts between adults and deviant juveniles are textbook examples.

This relationship between social networks and an actor’s goals and utilities helps us to understand the dynamics of social capital. A migrant tends to benefit from the resources of his/her ethnic community upon arrival in the host country; they help the migrant to settle in smoothly. However, the situation changes if the migrant succeeds in business over the years. If the migrant learns that there are better business opportunities outside of the ethnic community, his/her utility changes; his/her new goal is to succeed in the world outside of the community. Although the bonding social capital that the successful migrant has accumulated might drag him/her back to the community, the social networks of their community are no longer converted into social capital because the migrant’s goal has changed.

Let us turn to the causes of social capital. What creates social capital? Many studies have been conducted to answer this simple research question. Rather than reviewing them all, I propose two dimensions to clarify discussion of this topic. The first dimension focuses on the level at which social capital is created, be that the micro, meso, or macro level (Halpern, 2005; Inaba, 2011). The second dimension concerns whether social capital is created intentionally or unintentionally.

Halpern (2005) identifies a number of micro-level causes of social capital: biology and personality, age, family, social class, education, work, religion, television and individualized consumption, and exposure to environments of distrust. For example, people with a high socioeconomic status are more likely to have a high level of generalized trust than those with a low socioeconomic status. However, two caveats should be mentioned in response to this

finding. First, a cause might have different effects depending on the type of social capital being created. Although high socioeconomic status increases a person's level of generalized trust, which in turn enhances their bridging social capital, it does not necessarily enhance bonding social capital. Meanwhile, it is possible that people with a low socio-economic status, such as blue-collar workers, share a 'buddy feeling' with their close friends and co-workers that contributes to the cultivation of bonding social capital. Second, conversely, a cause could affect both bridging and bonding social capital in the same way. For example, Putnam (2000) shows that people who watch a lot of television are less likely to trust strangers and to be engaged in community activities. Thus watching television has a negative effect on bridging as well as bonding social capital.

Meso-level causes of social capital include civil society and associational involvement, school and community, ethnic and social heterogeneity, residential mobility, transport and commuting, and the physical environment and urban design (Halpern, 2005). The same cause has different effects depending on the type of social capital being created. Ethnic and social heterogeneity hinders the creation of bonding social capital but encourages the creation of bridging social capital. This logic is also applied to residential mobility. While low residential mobility contributes to the cultivation of bonding capital, residents of a community characterized by low mobility lack opportunities to interact with newcomers and thus do not learn to trust strangers (Macy and Sato, 2002).

Halpern (2005) identifies six macro-level causes of social capital: history and culture, social structures and hierarchy, economic inequality, labor market trends, the size and nature of the welfare state, and individual values and lifestyle choices. For example, Putnam (1993) focuses on the history and culture of northern and southern Italy to understand the difference in the level of social capital between the two regions. The effect of the welfare state is also worth mentioning. Generous welfare policies could enhance solidarity among citizens and thus create social capital. High social capital in turn gives legitimacy to the welfare state (Halpern, 2005: 273). In general, we can assume a mutual reinforcing mechanism between macro-level causes and social capital (Inaba, 2011).

A second dimension is whether social capital is created intentionally or unintentionally. Many scholars in this field assume that social capital is created unintentionally as a byproduct of other activities. As mentioned above, Putnam (1993) attributes the high level of social capital in northern Italy to history and

culture. Coleman argues that 'most forms of social capital are created or destroyed as a byproduct of other activities' (Coleman, 1990: 317). Take friendship relations for example. People make friends based on the intrinsic value of friendship (Arrow, 2000). However, when a person becomes sick, they may call friends for help, thus relying on social capital that is a byproduct of friendship.

On the other hand, Lin (2001a) and Burt (1992, 2005) are proponents of the idea that social capital is created intentionally. In Lin's theory on social capital and status attainment, actors try to improve their status by establishing ties with other actors of higher status. Likewise, in Burt's theory of structural holes, entrepreneurs try to create social networks that are rich in structural holes. Buskens and Van de Rijt (2008) developed a sophisticated model demonstrating the dynamics of the networks that actors create to maximize structural holes.

Although the unintentional creation of social capital can be separated from the intentional creation of social capital for analytical purposes, the two processes are empirically interrelated. It is interesting to examine how they change over time. For example, suppose that two school friends become business partners after graduation. The co-establishment of their business is an example of the conversion of friendship into social capital. Then suppose that they broke up their partnership, leading to the breakup of their friendship; the breakup of their business partnership would be converted into the breakup of social capital based on their friendship.

Critical assessment of theory and evidence

Two issues will be discussed in this section: (1) conceptual confusion and (2) the usefulness of the concept of social capital. Specialists in the field have found it almost impossible to reach a consensus on the conceptualization of social capital. Thus, as mentioned in the first section, it is important to define which aspects of social capital are being focused on in a particular analysis. Otherwise, the same concept might be used to mean different aspects of social capital.

The second issue is more crucial than the first one. Does social capital address new social phenomena, or is it just a new expression of classical concepts? If the latter is the case, we do not need to use the concept. Elster (2007) is harsh on this point: 'While the idea of "human capital" is a valuable extension of the idea of physical capital, the same cannot be said about "consumption capital" (Gary Becker), "cultural capital" (Pierre Bourdieu), and

“social capital” (Robert Putnam). At best, these are useless and harmless metaphors; at worst, they open fruitless avenues of research and suggest false causal hypotheses’ (Elster, 2007: 456).

Arrow (2000) criticized the concept more concretely. He argues that the metaphor of capital and the term ‘social capital’ should be abandoned (Arrow, 2000: 4). He maintains that capital requires three aspects – (1) extension in time, (2) deliberate sacrifice in the present for future benefit, and (3) alienability – and that social capital fails to satisfy the second requirement. This is because, from his theoretical perspective, ‘[t]he essence of social networks is that they are built up for reasons other than their economic value to the participants’ (Arrow, 2000: 4).

From Arrow’s viewpoint, social capital is just a metaphor, not a powerful new concept with which to study social phenomena. However, he misses the dynamics of social capital that are outlined above. An intriguing aspect of social capital is that it is created from the conversion of social networks established for other purposes, such as in the friendship example. This can also be applied to the dynamics of physical capital. Suppose that a person (Mr. A) has saved some money just in case of an unforeseen emergency; he has not done that for a particular future benefit. Then a friend (Ms. B) asks Mr. A to loan her the money because she wants to establish a business. If Mr. A invests in Ms. B’s business, the money becomes capital to her. The point of this example is that something is converted into capital through the utilities of the participants. This is explored in the next section.

New directions

Two new directions are proposed in this section: (1) the relationship between utility and social capital and (2) the relationship of social capital to local concepts. I have pointed out the importance of considering the utility and goals of actors when talking about their social capital. More formally, the relationship between utility and social capital can be expressed by the following formula:

utility = f (social networks, other components of social capital such as trust and norms)

This formula shows how the components of social capital determine the utility of an actor via his/her utility function. This formula helps us to understand the different effects of the components of social capital on different people and the same person at different times. As mentioned above, social closure becomes social capital for parents of high school

students and increases their utility, while it becomes negative social capital for entrepreneurs and decreases their utility. This is because the parents and entrepreneurs have different utility functions. Social closure is also social capital for a new migrant, but becomes a constraint over time. This is because the migrant’s utility function changes over time.

However, this argument is not systematic. We need to create a general theoretical framework on the relationship between components of social capital and the utility function that goes beyond these particular cases. What social position in what social structure forges what form of the utility function? Answering this question would contribute to the advancement of our knowledge on the effects of social capital.

A second direction is to study the relationship between social capital and local concepts that express similar meanings. Asian societies are rich in social relations among their members and there are words that express these relationships. *Guanxi*, for example, means social relations in Chinese (Lin, 2000b), and *Aidagara* and *En* are Japanese words that express social relations and the momentum behind them, respectively (Hamaguchi, 1985). According to Lin and Hamaguchi, such local terms have a deeper meaning than social capital, a western-born concept. In other words, social capital cannot capture the whole picture of social relations in Asian societies, while *Guanxi*, *Aidagara*, and *En* have not been used as universal concepts like social capital because scholars using them tend to emphasize their particularity (Sato, 2010). This tension between social capital and local concepts leads to research questions like the following:

1. Why have local concepts expressing social relations not been elaborated to universal sociological concepts like social capital?
2. If social capital does not grasp the locality of social relations, how can comparative studies on social capital be possible?
3. Is it possible to create a new concept that covers social capital as well as local concepts of social relations? If so, does this project contribute to our understanding of actors and society?

Answering these questions will enhance the study of social capital by adding global perspectives to it.

Annotated further reading

Too many books and articles have been published on social capital to cover them all here. Thus only a few books are listed to assist readers' understanding of the concept.

Halpern D (2005) *Social Capital*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

This is a balanced, readable book that can be used as a textbook. In the introductory chapter, Halpern explains the concept of social capital, its history, and its measurement. Then he shows the effects of social capital on economic performance, health and well-being, crime, education, and government and the effective state. Finally, he explores the causes of social capital and policy implications.

Lin N (1999) Building a network theory of social capital. *Connections* 22(1): 28–51.

This article is an excellent introduction to social capital with a broad coverage of literature in this field as well as a theoretically and empirically clear approach to the concept.

Lin N (2001) *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Putnam RD (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

As shown in the text, Lin is a strong proponent of the individualistic approach to social capital, whereas Putnam represents the collective approach to it. Thus comparing these books gives a broader perspective on the concept.

There are many edited books on social capital, and these are just a few of them. They contain chapters on social capital in many fields, thus readers could pick up chapters that interest them. Baron et al. (2000), Castiglione et al. (2008), Hsung et al. (2009), Lin et al. (2001), Lin and Erickson (2008), Ostrom and Ahn (2003), and Svendsen and Svendsen (2009) are also good collections of papers on social capital.

Dasgupta P and Serageldin I (eds) (2000) *Social Capital: A Multifaceted Perspective*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Grootaert C and Van Bastelaer T (eds) (2002) *Understanding and Measuring Social Capital: A Multidisciplinary Tool for Practitioners*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Grootaert C, Narayan D, Jones VN and Woolcock M (2004) *Measuring Social Capital: An Integrated Questionnaire*. Washington, DC: The World Bank. As a part of the activities of the World Bank, Dasgupta and Serageldin (2000) and Grootaert and Van Bastelaer (2002) focus on the relationship between social capital and development. This article did not give a full explanation on measurement of social capital, so Grootaert et al. (2004) would be helpful to those who want to measure social capital. Lin (1999), who is mentioned above, also gives a

clear theoretical explanation of measurement and shows how to measure social capital in concrete ways.

Bian Y (2001) *Guanxi* capital and social eating in Chinese cities: Theoretical models and empirical analyses. In: Lin N, Cook K and Burt RS (eds) *Social Capital: Theory and Research*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Hamaguchi E (1985) A contextual model of the Japanese: Toward a methodological innovation in Japan studies. *Journal of Japanese Studies* 11(2): 289–321.

Lin N (2001) *Guanxi*: A conceptual analysis. In: So AY, Lin N and Poston D (eds) *The Chinese Triangle of Mainland China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong: Comparative Institutional Analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Qi X (2012) A case study of globalized knowledge flows: *Guanxi* in social science and management theory. *International Sociology* 27(6): 707–723.

Sato Y (2010) Are Asian sociologies possible?: Universalism versus particularism. In: Burawoy M, Chang M and Hsieh MF (eds) *Facing an Unequal World: Challenges for a Global Sociology*, Vol. 2. Taipei: Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica and Council of National Associations of International Sociological Association.

Lin (2001) and Hamaguchi (1985) show the meaning of *Guanxi*, *Aidagara*, and *En*. Bian (2001) and Sato (2010) link such local concepts to social capital. Qi (2012), in line with Sato's interest in the status of the local concepts in global sociology, studies the status of *Guanxi* in the global flows of knowledge.

References

- Arrow JA (2000) Observations on social capital. In: Dasgupta P and Serageldin I (eds) *Social Capital: A Multifaceted Perspective*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Baron S, Field J and Schuller T (eds) (2000) *Social Capital: Critical Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blau PM and Duncan OD (1967) *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: Wiley.
- Bourdieu P (1986) The forms of capital. In: Richardson JE (ed.) *Handbook of Theory of Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Burt RS (1992) *Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burt RS (2005) *Brokerage and Closure: An Introduction to Social Capital*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buskens V and Van de Rijdt A (2008) Dynamics of networks if everyone strives for structural holes. *American Journal of Sociology* 114(2): 371–407.
- Castiglione D, Van Deth JW and Wolleb G (eds) (2008) *The Handbook of Social Capital*. Oxford: Oxford

- University Press.
- Coleman JS (1988) Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94(Supplement): S95–S120.
- Coleman JS (1990) *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Dasgupta P and Serageldin I (eds) (2000) *Social Capital: A Multifaceted Perspective*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Elster J (2007) *Explaining Social Behavior: More Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fukuyama F (2000) Social capital and civil society. IMF Working Paper WP/00/74.
- Gittell R and Vidal A (1998) *Community Organizing: Building Social Capital as a Development Strategy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Granovetter MS (1973) The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 78(6): 1360–1380.
- Grootaert C (1998) Social capital: The missing link? Social Capital Initiative Working Paper No. 3.
- Grootaert C and Van Bastelaer T (eds) (2002) *The Role of Social Capital in Development: An Empirical Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halpern D (2005) *Social Capital*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hamaguchi E (1985) A contextual model of the Japanese: Toward a methodological innovation in Japan studies. *Journal of Japanese Studies* 11(2): 289–321.
- Hsung R, Lin N and Breiger RL (eds) (2009) *Contexts of Social Capital: Social Networks in Markets, Communities, and Families*. New York: Routledge.
- Inaba Y (2007) *Social Capital: Solving Issues in Contemporary Economy and Society by 'Ties of Trust'*. Tokyo: Seisansei Shuppan (in Japanese).
- Inaba Y (2011) *Introduction to Social Capital: From Isolation to Ties*. Tokyo: Chuo Koron Shinsha.
- Kawachi I, Subramanian SV and Kim D (eds) (2008) *Social Capital and Health*. New York: Springer.
- Krishna A and Uphoff N (2002) Mapping and measuring social capital through assessment of collective action to conserve and develop watersheds in Rajasthan, India. In: Grootaert C and Van Bastelaer T (eds) *The Role of Social Capital in Development: An Empirical Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lin N (1990) Social resources and social mobility: A structural theory of status attainment. In: Breiger RL (ed.) *Social Mobility and Social Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lin N (1999) Building a network theory of social capital. *Connections* 22(1): 28–51.
- Lin N (2001a) *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lin N (2001b) *Guanxi: A conceptual analysis*. In: So AY, Lin N and Poston D (eds) *The Chinese Triangle of Mainland China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong: Comparative Institutional Analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Lin N and Erickson BH (eds) (2008) *Social Capital: An International Research Program*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lin N, Cook K and Burt RS (eds) (2001) *Social Capital: Theory and Research*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Lin N, Ensel WM and Vaughn JC (1981) Social resources and strength of ties: Structural factors in occupational status attainment. *American Sociological Review* 46: 393–405.
- Macy MW and Sato Y (2002) Trust, cooperation, and market formation in the U.S. and Japan. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 99(Suppl. 3): 7214–7220.
- Morgan SL and Sørensen AB (1999) Parental networks, social closure, and mathematical learning: A test of Coleman's social capital explanation of school effect. *American Sociological Review* 64(5): 661–681.
- Ostrom E and Ahn TK (eds) (2003) *Foundations of Social Capital*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Portes A (1998) Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 1–24.
- Portes A and Rumbert RG (1990) *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Portes A and Sensenbrenner J (1993) Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action. *American Journal of Sociology* 98(6): 1320–1350.
- Putnam RD (1993) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam RD (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Sakata S (2001) Social capital and developments. In: Sato H (ed.) *Aid and Social Capital: The Possibility of the Study of Social Capital*. Chiba: Institute of Developing Economies (in Japanese).
- Sato Y (2010) Are Asian sociologies possible? Universalism versus particularism. In: Burawoy M, Chang M and Hsieh MF (eds) *Facing an Unequal World: Challenges for a Global Sociology*, Vol. 2. Taipei: Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica and Council of National Associations of International Sociological Association.
- Svendsen GT and Svendsen GLH (eds) (2009) *Handbook of Social Capital: The Troika of Sociology, Political Science and Economics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Uphoff N (1999) Understanding social capital: Learning from the analysis and experience of participation. In: Dasgupta P and Serageldin I (eds) *Social Capital: A Multifaceted Perspective*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Woolcock M (1998) Social capital and economic development: Toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and Society* 27(2): 151–208.
- Woolcock M (2001) The place of social capital in understanding social and economic outcomes. *ISUMA: Canadian Journal of Policy Research*. 2(1): 11–17.

Yoshimichi Sato is Distinguished Professor of Tohoku University. He was the director of the Center for the Study of Social Stratification and Inequality for 10 years and has published six books on social stratification and inequality. He is also active in the study of rational choice theory. [email: ysato@sal.tohoku.ac.jp]

résumé On devrait s'attaquer à trois problèmes théoriques pour comprendre la variété des aspects du capital social: sa conceptualisation, ses effets sur la vie sociale et la société et ses causes. Cet article commence par la suggestion que les réseaux sociaux sont le cœur du capital social. Ce qui fait la différence entre les théories variées de capital social, c'est la façon d'ajouter des autres éléments au cœur du réseau social. Depuis, cet article montre l'importance de quatre aspects du capital social: les objectifs et les utilités des agents qui utilisent de capital social, les niveaux de définition, la couverture de capital social, et les sortes de capital social. En suivant du débat théorique, cet article revoit la littérature sur le domaine pour exposer les causes et les effets de capital social. Depuis, cet article examine des critiques sur le concept, et enfin propose deux directions nouvelles: (1) des recherches systématiques de la relation entre les composants de capital social et les fonctions d'utilité des agents, et (2) la recherche de capital social par rapport aux concepts locaux qui expriment de signification similaire.

mots-clés capital social ♦ confiance ♦ fonction d'utilité ♦ normes ♦ réseaux sociaux ♦ valeurs

resumen Se deben abordar tres cuestiones teóricas para entender la variedad de aspectos del capital social: su conceptualización, sus efectos sobre la vida social y la sociedad, y sus causas. Este artículo comienza con la proposición de que las redes sociales son el corazón del capital social. Lo que hace la diferencia entre las diversas teorías de capital social es como agregan otros elementos al corazón de la red social. Después, este artículo muestra la importancia de los cuatro aspectos del capital social: los objetivos y las utilidades de los agentes que utilizan el capital social, los niveles de definición, la cobertura de capital social, y las categorías de capital social. Después de la discusión teórica, este artículo revisa la literatura en el campo para explorar las causas y los efectos de capital social. Luego, este artículo examina las críticas del concepto, y finalmente propone dos nuevas direcciones: (1) las investigaciones sistemáticas de la relación entre los componentes de capital social y las funciones de utilidad de los agentes, y (2) el estudio de capital social en relación con los conceptos locales que expresan significados similares.

palabras clave capital social ♦ confianza ♦ función de utilidad ♦ normas ♦ redes sociales ♦ valores