

Social Capital and Civic Engagement

*Naim Kapucu**

ABSTRACT

The term social capital has been identified as a collection of resources that either an individual or organization gains through a set of communal norms, networks, and sanctions. Social capital can be viewed on both the collective and individual resource front and has been studied, analyzed, and reported on the micro, meso, and macro levels. The article reviews the literature on social capital from different perspectives. Specifically, the article focuses on bonding, linking, and bridging social capital. It also provides a small empirical evidence of social capital among young adults with discussions for future research and implications for civic engagement and social capital.

Keywords: Social capital, nonprofits, civic involvement, embeddedness, networks

* University of Central Florida.

INTRODUCTION

Social capital has been identified as a collection of resources that either an individual or organization gains through a set of communal norms, networks, and sanctions (Putnam 2000). Social capital can be viewed on both the communal and individual resource front and has been studied, analyzed, and reported on the micro, meso, and macro levels. As an individual resource, social capital plays a prevalent role in the economic performance of an individual, organization, and country through its support of increased informational flow and reduction of transaction costs. Bridging, bonding and linking of social capital can assist in the increasing of trust between individuals, and as such, promote a healthy and expanded social network (Halpern 2005; Field 2003).

There seems to be a general consensus that there is currently a decline in social capital within American communities (Putnam 2000). If there is a decline in social capital, "the quality of education is threatened, public safety suffers, philanthropy wakens, economic development lags, and especially civic institutions become less responsive" (Orlando Regional Chamber of Commerce 2005). If social capital among young adults continues to decline, then a connection between individuals and community will be lacking. Much research has been conducted in the past regarding social capital and proposals for the cause of the decline. This article has similar objectives but focuses on three attributes that characterize social capital. The article examines if there is a difference in means between age groups and their level of social capital. The sub-research questions as they relate to the attributes of social capital are: Is there a difference in means between age groups and their level of community involvement? Is there a difference in means between age groups and their level of trust? Is there a difference in means between age groups and their level of inter-personal relationships? It is assumed that young adults (ages 18-29) will have less social capital than the older age groups. They are less likely to be married and less likely to be politically involved, which leads to being less involved in their community. By comparing age groups and social capital, this data demonstrates which age groups are most involved in creating better communities.

The sample for this study was drawn from respondents to the 2005 survey on social capital, "The Ties That Bind: The Central Florida Social Capital Survey." The sample size consists of 1,606 people who responded to the study within seven Central Florida counties. Implications involve using this data to forecast future groups to target in hopes of an increase in social capital. Future studies can use this knowledge as a foundational framework

to make people of all age ranges more aware of social capital. This will benefit society and result in citizens getting more involved in civic engagement and becoming active citizens within their communities working with nonprofit and civic agencies, for example.

Social Capital: A Literature Review

The notion of *social capital* has become popular in a wide range of disciplines. The definition of the concept of social capital is complex which has been referred and illustrated with different explanations and meanings throughout the literature. The definitions of social capital vary based on relations between actors, the structure of these relations, internal and external types of linkages among actors (bonding & bridging), dimensions, etc. (Adler & Kwon 2002). In general, social capital can be defined as a structure of relations between actors (Coleman 1988), connections and networks among individuals and organizations (Kapucu 2008) which comprise reciprocal trust, norms, values (King 2004) and behaviors (Larsen et al. 2004). In other words, social capital can be explained “through changes in the relations among persons that facilitate actions” (Coleman 1988: 100). Compared to physical capital and human capital – social capital is relatively less tangible and observable which means that it is embodied more to the relations among actors (Coleman 1988; Healy 2001).

Putnam (2000) argues that social capital carries vast importance which allows resolving collective problems easily, increasing individual benefits by mutual cooperation, ensuring compliance with established norms and alleviating the individual burden in carrying out their missions. It establishes an environment where people are trustworthy, which leads to repeated interactions and creates a cost-effective environment in businesses and social transactions. Social capital constitutes the flow of information, facilitates achievement of goals, and in general contributes a big value to our life. Adler & Kwon (2002) illustrates the numerous cons of enhanced social capital as: influence in individual career success, enhancement of the pool of recruits for organizations, product innovation and resource exchange in firms, reduced turnover rates, strengthened supply relations, networking, organizational entrepreneurship, etc. Social capital is one of the core values which have a positive effect on individual as well as organizational effectiveness. It leads to sharing of communication; exchange of resources, knowledge, and trust which all contribute to improved organizational advantage, innovation, and value (Kapucu 2008).

Even though there are many affirmative outcomes of social capital, there is no guarantee that it will produce only positive results (Coffe & Geys 2006). Adler & Kwon (2002) draws attention on the positive and negative sides of social capital. They enhance three main types of benefits/advantages which relates to social capital. First, social capital significantly facilitates access to broad resources of information and knowledge. A high level of social capital provides vast access to information resources and facilitates enhancement of timely and high quality information. Second, the benefit of social capital can be described as influence, power and control. Power factors affect the ability of getting things done and increases leadership opportunities. The third benefit of social capital is solidarity. Organizations with high solidarity, culture and norms take advantage of a reduced need for formal controls and monitoring. Frequent interaction among actors, faster dispute resolution, increased organizational trust and commitment are affected from high solidarity.

One of the main disadvantages of maintaining social capital is related cost-effectiveness. Social capital requires a substantial investment in development and maintenance of relationships. The establishment of these relations often time result as being less cost-effective in certain situations. The development of strong ties among actors requires a big amount of time and resources which are less cost effective. The provision of weak ties cost less, and more often than not, are more preferable to use. The second risk of social capital is power benefits. Having contacts with actors, who in turn also have contacts with other actors, sometimes creates a vague situation. This means if the actor who receives information and is dependent on focal nodes and also has a relation with other actors then it makes this actor to be less dependent on focal nodes and expands its power. While having positive sides, it also represents some negative aspects. Solidarity may affect the relationship among actors and decrease the flow of new ideas and innovation in order to preserve cohesion of the group. Actors may be too embedded and loyal to their organizations or each other that they may lack the adaptation of novel ideas. Strong norms among actors may dictate the sharing of resources which may discourage individual incentives and slower the development of social capital (Adler & Kwon 2002). Another risk factor is that powerful networks and a high level of social capital, if not utilized, can be used in wrong purposes like for destruction of others. Also, individuals or actors that behave differently than the accepted culture, tradition and manner which are characteristic for networks may be banished or kicked out (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson 2008).

Putnam (2000) emphasizes the importance of trust and reciprocity within networks and between individuals as one of the possible ways to measure

social capital which also lead to enhanced collaboration and effectiveness. The different types of social capital and aspect of bonding and bridging networks have been given special attention over the literature. A distinction between homogenous and heterogeneous networks and their effects as positive externalities have been argued considerably. While bonding social capital is associated with closed networks (Coffee & Geys 2006) and denotes internal relation and social interaction of organizations and individuals with the same or similar background (Adler & Kwon 2002; Putnam 2000), bridging networks entails cross-cutting networks (Coffee & Geys 2006) which focus on external relations and generates reciprocal relations between different groups of society (Putnam 2000; Adler & Kwon 2002). Coffee & Geys (2006) argues that bridging social capital generalize and develop more positive externalities than bonding social capital. Their theoretical argument is based on the assumption that interaction and positive experiences with different individuals and actors enhances more trust and mutual understanding than cooperation among homogenous actors. Of course, this assumption does not argue and imply bonding social capital to be something negative, however it suggests that bridging social capital has more positive effects than bonding social capital on individuals and organizations. Besides bonding and bridging, some authors also recognize the “linking” form of social capital. Healy and Cote (2001) refer to the idea of linking social capital as relations existing between groups and individuals of different social layers which enables members to leverage the range of resources, ideas, information, and social outcomes than are available (Woolcock 2001).

Social Capital as Collective Resource

Social capital is a collection of resources that an individual or organized structure gains through a set of communal norms, networks, and sanctions. This can be studied at the individual micro-level; from the meso-level such as a community, organization, or state; or at the macro-level of a country or even globally. Social capital is formed through bonding in homogenous groups, bridging connections into external heterogeneous groups, and linking vertically with others of different levels of power and resources (Halpern 2005). According to Field (2003), the foundations of social capital began in the fields of economics, sociology, and political science. Human capital, associating an economic benefit to labor and skills, was popularized by economists Theodore Schultz and Gary Becker in the 1960s. These works became the foundation for others to study social capital and attempt to measure its benefits. Pierre Bourdieu, a European sociologist, studied social capital at the individual level. He believed that social capital was cultural capital primarily benefiting the upper class through their use of social

connections. James Coleman, an American sociologist, believed that social capital was a benefit available to and employed by all social classes. He viewed social capital as a public good and an asset that contributes to the social structure for the public's benefit. Becker's rational choice theories toward human capital and economic studies relating to families and education were especially important in the theoretical framework of Coleman's work. Robert Putnam, an American political scientist, expanded the study of social capital. He views it as "a resource that functions at a societal level" (Field, 2003: 40).

Social Capital as Individual Resource and Power of Networks

Field (2003) discusses the power of networks and the benefits of social capital that have been observed through empirical studies in a variety of disciplines. Regarding education, both parent and student connections had an impact on student achievement. It has been found that minorities and immigrants perform better academically when they have access to bridging relationships. The impact of mothers and achievement has also been studied. Only a minimal impact was found when the mother had a low-skill job. Moving after fifth grade had a negative impact on graduation rates although parental support can decrease the impact.

Coleman (1988) expands on the role of human capital and social capital relating to graduation rates. He uses rational action theory as the basis of his study with social capital being a resource available to the subjects and uses logistic regression to analyze his data. Social capital in Coleman's view builds human capital. Parents must share their human capital, i.e. knowledge, skills, time, and attention, with their children otherwise the parent's human capital is not transferred to the child. Single parent families and multiple children have negative effects on graduation rates presumably due to the lack of time and attention to devote to the children and a lack of time for involvement in the school community. Moving the family also had a negative impact on graduation rates with the number rising with each successive move due to a lack of strong community social capital and loss of norms. He also reports on dropout rates between Catholic, private, and public schools. Coleman finishes with his belief that social capital is a public good and people in general under-invest in social capital because they only perceive of a small portion of the benefits. Halpern (2005) goes on to discuss research regarding the economic benefits of social capital. Several studies found that a majority of people obtained employment through the use of bonding or bridging social capital. Companies further benefit by these networks through financial savings with lowered recruiting costs, longer

retention rates, and positive sources for future recruiting referrals. Longer retention rates helped businesses to withstand economic downturns, kept intellectual knowledge retention within the company, and helped to build a loyal customer base.

Social capital has important implications for society and reduces the effects of individual's acting for their own benefit. The collective action problem is similar to the individual's decision making process in rational choice theory. If everyone chose to act in a way that was most beneficial to him or herself, the outcome would be worse for all parties than if they all chose the other option (Warren et al. 2002). By increasing social capital, we as a society should be able to reduce the collective action problem through increased trust, stronger community, and bridging bonds, and reciprocal kind works towards each other. These bonds are important for social policy objectives because they foster increased political involvement, better overall health for citizens, higher educational achievement, decreases in crime, and improve economic gains. The process of social capital is circular with each act building on the last and fostering future growth.

Burt (1997) deals with social capital at the individual level – he says that individuals can gain social capital by spanning structural holes. Burt presents evidence that indicates that one can achieve a higher level of performance on a number of measures operating in a sparse network, while operation in a dense network usually results in lower levels of performance. However, if one spans a structural hole, unless you can create or maintain control (a situation in which you are the only link between the clusters of networks), other members of those clusters will meet one another and establish their own links, lessening individual social capital. On the other hand, Putnam deals with social capital at the group or community level. Putnam (2000) argues that “a well connected individual in a poorly connected society is not as productive as a well-connected individual in a well-connected society” (p. 20).

Nahapiet & Ghoshal (1998) discuss evolving organizational (firm) theory that focuses on an organization's ability to create and share knowledge instead of the more traditional focus on the causes and consequences of market failure. They present an argument in support, and the expansion of new public management that makes the following three arguments: 1) social capital facilitates the creation of new intellectual capital, 2) organizations, as institutional settings, are conducive to the development of high levels of social capital, and 3) it is because of their more dense social capital that affirms, within certain limits, have an advantage over markets in creating

and sharing intellectual capital. These arguments are presented in a series of hypothesized relationships between different dimensions of social capital and the main mechanisms and processes necessary for the development of intellectual capital. The authors argue that intellectual capital is created through two generic processes – combination and exchange. Combination, or the process that combines materials and forces to produce and contribute to economic development, has been assigned two speeds – incremental and radical (innovation). Exchange represents the transfer of knowledge between parties – sometimes building on old knowledge, sometimes coming together in teamwork to coactively create new knowledge. These relationship patterns are the foundation of social capital.

Evaluation of network positioning, organizational language, shared experiences, trust, norms, and obligations are all important to help an organization gain a competitive advantage by understanding how to best identify their position and then position themselves to take full advantage of their ability to develop social and thus intellectual capital. Cost, the negative face of social capital, and the logistics of managing such an organization are briefly discussed. This argument in favor of social capital as a means to intellectual capital is important because it supports a perspective that moves institutional theory from value appropriation to value creation – and would allow a firm to be proactive in the development of its organizational social relations structure.

Social Capital and Embeddedness

Granovetter (1985) discusses the extent to which economic action is embedded in structures of social relations – in essence – when money is involved; do people behave differently depending on the depth (embeddedness) of their societal relationships? His premise – that economic relations between individuals or firms are embedded in actual social networks and do not exist in an abstract idealized market, takes a position that is somewhat the middle of the road among social theorists – suggesting that embeddedness of economic behavior is lower in non-market (capital) societies than some development theorists imply, but that it is greater than many economists and formalists think. His embeddedness argument adds a dimension of consideration to the traditional economic concept of rational choice and stresses the role of concrete personal relations and structures (networks) in the generation of trust and malfeasance. In a critique of Oliver Williamson's *Markets & Hierarchies*, he finds evidence to support his premise that the more complex the economic interaction between organizations, the more likely it is to find the presence of networks of

interpersonal relations in direct proportion to efficiency. This groundbreaking work applied sociology concepts to economic evaluation, and continues to be used today in the emerging field of economic sociology – the study of how personal relationships and networks of relationships influence markets and hierarchies and organizational behavior.

Robert Putnam (1993) studies the role of social capital in political life by examining two possible explanations for differences in governance institutions in Italy: socioeconomic modernity and “civic community.” While he finds some support for the socioeconomic explanation, Putnam contends it does not tell the entire story and sets out to explore the potential correlation between effective democracy and “civic community.” Putnam (1993) defines “civic-ness” through four philosophical themes: civic engagement, measured by participation in public affairs; political equality, measured by horizontal cooperation versus vertical authority / dependency; solidarity, trust, and tolerance, which enable citizens to deal with conflict; and associations that incubate and reinforce community norms and values. But the connection between social capital and governance, though philosophically posited by others, had yet to be tested empirically.

Putnam addressed this shortfall by testing for correlation between social capital and the quality of governance. Putnam tested four indicators to tease out this relationship: association membership; newspaper readership; electoral turnout; and “preference voting.” Finding these indicators highly correlated, he combined them into a single “Civic Community Index” to examine whether the “civic-ness” of a region correlated with regional government performance. The resulting high correlation ($r = .92$), and the fact that the relationship between economic development and institutional performance vanished when “civic-ness” was taken into account, led him to conclude that “civic-ness” is a better predictor than socioeconomic factors. Putnam’s evidence also dismisses the philosophical notion that social capital is more prevalent in small, traditional villages (*Gemeinschaft*) than in large, rationalistic societies (*Gesellschaft*). Finding that the most traditional villages in Italy tend to rate low on “civic-ness” led him to reject the hypothesis that modernization inhibits civic community. And after finding the degree of political conflict totally uncorrelated with government performance, he also rejected the possibility that political consensus within civic communities could explain successful governance. He found no evidence for several other potential explanations, including: social stability; education; urbanism; personnel stability, and the Communist Party. In the final analysis, he concludes that the evidence clearly supports his hypothesis that the degree of “civic-ness,” or social capital, is the most important factor in explaining effective governance. This study’s insights provided the foundation for his

American study that focused interdisciplinary attention on the concept of social capital.

Organizational Social Capital

Leana and Van Buren (1999) build on social capital theory to develop a construct of organizational social capital and a model of its components. The authors define two components of organizational social capital--associability and trust--and contend both are necessary to develop organizational social capital. They then discuss how employment practices can encourage or discourage organizational social capital, and further illuminate its consequences, costs and benefits. The authors discuss three ways employment practices can manage social capital. Because trust is built over time, practices that promote job stability build social capital in organizations. Noting Coleman's emphasis on norms, they argue that reciprocity norms develop organizational social capital by rewarding individuals who share the organization's values and goals. Further following Coleman, they contend that bureaucracy can maintain organizational stability despite individual interests by using bureaucratic roles to define social structure in terms of positions rather than people. The authors argue that social capital must be balanced; as a public good, organizational social capital doesn't always provide immediate rewards to the individual, so the trick is to find employment practices that balance the levels of social capital held by the individual and the organization. They discuss the benefits of organizational social capital in justifying individual commitment to the collective good; facilitating flexibility; managing collective action and developing intellectual capital. But practices that increase social capital also have maintenance costs, and the authors also suggest social capital can sometimes impede innovation when the stability and strong norms that foster social capital keep participants embedded in established practices.

The authors propose organizational social capital as a unifying construct that can help redirect organizational emphasis from individual to long-term collective contributions to organizational success. They suggest their model extends the individual-contributions employment model by placing norms and relationships into the mix as a way to reduce transaction costs and add depth and breadth to the study of organizational effectiveness.

Social Capital and Association: Decline in Social Capital

The discussion of social capital is popular among social scientists, i.e., political scientists and sociologists. The trend is to bemoan the decline in

social capital within American communities, as Robert Putnam indicates (2000). A decline in social capital means that “the quality of education is threatened, public safety suffers, philanthropy weakens, economic development lags, and civic institutions become less responsive” (Orlando Regional Chamber of Commerce, 2005). While most authors discuss how to increase social capital, it is worth noting that Pamela Paxton conducted a study to see if the decline in social capital actually exists. Paxton measures social capital as a combination of trust and associations.

Associations or membership in groups has actually remained the same over the years. However, “there is some evidence for a shift toward more associations outside of neighborhoods” (Paxton 1999: 122). Because there is a change in where associations are made, this could explain the ‘decline’ in social capital that other researchers are worried about. Paxton seems more concerned because she found that trust in individuals has declined. “For example, consider the recent rise of gated communities and the increased use of private security guards. It could be that our trust in one another impact how we organize our lives...” (Paxton 1999: 123). Although Paxton indicates that there was not a decline in social capital, as most other authors claim, it seems apparent that she believes the possibility exists.

Another attribute of social capital chosen for this paper is the existence of personal relationships. According to Jo Anne Schneider (2001), “Personal relationships within a community are important and provide a safe and trusting environment for people, which assist in sharing and communicating information about resources which can result in an increase in social capital in many communities” (p. 3). Patricia Felkins (2002) claims that when groups (cultural, political, economical, etc.) share a common goal, they become linked in order to benefit the community. Most importantly, linked communities come together to discuss and diffuse local issues before they reach a crisis point. And according to Astone et al. (1999), social capital can depreciate if the relationships between family members depreciate.

Consider two cousins who in childhood lived on the same street and continue in adulthood to live nearby. Suppose further that the first of these cousins served in the armed forces and subsequently joined a veterans’ social club. The second cousin will probably become acquainted with some members of the social club by virtue of being invited to informal gatherings at the first cousin’s house. Through these face-to-face interactions, the second cousin may make many friends meet potential sexual partners and make business contacts. If one of the two cousins moves a hundreds of

miles away on becoming an adult, however, the effort required to maintain the relationship will increase; if both parties are not willing to increase their effort, the value of the relationship as a capital resource for meeting new people will depreciate (p. 4).

The consensus seems to be that personal relationships affect social capital, which is why it was chosen as an important attribute of social capital in this study. This study is based on the theory that young adults have less social capital than any other age group. Common sense seems to indicate that young adults are less likely to be married (or have close personal relationships through extended family) than those aged 30-105. More importantly, it is no secret that young adults are not as politically involved as others. Census data shows that Americans under the age of 30 vote much less than their older counterparts. "The facts are clear and compelling: today's youth express overwhelmingly cynical views about government and political leaders, and they cite their cynicism as a reason for their indifference to and disengagement from politics" (Bennett 1997: 50). The idea that young people are not involved in politics speaks to their involvement with their communities. Paxton (1999) believes that, "[s]ocial capital, as originally theorized, does not include specific actions of individuals, such as voting or volunteering – these are outcomes that we would expect to be *facilitated* by high levels of social capital" (1999: 101). According to Kwak et al. (2004):

Research has shown that associational life, in part, mobilizes members by functioning as a context in which various democratic virtues are enhanced. In particular, group activities and political discussion among members may broaden individuals' interest and concerns, making public affairs and political issues more salient. Moreover, active recruitment into political activities is thought to occur in social associations (644).

The social capital literature points to political activity as being a result of high social capital. It may be safe to assume that because young adults do not tend to be politically active, it is as a result of their social capital being low. However, Robert Putnam considers that political involvement may have increased among young adults, but the attributes of social capital has not increased for this age group. After the tragic events on September 11th, 2001, Americans have increased their involvement with friends within communities and public institutions. The level of citizens' political consciousness and engagement are higher than they had been in passed years, particularly among young Americans, aged 35 and under. Young

adults' interest in public affairs was found to have increased by 27 percent compared to past years. Although the research found an increase in public interest, there has been less of an increase in civic-minded behavior (Putnam 2000). The literature seems to confirm that at the very least political participation has been low among young adults; and some of the literature infers that this is a result of low social capital. Therefore, it is hypothesized that young adults have less social capital than those in other age ranges.

Young Adults and Civic Engagement

The analysis is based on the data collected by the Survey Research Laboratory in the Institute for Social and Behavior Sciences at the University of Central Florida among central Florida residents. Out of the seven counties in Central Florida, 1,606 citizens completed the survey. For research purposes, the focus is on the amount of social capital among young adults between the ages of 18 through 29. The age group of young adults will be compared to the other three age groups of respondents ranging from the ages of 30 up to 105. Out of the 1,606 respondents, 182 are within the range of analysis (18-29 year olds). The respondents were chosen through a random sampling process. In connection with the Survey Research Laboratory in the Institute for Social and Behavior Sciences at the University of Central Florida, a computer assisted telephone survey was conducted. Because the sample was chosen at random, and a large number of citizens answered the survey, the results are generalizable. The focus of this part of the article is to determine if there is a relationship between age groups and the level of social capital.

Responses to the questions were received through telephone surveys. At random, a computer-assisted method was used to call citizens living within Central Florida. The survey consisted of sixty-seven questions providing quantitative data. The survey begins and ends with questions that provide demographic information about the respondent. The bulk of the survey asks a range of questions about a person's religious preferences, work environment, social activities in their community, and political affairs. With each question, the respondent chose from a choice of answers. These answers have been developed to include all possibilities and with a concluding answer of "*don't know, not applicable, refused.*"

For research purposes, only nine survey questions were needed to answer the research questions (Appendix A). The survey instrument measures citizens' involvement within their communities through a range of questions. From the survey, the questions that particularly relate to

community involvement, trust, and inter-personal relationships are the focus. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program was used in analysis of the data. Nine survey questions were chosen that encompass the attributes of social capital, for this particular survey. ANOVA testing was used in comparing the age groups in response to their level of social capital.

1,606 citizens within the Central Florida counties answered the survey. A large sample size increases the precision of the data and reduces outliers. All the respondents were reached by a random method of computer dialing, which guaranteed that everyone in the population had an equal chance of being surveyed thus increasing generalizability. The validity of these measures is to show the amount of involvement within the community. With accurate measures, it will be determined how much social capital young adults contribute to in their community.

Statistical testing was used to determine if there is a difference of means between the age groups and social capital. The results were produced through ANOVA testing using nine attributes to distinguish social capital as an index variable (see appendix B). The results are statistically significant at p value 0.000. The post-hoc test shows the various mean comparisons between age ranges and the attributes of social capital (Appendix C). The mean scores show the differences of social capital among the age groups. The post-hoc test, Tukey, is designed to best measure comparisons between many groups. The Tukey test result shows the young adult's age group compared to the other three age groups. For example, when looking at Tukey HSD, the difference of social capital between 18-29 year olds and 30-49 year olds was 0.24764. This means that 18-29 year olds have greater social capital than 30-49 year olds. In fact, 18-29 year olds have greater social capital over all age groups and this is significant at the 0.05 level.

Conclusion

The article reviewed the social capital literature briefly from different perspectives. It also provided an example comparing social capital levels among different age groups in Central Florida. The analysis supports that there is a mean difference between age and community involvement, trust, and inter-personal relationships between the age groups. The study concludes that young adults comprise the most social capital out of all the age groups. With these unexpected results, it is now hypothesized that the younger generation are in the process of change and meeting new people constantly, while the older age groups live a more steady and routine life, which would explain the differences in social capital. This research should

provide a foundation for future studies related to social capital. For example, it may be interesting to look at social capital in terms of connections or contact. Another suggestion for future research could be analyzing other attributes of social capital and comparing them within a particular age group. A final recommendation for future research would be to examine this issue more carefully and then determine how to translate all this social capital that young adults have into engaging in community affairs and civic society. In conclusion, the age of a person does affect social capital; and young adults have more of an impact on social capital than was expected. Interestingly enough, this does not seem very surprising when considering the mobility and outgoing behavior of 18-29 year olds.

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank the Central Florida Social Capital Survey funding partners and Dr. Jim Wright for allowing us to use their survey in the paper. A group of student in my analytic techniques class discussed the youth civic engagement and social capital in their course projects. Additionally, I would like to thank Zafar Hasanov, graduate researcher at the Center for Public and Nonprofit Management, for his contribution to the literature review on social capital. I would like to thank also Davion Walker, research scientist at the Center for Public and Nonprofit Management, for his review of the manuscript.

Appendix A: Survey Questions on Social Capital and Volunteering

Nine survey questions were selected from the survey to study three questions relating to each attribute of social capital. The nine were combined to create one social capital index variable and each individual attribute set was also used to construct social capital attribute index variables.

TRUST

6. Now, I want to ask you some questions about how you view other people. Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?

- 1 People can be trusted
- 2 You can't be too careful
- 3 (VOLUNTEERED) Depends
- 8 Don't Know
- 9 Refused

25. How about the STATE government here in Florida? How much of the time do you think you can trust the STATE government to do what is right? [IF NEEDED: Would you say just about always, most of the time, only some of the time, or hardly ever?]

- 1 Just about always
- 2 Most of the time
- 3 Some of the time
- 4 Hardly ever
- 9 DK/NA/Refused

25-A. And how about COUNTY government there in [COUNTY]? How much of the time do you think you can trust the COUNTY government to do what is right? [IF NEEDED: Would you say just about always, most of the time, only some of the time, or hardly ever?]

- 1 Just about always
- 2 Most of the time
- 3 Some of the time
- 4 Hardly ever
- 9 DK/NA/Refused

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

32. In the past 12 months, have you taken part in any sort of activity with people at your church or place of worship other than attending services? This might include teaching Sunday school, serving on a committee, attending choir rehearsal, retreat, or other things like that.

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 8 Not applicable (R has no religion)
- 9 DK/NA/Refused

56. Now, I'm going to ask you about how many times you may have done certain things in the past twelve months. For all of these, I want you just to give me your best guess, and don't worry that you might be off a little.

About how many times in the past 12 months did you attend a celebration, parade, or a local sports or art event in your community? (About how often did you) take part in artistic activities with others such as singing, dancing, or acting with a group? (About how often did you) play cards or board games with others? (About how often did you) visit relatives in person or had them visit you? (About how often did you) have friends over to your home? (About how often were you) in the home of a friend of a different race or had them in your home? (About how often did you) socialize with coworkers outside of work? (About how often did you) attend any public meeting in which there was discussion of town or school affairs?

Would you say you did this?

- 0 Never
- 1 Once
- 2 A few times
- 3 About once a month on average
- 4 Twice a month on average
- 5 About once a week on average
- 6 More often than once a week?
- 9 DK/NA/Refused

58. About how many times in the past twelve months have you volunteered?

- 0 Never
- 1 Once
- 2 A few times
- 3 About once a month on average
- 4 Twice a month on average
- 5 About once a week on average
- 6 More often than once a week?
- 9 DK/NA/Refused

PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

46. Now, I want to ask you some questions about family, friends, and neighbors. First, I'd like you to describe your household. Are you currently married, separated, divorced, widowed, or have you never married?

- 1 Currently married
- 2 Separated
- 3 Divorced
- 4 Widowed
- 5 Never Married
- 9 DK/NA/Refused

51. Next I have a few questions about your IMMEDIATE NEIGHBORS. These are the 10 or 20 households that live closest to you. About how often do you talk to or visit with your immediate neighbors – just about everyday, several times a week, several times a month, once a month, several times a year, once a year or less, or never?

- 1 Just about everyday
- 2 Several times a week
- 3 Several times a month
- 4 Once a month
- 5 Several times a year
- 6 Once a year or less
- 7 Never
- 9 DK/NA/Refused

53. Now, how about friends? About how many CLOSE FRIENDS do you have these days? These are people you feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help. Would you say that you have no close friends, one or two, three to five, six to ten, or more than that?

- 1 No close friends
- 2 1-2 close friends

- 3 3-5 close friends
- 4 6-10 close friends
- 5 More than 10 close friends
- 9 DK/NA/Refused

Appendix B: Descriptive Table

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
18-29	160	2.5469	.53896	.04257	2.4628	2.6310	1.44	4.22
30-49	432	2.2992	.44524	.02142	2.2571	2.3414	1.33	3.78
50-64	341	2.2374	.44427	.02405	2.1901	2.2847	1.33	3.78
65 and over	347	2.1854	.44295	.02378	2.1386	2.2321	1.11	3.67
Total	1280	2.2829	.46950	.01312	2.2572	2.3086	1.11	4.22

Appendix C: Post Hoc Tests: Multiple Comparisons (Dependent Variable: Social Capital)

	(I) age of respondent in categories	(J) age of respondent in categories	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Tukey HSD	18-29	30-49	.24764(*)	.04229	.000	.1389	.3564
		50-64	.30949(*)	.04378	.000	.1969	.4221
		65 and over	.36153(*)	.04367	.000	.2492	.4739
	30-49	18-29	-.24764(*)	.04229	.000	-.3564	-.1389
		50-64	.06186	.03311	.242	-.0233	.1470
		65 and over	.11389(*)	.03296	.003	.0291	.1987
	50-64	18-29	-.30949(*)	.04378	.000	-.4221	-.1969
		30-49	-.06186	.03311	.242	-.1470	.0233
		65 and over	.05204	.03486	.442	-.0376	.1417
	65 and over	18-29	-.36153(*)	.04367	.000	-.4739	-.2492
		30-49	-.11389(*)	.03296	.003	-.1987	-.0291
		50-64	-.05204	.03486	.442	-.1417	.0376

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S.-W. (2002). Social Capital: Prospects for a New Concept. *The Academy of Management Review*, 27 (1), 17-40.
- Astone, Nan Marie, Constance A. Nathanson, Robert Schoen, Young J. Kim (1999). "Family Demography, Social Theory, and Investment in Social Capital," *Population and Development Review* 25.1, (pgs. 1-31)
- Bennett, Stephen E. (1997). "Why Young Americans Hate Politics, and What We Should Do About It." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 30(1): 47-53.
- Burt, R. (1997). The Contingent Value of Social Capital. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 339-365.
- Campo, S. S., & McFerson, H. M. (2008). *Public Management in Global Perspective*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Coffe, H., & Geys, B. (2006). Towards an Empirical Characterization of Bridging and Bonding Social Capital. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36 (1), 121-139.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95-120.
- Felkins, Patricia (2002). *Community at Work: creating and celebrating community in organizational life*. Hampton Press: New Jersey.
- Field, John. 2003. *Social Capital*. New York: Routledge.
- Gittell, Marilyn (2003). *Social Capital and Social Citizenship*. Maryland: Lexington Books.
- Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*. 91(3). 481-510.
- Halpern, David. (2005). *Social Capital* (pp. 43-72). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Healy, C. S. (2001). *The Well-being of Nations. The role of human and social capital*. Paris: OECD.
- Jasinski, J & Wright, J. (2005). *The Ties That Bind: The Central Florida Social Capital Survey, Marginal Results, County-by-County*. Institute for Social and Behavior Sciences, University of Central Florida.
- Kapucu, Naim. (2008). Network Analysis in Nonprofit Management. *Political Science and Public Administration Journal (AUSBF)* 63(2): 65-89.
- King, N. K. (2004). Social Capital and Nonprofit Leaders. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 14 (4), 471-486.
- Kwak, Nojin, Dhavan V. Shah, Lance Holbert (2004). "Connecting, Trusting, and Participating: The Direct and Interactive Effects of Social Associations." *Political Research Quarterly*. 57.4 (pgs. 643-652)

- Larsen, L., Harlan, S. L., Bolin, B., Hackett, E. J., Hope, D., Kirby, A., et al. (2004). Bonding and Bridging: Understanding the Relationship between Social Capital and Civic Action. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24, 64-77.
- Leana, C. R., Buren III, H. J. V. (1999). Organizational Social Capital and Employment Practices. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 538-555.
- Nahapiet, J & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*. 23(2). 242-266.
- Orlando Regional Chamber of Commerce (2005). *The Ties That Bind: The Central Florida Social Capital Survey*. Retrieved on January 31, 2006 from <http://www.orlando.org/index.php?src=gendocs&id=301&category=About%20Us>
- Putnam, Robert (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993). Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy, Chapter 4. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Paxton, Pamela (1999). "Is Social Capital Declining in the United States? A Multiple Indicator Assessment." *The American Journal of Sociology*. 105.1 (pgs. 88-127)
- Schneider, Jo Anne (2001). The Kenosha Capital Study: Churches, Nonprofits, and Community. Indiana University of Pennsylvania. (pgs. 3-4).
- Warren, M. R., Thompson, M. R., & Saegert, S. (2002). The Role of Social Capital in Combating Poverty. In S. Saegert, J. P. Thompson, & M. R. Warren (Eds.), *Social Capital and Poor Communities*, (pp. 1-28). New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press.
- Woolcock, M. (2001). The place of social capital in Understanding Social and Economic Outcomes. *Canadian Journal of Policy Research*, 2 (1), 11-17.