

Community Social Capital, Caste and Village

Mr. John Peter V¹, Ms. Midhila Krishnan², Dr. S. Kalavathi³

¹Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, Queen Mary's College, Tamil Nadu, India

² Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, Queen Mary's College, Tamil Nadu, India

³ Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, Queen Mary's College, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract: Putnam's concept of Social Capital was derived from the Coleman's functional perspectives, and he defined the social capital as "features of social organization, such as trust, norms and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions". A cross sectional study was designed to measure the social capital of Kilpenathur Block, Thriuvannamalai District, Tamil Nadu, India. The block was categorized into four clusters as north, south, east, and west, from each of the clusters, randomly one village was selected for the research and 400 respondents were studied. The data were collected randomly to measure the community social capital. The social capital scale was constructed by using the extraction of principle axis factoring method. Three factors were identified based on the grouping of variables, such as Neighbourhood connection/Trust, Community participation, and Community Network. Independent t-test results indicated about gender and three factors of social capital (Neighbourhood connection/Trust, Community Participation, and Community Network) and had highly significant difference (sig. 00). Chi-square tests were conducted between caste community (CC) and demographic variables, such as occupation, education, house, farm power and land. Consequently the tests were also conducted for village community (VC) and demographic variables such as occupation, education, house, farm power and land. The chi-square test results for CC and Occupation (sig.000), Education (sig.000), House (sig.000), Farm power (sig.015), Land (sig.000) and Age group (sig.000) showed high significance difference.

Keywords: Community, Village, Panchayat, Social capital, Network,

1. INTRODUCTION

The word social capital was appeared from an article of Lyda Judson Hanifan in a year 1916 from the school of rural community centre (Hanifan 1916). Bourdieu was the pioneer to conceptualize the social capital concept in sociology. He introduced the concept in French version of the book "Distinction", it was published in the year 1979 (Adam and Roncevic 2003; Bourdieu 1984). He defined 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 - or in other words, to membership in a group - 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". It was concentrated on acquiring potential resources through durable networks from the institutional relationships to benefit through the group members (Bourdieu 1986).

Lin had contributed the book of social capital with fully developed theoretical framework in the year 2001 and to him social capital was a "resources embedded in a social structure that were accessed and/or mobilized in purposive actions" (Lin 2001a). He conceptualized the ideas, as the resources were rooted in social structure at purposive actions. He had distinguished the concept of social capital into two types as contact resources and network resources (Lin 2001b). Coleman had considered social capital in a functional perspective to originate the social capital resources. He conceptualizes the idea that "social - structural resources" were derived from the structures of social relations. He defined concept as "social capital is not a single entity but a variety of different entities having two characteristics in common: They all consist of some aspect of a social structure, and they facilitate certain actions of individuals who are within that structure, Like other forms of capital, social capital is productive, making possible the achievement of certain ends that would not be attainable in its absence" (Coleman 1990). Putnam concept was derived from the Coleman's functional perspectives, and defines the social capital as "features of social organization, such as trust, norms and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions" (Putnam 1993). Again he redefined the definition as "connections among individuals - social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them" (Putnam 2000). Social capital included the resources of relationships existence in individuals, groups and communities, and the spring from these relationships were not personal but public. Paul Collier describes about social capital and it was 'social' in nature, and it involves some non-market process, which nevertheless has economic effects. We had

conducted a study to construct a community social capital scale, in order to measure the level of social capital among adults in villages.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

We had used cross sectional study design to measure the social capital of Kilpenathur Block, Thriuvannamalai District, Tamil Nadu, India. The block was categorized in to four clusters as north, south, east, and west, from each of the clusters, randomly one village was selected for the research. Those villages were Sriunathur, Kalpoondi, Rajanthangal and Kaniampoondi. According to the 2011 census of India, Sriunathurpanchayat had the population of 3032, Male 448 and Female 436. Kalpoondipanchayat had the total population of 1526, Male 758 and Female 768. Rajanthangalpanchayat had the total population of 1755, Male 901 and Female 854. Kaniampoondipanchayat had the population of Male 448, Female 436 and total population 884. Over all four villages together the total population was 7197. For this population, the sample size was calculated with the margin of error 5%, Confidence level 95% and sample proportion of 50%. The total arrived sample size was three sixty five. So we were decided to collect sample size at the equal proportion. From each of these villages, hundred each of 400 respondents were studied and data were collected randomly to measure the community social capital.

For the Measurement of community social capital scale, we had identified 70 questions from various reviews. Those questions were assessed and scrutinized as 11 questions based on the opinion of subject experts and those questions weremodified in to the Indian context. We had done factor analysis to classify the factors for social capital, through principle axis factor analysis in SPSS. The Principle Axis Factor analyses were predicted three factors for the eleven variables and the reliability test was conducted for the predicted factors and the Cronbach's Alpha value was .731. This reliability score was considered to be fulfilling to conduct or to carry forward the study. These three factors scores were computed in to a social capital score. The total social capital score (TSCS) was recoded as Low social capital score (LSCS - 11 to 21), Medium Social Capital Score (MSCS - 22 to 44), High Social Capital Score (HSCS- 45 to 55) value. The demographic variables of the respondents and total social capital score were tested with chi-square test, ANOVA and independent t-test. All these test and analysis were conducted in SPSS 21 version.

3. RESULTS

The social capital scale was generated by using the extraction of principle axis factoring method. The factors were categorized by using rotation method of Varimax with Kaiser Normalization test. Three factors were identified based on the grouping of variables, such as Neighbourhood connection/Trust, Community participation, and Community Network. If the cronbach's alpha values were deleted for the factor one, the values are reduced to .553. If the factor two was deleted from the scale, it values were reduced to .613. If the factor three was deleted from the scale, the values werereduced to .725.

Table 1: Community Social Capital Scale (Rotated Factor Matrix^a)

Questions	Factor		
	Neighbourhood connection/Trust	Community Participation	Community Network
How many times have you visited a neighbour in the past week?	.800	.165	.148
Most of the people in this village/Neighbourhood are basically honest and can be trusted?	.765	.183	.106
If you drop your purse or wallet in the neighbourhood, someone will see it in and return it to you?	.475	.329	.200
Do you go outside your local community to visit your Family/Friends/Relatives?	.452	.349	.149
How many people did you talk to yesterday (Min 4 people)?	.106	.634	.167
When you go shopping or out to eat, how often do you see or run into someone you know by name?	.364	.569	.342
Do you think that in this neighbourhood/ village people generally trust each other in matters of lending and borrowing?	.153	.567	-.006
When you were going for a shopping in a local area, how often do you join with the friends and neighbours?	.307	.430	.022
How often do you help a local group as a volunteer?	.058	-.058	.826
In the past week, how many phone conversations have you had with family and relatives?	.495	.258	.545
Have you attended a local community event in the past 6 months (e.g., church/temple/Mosque fete, School program, Craft exhibition, General program)?	.153	.226	.460

Out of four (Sirunathur, Kalpoondi, Rajanthangal, and Kaniampoondi) villages, none of the villages were found to have high social capital score between the age group of 45 to 55. The social capital was measured among four

villages in Kilpenathur Block and there were no significance difference between the four villages (Sig .62). (see table: 2)

The respondent's age groups and social capital had the (sig.013) significance difference. Between the age group of 29 to 39 had medium social capital score for 112 respondents, out of 159 respondents, which was 70.44%. The age group between 18 to 28 years had medium social capital score for 71 respondents, out of 83 respondents, and which was 85.54%. The age group among 51 to 60 had the medium social capital score for 66 respondents, out of 77 respondents, which was 85.71%. The age group of 40 to 50 years had the medium social capital score for 62 respondents, out of 81 respondents, which was 76.54%. The social capital and gender indicated high significance difference of sig.000. The male respondents of 182 had medium social capital score, out of 196 respondents, which was 92.85%. And 129 female respondents were having medium social capital score, from the total respondents of 205 and which was 62.92%. The respondent caste community status and social capital had shown the significance difference of Sig.008. (see table: 2)

From the overall scheduled caste population of 152 respondents, 29.60% of the respondents were rated as low social capital and 70.39% respondents were rated as medium social capital. From the total most backward class population of 45, 8.88% of the respondents had low social capital score and 91.11% respondents had medium social capital. In Backward class 30 (17.96%) respondents had low social capital score, 137 (82.03%) respondents had medium social capital score, out of 167 (41.75%) respondents. Among the total other caste respondents, 27.77% of the respondents had low social capital score and 72.22% of the respondents had the medium social capital score.

Table 2: Measurement of Community Social Capital

S.No	Variables	Low Social Capital	Medium Social Capital	Total	Pearson Chi-Square Significance
I	Village				
1	Sirunathur	19 (19%)	81(81%)	100 (25%)	Sig. (.620)
2	Kalpoondi	25 (25%)	75(75%)	100 (25%)	
3	Rajanthangal	20(20%)	80(80%)	100 (25%)	
4	Kaniampoondi	25(25%)	75(75)	100 (25%)	
II	Age				
1	18 to 28	12 (14.45%)	71(85.54%)	83 (20.75%)	Sig. (.013)
2	29 to 39	47 (29.55%)	112 (70.44%)	159 (39.75%)	
3	40 to 50	19 (23.45%)	62 (76.54%)	81 (20.25%)	
4	51 to 60	11 (14.28%)	66 (85.71%)	77 (19.25%)	
III	Gender				
1	Male	13 (6.63%)	182 (92.85%)	196 (49%)	Sig. (.000)
2	Female	76 (37.07%)	129 (62.92%)	205 (51.25%)	
IV	Community				
1	SC	45 (29.60%)	107 (70.39%)	152 (38%)	Sig. (.008)
2	MBC	4 (8.88%)	41 (91.11%)	45 (11.25%)	
3	BC	30 (17.96%)	137 (82.03%)	167 (41.75%)	
4	OC	10 (27.77%)	26 (72.22%)	36 (9%)	
V	Occupation				
1	None	68 (43.87%)	87 (56.12%)	155 (38.75%)	Sig. (.000)
2	Labourer	16 (9.09%)	160 (90.90%)	176 (44%)	
3	Business	0 (0%)	35 (100%)	35 (8.75%)	
4	Independent profession	4 (17.39%)	19 (82.60%)	23 (5.75%)	
5	Cultivation	1 (9.09%)	10 (90.90%)	11 (2.75%)	
VI	Education				
1	Illiterate	49 (33.79%)	96 (66.20%)	145 (36.25%)	Sig. (.000)
2	Can read only	16 (34.07%)	31 (65.96%)	47 (11.75%)	
3	Can read and write	8 (11.11%)	64 (88.88%)	72 (17.5%)	
4	Primary	0 (0%)	37 (100%)	37 (9.25%)	
5	Middle	0 (0%)	12 (100%)	12 (3%)	
6	High School	12 (25.53%)	35 (74.46%)	47 (11.75%)	
7	Graduate	4 (10%)	36 (90%)	40 (10%)	
VII	House				
1	No House	0 (0%)	52(100%)	52 (13%)	Sig. (.000)
2	Hut	0 (0%)	20(100%)	20 (5%)	
3	Kutcha House	1 (7.69%)	12 (92.3%)	13 (3.35%)	
4	Mixed House	26(17.21%)	125 (82.78%)	151 (37.75%)	
5	Pucca House	58(37.66%)	96 (62.33%)	154 (38.5%)	
6	Mansion	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	10 (2.5%)	

The respondents' occupational status and social capital score had showed highest significance difference of Sig.000. Out of total respondents of 155 were having no jobs, the 56.12% of the respondents had medium social capital score and 43.87% respondents had less social capital score. Out of 176 total respondents belong to the category of labourer, 90.90% of the respondents were having medium social capital score and 9.09% of the respondents were having less social capital score. Out of total respondents 35 under the category of business, all the respondents were having medium social capital score and none had less social capital score. Out of 23 total respondents under Independent profession, 82.60% of the respondents were having medium social capital and 17.39% of the respondents had less social capital score. Out of total respondents of 11 under the profession of cultivation, 90.90% of the respondents were having medium social capital score and 9.09% of the respondents were having less social capital score.

The respondents' education and social capital were representing the high significance value of sig.000. Out of total respondents of 145 illiterates, 33.79% of the respondents were having less social capital score and 66.20% of respondents were having medium social capital score. Out of total respondents of 47 (11.75%), 16 (34.07%) respondents had less social capital and 31 (65.96%) respondents had medium social capital. Out of total respondents can read and write were 72 (17.5%), 8 (11.11%) respondents had less social capital and 64 (88.88%) respondents had medium social capital. Among 37 (9.27%) of primary school respondents, 37 (100%) of the respondents had medium social capital score and none of the non-primary school respondents had less social capital score. Among 12 (3%) of Middle school respondents, 12 (100%) respondents were having medium social capital and none of the non-middle school respondents had less social capital score. Among 47 (11.75%) of the high school respondents, 35 (74.46%) respondents were having medium social capital score and 12 (25.53%) respondents had less social capital score. Among 40 (10%) of the graduate respondents, 36 (90%) of respondents were having medium social capital score and 4 (10%) of the respondents had less social capital.

The results of housing and social capital are giving the highest significance difference of sig.000. Out of total respondents of 52 (13%), 52 (100%) of the respondents were having medium social capital and no respondents had less social capital. Among 20 (5%) of the respondents in hut house, all 20 (100%) of the respondents were having medium social capital and none of the respondents had less social capital score. Among 13 (3.35%) of the Kutch House respondents, 12 (92.3%) of the respondents were having medium social capital and 1 (7.69%) of the respondent had less social capital score. Among 151 (37.75%) of the Mixed House respondents, 125 (82.78%) of the respondents were having medium social capital score and 26 (17.21%) of the respondents had less social capital score. Among the 154 (38.5%) of the Pucca House respondents, 96 (62.33%) of the respondents were having medium social capital score and 58 (37.66%) of the respondents had less social capital score. Among the 10 (2.5%) of the Mansion respondents, 4 (40%) of the respondents were having less social capital and 6 (60%) respondents had medium social capital score.

The ANOVA was conducted between the three factors of social capital (Neighbourhood connection/Trust, Community Participation, and Community Network) and age group, among these only Community Network and age group had significance difference between the group and within the group at the significance difference of sig.003. Independent t-test results had indicated about gender and three factors of social capital (Neighbourhood connection/Trust, Community Participation, and Community Network) had highly significant difference (sig. 00). The test results of ANOVA about Caste community and factors of social capital were having high significant difference between and within the caste community groups on Neighbourhood connection/trust, community participation and Community network.

The test results had also delivered no significant difference of (sig. 688) between Scheduled caste and backward caste on Neighbourhood connection/Trust. Community participation between Scheduled caste (SC) and backward caste (BC) (sig. 761) and other caste (OC) (sig. 335) had no significant difference. The community network between SC and OC (sig. 1.00) were having no significant difference. Most backward caste (MBC) and other caste (OC) were having no significance difference of sig. 145, Backward caste and Other caste were having no significance difference of sig. 343. Between OC and SC (sig. 1.0), MBC (sig. 145), BC (sig. 343) were having no significance difference. But the Chi-square test for caste community and total social capital score had high significant difference of sig. 008.

Chi-square tests were conducted between caste community (CC) and demographic variables, such as occupation, education, house, farm power and land. Consequently the tests were also conducted for village community (VC) and

demographic variables such as occupation, education, house, farm power and land. The chi-square test results for CC and Occupation (sig.000), Education (sig.000), House (sig.000), Farm power (sig.015), Land (sig.000) and Age group (sig.000) had showed high significance difference. But the chi-square test results for VC and Occupation (sig.883), Education (sig.465), House (sig.995), Farm power (sig.656), Land (sig.668) and Age group (sig.425) had showed no significance difference.

4. DISCUSSION

The social capitals for four villages were not reached to the high social capital score, but it was remained in low and medium social capital score. The study conducted in four villages had not shown any significance difference among social capital and village, it was clear sign that whole block have equally dispersed social capital. The analysis between the age group and social capital projected that at the age group of 29 to 39 were having the highest percentage of 41.9% social capital difference. Age group of 40 to 50 were having the 30.6% of Social capital difference. Age group of 18 to 28 (16.9%) and 51 to 60 age group (16.6%) of social capital differences were presented among the measurement of social capital and age. The results clearly indicated about the age group of 29 to 39 and it had the highest social capital differences because this group were considered to be active and potentially working group.

Gender and social capital results were projected that male population had the minimal social capital difference 7.14% between low social capital and medium social capital. Female respondents had 58.9% of social capital difference between low social capital score and medium social capital score. However both gender respondents were having medium social capital at more numbers. Considerably female more respondents were falling under low social capital. Measurements of caste community social capital were pointing that more number of respondents (45nos) were falling under low social capital score. Scheduled caste communities are the vulnerable groups in India, who are unprivileged to education, social participation and economic development.

When it comes to backward caste groups, they had more number of respondents (137nos) under the category of medium social capital score. Comparatively backward caste communities are self-independent and thriving to be educated, employed and economically developed. Similarly, the SC and BC communities were having no difference of Neighbourhood connection/Trust, Community Participation, and Community Network but still the SC communities were not economically independent because comparing to BC community, SC community people were less involved in own business.

5. CONCLUSION

The results of the study indicate that there are no significant changes in the manifestation of social capital based on the different village panchayats. But in connection with demographic dynamics of the village population and the community differentiation, social capital varies accordingly. The results of the study indicated that individuals belong to the young age group have comparatively high social capital and in terms of community, Backward Caste categories have high social capital. Village communities, as large heterogeneous groups are not significantly different from each other in terms of social capital. But small homogeneous groups like caste and community and its subtle features makes huge differences in the manifestation of social capital. It varies according to the demographic features and community characteristics.

REFERENCES

- Hanifan., and Lyda Judson (1916). "The Rural School Community Center" *Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science*.67: 130 – 8.
- Adam, Frane and Borut, Roncevie (2003). "Social Capital: Recent Debates and Research Trends ." *Social Science Information*.42: 155 – 83.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1986). "The Forms of Capital." Pp. 241 – 58 in J. G. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Lin, Nan. (2001a). *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Lin, Nan . (2001b). "Building a Network Theory of Social Capital." Pp. 3 – 29 in N. Lin, K. Cook and R. S. Burt (eds.), *Social Capital: Theory and Research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Coleman, James S. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Putnam, Robert D. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Oberle M. (2016) Robert D. Putnam: *Bowling Alone. The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon and Schuster 2000, 541 S. In: Salzborn S. (eds) *Klassiker der Sozialwissenschaften*. Springer VS, Wiesbaden