

To appear in Handbook on Social Capital, edited by Dario Castiglione, Jan van Deth and Guglielmo Wolleb, Oxford University Press

Central aim: Identify the central topics related with the concept of social capital to describe a network-based theory of social capital and point out how such a theory should help resolving a number of prevalent and critical issues.

The section **Definition and theory** places social capital in a family of capital theories.

Social capital definition: resources embedded in one's social networks, resources that can be accessed or mobilized through ties in the networks (Lin 2001a: Chapter 2). Through such social relations or through social networks in general, an actor may borrow or capture other actors' resources (e.g., their wealth, power or reputation). These social resources can then generate a return for the actor.

Sources of social capital: (1) structural positions, an actor's position in the hierarchical structure of social stratification. (2) Network locations, an actor's location in the networks that exhibit certain features, such as closure or openness, or bridging. (3) Purposes of action: instrumental- e.g., for gaining wealth, power, or reputation, or expressive - e.g., for maintaining cohesion, solidarity, or well-being. (Lin 2001a: Chapter 5).

Each of the following sections in the chapter addresses one of the next issues:

1.-Whether social capital should be assessed in terms of its potential capacity (access) or its actual use (mobilization): **ACCESS AND MOBILIZATION**

2.-How can rigorous measurements can be developed: **MEASUREMENTS**

3.-How social capital can be distinguished from social networks: **SOCIAL NETWORKS AND SOCIAL CAPITAL**

The two concepts are not equivalent or interchangeable terms. Networks provide the necessary condition for access to and use of embedded resources. Without networks, it would be impossible to capture the embedded resources. Network features should be seen as important and necessary antecedents exogenous to social capital.

For example, for a given network, density or closure of networks may increase the sharing of resources among participants as individuals and/or as a group (Bourdieu, 1980; Bourdieu, 1983/1986; Coleman, 1990: Chapter 12). On the other hand, sparse or open networks may facilitate access to better or more varied resources or information, control or influence (Burt, 2001; Lin, 1999a). What is needed is to specify conditions under which certain network features such as density or openness lead to the capturing of certain resources that generate certain kinds of returns (Burt, 2001).

4.-How the theory clarifies the linkages among purposes of action, network features and social capital: **PURPOSES OF ACTION, HOMOPHILY AND HETEROPHILY, AND NEEDS TO BRIDGE OR BOND**

Purposes of action: 1.- instrumental action with the purpose to obtain additional or new resources i.e for gaining wealth; power, or reputation., getting a new job, a promotion.

2.-Expressive action the purpose is to maintain and preserve the existing resources; i.e. for maintaining cohesion, solidarity or well-being.

Lin (1986) delineates three layers of social relations that differentiate such intensity and reciprocity. The most inner layer is characterized by intimate and confiding relations: the ties engage in reciprocal and intense interactions. These relations are *binding (obligatorio, amarrar atar)* in that ties are obligated to reciprocate exchanges and services to one another.

The intermediary layer is characterized by ties that generally share information and resources. These relations, typifying most social networks with a mixture of stronger and weaker ties or direct and indirect ties, nevertheless are said to be *bonding (vinculo emocional)*.

The outer layer is characterized by shared membership and identity. Here a collectivity or institution provides the backdrop for the membership or identity (e.g., church, clan, or club). These relations, mediated through the collectivity, provide members a sense of *belongingness (sentido de pertenencia)*.

Thus, in assessing whether binding or bonding social relations provide sufficient or insufficient social capital, two contingent factors need be considered: (1) the purpose of the action and (2) the richness of embedded resources.

The expectation is that binding and bonding relations should be useful for accessing and mobilizing necessary resources for expressive actions (Lin and Ensel, 1989). Why? Because of the homophily principle: there is a strong correspondence between intensity of interactions, shared sentiment, and shared resources. This means that the inner layers, among ties that bind, will generate similar resources (capital). So, the resources an individual can get from others close in relation are going to be similar to his or her own resources. These layers of dense and reciprocal relations have positive effects to expressive actions where the aim is to consolidate existing resource (Page 13).

But, the inner layers with its binding and bonding relations may be confining rather than facilitating for instrumental actions. The network strategy for instrumental action, however, is more complex. It is necessary to introduce further consideration about the richness of embedded resources – social capital – in each layer of relations.

When additional or better resources are needed, in the case of instrumental actions, then the utility of inner layers is contingent on how rich or varied resources are among the ties. If the embedded resources are relatively rich, the inner layer, with its reciprocal relations, is quite capable of providing resources to achieve individual and collective instrumental goals. However, if the actor is relative poor in resources, then the inner layer of relations, due to the homophily principle, are also likely to involve ties with relatively poor resources.

What then should the network strategy be to seek and find richer and more varied resources? (Page 14) Applying the Heterophily principle, the strategy should be bridging because as one reaches out of one's inner circle, one is more likely to encounter ties with more diverse characteristics and resources. Heterophilous resources not only reflect different and new resources, but also increase the chances of containing better resources.

Summary of the main ideas: For expressive purposes where additional resources are not of priority, then binding and bonding relations are likely to be the necessary and sufficient condition for the access and mobilization of embedded resources. For instrumental purposes where additional and better resources are needed, binding and bonding relations may not be sufficient. Accessing better social capital may require extending one's reaching beyond inner circles – bridging through weaker ties or non-redundant ties (e.g., structural holes) (Page 14).

How network features (density, bonding, or bridging) links with social capital? As the relationships extend from the inner layer to the outer layer, the intensity of relationships

decreases, the density of the network decreases, and, most critically, resources embedded among members become more diverse or heterophilous (Page 14).

Lin makes an important clarification at the end of this section about the confusion that sometimes appear in general literature on the so-called “bonding” or “bridging” social capital: Social capital does not bind or bridge. It is the nature of the social networks that bind (*amarrar, atar, obligar*), bond (*Lazo, vínculo, desarrollar lazos*) or bridge (*Puente, extenderse, abarcar*) and the relative advantage these networks offer to social capital depends on the purpose of action (page 15).

5.-How the theory and its measures can consistently be used for micro-and-macro analysis:
MICRO- AND MACRO-LEVEL CORRESPONDENCE

Aim: extend the theory and its measurement to the macro- level analysis. The fundamental argument is that this theory can be adapted to the macro-level. Why? A collectivity can be seen as a social network and its members as actors who bring their resources to bear. So, the embedded resources provided by members are the internal social capital for the collectivity. For expressive purposes, or solidarity and cohesion of the collectivity, the utility of internal social capital is contingent on the density of relations among members – the binding and bonding among members (page 15). For instrumental goals, internal social capital may not be sufficient. There is a need for the collectivity to reach out for other and better resources defined as the external social capital for the collectivity.

Thus, the network-based theory of social capital as applied to the macro- or collective - level maintains its theoretical fundamentals. Yet, it is important to recognize the complexity at the macro- level where each collectivity is simultaneously a network of members and an actor in a web of social networks (page 16).