

IMPACT OF PARENTAL EDUCATION ON SOCIAL CAPITAL

Swarupa Lakshmi

*Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, S K Somaiya VinayMandir College,
Vidayavihar, Ghatkopar East, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India*

Received: 22 Mar 2018

Accepted: 03 Apr 2018

Published: 07 Apr 2018

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine the impact of educational level of respondents' parents on different components of social capital. The Sample comprised of 200 students as respondents drawn randomly from semi-urban degree colleges located in Vaishali district of Bihar (India). For measuring social capital, Lakshmi (2015) scale was used. Five factors, namely; bonding with friends, acceptance of system, support & cooperation, selfishness and harmony were found reliable. The findings revealed that the educational level of respondents' father did not significantly influence acceptance of the system, support & cooperation, harmony and selfishness dimensions of social capital, but it was significant for bonding with friend's dimensions of social capital. The findings also revealed that the educational level of respondents' mother did not significantly influence acceptance of the system, support & cooperation, harmony and selfishness dimensions of social capital. However, it was significant for bonding with friend's dimensions of social capital.

KEYWORDS: *Social Capital, Parental Education, Factor Analysis*

INTRODUCTION

Social capital can be broadly defined as the networks of relationships among people who live and work in a particular society, enabling that society to function effectively. Many social scientists and development agencies have dwelt upon the concept of social capital widely giving impetus to considerable theoretical and empirical research in this field. According to World Bank, there is growing empirical evidence that social capital contributes significantly to sustainable development. World Bank (1999) stated 'Social capital refers to the institutions, relationships and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society's social interaction. The central premise of social capital is that social networks have values. It refers to the collective value of all "social networks" (who people know) and the inclinations that arise from these networks to do things for each other ("norms of reciprocity")'.

The term 'social capital' is a relatively new concept and has been discussed extensively by social scientists such as Putnam (1993), Coleman (1988), Bourdieu (1980) and Fukuyama (1999). The concept of social capital arose because while neo-classical economists can explain only about 80 per cent of economic activities; remaining 20 per cent be explained by human nature and behavior. Fukuyama (1999), Coleman (1988) and Putnam (1993, 2000) were unanimous in defining trust as a key component of social capital.

L. J. Hanifan's 1916 article regarding local support for rural schools is one of the first occurrences of the term social capital in reference to social cohesion and personal investment in the community. Hanifan (1916) described social capital as “those tangible assets (that) count for most in the daily lives of people: namely goodwill, fellowship, sympathy and social intercourse among the individuals and families who make up a social unit”.

Bourdieu (1986) described social capital mainly in terms of networks of relations. He defined it 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”. Bourdieu described three dimensions of capitals, each with its own relationship to class: economic, cultural and social capital. These three resources become socially effective, and their ownership is legitimized through the mediation of symbolic capital. Thus Bourdieu’s concept of social capital is instrumental, focusing on the advantages to the possessor of social capital and the “deliberate construction of sociability” for the purpose of creating this resource. James Coleman (1990) explained social capital as aspects of a social structure that function as a resource of the individuals in a group, claiming that social capital ‘inhere in the structure of relations between persons and among persons’. Thus, social capital can be comprehended in the relations between individuals and groups, not in individuals per se. In other words, Coleman identified social capital in functional terms as a resource that the individual attempt to pursue and accumulate. He identified three forms of social capital: obligations and expectations, information channels, and norms. Putnam (1993) makes a distinction between two kinds of social capital: bonding capital and bridging capital. Bonding social capital is inward looking and refers to relations within homogeneous groups such as families or social or ethnic groups. But in order to create peaceful societies in a diverse, multi-ethnic country, one needs to have a second kind of social capital: bridging. Bridging is evident when people make friends with others who are not like them, like supporters of another football team. Bridging social capital refers to relations between different groups, networks and encompasses people across diverse social cleavages. Fukuyama (1999) claims that concept like trust, networks, and civil society that have been associated with social capital are, in fact, only a secondary phenomenon, emerging as an outcome of social capital but not being social capital itself. His definition characterizes social capital as an informal norm that promotes cooperation between (two or more) individuals. Fukuyama (1995) argues that social capital is a necessary pre-condition for successful development, but a strong rule of law and basic political institution are necessary to build social capital. He further believes that a strong social capital is necessary for a strong democracy and strong economic growth.

The aim of the present study is to examine the impact of parental education on individual’s social capital. The following hypotheses have been formulated:

- *It was hypothesized that educational level of the father will not significantly influence respondents’ scores on different factors of social capital.*
- *It was hypothesized that the educational level of mother will not significantly influence respondents’ scores on different factors of social capital.*

METHOD OF STUDY

Sample

The sample comprised of 200 students randomly drawn from degree colleges in the district of Vaishali (Bihar). While 111 students were male representing 55.5% of the sample, the remaining 89 were female representing 44.5% of the sample. The respondents were on average 25.25 ($SD = 4.60$) years old with the range of 20 to 28 years. In terms of educational level, while 64.5% of the respondents were undergraduate, remaining 35.5% were postgraduate. The distribution of educational level of respondents' father was 20.5% non-matriculate, 15.0% matriculation pass, 14.0% graduate and 50.5% holding postgraduate degree. The educational level of respondents' mother was 41.5% non-matriculate, 15.5% matriculation pass, 20% graduate and remaining 23.0% postgraduate degree holder.

Measures

A questionnaire was developed by Lakshmi (2015) having two parts. Part one contained sixty statements pertaining to the participants' social capital. The statements measured social capital on a 5-point scale ranging from 'strongly agree' (5), agree (4), neither agree nor disagree (3), disagree (2) and strongly disagree (1). The sample statements were as follows: (i) you trust your friends; (ii) you talk freely with your friends.

Initially, the questionnaire comprised of 60 items to assess the social capital of the respondents. Subsequently, eight items were dropped on the basis of item analysis. Finally, responses to the remaining 52 items were factor analyzed using the principal component analysis (PCA) with a rotated varimax solution on the criteria that eigenvalue should not be less than 1(one) and the factor must have acceptable reliability (alpha coefficient $>.60$). An initial analysis (SPSS-17 version) was run to obtain an eigenvalue for each factor of the data.

Factor I was given the name, '*Bonding with friends*'. The factor explained 78.20 per cent of the common variance and also showed higher reliability ($r_{ii} = .80$).

Factor II was given the name, '*Acceptance of system*'. The factor explained 24.36 per cent of the common variance and also showed higher reliability ($r_{ii} = .73$).

Factor III was given the name, '*Support and cooperation*'. This factor explained 34.64 per cent of the common variance and also showed higher reliability ($r_{ii} = .72$).

Factor IV was given the name, '*Selfishness*'. This factor explained 12.93 per cent of the common variance and also showed higher reliability ($r_{ii} = .60$).

Factor V was given the name, '*Harmony*'. This factor explained 14.50 per cent of the common variance and also showed higher reliability ($r_{ii} = .68$).

Part two of the questionnaire measured age and gender of the respondents. Data were collected from June to August 2016.

RESULTS & DISCUSSIONS

In order to verify the hypothesis that the level of fathers' education of the respondents will not significantly influence respondents' scores on social capital factors, One-way ANOVA has been computed. Table 1 presents the summary of the statistical findings.

Table 1: One-way ANOVA Displaying the Level of Fathers' Education of Respondents on Factors of Social Capital

Factors	Groups	SS	MS	F df=3/196
Bonding with friends	Between	3.68	1.23	2.72
	Within	88.41	.45	
Acceptance of system	Between	3.58	1.19	1.78
	Within	131.06	.67	
Support & cooperation	Between	2.38	.80	1.88
	Within	82.73	.42	
Selfishness	Between	3.14	1.05	1.30
	Within	157.71	.81	
Harmony	Between	.90	.30	.75
	Within	79.26	.40	

*p <.05, **p<.01, N=200

Table 1 displays that F-test such as, *acceptance of the system* (F 3/196 =1.78, p>.05), *support & cooperation* (F 3/196 = 1.88, p>.05), *selfishness* (F 3/196 =1.30, p>.05) and *harmony* (F 3/196 =.75, p>.05) are not statistically significant. However, the factor *bonding with friends* (F3/196=2.72, p<.05) is statistically significant. The null hypotheses of no difference hypothesis have been accepted in the case of *acceptance of the system*, *support & cooperation*, *selfishness* and *harmony*. Null hypothesis has been rejected in the case of *bonding with friends* and the alternative hypothesis has been accepted.

In order to verify the hypothesis that the level of mothers' education of the respondents will not differ significantly in terms of personality factors, One-way ANOVA has been computed. Table 2 presents the summary of the statistical findings.

Table 2: One-way ANOVA Displaying the Level of Mothers' Education of Respondents on Social Capital Factors

Factors of Social Capital	Groups	SS	MS	F df=3/196
Bonding with friends	Between	6.11	2.04	4.64
	Within	85.97	.44	
Acceptance of system	Between	2.45	.82	1.21
	Within	132.19	.67	
Support & cooperation	Between	2.50	.83	1.98
	Within	82.61	.42	
Selfishness	Between	.61	.20	.25
	Within	160.23	.82	
Harmony	Between	2.54	.85	2.14
	Within	77.63	.40	

*p <.05, **p<.01, N=200

Table 2 displays that F-test such as, *acceptance of the system* (F 3/196 =1.21, p >.05), *support & cooperation* (F 3/196 = 1.98, p>.05), *selfishness* (F 3/196 =.25, p>.05) and *harmony* (F 3/196 =2.14, p>.05) are not statistically significant. However, the factor *bonding with friends* (F3/196=4.64, p<.05) is statistically significant. The null hypotheses

of no difference hypothesis have been accepted in the case of *acceptance of the system, support & cooperation, selfishness and harmony*. Null hypothesis has been rejected in the case of *bonding with friends* and the alternative hypothesis has been accepted.

CONCLUSIONS

In general, the study showed that education levels of the parents did not significantly influence respondents' scores on *acceptance of the system, support & cooperation, selfishness and harmony* factors of social capital. However, parental educational level significantly influenced respondents' scores on *bonding with friends* factor of social capital. In addition, there are several considerations that need to be taken into account when considering the findings of the current study. First, the study was primarily based on self-report data. As a result, the strength of relations between variable was overestimated due to a common method of variance. Second, the nature and forms of social capital change over time as well as the multidimensional construct of social capital.

REFERENCES

1. Bourdieu, P. (1980). *Le capital social: notes provisoires*, in: *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, Vol. 31, 2-3.
2. Bourdieu, P. (1983/ 1986). *The forms of capital*. In J. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (New York, Greenwood), 241-258.
3. Coleman, J. S. (1988). 'Social capital in the creation of human capital.' *The American* pp. 94: S95.
4. Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundation of social theory*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
5. Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Social capital and the global economy*. *Foreign Affairs*, 74, 89-103.
6. Fukuyama, F. (1999). *Social capital and civic society*. Paper presented at the IMF Conference on Second Generation Reforms, IMF Headquarters Washington, DC.
7. Ashiq, Huma, MALIK TARIQ MAHMOOD, and SYED ABDUL SIRAJ. "Use of mobile communication and its affect on social capital of college going teenager." *International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature* 1.3 (2013): 45-60.
8. Hanifan, L. J. (1916). 'The rural school community center', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 67, 130-138.
9. Lakshmi, S. (2015). *Personality correlates of Social Capital*. Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, B R A Bihar University, Muzaffarpur (Bihar).
10. Putnam, R. D. (1993). "The prosperous community: Social capital and public life". *The American Prospect* 4.
11. Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
12. World Bank (1999). 'What is social capital?' *PovertyNet*<http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/scapital/whatsc.html>

