



Social Capital and Community Cohesion: The Constitution of Community Social Capital in Malaysia

Ahmad Shukri Abdul Hamid^{1*}, Najib Ahmad Marzuki², Noor Azizah Ahmad³, Mohd. Sobhi Ishak⁴

¹School of Applied Psychology, Social Work and Policy, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 UUM Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia, ²School of Applied Psychology, Social Work and Policy, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 UUM Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia, ³School of Applied Psychology, Social Work and Policy, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 UUM Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia, ⁴School of Multimedia Technology and Communication, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 UUM Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia.

*Email: shukri@uum.edu.my

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses what constitutes community social capital and how community cohesion is achieved. The insights explicated in this paper came from a study on community social capital in Malaysia. The study utilized a combination of focus group discussions and a survey method of a total of 293 respondents covering six communities from six districts in the state of Kedah, Malaysia. The study had produced a community social capital measuring instrument comprising a total of 36 items covering six different dimensions. The study reveals that within the conceptual corpus of social capital, there are several "social dimensions" that can be construed as the socio-psychological contexts where people within a community may converge and develop a sense of togetherness. Social cohesion is the outcome of the interaction that occur within these realms. This correspond to an age-old sociological wisdom about society being the product of social interaction.

Keywords: Social Capital, Community, Malaysian Society

JEL Classifications: Z13 Economic Sociology, Economic Anthropology, Social and Economic Stratification

1. INTRODUCTION

In 2012 a study was carried out to investigate the nature of community social capital in Malaysia (Marzuki et al., 2014). It aimed to generate a set of indicators capable of producing localized measure of community social capital. Bearing the fact that up to that point in time, such measures have yet to be developed in Malaysia, the study managed to produce a set of indicators of community social capital that are deemed suitable to not only measure levels of social capital in Malaysian setting but also managed to bring forth insights over what constitutes the ingredients that make a community bind itself together. This paper aims to elaborate on the latter by focusing on what can be learnt from this particular study. In other words, it tends to answer the question of how a typical community in Malaysia holds itself together as a social unit.

2. SOCIAL CAPITAL AND THE COMMUNITY

An age-old sociological wisdom states that society is the product of social interaction. The basic premise may be simple but there's no denial that interaction is a complex process. Sociologically, the idea of how a community come to be is a basic one and based on this assertion, a community should constitute a network of interdependent individuals, even though the nature of their interdependence might be complex. This is precisely the case in Malaysia, where understanding this basic idea constitutes a challenge due to the multicultural and multi-religious nature of her population. With more diversity comes complexity. Yet as history tells it, the Malaysian society remains one of few instances where social diversity has been a valuable asset for a country to grow upon and develop. Hence an insight into what makes the Malaysian society holds itself together is a valuable one.

3. MEASURING COMMUNITY SOCIAL CAPITAL

In recent times, sociological scholarship has been abuzz with the idea of social capital and how it was considered to be a beneficial for academic and policy purposes (Schuller, 2007; Siegle, 2014; Kwon and Adler, 2014). The concept has gained a considerable traction amongst scholars and researchers of various disciplines, as well as policy makers both on local as well as international level (Halpern, 2005). Some consider it to be a gem in sociological theory since it has such an enormous grab on contemporary thinking about society and social cohesion (Kwon and Adler, 2014; Halpern, 2005). Evidently there has been much discussion on this together with convincing evidence as to the utility of the concept in conceptualizing as well as solving social problems (Siegle, 2014). Others however are quite sceptical, particularly due to its unusual flexibility in catering for a wide spectrum of social problems and issues (Woolcock, 2010). The main argument is that such conceptual breadth renders the idea quite loose (Portes, 1998; Fine, 2001) and at times useless (Macinko and Starfield, 2001; De Hart and Dekker, 1999).

The controversy does not end there. On top of that, there are also different conceptions on the nature of social capital with regard to whether it exists on personal or social level. As with many conceptual iterations within sociology, the plains of social existence vary from the micro to the macro. Thus, some scholars insist that social capital is an individual attributes while others look at it as communal or societal asset. Uphoff (2000) for example considers social capital to exist in two categories simultaneously: Structural social capital and cognitive social capital. Similarly, Cote and Healy (2001) identify three types of social capital networks operating in any social setting at any one time, with each corresponds to a different level of social organization. Harpham (2008) also argues for the indispensability of viewing the phenomenon in both of its – individual and societal – dimensions. Evidence abound in support of each arguments, however. As far as individual social capital is concerned, researchers such as Schneider et al. (1997) and Narayan and Pritchett (1999) have developed instruments which measure individual social capital. Whereas, in terms of collectivity, Halstead and Deller (2015) argued that social capital can be measured at a higher level of social organization, such as communities and societies.

The existence of these dual iterations regarding the nature of social capital is beneficial for the current purpose. The idea that social capital can be conceptualized based on both social and personal level provides the basis for this discussion to explore on the idea that a community exists not on the basis of the number of people alone. It is actually the quality of interactions that exist between individuals in the communal setting that actually provides the bonding agent which makes the community possible in the first place (Pooley et al., 2005). While it can be argued that both contentions have their own merits for the claim yet it is the focus of this paper to limit the discussion only to the communal dimension of the concept. Specifically, the focus is on community level social capital. The next section will delve into the concept of community social capital based on the aforementioned study. The following section discusses the insights gained from the study based on its findings.

Many contemporary scholars concur that measuring social capital is a difficult task. Some would state outright that there is no single measure that can appropriately capture the overtly vast idea behind the concept and thus no one single measure can be said to exist (Pooley et al., 2005). The study entitled “Development of Community Social Capital Indicators” (Marzuki et al., 2014) is one of many attempt aimed to develop an indigenous measure of community social capital. The attempt is obviously not meant to produce a one-size-fits-all measure of the concept. Instead, the scope is modest in the sense that it focuses only on specific type of community, which is a predominantly Malay community with some diversity in terms of ethnic and religious composition. The final outcome of the study emerged in the form of a set of indicators comprising 36 items that measure community social capital along six dimensions. The completed instrument were then administered to a total of 293 respondents covering six communities from six districts in the state of Kedah, Malaysia. Based on the statistical tests conducted throughout the study it was found that all of the dimensions contribute significantly to the sense of community which can be interpreted as social capital that exists at the communal level.

The methods involved in formulating and finally building a set of constructs that represent a measure of social capital involve two broad phases. In the first phase, two focus group sessions were conducted with two different groups of residents from a local community in the district of Kubang Pasu, Kedah. The sessions involved a total of 18 adult individuals picked at random from a large housing estate. The housing estate comprises residents from various ethnicities and religions. The main purpose of the focus group discussions was to generate social capital constructs based on the points of view of actual community members. Prior to the sessions, the study had reviewed a number of previous social capital instruments and measures developed by scholars and researchers within the area of community social capital. A social capital instrument developed by Onyx and Bullen (1998) has been found to have the most suitable set of constructs (social capital elements) to be adopted for the study. Throughout the focus group discussions, eight social capital elements featured in the Onyx and Bullen study were adopted and used as a template to elicit conceptual ideas from the respondents.

The second phase of the study involved redefining the constructs and comparing the findings from the focus group discussions with the constructs from Onyx and Bullen (1998). The outcome of the focus group analysis was a set of six constructs which were deemed most suitably reflect the local community setting. Two of the original constructs were removed because: (a) It was found the construct (i.e., family and friend connections) was redundant with an existing construct (i.e., neighborhood connections) and (b) the “work connections” construct was found to be unsuitable with the social context. The suitable constructs were then selected and retained into a new adapted instrument. Table 1 contains a list of the eight social capital elements featured in the original study and the retained constructs.

4. SOCIAL CAPITAL COMPOSITION AND COMMUNITY COHESION

The main task of this essay is to explicate the components of social capital construct as they were measured in this particular study and how do they come together to create social cohesion. The following has been formulated based on the findings of the aforementioned study which incidentally offer insights into how social capital becomes instrumental in fostering a community. In general, the findings of the study point toward the existence of six socio psychological realms that exist in the midst of a community which can be associated with the constitution structural-type social capital. This finding correspond to another recent study by one of the current authors which concluded that community social capital is generated out of three different types of community processes and mechanisms which runs across different levels of social organization (Ahmad, 2015).

Table 2 presents the result of a path analysis of all of the constructs contained within the community social capital measurement instrument. Overall, as shown in Table 2, the findings of the study indicate that all except one of the indicators (constructs) which the study had formulated (in large part involving the process described in the previous section), has a very strong predictive value as dimensions of social capital. In other words, the relatively high predictive value (>0.8) of each of the constructs indicate they constitute formative elements for community social capital. The only construct that features lower predictive value is “tolerance of diversity.” With a relatively lower standardized regression weight value of 0.5 the construct can still be considered as a good predictor but a lesser one at that compared to other constructs.

To simplify this finding, a community can be said to have the capability to exist and function as a cohesive unit if it is able to increase the social or psychological attachment of its members

towards the following aspects of the community. Table 3 simplifies the findings on each of the social capital dimensions by extracting their range of mean scores.

Table 3 highlights the range of mean scores for each of the social capital constructs. The scores are based on 7-point Likert scale. In general, each constructs show a relatively high score which suggests that respondents favor positively for each of the social capital dimensions. At the same time, at the lower end the scores still show a relatively positive rating given by the respondents. The following discussions elaborate on each of the constructs and how in simplified form the constitution of social capital contributes to the community cohesion.

- a. Active involvement in social activities: Social activities (activities done in collective and cooperative spirit) are the lifeblood of a community. As findings of this study suggest, a community rich in social capital comprises members who enjoy helping each other, keen to get involved in community activities, willing to spend time for the group, willing to contribute and provide for community needs.
- b. Being proactive in social context: Being proactive is another indicator for a community that binds together well. Members who are proactive are willing to take the first step in making a worthwhile effort, knowing that such action might be beneficial for others. It may also be regarded as an altruistic gesture since people who are proactive put the welfare of others ahead of themselves. The study finds that amongst the behavior that people enjoy doing proactively include tending for environmental cleanliness, minding the welfare of others especially neighbors (to be differentiated with minding other people’s business), taking active measures against unruliness, initiate beneficial actions and offer advice to others.
- c. Feeling of trust and safety: Trust is a crucial part of being in a community. Having trust would normally be followed by a feeling of safety and security. Findings from the study indicate

Table 1: A comparison between original instrument and the adapted

Original instrument (Bullen and Onyx 1998)		Adapted instrument	
Social capital elements	Items	Social capital dimensions	Items
Participation in the local community	5	<i>Penglibatan dalam aktiviti komuniti</i>	12
Proactivity in a social context	6	<i>Proaktiviti dalam konteks sosial</i>	12
Feeling of trust and safety	5	<i>Rasa percaya dan selamat</i>	10
Neighborhood connections	5	<i>Hubungan kejiranan</i>	14
Tolerance of diversity	2	<i>Toleransi kepelbagaian</i>	10
Value of life	2	<i>Nilai kehidupan</i>	12
Family and friends connections	3		
Work connections	3		

Source: Ahmad (2015) and Marzuki et al. (2014). Note: The researchers decided to retain much the naming of the constructs as they appear in the original instrument because they were considered as accurately depicting the constructs. However, they were translated to Bahasa Melayu (Malay language) because the study was conducted, and the instrument were developed and tested, in Bahasa Melayu

Table 2: Path analysis of social capital constructs and significance level

Construct	Standard regression weight	Regression weight	SE	CR	P	Significance
Participation in local community	0.817	0.662	0.63	10.427	***	Significant
Proactivity in social context	0.819	0.928	0.88	10.522	***	Significant
Feeling of trust and safety	0.875	0.928	0.79	11.681	***	Significant
Neighborhood connections	0.960	1.077	0.102	10.522	***	Significant
Tolerance of diversity	0.590	0.713	0.79	8.999	***	Significant
Value of life	0.908	0.844	0.75	11.200	***	Significant

***Significant at 0.05 ($P < 0.05$). Source: Marzuki et al. (2014). SE: Standard error

Table 3: Analysis of upper and lower range of mean scores for social capital constructs

Social capital dimensions	Mean scores	
	Min	Max
Participation in local community	5.54	6.02
Proactivity in social context	4.97	5.77
Feeling of trust and safety	5.11	5.78
Neighborhood connections	5.43	6.16
Tolerance of diversity	4.97	5.59
Value of life	5.22	5.87

that tight community value trust by putting high level of trust in other people, possess high level of safety when living in the community, always believe in the goodness of others, and avoid having bad thoughts about others and having faith in neighbors.

- d. Being neighborly: Communities that bind together well put a very high value on being neighborly. At some point neighbors are indistinguishable from family and friends. In this study, neighborliness is a good predictor of community social capital because people who live in good communities enjoy helping their neighbor out, always try to maintain good relationship with them, keep in contact, maintain a good impression towards them, maintains regular interaction, put great trust in them and be willing to offer assistance when needed.
- e. Tolerance of diversity: In Malaysian context living next to a person of different ethnic and religious identity is common. Malaysians have come to accept the fact that tolerance is something that they must have in order to live harmoniously in communal setting. Hence, tolerance towards people of various ethnic and religious backgrounds must be observed. The study found that Malaysian are generally tolerant towards others, except in areas that are being regarded as sensitive. Overall, they have no problem mingling with people of different backgrounds, accepting of others' way of life, strive to maintain good neighborly relations with others, accept their cultural practices, feeling comfortable living in the same community with others, learn to respect other people's religious practices and respect their ways of life.
- f. Value one's life: One measure of good community is the way people feel about themselves as being part of the community. As social actor, satisfaction in life generally would indicate the quality that a person has with the surrounding. Thus, one would put a high value on life if one considers others appreciate his or her presence, feel satisfied with his or her involvement in the community, accept group decisions on important things, willing to express ideas and voice out concerns and feel satisfied with the way the community turns out.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This paper presents a conceptual analysis of what constitutes community social capital. The existence of community social capital, in turn indicates the level of cohesiveness of the said community. The idea explicated throughout this paper was derived from a study on community social capital in Malaysia. The study was designed to produce a localized measure of the concept

community social capital. This is in line with the assertions of many social capital researchers that a localized social capital measure is indeed more appropriate measure since the existence of social capital vary widely in accordance with local characteristics and cultures (Krishna, 2002). The findings of the study suggest that all constructs developed to measure dimensions social have statistically significant predictor value as a measure of community social capital. There are six socio psychological realms, designated as "participation in local community," "proactivity in social context," "feeling of trust and safety," "neighborhood connections," "tolerance of diversity," and "value of life," that can be said to constitute the community social capital pool. It therefore can be argued that as far as community living is concerned, for as long as the community members can invest resources to and withdraw resources from, this pool, community cohesion can be said to exist, albeit at varying levels. This finding conforms with the common assertion about social capital that it is made up of common good (Smidt, 2003). However, due to the limited scale of the study from which these analyses were derived, the preceding conclusions should be considered with caution as to the extent to which they can be generalized.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, S.A.H. (2015), *The Role of Religious Congregation in the Formation of Community Social Capital: A Case Study in the District of Kuala Muda, Kedah*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Cote, S., Healy, T. (2001), *The well-being of nations. The role of human and social capital*. Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development. Paris: OECD.
- De Hart, J., Dekker, P. (1999), *Civic engagement and volunteering in the Netherlands: A 'Putnamian' analysis*. In: Van Deth, J., Maraffi, M., Newton, K., Whiteley, P., editors. *Social Capital and European Democracy*. London: Routledge.
- Fine, B. (2001), *Social Capital Theory Versus Social Theory: Political Economy and Social Science at the Turn of the Millennium*. London: Routledge.
- Halpern, D. (2005), *Social Capital*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Halstead, J.M., Deller, S.C., editors. (2015), *Social capital and community development: An introduction. Social Capital at the Community Level: An Applied Interdisciplinary Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Harpham, T. (2008), *The measurement of community social capital through surveys*. In: Kawachi, I., Subramanian, S.V., Kim, D., editors. *Social Capital and Health*. New York: Springer. p51-62.
- Krishna, A. (2002), *Active Social Capital: Tracing the Roots of Development and Democracy*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kwon, S., Adler, P.S. (2014), *Social capital: Maturation of a field of research*. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(4), 412-422.
- Macinko, J., Starfield, B. (2001), *The utility of social capital in research on health determinants*. *Milbank Quarterly*, 79(3), 387-427.
- Marzuki, N.A., Ahmad, N.A., Hamid, A.S.A., Ishak, M.S. (2014), *Pembentukan Indikator Modal Sosial Komuniti: Kearah Penjanaan Instrumen Modal Sosial Komuniti di Malaysia*. FRGS Research Report. Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Narayan, D., Pritchett, L. (1999), *Cents and sociability: Household income and social capital in rural Tanzania*. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 47(4), 871-897.
- Onyx, J., Bullen, P. (1998), *Measuring social capital in five communities in New South Wales: An analysis*. Center for Australian Community

- Organizations and Management. Working Paper Series No. 41. Sydney: University of Technology.
- Pooley, J., Cohen, L., Pike, L. (2005), Can sense of community inform social capital? *The Social Science Journal*, 42(1), 71-79.
- Portes, A. (1998), Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24(1), 1-24.
- Schneider, M., Teske, P., Marschall, M. (1997), Institutional arrangements and the creation of social capital: The effects of public school choice. *The American Political Science Review*, 91(1), 82-93.
- Schuller, T. (2007), Reflection on the use of social capital. *Review of Social Economy*, 65(1), 11-28.
- Siegle, V. (2014), *Measuring Social Capital*. United Kingdom: Office for National Statistics. Available from: http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171766_371693.pdf. [Last accessed on 2015 Nov 23].
- Smidt, C., editor. (2003), *Introduction. Religion as Social Capital*. Texas: Baylor University Press.
- Uphoff, N. (2000), Understanding social capital: Learning from the analysis and experience of participation. In: Dasgupta, P., Serageldin, I., editors. *Social Capital: A Multifaceted Perspective*. Washington: World Bank. p215-249.
- Woolcock, M. (2010), The rise and routinization of social capital, 1988-2008. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 13, 469-487.