
PRINCIPAL FEATURES OF FAMILY SOCIAL CAPITAL IN RUSSIAN REGIONS (THE CASE OF VOLOGDA REGION)

TATIANA GUZHAVINA

Social science offers a variety of theoretical concepts for studying the family and its resources. One of those concepts is the concept of social capital, which allows us to view the family as an environment that forms the social capital of younger generation. While mostly remaining a private sphere of life, the family performs a range of social functions that make it a significant social institution. One of those functions is the socialization of the young generation. The inclusion of young people into the system of social relations, and then into the activities of maintaining and developing these relations, makes the connection between generations possible. It allows people to inherit cultural experience, preserve it and pass it on to new generations. Despite existing destructive processes, such as increasing individualization, weakening of family ties and the decreasing role of parents in socialization, imbalance in social functions and increase in divorces, etc., the family continues to play a dominant role in this process. Researchers mainly consider those transformations in family structures a consequence of socio-economic and cultural factors¹. Therefore, analyzing the essence of family social capital and the opportunities that are associated with it and identifying problems/barriers that arise during its formation is a difficult cognitive task.

The theoretical framework of the study. Initially, the concept of social capital was closely associated with the family. L. Hanifan introduced the term *social capital* in the 1960-ies based on her study of social interactions within the family and community². According to the founder of the theory of social capital, J. Coleman, its formation amongst children depends on the capabilities of parents, the structure of the family and its inclusion in the network of relations inside the community. J. Coleman's interest in the family can be explained by the attention that he paid to social structures, which, according to him, contain the necessary resources for the development of social capital.

J. Coleman claims that social capital is a derivative of social structures that

¹ **Liausheva S.A.** The influence of society modernization on the institution of the family // Bulletin of the Adygea State University. Series 1: Regional studies: philosophy, history, sociology, jurisprudence, political science, cultural science. 2010. No. 2, pp. 105-110.

² **Hanifan L.I.** The Rural School. Community Center // Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 1967, pp. 130-138.

provide access to significant financial, cultural, social and information resources. Coleman thus views social capital as a byproduct of the existing structure of relations that assists the individual in taking any action, regardless of whether they act in their own interests or in the interests of society³. According to J. Coleman, the family creates social capital parallel to the human capital of children, formed through the human capital of parents. By communicating with their children, paying attention to them, sharing their vision of the future and expecting success at school, parents form the human capital of their children. Parents usually expect some economic return from the education of their children and their successful careers. Parents thus invest in the next generation of their family and expect future support from them.

The process of forming the human capital of children is largely determined by the social capital of parents. Relations between parents and children and social relations outside the family create a dense social structure consisting of expectations, norms, and trust that eventually form social capital. However, it is only possible through the creation of closed social organizations. Effective norms are impossible without closed communities. In a closed structure, some actors can unite and resist the negative actions of others. In this context, J. Coleman uses the term 'intergenerational closure' in relation to the family⁴. J. Coleman describes the forming of social capital through mechanisms of social control. The parents' inclusion in the local school community and the ability to communicate on a daily basis leads to an agreement on acceptable internal and external norms of behavior and sanctions against negative behavior. He notes that the situation when the parents know each other well, when they are neighbors or friends and when they jointly participate together in the activities of a religious community or in school affairs, contributes to the creation of closed, strong ties and strengthens social control⁵.

J. Coleman draws attention to a number of factors that reduce the possibilities of forming social capital within the family. Those factors include the increase in the number of single-parent families consisting of mothers with minor children and the increase in the amount of time that parents spend at work. Those factors violate the structural integrity of the family's social capital. Another negative factor is labor migration. It leads to the breaking of ties and relations with the local community and consequently leads to the loss of social capital. Modern market consumption is also a negative factor according to J. Coleman. He emphasizes the sphere of leisure oriented at various generations with a special focus on young people. The younger generation forms a special lifestyle that can only take place outside the family. Such leisure activities create a gap and alienate young people from their parents⁶. Overall, J. Coleman concludes

³ Coleman J. Capital social and human // ONS.2001. No. 3; pp. 120-139.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Coleman J.S. The Creation and Destruction of Social Capital: Implications for the Law, 3

that families and communities in the modern world are weaker than they used to be, and that the trend will continue in the future⁷.

P. Bourdieu, another theorist who worked with the concept of social capital, paid attention to the family as an environment for the formation of social capital. He characterizes social capital as an actor's resource. Bourdieu views family relations as group relations, which always lend themselves to institutionalization that contributes to the accumulation of family social capital and its transfer from generation to generation. A family's name or status can help make new contacts and strengthen social positions. According to Bourdieu, group membership creates advantages and leads to control over the acceptance of new members. This is the reason why inclusion in a family group cannot be a purely personal affair⁸. New generations create family social capital by entering the 'right' school, the 'right' university, the 'right' family. According to P. Bourdieu, economic capital is the basis of this process. Actors reproduce social capital through constant work aimed at maintaining contacts and ties; it works similarly to investment and continuous exchange⁹.

J. Coleman and P. Bourdieu have laid the foundations of the scientific discourse on the role of family in the formation of social capital. In our study, we use the approach developed by them as a methodological principle. We believe that looking at the family as the core of the formation of social capital is the most productive approach. The study of the capabilities of the family and the relations that the family forms in the external social space is an important research goal.

Research methodology. To achieve the goal set in this article, we used the data of an empirical study conducted by scientists of the Vologda Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences in the framework of the RFBR grant called Regional Social Capital in the Context of Crisis. The survey was conducted in 2016 in the Vologda region in the cities of Vologda and Cherepovets, and in eight districts of the region (Babaevsky, Velikoustyugsky, Vozhegodsky, Gryazovetsky, Kirillovsky, Nikolsky, Tarnogsky and Sheksninsky). The sample is quota by gender and age, the sample size was 1,500 people.

Sampling method: zoning with proportional distribution of observational units. The sampling error does not exceed 3-4%. Families with minor children were viewed as the object of the study and were therefore picked from the original broader sample. Their share in the sample was about 63%. Further grouping of the data showed that the respondents with minor children could be grouped according to the type of the family: multigenerational families that include grandparents, parents and children, nuclear families that include parents

Notre Dame J.L. Ethics & Pub. Policy.1988. № 3, pp. 375 - 404.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ **Bourdieu P.** Forms of capital // Economic Sociology [Electronic Journal]. 2002. No. 5. WITH. 60-75 // URL: <https://ecsoc.hse.ru>

⁹ Ibid.

and children, and single-parent families. The analysis showed that most of the minor children live in families with both parents.

For further data analysis, we used a technique based on an indicator model developed for measuring social capital¹⁰. The model allowed us to subdivide all responding parents into groups in accordance with the level of accumulated social capital. In order to do this, we calculated the social capital index for each respondent. The first group or Type 1 includes respondents with the lowest social capital index. The second group or Type 2 includes respondents with low social capital, with a slightly higher index than Type 1. Type 3 includes respondents with mid-level social capital. Type 4 includes respondents with a relatively high social capital. Finally, the highest index values that we obtained allowed us to single out a group of respondents with high social capital - Type 5. By allocating those types we were able to compare the available resource capabilities of the respondents (parents), and compare the reproduction of social capital in the families and its transfer to subsequent generations¹¹.

For further study of family social capital and the identification of its essential characteristics, we rely on the following points. Firstly, we pay attention to the embodiment of social capital in social relations. The parents build the basis of those relations and include their children in them. The analysis of inclusion in networks is important for understanding the possibilities for the formation of the normative component of social capital. Networks include the territorial community consisting of neighbors, residents of the house, neighborhood and town/village as well as the family environment itself. In general, both strong and weak ties are important here. Secondly, we single out trust as a fundamental element of social capital, formed in networks of family ties. Thirdly, the family's recourses to reproduce social capital are reflected in its investment opportunities.

The investments are primarily material opportunities and the time spent on maintaining contacts and ties. Indicators included the respondents' answers regarding their self-esteem concerning the family's financial situation the inclusion of parents in social networks. These characteristics reveal the essential features of family social capital.

Results and discussion. The modern family experiences significant pressure from many factors generated by new sociocultural trends, from globalization to strengthening individualization. The family is a private sphere of human life, however, it is an institution that makes society possible. The duality of the family is manifest in its institutionalization on the one hand, and status of a small group, on the other. As an institution, it ensures the implementation of

¹⁰ Afanasyev D.V., Guzhavina T.A., Mehova A.A. Social capital in the region: on the issue of measuring and building an indicator model // Economic and social changes: facts, trends, forecast. 2016. No. 6, pp. 110-125.

¹¹ Guzhavina T.A., Vorobyeva I.N. The use of factor analysis in measuring social capital // Social space. [Electronic journal]. 2017. № 4 (11). URL: <http://sa.vscs.ac.ru/article/2377>

one of the basic needs of society: the continuation of the lineage. Status positions, norms of interaction and sanction practices serve as institutional features. As a small group, a family performs significant psychological, cultural and social functions. The variety of internal family trends in the modern world include increase in the number of child-free families and families with few children, increase in the number of divorces, rejection of marriage in favor of cohabitation, changes in the rights and duties of spouses, etc. Nevertheless, the family continues to be the most important social value and fundamental social institution, a social group where the younger generation socializes and develops its social capital.

The family lays the foundation for a child's interaction with the world around them. A child learns to trust their parents and other close people. Gradually, their trust expands to caretakers, teachers and doctors. The parent's radius of trust contributes to the expansion of the child's radius. In fact, parents pass on their experience of trustful or distrustful interaction with the outside world to their children. In this context, the study of parental trust allows us to assess their accumulated resource of trustful relationships, which then becomes the basis for the development of trust among their children. Therefore, we will focus on trust, which is one of the most important indicators when measuring social capital. In the indicator model trust is a multicomponent measure, which includes attitudes toward the immediate and distant surroundings, trust in people, professions, and institutions. Indices of trust towards the inner circle are of course higher. As an indicator, trust clearly shows the differences between the groups distinguished by the level of their social capital (Table 1).

Table 1

Distribution of answers to the following question: In your opinion, who can be trusted nowadays? (Expressed in % and categorized by the level of social capital)

Possible answer	Type of social capital				
	1	2	3	4	5
No one can be trusted	48	31	17	9	0
Only the closest friends and relatives	45	60	61	53	41
You can trust most of your friends	4	8	15	29	28
Most people can be trusted	2	1	7	7	16
You can trust all people without exception	0	1	1	2	13

Close friends and relatives are the first ones in the radius of trust, which is quite natural. However, respondents belonging to Type 1 most often chose the answer 'No one can be trusted.' It can be argued that trust as a basic attitude that constitutes social relations does not dominate in their families. With each next level of accumulated social capital, we can see an increase in the radius of trust and, therefore, expansion of contacts. In terms of M. Granovetter, weak ties complement strong ties¹². This expands access to resources of other actors

¹² **Granovetter M.** Strength of weak ties // Economic Sociology [Electronic Journal] T. 10. No. 4, September 2009 / Pp. 31-50. Access Mode: <https://ecsoc.hse.ru>

in the network. It is especially true for information resources. G. Coleman indicates the importance of access to information. He considers the ability to obtain information an important form of social capital that facilitates actions¹³. According to him, relationships lose some of their importance when there is access to information. However, our data shows that most of our respondents are members of stable social groups consisting of close friends and relatives. Those groups imply significant relationships and normative interaction although some information barriers may exist. In such case, we observe signs of a closed type of social capital¹⁴. However, distrust is indeed a natural reaction to the absence or lack of information, to an increase in various kinds of risks and individualization of private life¹⁵. In this context, expanding contacts and expanding access to information helps to reduce distrust.

Despite the rather high level of distrust demonstrated by the population, in reality people help each other, express readiness to accept strangers in the neighborhood and generally positively evaluate their place of residence.

One of the indicators that characterizes interaction amongst individuals and indicates the importance of trust is mutual assistance. The data shows that respondents with a high level of accumulated social capital give higher assessments to the level of mutual assistance in their place of residence (Table 2).

Table 2

Distribution of answers to the following question: How much do people in your house, neighborhood, city, and village help each other today? (Expressed in% and categorized by the level of social capital)

Answer	Type of social capital				
	1	2	3	4	5
Always	0	4	5	10	43
Mostly	2	9	23	32	43
Sometimes	44	44	38	32	14
Rarely	28	32	28	17	0
Never	26	10	5	7	0

There is a correlation between the respondents' level of social capital and their assessment of how much people help each other. A respondent's opinion on this might also reflect their own attitude towards helping others. Since we are analyzing the opinions of respondents with children, we can assume that

¹³ Coleman J. Capital social and human // ONS. 2001. No. 3, pp. 120-139.

¹⁴ Putnam R. Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital // Journal of Democracy. 1995. January, pp. 65-78. Sandefur, G., Meier, A., Hernandez, P. Families, Social Capital, and Educational Continuation. // CDE Working Paper No. 99-19, 1999. Center for Demography and Ecology. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison.

¹⁵ Coleman J. Capital social and human // ONS. 2001. No. 3, pp. 120-139; Shimko S. V., Ozerov A. A., Tarasenko L. V. Socialization risks: theoretical and methodological problems of research // Bulletin Adyghe State University. Series 1: Regional Studies: Philosophy, History, Sociology, Jurisprudence, Political Science, Cultural Studies, 2012, №. 2, pp. 128-134; Aebly G., Widmer E. D., Carlo I. D. Bonding and Bridging Social Capital in Step- and First-Time Families and the Issue of Family Boundaries // Interpersona.- 2014, -Vol. 8(1), pp. 51-69.

they will transmit their attitude to their children.

Trust is also reflected in the willingness to communicate with new people. In the modern world strangers can become neighbors. The willingness to communicate with them indicates a presence of communicative opportunities as well as willingness to expand the circles of trust. Respondents with higher levels of accumulated social capital demonstrate greater experience and therefore better skills in regards to social contacts (Table 3).

Table 3

Distribution of answers to the following question: If new and unfamiliar people move in next door to you, how easily will the residents living nearby accept them? (Expressed in % and categorized by the level of accumulated social capital, rated on a 4 point scale)

Answer	Type of social capital				
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Not easily	9.3	5.1	4.8	3.8	0
2	33.3	23.7	17,2	25,2	35.7
3	33.3	30.5	41,4	39.6	21,4
4 Easily, without any problems	24.1	40.7	36.0	29.6	42.9

Orientation towards sociability and willingness to interact are also reflected in the respondents' assessments of their place of residence. More open and contact-oriented people with higher levels of social capital give more positive assessments (Table 4).

Table 4

Distribution of answers to the question: Please assess your place of residence (settlement) (expressed in % and categorized by the level of accumulated social capital)

Answer	Type of social capital				
	1	2	3	4	5
Bad	9	6	2	3	0
Tolerable	42	37	31	20	14
Good	49	54	62	71	71
Excellent	0	3	5	7	14

Although the respondents' opinions clearly depend on their level of social capital, for the most part their answers indicate the presence of trust necessary for interacting with others.

The family's ability to create and maintain its social capital largely depends on the level of investment, for example, time spent on visits and communication, maintaining contacts in relationship networks or the material resources spent on gifts, charity, receiving information, etc. Leisure shared with others is also an important form of investment (table 5).

Table 5

Distribution of answers to the following question: How often do you have lunch, dinner, or tea with other people outside your house during the weekends? (Expressed in % and categorized by the level of accumulated social capital, rated on a 4 point scale)

points	Type of social capital				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Never	27.8	13.6	11.3	10.7	0
2	37	32,2	38.7	32.1	35.7
3	31.5	40.7	40.3	47.2	50
4. Almost always	3,7	12.7	9.7	9,4	14.3

There is a significant difference in sociability between respondents from groups 4 and 5 and those from groups 1 and 2. The former are open to informal contacts, which, of course, helps them to maintain social capital. It is also noteworthy in group 5, no one answered ‘never’ to this question.

Investments in social capital require material expenses and are associated with the material capabilities of the family. P. Bourdieu pointed it out as one of the roles of economic capital, which he considered the primary form of capital¹⁶. During this study, we were not able to directly assess the families’ material expenses on maintaining their social contacts. Given the conversion capabilities of various types of capital, we hypothesized that respondents from groups with a high level of accumulated social capital would assess their financial situation better than those in lower groups (table 6).

Table 6

Distribution of answers to the following question: How would you assess the current financial situation of your family? (Expressed in % and categorized by the level of accumulated social capital)

Answer	Type of social capital				
	1	2	3	4	5
Good	0	4.2	4.3	8.2	21,4
Rather good	1.9	9.3	7	14.5	21,4
Average	46.3	37.3	57	54.7	28.6
Rather bad	29.6	33.1	19,4	14.5	0
Bad	22.2	12.7	9.7	3.8	7
Don’t know/not sure	0	3.4	2.7	4.4	21,4

The study revealed direct correlation between the respondent’s self-assessment regarding their material situation and the level of their social capital. The higher the social capital, the more positive the ratings and therefore the investment opportunities of the respondents and their families.

Conclusion. A study of family social capital showed that Russian families

¹⁶ Bourdieu P. Forms of capital / t P. Bourdieu // Economic Sociology [Electronic Journal] .2002. No. 5, pp. 60-75 // URL: <https://eesoc.hse.ru>

possess it to varying degrees. Its distribution is clearly unbalanced. The methodology we elaborated and used for studying social capital allows us to assess the differences and distinguish groups of respondents (parents) according to their level of social capital. The presence of social capital is manifest in the level of trust, readiness for communication and mutual assistance. The narrowness of the trust radius does not contribute to the growth of social capital, and its lack can limit the possibility of passing it on to the future generations. Maintaining social capital requires investments. Investment resources include primarily material resources and time. Most families possess the resources necessary to form their social capital and invest in it. Altogether, this creates favorable conditions for most families in regards to the formation of social capital of younger generations.

Acknowledgement. The article was prepared with the support of the Russian Foundation for Fundamental Research (RFFI) (Grant no. 19-011-0724 / 19 “The Barriers to Civic Participation and Mechanisms to Overcome them at the Regional Level”. I express my gratitude to I.N. Vorobyeva (Ph.D., associate professor at the Department of Sociology and Social Technologies of Cherepovets State University) and N.N. Yasnikov (research engineer) for their help in processing the survey data.

Keywords: *Family, family social capital, resources for investing, Coleman J., Bourdieu P.*

SUSՅԱՆԱ ԳՈՒԺԱՎԻՆԱ – Ընտանեկան սոցիալական կապիտալի հիմնական բնութագրիչները Ռուսաստանի տարածաշրջաններում (Վոլոգդայի տարածաշրջանի օրինակով) – Հոդվածում բացահայտվում են Ռուսաստանի տարածաշրջաններում ընտանեկան սոցիալական կապիտալի հիմնական բնութագրիչները: Վոլոգդայի տարածաշրջանում իրականացված սոցիոլոգիական հետազոտության արդյունքները վերլուծվել են Ջ. Քուլմանի և Պ. Բուրդյեի սոցիալական կապիտալի հայեցակարգերի հիման վրա: Պարզվել է, որ ընտանիքների մեծամասնությունը սոցիալական կապիտալի ձևավորման համար ունի համապատասխան ռեսուրսներ: Այնուամենայնիվ, այն բաշխված է ծայրաստիճան անհավասար: Վստահության նեղ շառավիղը չի նպաստում սոցիալական կապիտալի աճին, և դրա անբավարարությունը կարող է հետագայում սահմանափակել սոցիալական կապիտալի փոխանցումը ապագա սերունդներին:

Բանալի բառեր – *ընտանիք, ընտանեկան սոցիալական կապիտալ, ներդրումներ անելու ռեսուրսներ, Ջ. Քուլման, Պ. Բուրդյե*

ТАТЬЯНА ГУЖАВИНА – Основные характеристики семейного социального капитала регионов России (На примере Вологодской области). – Статья посвящена исследованию семейного социального капитала. На основе теоретической модели, в основе которой концептуальные разработки Дж. Коулмана и П. Бурдьё, был проведен анализ эмпирических данных, полученных в

ходе социологического исследования, проведенного в Вологодской области. Было установлено, что большая часть семей располагают ресурсами для формирования своего социального капитала, инвестируют в него. Однако распределен он крайне неравномерно. Узкий радиус доверия не способствует росту социального капитала. Его недостаток может ограничить в дальнейшем и его передачу следующим поколениям.

Ключевые слова: семья, семейный социальный капитал, ресурсы для инвестирования, Дж. Коулман, П. Бурдьё

Ներկայացվել է՝ 25.03.2020

Գրախոսվել է՝ 21.05.2020

Շնորհանվել է տպագրության՝ 24.07.2020

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the study of family social capital. On the basis of a theoretical model, based on the conceptual developments of J. Coleman and P. Bourdieu, an analysis of empirical data obtained in the course of a sociological study conducted in the Vologda Oblast was carried out. It was found that most of the families have the resources to form their social capital and invest in it. However, it is distributed extremely unevenly. A narrow radius of trust does not promote the growth of social capital. Its deficiency can further restrict its transmission to the next generations.

Keywords: Family, family social capital, resources for investing, Coleman J., Bourdieu P.

About Authors

Tatiana Guzhavina – PhD, Associate Professor, Leading Researcher of Vologda Research Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences (VolSC RAS)

E mail: tanja_gta@mail.ru

REFERENCES

- Liausheva, S.A. (2010) The influence of society modernization on the institution of the family, *Bulletin of the Adygea State University. Series 1: Regional studies: philosophy, history, sociology, jurisprudence, political science, cultural science*, No. 2, pp. 105-110.
- Hanifan, L.I. (1967) The Rural School. Community Center, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, pp. 130–138. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/000271621606700118>
- Coleman, J. (2001) Capital social and human, *ONS*, No. 3, pp. 120-139.
- Coleman, J.S. (1988) The Creation and Destruction of Social Capital: Implications for the Law, *3 Notre Dame J.L. Ethics & Pub. Policy*, No 3, pp. 375 - 404.
- Bourdieu, P. (2002) Forms of capital, *Economic Sociology*, No. 5. pp. 60-75. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.17323/1726-3247-2002-5-60-74>
- Afanasyev, D.V., Guzhavina, T.A. & Mehova, A.A. (2016) Social capital in the region: on the issue of measuring and building an indicator model, *Economic and social changes: facts, trends, forecast*, No. 6, pp. 110-125. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.15838/esc.2016.6.48.6>
- Guzhavina, T.A. & Vorobyeva, I.N. (2017) The use of factor analysis in measuring social capital, *Social space*, No 4 (11), retrieved from: <http://sa.vsc.ac.ru/article/2377>
- Granovetter, M. (2009) Strength of weak ties, *Economic Sociology*, T. 10. No. 4, Pp. 31-50. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.17323/1726-3247-2009-4-31-50>
- Coleman, J. (2001) Capital social and human, *ONS*, No. 3, pp. 120-139.
- Putnam, R. (1995) Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital, *Journal of Democracy*, pp. 65-78. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.1995.0002>
- Sandefur, G., Meier, A. & Hernandez, P. (1999) Families, Social Capital, and Educational Continuation, CDE Working Paper No. 99-19, Center for Demography and Ecology. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Coleman, J. (2001) Capital social and human, ONS, No. 3, pp. 120-139

Shimko, S. V., Ozerov A. A. & Tarasenko L.V. (2012) Socialization risks: theoretical and methodological problems of research, Bulletin Adyghe State University. Series 1: Regional Studies: Philosophy, History, Sociology, Jurisprudence, Political Science, Cultural Studies, No 2, pp. 128-134

Aeby, G., Widmer, E.D. & Carlo, I.D. (2014) Bonding and Bridging Social Capital in Step- and First-Time Families and the Issue of Family Boundaries, *Interpersona*, Vol. 8(1), pp. 51–69.

Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5964/ijpr.v8i1.149>