The Social Science Review A Multidisciplinary Journal. November-December, 2025. Vol. 3. Issue 6. 281-284
Published by: Pather Dabi Educational Trust, (Regn No: IV-1402-00064/2023), Under Govt. of West Bengal, India

The Social Science Review
A Multidisciplinary Journal
ISSN: 2584-0789
(Open-Access, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Bi-Monthly, International e-Journal)
Homepage: www.tssreview.in

SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF ECONOMIC OUTCOMES: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SOCIAL CAPITAL

Somnath Karmakar [1] & Souvik Dasgupta [2]

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Author Details:
[1] Research Scholar, Department of Economics, Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University, Purulia, West Bengal, India;
[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University, Purulia, West Bengal, India

Corresponding Author:
Somnath Karmakar

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.70096/tssr.250306042

Abstract
The different dimensions of social capital such as networks, norms, trust, and power relations has been increasingly recognized as critical factors in explaining differences in economic performance, institutional effectiveness, and social well-being. This article explores the key theoretical perspectives on social capital as a concept, its theoretical roots, and its significance in economic research. It traces the development of the concept from its early sociological roots to its growing prominence in economics and development studies. The present discussion synthesises the contributions from scholars such as Bourdieu, Coleman, Putnam, and Woolcock on social capital.

Keywords: *Social Capital, Development Economics, Institutions, Networks, Trust*

Introduction

The concept of social capital has evolved gradually from early philosophical reflections on community, social cohesion, and collective life into a central analytical framework in contemporary economics and the social sciences. Long before the term "social capital" was formally articulated, classical philosophers emphasized the importance of social relationships and moral bonds in sustaining social order and economic life. Thinkers such as Aristotle highlighted the role of friendship, trust, and civic virtue in promoting cooperation and the wellbeing of the polis, while later social theorists stressed the embeddedness of economic behaviour within social relations (Aristotle, trans. 1998; Polanyi, 1944). These early insights laid the intellectual groundwork for understanding social relationships as productive resources rather than merely social by products.

The modern articulation of social capital emerged in the late twentieth century as scholars sought to explain economic and social outcomes that could not be fully accounted for by conventional market-based models. Pierre Bourdieu established social capital as the sum of real and prospective resources that comprise long-lasting social networks, illustrating its role in reinforcing social inequalities (Bourdieu, 1986). James Coleman further advanced the concept by linking social capital to rational choice theory, arguing that social structures facilitate certain actions by reducing transaction costs and enabling cooperation (Coleman, 1988). These contributions signified a move from philosophical intuition to rigorous theoretical analysis, establishing social capital as a kind of capital equal to physical and human capital.

The concept gained widespread prominence in economics and political science through the work of Robert Putnam, who demonstrated how variations in social capital manifested through trust, norms of reciprocity, and civic engagement could explain differences in institutional performance and economic development (Putnam, 1993; 2000). The subsequent research integrated social capital into development economics, labour economics, and institutional analysis, highlighting its role in influencing growth, governance, inequality, and welfare outcomes. Today social capital is widely known as a key instrument linking social structures to economic performance, reflecting a broader shift in economics toward incorporating institutions, networks, and social norms into analytical frameworks. Thus, the evolution of social capital represents a movement from early philosophical insights into community and social interaction toward a sophisticated, empirically grounded concept that enriches modern economic analysis.

Conceptual Foundations of Social Capital

Social capital is the intangible wealth that emerges from interactions and cooperation between individuals and communities. It is involving trust, cooperation, and shared norms which fosters a sense of belonging and mutual support, forming connections and relationships among individuals and communities. Hence, social capital relates to the networks, relationships, customs, and trustworthiness that enable people and institution to work together for the betterment of all. Social capital significantly impacts individual opportunities, resource access, and overall life quality. Strong social connections lead to collaboration, sharing information and resources, and support during times of need. This leads to increased efficiency, innovation, productivity, and a stronger sense of community. In the presence of social capital, achieving many development outcomes becomes easier. There are three major types of social capital:

I. ***Bonding Social Capital***: denotes strong and deep ties between people who have comparable socioeconomic features, such as family members, close friends, or people belonging to the same ethnic and religious groups (Putnam, 2000). These horizontal linkages are distinguished by high interpersonal trust, psychological closeness, and strong reciprocity (Coleman, 1988). Bonding capital is functionally vital for "getting by" in daily life; it provides a crucial safety net for mutual support and solidarity (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). For instance, it helps individuals cope with crises through the provision of emotional aid, financial assistance, shared resources like childcare. However, while bonding capital strengthens internal cohesion, scholars like Portes (1998) warn that excessive reliance on these dense ties can lead to "social closure" or insularity, potentially restricting individual freedom and limiting exposure to outside ideas or economic opportunities.

II. ***Bridging Social Capital***: In contrast, bridging social capital involves more distant, often "weaker" ties that link people across heterogeneous social groups (Granovetter, 1973). These connections typically form among neighbours, colleagues or members of professional associations who differ in background, ethnicity, class, or occupation. Putnam (2000) argues that while bonding capital is for "getting by" and bridging capital is essential for "getting ahead." Its primary value lies in its capacity to facilitate the diffusion of diverse information and innovation. Because these ties span social cleavages, they are critical for social mobility and community cooperation (Narayan, 1999). For example, professional networks allow individuals to access job opportunities outside their immediate circle, fostering social cohesion and inclusion in diverse societies.

III. ***Linking social capital***: is a notion later refined by Woolcock (1998) and Szreter and Woolcock (2004), refers to "vertical" relationships that connect individuals to people or groups in positions of power and authority. Unlike the horizontal nature of bonding and bridging, linking ties cut across formal hierarchies, connecting citizens with government officials, policymakers, NGOs, or financial institutions. This form of capital is essential for accessing institutional resources and influencing decision-making processes. For marginalized communities, linking social capital is particularly critical; it allows them to leverage networks beyond their immediate peer groups to secure public services, funding, or legal protection, effectively acting as a lever for development and well-being (World Bank, 2000).

Evolution of the Concept

As a concept "social capital" has a rich and complex history, evolving from early philosophical insights into community and social interaction to becoming a prominent analytical tool in modern economics. The term itself gained widespread recognition in the 1990s, the underlying ideas have much deeper roots. The fundamental ideas behind social capital have their roots in classical political economics and Enlightenment philosophers who investigated the connection between social well-being and associational life. Although they did not utilize the phrase "social capital," their efforts established the foundation. Hanifan, a rural school administrator in West Virginia, is generally recognized as the first person to utilize the phrase "social capital". He defined it as the "goodwill, fellowship, mutual sympathy, and social interaction among a group of individuals and families," emphasizing its potential to enhance both community well-being and academic achievement. Hanifan's work in 1916 was significant because it provided an early conceptualization of the idea that social relationships and networks have value and can be a resource for individuals and communities. This foundational idea has since become a central concept in various fields, including sociology, economics, and political science. he highlighted its importance in making "tangible substances count for most." (Hanifan, 1916; Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). In "The Death and Life of Great American Cities," Jacobs emphasized the importance of "networks" as "cities' rare social capital" in fostering urban vitality. (Jacobs, 1961; Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). While Hanifan (1916) used the term much earlier in an educational context, Loury (1977) introduced it into the economic analysis of inequality by ascertaining the consequences of social position in explaining differences in "human capital" characteristics, particularly in relation to racial disparities. Granovetter (1985) discussed how economic action is "embedded" in social relations, influencing trust and reducing opportunism.

Bourdieu (1986) described 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." In essence, it refers to the resources such as economic, cultural, or symbolic that an individual or group can mobilize by virtue of their connections, memberships in social networks, and group affiliations. Coleman (1988) provided a more functional definition, viewing social capital as a "productive asset" that facilitates actions and helps individuals and groups achieve particular ends that would be impossible without it. He focused on its role in creating human capital and solving collective action problems. Coleman explicitly attempted to integrate rational choice economics with sociological structure. (Coleman, 1988). Robert Putnam a political scientist, was substantially responsible for popularizing the notion of social capital. In particular, his 1993 book "Making Democracy Work", which correlated civic engagement with government quality in Italy. He demarcated 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 conceptualized social capital as an inherently collective phenomenon, associating it with the prevalence of voluntary associations, levels of civic engagement, and the extent of trust and reciprocity within a community. His work brought the concept into mainstream development discourse. (Putnam, 1993).

Social Capital in Economic Theory

Theoretical developments of social capital in economic analysis reflects a growing recognition that economic activity is not solely driven by individual rationality and tangible assets. Instead, the "invisible hand" is often guided by the "social glue" of trust, norms, and networks, which significantly influence productivity, market efficiency, institutional performance, and overall development outcomes. Describing social capital as "capital" frames it as a productive resource that can be accumulated, invested, and mobilized to generate returns, much like physical, financial, or human capital.

Loury (1977) is widely credited with introducing the specific term into modern economic discourse. In his analysis of racial income inequality in the US, he observed that young Black workers with the same education (Human Capital) as White workers still had lower wages. He theorized that the missing variable was "Social Capital"—the set of social resources such as connections, role models, information channels) inherent in the community structure. For Loury, social capital was an individual asset derived from social location. Coleman (1988) argued that social capital like family structure and community norms was the input that allowed human capital to form. According to Granovetter's (1985) economic actions are shaped by the networks of social relationships in which actors are situated, rather than being the result of isolated, purely rational decision-making. While social ties can facilitate cooperation, reduce uncertainty, and make markets function more smoothly, they can also produce exclusion, favouritism, and rigidity, limiting competition and innovation. Thus, economic outcomes cannot be fully understood without examining the specific social relationships and network structures in which economic action is embedded. During the 1990s, social capital became a key focus for organizations like the World Bank, which recognized its implications for economic development and poverty reduction. They viewed it as a crucial factor in building resilient communities, improving service efficiency, and fostering collective action for shared prosperity. (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000; World Bank, 1998)

Economists argue that social capital expressed through trust, norms, and networks. It also helps lower transaction costs, support contractual relationships, improve information sharing, and promote collective action across different economic settings, from local credit systems to broader market operations. Scholars like Partha Dasgupta have explored the economic implications of trust. (Dasgupta, 1988; Ostrom, 1990). Just as financial capital supports investment in physical assets and human capital develops skills and knowledge, social capital strengthens the ability of individuals and groups to mobilize resources effectively (Lin, 2001). Empirical research suggests that societies characterized by strong social capital tend to experience better governance outcomes, improved economic performance, and higher levels of civic engagement (Putnam, 1993; 2000).

From an institutional point of view, major outcomes such as economic growth, inequality, and social capital accumulation are heavily reliant on the quality and efficacy of institutions. Well-functioning institutions promote cooperation, trust, and participation by providing predictable rules and credible enforcement mechanisms (Williamson, 2000). In contrast, weak or extractive institutions often generate inefficiencies, social exclusion, and unequal access to economic opportunities, thereby undermining long-term development (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012).

Conclusion

These social resources have intrinsic value because they give individuals and groups access to information, support, and prospects that would otherwise be costly or hard to obtain. In this sense, social capital is not merely a social characteristic of communities but a productive asset that contributes to both individual success and collective well-being. Thus, conceptualizing social capital as "capital" underscores its role as a durable and productive resource that generates long-term benefits for individuals, communities, and societies. Social capital has evolved over time into a more comprehensive and diverse manner. It has grown in recognition in a wide range of academic disciplines, including economics, political science, sociology, and even public health. The notion of social capital is also relevant in the social sciences, community development, and economics.

While widely accepted, social capital has also faced critiques regarding its definition, measurement, and potential downsides (e.g., exclusionary aspects of bonding capital, or "dark side" of networks that foster corruption). Economists like Edward Glaeser have developed individual-based approaches to social capital, focusing on how individuals invest in social connections for personal returns. (Glaeser, 2013)

Acknowledgment: No
Author's Contribution: *Somnath Karmakar*: Literature Review, Analysis, Referencing; *Souvik Dasgupta*: Drafting
Funding: No
Declaration: All the authors have given consent for the publication.
Competing Interest: No

References

1. Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Business.
2. Aristotle. (1998). *Politics* (C. D. C. Reeve, Trans.).
3. Bourdieu P (1986) The forms of capital. In: Richardson J (ed) Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education. Greenwood, New York, pp 241–258.
4. Claridge, T. (2021). Evolution of the concept of social capital. *Social Capital Research*, 1-5.
5. Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*, S95-S120.
6. Dasgupta, P. (1988). Trust as a Commodity. In D. Gambetta (Ed.), Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations (pp. 49-72). Basil Blackwell.
7. Glaeser, E. L., Laibson, D., & Sacerdote, B. (2002). The Economic Approach to Social Capital. *The Economic Journal, 112*(483), F437-F456.
8. Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, *78*(6), 1360–1380.
9. Hanifan, L. J. (1916). The Rural School Community Center. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 67(*1), 130-138.
10. Jacobs, J. (1961). Jane jacobs. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, *21*(1), 13-25.
11. Loury, G. C. (1976). *A dynamic theory of racial income differences* (No. 225). Discussion paper.
12. Lin, N. (2002). *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action* (Vol. 19). Cambridge university press.
13. Narayan-Parker, D. (1999). *Bonds and bridges: Social capital and poverty* (Vol. 2167). World Bank Publications.
14. North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, institutional change and economic performance. *Cambridge Univ Pr*.
15. Polanyi, K. (1944). The Great Transformation Beacon Press. *Boston MA*.
16. Portes, A. (1998). Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology. *Annu. Rev. Sociol*, *24*, 1-24.
17. Putnam, R. D. (1993). Making Democracy Work.
18. Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.
19. Szreter, S., & Woolcock, M. (2004). Health by association? Social capital, social theory, and the political economy of public health. *International journal of epidemiology*, *33*(4), 650-667.
20. Williamson, O. E. (2000). The new institutional economics: taking stock, looking ahead. *Journal of economic literature*, *38*(3), 595-613.
21. Woolcock, M. (1998). Social capital and economic development: Toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and society*, *27*(2), 151-208.
22. Woolcock, M., & Narayan, D. (2000). Social capital: Implications for development theory, research, and policy. *The world bank research observer*, *15*(2), 225-249.
23. World Bank. (2000). *World development report 2000/2001: Attacking poverty*. Washington, DC: World Bank
24. World Bank. (1998). The Initiative on Defining, Monitoring and Measuring Social Capital. Social Capital Initiative Working Paper No. 1.