

SOCIAL CAPITAL IN THE PHILIPPINES: RESULTS FROM A NATIONAL SURVEY*

Ricardo G. Abad

Two major notions of social capital, namely networks and trust, take center stage in this review of findings from a national survey conducted by the Social Weather Stations. The major findings fall into three general themes: first, the pervasiveness in Philippine society of network contacts with close family and friends, or bonding social capital; second, the paucity of associational ties, or bridging social capital, among adult Filipinos; and third, the asymmetry of social capital, in that those who bond more and trust more are more likely to come from the ranks of the privileged. These findings suggest that discussions on social capital, in concept and practice, must take into account the sociological forces that lay down the blueprints for distributing scarce goods in society.

OVERVIEW OF THE CONCEPT

Social capital makes sense as a public good or a private good. Robert Putnam and Francis Fukuyama, two influential interpreters of the concept, see it as a public good, or as cultural forces that make groups cohesive enough to pursue common goals. To Putnam (1993:167; also see Putnam 1996:56), social capital has thus come to mean the “features of social organizations, such as trust, norms, and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions.” To Fukuyama (1995:26, 159), one form of social capital, namely mutual trust, or what he calls “spontaneous sociability,” gives members of a community a “prior moral consensus” that makes unnecessary extensive contractual and legal regulation of their social relations. Trust, in this sense, has replaced the rule book or the office manual. In contrast, the works of Pierre Bourdieu (1986) and James Coleman

(1988) see social capital as a “private good,” or a set of assets or resources that a person or group invests in to secure economic transactions, acquire other forms of capital, or succeed in competitive rivalries. Or as Nan Lin (2000:25) puts it, social capital represents those “resources embedded in social networks accessed and used by actors for actions.” Similarly, Ronald Burt (1992:8-9; also see Burt 1997) sees an investment in social capital, or one’s “relationships with other players, as the “final arbiter of competitive success” in market transactions.

Both positions are persuasive. But because scholars still find the concept elusive, no standard definition of the concept prevails in the literature. One route to reconcile these views, says Adler and Kwon (2000), is to take a “neutral” stance, namely to view social capital as both a public good and a private good,

or what they call the concept's external and internal dimensions, and to adopt a definition that fits both perspectives. They then propose to let social capital stand for "the sum of resources available to an individual or group by virtue of their location in the structure of their more or less durable social relations (Alder and Kwon 2000:9)." The suggestion echoes Micheal Woolcock's (1998:153) earlier definition of social capital simply as "the information, trust, and norms of reciprocity inhering in one's networks." Woolcock maintains the neutral stance in a subsequent work (Woolcock 2002:22-23; also see Woolcock and Narayan 2000:226) where social capital means "the norms and networks that enable people to act collectively." Likewise, Robert Putnam (2002:8), in a later discernment, concedes that that social capital does not merely possess "investment value" (a private good) but also provide "direct consumption value" (a public good). He then advances a view of social capital as the "social networks and the associated forms of reciprocity" that create value for individual or collective gain. Yet there is still no wide consensus on this neutral position. In a relatively recent review of the literature, Ostrom and Ahn (2003: xiv) define social capital "an attribute of individuals and of their relationships that enhances their ability to solve collective action problems." Not only does the definition stress social capital as a public good, it also proposes that an *individual* attribute, in this case trustworthiness, is also a form of *social* capital.

Unsettled these views may be, social capital remains in wide use. One reason is that studies have consistently shown that social capital matters much in social

life. Studies of *human capital* may show that "what you know" (skills, knowledge) and "what you have" (wealth, credentials, property) make a difference in one's social state. Studies of *social capital* posit, however, that "who you know" also make as much, if not more, of a difference because "what you know," and "what you have," depend largely on "who you know" (Lin 1999; Marsden and Hurlbert 1988). Moreover, social capital makes a difference in effecting a "private return" (e.g., increased income opportunities) or a "public effect" (e.g., national economic success). Or as Woolcock (2002:20) puts it: "one's family, friends, and associates constitute an important asset, one that can be called upon in a crisis, enjoyed for its own sake, or leveraged for material gain."

Indeed, social capital—taken to mean as involvement in groups, and the amount of solidarity and trust that this involvement generates—shows affinities with, among others, citizen participation and democratic governance (Putnam 1993, 1995; Fukuyama 1995; Badescu and Uslaner 2003; Body-Gendrot and Gittel 2003), as well as have direct policy relevance in areas such as education, health, crime, and welfare (e.g., Coleman 1988, 1990; Fukuyama 1995; Campbell 2000; Barbera 2005). Studies of development also reveal that communities blessed with a "rich stock of social networks and civic associations" are better able to confront poverty, resolve disputes, and successfully implement development projects (e.g., Isham et al. 2002; Woolcock 2002; Trigilia 2001; Woolcock and Narayan 2000).

Likewise, social capital indicators such as networks, trust, and civic norms

also correlate with an impressive economic performance on the macro-level (Knack and Keefer 1997; Dasgupta 2002) and with indicators of modernization (Ingelhart 1997). The concept of networks has also helped economists in the study of market performance (Rauch and Casella 2001; also see Isham et al. 2002 and Grabher and Powell 2004). Conversely, the absence of social capital signals social exclusion, among its manifestations being poverty, vulnerability, and powerlessness (Narayan 2000; Phillipson et al. 2004). So impressive, in fact, does the availability of social capital benefit societies, and its unavailability spelling social disaster that the World Bank has adopted social capital as a major cornerstone of their development strategy with a website devoted to this concern.

Social capital, however, has its “downsides.” Strong social ties, according to Portes (1998), can also make excessive claims on group membership, restrict individual autonomy, and create a self-perpetuating opposition to the social mainstream. Portes and Landolt (1996) add that social networks which are isolated, parochial, or working at cross purposes to society’s common interests (like drug cartels, corruption rings, or rebel groups) can actually hamper economic and social development. Clearly, then, what is social capital to some means social exclusion, oppression, and underdevelopment to others (Harriss and de Renzio 1997). The same ties that bind, as Narayan (2002) puts it, also exclude.

The existence of social capital’s downsides—also called “anti-social capital” (Streeten 2001), negative social

capital, or the concept’s “dark side” (Schuller et al. 2001)—represents a criticism of social capital, one that the concept’s defenders have sought to account for in their analyses. Woolcock (1998, 2002), for instance, introduces the concept of “linking social capital” to describe ties between poor people and those in positions of influence. In another paper, Woolcock (2002) stresses the need to look at the institutional context of social capital and make connections between social ties and social structure. None of these efforts, however, satisfy critics like John Harriss (2002:113) who see the concept of social capital, as used at least by Woolcock and his colleagues at the World Bank, to be “a way of talking about ‘changing social relations’ – but without seriously questioning power relations and property rights.” Without this recognition of political and distributional issues, Harriss argues, social capital offers nothing. The critical edge, Harriss adds, that Pierre Bourdieu (1986) originally gave to the concept, namely that social capital is an instrument of power used to differentiate classes, gets blunted in the World Bank’s handling of the phenomenon.

Schuller et al. (2000) as well as Ostrom and Ahn (2003) cite other difficulties of the concept. In addition to definitional diversity, already noted above, the concept suffers, among others, from over-versatility, i.e., meaning many things to different researchers, and methodological imprecision. For Fine and Green (2000; also see Fine 2001), these limitations dispel notions that social capital is the “Trojan horse” that is capable of challenging the development agenda of the World Bank’s individualistically oriented economists. In fact,

for this and other reasons, Foley and Edwards (1999) have already made a case for “disinvesting” in social capital.

Despite these criticisms, Schuller et al. (2000:35-38) believe that despite its “adolescent characteristics,” social capital still offers much promise as a concept for understanding the social world. The concept shifts the focus of analysis from individual agents to patterns of relationships, links different levels of analysis, and reasserts issues of value (trust, sharing and social support, among others) in social scientific discourse. What is now needed, as Ostrom and Ahn (2003:xxxiv-xxv) urge, is more research to establish basic causal relations, refine definitions, and construct a coherent framework to study economic and political outcomes.

OBJECTIVE AND DATA

It is this need for more research, particularly in the context of nations in the global South, that prompts this investigation of social capital. No formal definition of social capital is advanced, though an open one that accounts for social capital as both public and private good makes sense in this exploratory exercise. The paper’s main interest is to describe, using survey data, how two key notions related to social capital, namely networks and trust, configure in Philippine society. Both these notions cut across the diverse literature on social capital (Schuller et al. 2002:14), have its own research tradition (see, for example, Misztal 1996 and Stompka 1999 on trust; Scott 2000 and Grabher and Powell 2004 on networks), and are less contentious as concepts compared to social capital itself (Koniordos 2005:4). As well, the two

notions also represent the two major divisions of the World Bank’s attempt to operationalize the concept in questionnaire form: one being the kinds of groups where people belong, and the other division being people’s perceptions of the reciprocities that surround efforts to work together and solve problems (Grootaert et al. 2004:3). Trust is one of those reciprocities, belonging to one’s stock of “cognitive” social capital; networks, in turn, constitute a large part of one’s “structural” capital (Krishna and Uphoff 2002 cited in Grootaert 2004:3).

Our data on social capital come from a national survey on Social Relations, conducted in 2001 by the Social Weather Stations (SWS) as part of its work with the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP), a consortium of 26 nations engaged in an annual survey on a common topic. While not explicitly about social capital, the survey contains several items on networks and trust, as well as items on social support, beliefs, and political efficacy that relate to trust and networks. No previous analysis has been made on this data set.

This 2001 SWS/ISSP national survey, administered to a random sample of 1,200 Filipino adults aged 18 years and over, had a sampling error of +/-3 percent. Appendix A summarizes the general demographic profile of the sample. The survey drew equal proportions of respondents (n= 300) from each of the four regional areas: National Capital Region, Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao. For this paper, these subtotals were made more representative of the population by weighing them according to census figures on the actual number of adult population in these areas. The

weights were not used, however, to project the figures on a national scale, thus keeping the base total of 1,200 persons intact.

The sample respondents are split evenly between females and males, a deliberate sampling strategy to neutralize the gender bias in responses. Other than these, following Appendix A, the sample of adult Filipinos shows a preponderance of ever-married persons (90%), Roman Catholics (78%), persons between 18-45 years old (64%), persons living in households with 6 or less people (78%), residents of rural areas (61%), and long-term dwellers in their community (a mean of 26 years). Most have had completed high school education and under (75%), are working in manual occupations (56%), and employed on a full-time basis (40%). Their mean monthly family income is P8,710, with a median of P5,000.

The data on social networks cover the adult Filipino's ties to family and friends, their ties to the larger community via organizations, the kinds of assistance given and received, as well as the extent of the respondent's agreement to statements about family life and friendship. In turn, the data on trust, center on three measures of "generalized trust." This paper will first describe general patterns in the distribution of these survey items, and because social capital resources are "neither brokered equitably nor distributed evenly (Foley and Edwards 1998:2)," this paper will then crosstabulate key items on networks and trust with selected demographic characteristics, specifically gender, life cycle variables (age and marital status), socioeconomic status (education and

family income), and rural-urban residence. Previous research on social capital, as well as studies on Philippine society and culture, will help contextualize the observations.

SOCIAL NETWORKS

Social networks are "sets of linkages among an identified group of people" (Bowling et al.1991, cited in Phillipson 2004:37), or "patterns of relationships connecting organizations, groups, and individuals (Stockard 2000:101-102)." One can thus imagine social networks as occurring on various levels: between large bodies such as nations or corporations, between smaller groups such as church organizations and kin groups, or between individual people (Marsden 1990). This paper's focus lies, however, in a "personal social network" which may be understood as the set of ties an individual has with organizations, groups, or other individuals.

These ties may be strong or weak: "strong ties" are contacts to people characterized by high levels of emotional intensity and intimacy, and "weak ties" are contacts to people not necessarily characterized by high levels of emotional intensity and intimacy (Granovetter 1973). In social capital literature, strong ties are synonymous with the notion of "bonding social capital," while "weak ties" represent "bridging social capital." Bonding social capital cover ties to people with similar demographic characteristics such as family members, close friends, neighbors and work colleagues, while bridging social capital mean ties to more distant associates and colleagues who have dissimilar demographic characteristics (Gittel and

Vidal 1998, cited in Grootaert et al. 2004:4; Narayan 2002; Woolcock 2002).

Social networks also have a directional dimension. Putnam (1993:173), for instance, talks about “horizontal networks” that assemble people of similar status and power, and “vertical networks” that bring together persons with asymmetrical status and power, thus resulting in relations characterized by hierarchy and dependence. Bonding and bridging social capital, as described above, may represent horizontal networks: they simply imply tight or loose connections between people. In contrast, a concept called “linking social capital”—understood here as ties to people in positions of authority and influence such as representatives of public institutions (state agencies, political parties) or private organizations (banks, business firms)—is synonymous with vertical social networks (Woolcock 1999, 2002; World Bank 2000).

While networks vary in size, density, tie strength, efficiency and effectiveness (Burt 1992; Scott 2000) as well as in the kinds of relationships among the members, all networks share two traits: a shared culture and an agreement among the members to operate within that shared culture (Phillipson et al. 2001:10). A high degree of agreement within the network, so the logic of social capital goes, elicits other forms of social capital—trust, norms of cooperation, obligations, and so on—that may yield (or withhold) benefits for persons and groups. In this sense, social networks may be seen as “structures of opportunity” that aid people to gain access to different sorts of resources (Phillipson 2001:1). However, these same

networks, if they are vertical in nature with strong ties among its members, may fail to generate enough trust to spill out into the larger society. For this reason, many scholars agree that a dense horizontal network, one with overlapping weak ties, carries more weight than network with very strong ties in sustaining social stability, civic engagement, and collective action (e.g., Granovetter 1973; Putnam 1993; Badescu 2003; Åberg and Sandberg 2003).

In the Philippines, formal social network analysis, or the attempt to explore the impact of network ties and network configuration on people’s lives (see Scott 2000, 2002 for reviews), are few in number (e.g., Martinez-Esquillo 1978; Matiasz 1980; Vancio 1981). What appears abundantly are works that deal with specific types of social networks, though not formally identified as such (Abad 2000). Three types prevail. “Kin-based networks,” the most documented, center on family and household arrangements that operate to provide social and economic support to its members (e.g., Porio et al. 1978; Castillo 1979, Miralao 1994, Medina 2001). “Non-kin-based networks” focus on friendship relations (e.g., Morais 1980, 1981; Dumont 1995), organizations (e.g., Po and Montiel 1980; Almirol 1986; Korten and Siy 1989; Jimenez, n.d.), and economic or work-based arrangements (e.g., Szanton 1970) that take care of people’s needs. A third type, known as the “alliance system” (e.g., Lynch 1959, 1973; Hollnsteiner 1963; Schlegel 1964) combines kin and non-kin members in a network geared to provide support in times of need and to enhance one’s social position. The use of “compadrazco” or ritual kinship is an essential part of this

crafting of alliances (e.g., Arce 1973; Potter 1974; Hart 1977). The importance of social networks, or social capital in general, to social development is also implicit in studies of community organizing and people's participation (see Abad and Eviota 1985:173-184), and is the subject of three ongoing researches (Estuar 2005; Romero 2005; Orpiada 2005). In addition, an investigation into the kinds of social capital generated in cyberspace, networks and trust among them, has also appeared (Balmes and Tomboc 2002).

The SWS/ISSP survey module on Social Relations can address matters pertaining to personal networks involving family and friends as well as to links with organizations but precludes discussion on the alliance system since no data are available on the socioeconomic position of the respondent's contacts.

Kin Networks: The Immediate Family

Tables 1 and 2 present data on the frequency of contact made by respondents with immediate family members, namely parents, children, siblings. Table 1 focuses on the frequency of *face-to-face* contact with these close relatives. Table 2 deals with contacts other than a face-to-face, personal visit.

Face-to-face contacts. "How often," the SWS/ISSP 2001 survey asked, "do you see or visit your (brother or sister/ daughter or son/ father or mother)?" The replies, summarized in Table 1, show that on a *daily* basis—including relatives who live with respondents in the same household—adult Filipinos have the most frequent contact with their children (75%), followed by with their parents (fathers, 48 percent; mothers, 46 percent), and then with their siblings or brothers and sisters (35%).

Table 1. Percent Distribution of Frequency of Face to Face Contact with Immediate Family Members - Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Frequency of visit	How often do you see or visit your...			
	Brother or sister	Daughter or son	Father	Mother
Lives in the same household	9%	51%	20%	20%
Daily	26	24	28	26
Several times a week	10	4	5	6
At least once a week	9	4	6	5
At least once a month	14	3	11	10
Several times a year	13	7	8	9
Less often	18	7	21	23
Never	-	-	2	1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
(N)	(1,082)	(467)	(501)	(729)
NAP, no contact	118	733	12	3
Deceased	-	-	687	468
Total sample	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200

The weekly figures are more impressive. Cumulating the percentages, Table 1 also shows that more than one-half to over four-fifths of the respondents see or visit an immediate family member *at least once a week*. Table 1 shows that about 83 percent see their children at least once a week, 59 percent have weekly contact with their fathers, 57 percent with their mothers, and over half or 54 percent see their siblings. On a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 representing “never (have any contact)” and 10 representing “daily” contact and “lives in same household,” the means are 8.4 for children, 6.8 for fathers, 6.6 for mothers, and 5.7 for siblings. Overall, then, the focal points of face-to-face contact for adult Filipinos are children and parents.

How do these overall patterns vary by social location? Several cross-tabulations, not shown here (see Abad 2006 for the tables), disaggregate the overall results by comparing the mean scores across the categories of selected demographic and geographical factors, all indicators of social location. The demographic indicators are gender, age, marital status, educational attainment, and monthly family income. The geographical indicators are place of residence and distance to mother’s home.

The disaggregated results (Abad 2006) show that regardless of social location, adult Filipinos generally have more contact with their children, followed by parents, and then siblings. Some exceptions, to this pattern, however, can be highlighted:

- Marital status does make a difference. Never married people, as a rule, have no children, and so focus their face-to-face contacts on parents and their

siblings. In turn, married and once married people (the widowed, separated, and divorced) have more contact with their children and less so with parents and siblings – in short, with their family of procreation more than their family of orientation.

- Age differences reflect the marital status pattern. Younger people, those in the 18-24 age bracket, most of whom are also unmarried, are more likely than people in older age groups, many of whom are or have been married, to have more face-to-face contact with their siblings and their parents. The tendency for young and unmarried Filipinos, who have already reached adulthood, to live with their parents and their siblings may help explain these age differences.
- Distance to mother’s residence also affects face-to-face contacts with parents and siblings. The shorter time it takes to reach the mother’s home, the more frequent the contact. If we assume that fathers live in the same dwelling place as mothers, we find the same pattern: the shorter the time to get to the parents’ house, the more frequent the contact with one’s father.

Indeed, many adult Filipinos live relatively close to their parents. Survey results show—more than a third of the sample (38%) are less than 30 minutes away from their mother’s house. In turn, 52 percent are an hour or less away, and nearly two thirds or 66 percent are under three hours away from their mother’s home. This relative proximity enhances contact with parents and other members of one’s family of orientation.

Contact via other means. Where personal visits are not possible, respondents may also reach their parents

through other means. "How often, "the 2001 survey asked, "do you have contact with your (brother or sister/daughter or son/father or mother) other than visiting?" The "other means" refer to contact through letters, telephone, fax, internet, and the like.

Table 2 shows that while over a third (38%) contact their children at least once a week through other means, about 30 percent make a similar weekly contact with their fathers, 26 percent do the same with mothers, and 29 percent with siblings. On a scale of 0 to 10, with "0" representing no contact at all and "10" daily contact, adult Filipinos score an average of 3.9 for children, 3.7 for fathers, 3.4 for mothers, and a lower 3.1 for siblings. These means do not vary much when cross-classified with indicators of social location (see Abad 2006 for the

disaggregated results). They are also lower than the averages obtained for personal visits. But perhaps people who often see close family members face-to-face do not greatly need to contact them through other means.

The general impression, then, is one of substantial contact between respondents and immediate family members, with adult Filipinos using other means such as letters or phones to supplement face-to-face contact. Stated conceptually, a strong amount of "bonding social capital" thrives among Filipinos. The fact that most adult Filipinos live a short distance away from close relatives helps to foster these ties. The other fact that Filipinos, in general, have resided in their communities for a relatively long time, a mean of 26 years (see Appendix A), also fosters close family

Table 2. Percent distribution of frequency of contact with immediate family other than visiting - Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

<i>Frequency of visit</i>	<i>How often do you have contact with your _____ besides visiting...?</i>			
	Brother or sister	Daughter or son	Father	Mother
Daily	12%	22%	15%	12%
Several times a week	8	8	7	7
At least once a week	9	9	8	8
At least once a month	12	10	11	10
Several times a year	11	10	10	9
Less often	48	42	24	27
Never	-	-	26	27
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
(N)	(930)	(212)	(403)	(581)
Missing/NAP	270	988	797	619
Total sample	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200

Note: This question was asked only of family members who did not live in the same household as R. Those cases were excluded from this table and would partly account for column subtotals less than 1,200. The balance of the missing cases would represent cases where the family members have lost contact with the respondent or are deceased.

ties. As past studies have shown (e.g., Höllinger and Haller 1990), long-term residence results in the dominance of “ascribed” networks centered on family and neighbors. The tendency for adult unmarried children to live with parents and siblings also increase the likelihood of face-to-face contact among immediate family members.

Will similar patterns hold for members of one’s non-immediate family?

Kin Networks: Non-Immediate Family Members

The 2001 SWS/ISSP survey asked respondents about the amount of contact (by personal visits or other means) they had with non-immediate family members – specifically , uncles or aunts, cousins, parents-in-law, brothers or sisters in law, nieces and nephews, and godparents. Table 3 shows that the most frequent

contacts, at the rate of more than twice in the last four weeks, were made with nephews and nieces (58%), followed by brothers or sisters-in-law (42%), parents-in-law (39%), cousins (38%), and uncles or aunts (31%). Less frequently reached were godparents (18%). On a scale of 0 to 10, with “0” representing no contact within the last month, and “10” representing very frequent contact or more than twice in the last month, the mean contact scores are, as above, highest for nephews and nieces (7.0) and lowest for godparents (2.7). These mean scores are as a whole lower than those found for intimate family members (a range from 5.7 to 8.4). Thus, contacts with non-immediate family members, including ritual kin, while occurring often enough, do not take place as intensely as contacts with close family members. They do reflect, however, the depth of the Filipino’s family network.

Table 3. Percent distribution of frequency of contact with non-immediate family members - Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Frequency of contact	How often do you have contact with your ____?					
	Uncles or aunts	Cousins	Parents-in-law	Brothers or sisters-in-law	Nieces & nephews	Godparents
More than twice in the last 4 weeks	31%	38%	39%	42%	58%	18%
Once or twice in the last 4 weeks	22	26	16	23	24	18
Not at all in the last 4 weeks	48	36	45	35	18	64
Total (N)	100% (1,021)	100% (1,152)	100% (682)	100% (1,072)	100% (1,140)	100% (787)
No such relative	179	48	518	128	60	473
Total sample	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200

Disaggregated results, not presented here (see Abad 2006), retain the overall pattern showing that in meeting non-immediate family members, adult Filipinos have the most contacts with nephews and nieces and least with godparents. Key variations in frequency of contact, however, appear by age, marital status, and place of residence.

- Regarding *age*, those under 30 years old are significantly more likely to make more contact with non-immediate relatives than persons in older age brackets.
- Regarding *marital status*, unmarried persons are also more likely to make contact with non-immediate family members compared to the presently married and once married. This pattern largely reflects the age differences cited above. As expected perhaps, married people have more contact with their in-laws compared to the once married – or widowed, separated, and divorced persons.
- Regarding *residence*, Filipinos living in urban areas tend to make significantly more contacts with non-immediate relatives compared to those residing in suburban areas or rural villages. This may suggest the geographical stability of kin relations in urban areas as opposed to those in rural areas.

Friends

In Philippine culture, close friends are vital to people's emotional life and constitute an important set of affiliations among Filipinos. Family ties, though close and deeply personal, often lock people in a web of duties and obligations, some of which may be difficult to refuse because of the strong authoritarian mode

in familial relations. Under these conditions, friendship bonds offer an escape or refuge from the strains of family life; as well as ensure a reciprocity of affection, support, and material assistance in times of need. These bonds, however, may also lock people in a web of duties and obligations that can compete with family demands (Dumont 1993, 1995; Morais 1980, 1981; Keifer 1968).

Several survey items pertained to friendship. The 2001 SWS/ISSP survey first enjoined respondents to think about people in their work places, in their neighborhood or district, and in other places like churches and clubs, people other than family or relatives, and asked for each place: *How many of these are close friend(s) of yours?* The results, displayed in Table 4, indicate the presence a wide friendship network among Filipinos. Nearly 95 percent of the respondents have at least one or two close friends, 50 percent have between one to eight friends, and a third or 33 percent say that they have eleven or more close friends. The median is 7, the mean is 10, and the large standard deviation of 12 indicates a distributional skew towards a greater number of friends.

And where do Filipinos find their friends? Survey data show that respondents tend to acquire friends where they spend most of their time in: close to home (mean of 4.6 friends) or in the workplace (mean of 4.0) rather in other places (mean of 3.3). The differences among these means are statistically significant using the Friedman test (χ^2 , 2df = 80.1, $p < .001$). For adult Filipinos, then, as well as for many non-Filipinos, propinquity begets friendship.

Table 4. Percent distribution of number of friends by location - Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Number of friends	Location of friends			
	At work place	Living near respondent	In other places	ALL PLACES
None	17%	13%	39%	5%
1-2	32	31	22	13
3-4	19	19	12	13
5-6	15	17	11	14
7-8	3	3	2	10
9-10	9	11	8	12
11 or more	4	6	5	33
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
(N)	(754)	(1,197)	(1,198)	(750)
Missing	446	3	2	450
Total Sample	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
<i>Median</i>	3.0	3.0	2.0	7.0
<i>Mean</i>	4.0	4.6	3.3	10.4
<i>S.D.</i>	5.8	5.8	5.3	11.9

Note: Missing cases mean that the respondent does not work so the question is not applicable, or that the respondent did not give an answer to the question

Disaggregated results, again not shown here (see Abad 2006), compares the mean number of friends in each of these three settings by selected demographic characteristics. Three of these characteristics—gender, age, and educational attainment—have the strongest influence on the number of friends:

- In general, males tend to have more friends than females: the overall means are 12.5 for males vs. 8.3 for females, with significant differences between them found on the mean number of friends in the work place and nearby one's residence.
- Age also exerts some effect as older people, specifically those 35 years old

(mean of 8.6) and above have, on the average, more friends than those under 34 years old (mean of 11.4). The significant difference only applies, however, to friends living close to home rather than friends at work or in other places.

- In turn, persons with higher level of schooling are more likely to have more friends compared to those with lower levels of educational attainment. The differences are particularly sharp between college-educated persons (a mean of 13.1 friends) against those who entered high school (mean of 9.4) and those in the elementary level or below (mean of 9.8). The differences are particularly striking for friends in the

work place and in other places suggesting that education introduces people to contacts outside one's kin world.

The survey also asked respondents if their *best friend* is a male or female, and if that friend is a relative or not. Spouses or lovers are excluded from the selection. The total column of Table 5 notes that the majority or 64 percent (32.3 + 31.6) of best friends are non-relatives, while over a third or 36 percent are kin relations. By gender, females are slightly more likely than males to be selected as best friends (52 vs. 48 percent). Moreover, males are more likely to choose females as best friends (9.1 percent) than it is for females to select males as close friends (4.6 percent). But the general gender pattern follows the principle of homogamy: male respondents are more likely to have best friends who are males (91 percent of the time), while female respondents are more likely to have best friends who are also females (96 percent of the time). The association between respondent's gender and the gender of

the respondent's closest friend is very strong ($\phi = .87$) and statistically significant ($\chi^2, 1df = 858.5$).

Contacts with best friends are also substantial. The SWS survey asked: *how often do you see or visit your friend (the friend you feel closest to)?* Again, spouses and lovers cannot be named as best friends. The replies, arrayed in Table 6, shows that nearly half the sample or 49 percent report that they see or visit their friends *daily* (including those whose declared close friend lives in the same household), while about a large 81 percent say they have face-to-face contact with their best friend *at least once a week or more*. On a scale of 0 to 10, with "0" representing no contact with one's best friend and "10" standing for daily contact with a best friend, adult Filipinos obtain a mean score of 7.9. This score compares favorably with the sample's mean face-to-face contact scores with children (8.4), nieces and nephews (7.0), father (6.7), and mother (6.6). Next to their children, then, adult Filipinos see their friends the most frequently.

Table 5. Percent Distribution of Gender and Relation of Best/close Friend by Respondent's Gender - Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Gender and relation of best friend	Total	Respondent's Gender	
		Male	Female
Male	48%	91%	4%
Relative	15	29	2.1
Non- relative	32	62	1.9
Female	52	9	96
Relative	21	4	38
Non- relative	32	5	58
Total	100%	100%	100%
(N)	(1,141)	(572)	(569)

Note: Missing from the table are respondents (N=59 of the total sample) who reported having no close friends.

Table 6. Percent Distributions of Frequency of Visit to Close Friend and Contact with Close Friend through other Means - Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Frequency of visit/contact	Questions	
	<i>How often do you visit your close friend?</i>	<i>How often do you have contact with your close friend besides visiting?</i>
Live in the same household	2%	—
Daily	47	19%
Several times a week	19	13
At least once a week	13	9
At least once a month	7	7
Several times a year	2	3
Less often	8	14
Never	2	35
Total	100%	100%
(N)	(1,139)	(1,121)
NAP/Missing	61	79
Total sample	1,200	1,200

Note: The second question was asked only of respondents whose friends did not live in the same household.

The SWS survey also asked. “*And how often do you have any contact with this friend aside from visiting, either by telephone, letter, fax, or email?*” Table 7 shows that about 19 percent do so daily, while almost twice that figure, or 40 percent, makes other kinds of contact at least once a week or more. On a scale of 0 to 10, the mean contact score for friends using other means is 4.3 for the total sample, a figure that is higher than any of the mean contact score using other means for close family members: children (3.9), father (3.7), mother (3.4), and siblings (3.1). Thus, not only do adult Filipinos see their friends very regularly, they also find time to reach them through the telephone, letter, fax or the internet more often than they do the same to their parents, siblings, or children.

How does the mean contact score for friends look when disaggregated by demographic statuses? The cross-tabulations, again not shown here (see Abad 2006), reveal that gender, age, and marital status apparently have little effect on the frequency of contact with friends, either by face-to-face meeting or by some long distance connection. But socio-economic status and place of residence have some effect, particularly in contacting friends using other means. Respondents who have higher educational attainment, belong higher family incomes, or live in large cities are more likely to contact their friends using other means – the telephone, fax, or the internet, for example.

Table 7. Mean Contact Scores for Friends by Demographic Characteristics - Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Characteristics	Mean contact scores	
	Face-to-face (N= 1,139)	Other Means (N= 1,121)
TOTAL	7.9	4.3
Gender		
Male	8.0	4.4
Female	7.8	4.2
<i>eta</i>	<i>.04, ns</i>	<i>.02, ns</i>
Age		
18-24	7.7	4.6
25-34	7.9	4.2
35-44	8.1	4.4
45 & over	7.7	4.1
<i>eta</i>	<i>.07, ns</i>	<i>.04, ns</i>
Marital status		
Unmarried	7.8	4.6
Presently married	7.9	4.3
Once married	7.8	3.4
<i>eta</i>	<i>.02, ns</i>	<i>.07, ns</i>
Educational attainment		
None or elementary	8.2	3.9
High school /Vocational	7.8	3.9
College / Post college	7.6	5.4
<i>eta</i>	<i>.08*</i>	<i>.14***</i>
Family income level		
Under P3,000/month	8.1	3.4
P3,000-5000	8.0	3.7
P5,001-10,000	7.9	4.5
Over P10,000	7.6	5.5
<i>eta</i>	<i>.08, ns</i>	<i>.20***</i>
Place of residence		
Rural village	8.3	3.6
Small city, suburb	7.3	4.0
Large city	7.1	5.6
<i>eta</i>	<i>.19***</i>	<i>.15***</i>

Notes: Mean contact scores range from 0 to 10.

Statistical significance of means determined by the one-way F-test.

*p< .05 **p< .01 ***p< .001 ns = not significant

Ties to close friends represent another type of network that generates a great deal of bonding social capital. Like ties to family, these bonds are emotional, geared towards loyalty, affection, and social support. In this context, it is understandable why, when asked to rate key characteristics of friends, respondents rated personal traits like “intelligence” less important (a margin of +36 percent, see Table 8) than the friend’s ability to “really understand” (+65 percent), to be “enjoyable company” (+61 percent) and to “help get things done” (+49 percent).

Attitudes about friends and family

Responses to two normative statements on friendship confirm these points. Table 9 reveals, for example, that a huge 88 percent of the sample strongly agree or agree that “people who are better off should help friends who are less well off.” This strong agreement, with a margin of 85 percent, reflects the pledge of mutual support among friends, and the ability of friendships to bridge gaps in

material inequality. One is reminded here of Kerkvliet’s (1990:196-197, 250; also see Cannel 1999:27-254) observation that while poor Filipinos are keenly aware of the material gaps between themselves and others, they also believe that all Filipinos are alike in dignity, and worthy of assistance from fellow citizens. Friendship apparently operates on similar rules: two friends may stand on opposite rungs of the stratification ladder but have a moral obligation to help each other in times of need. There is, in Philippine culture, a striving for harmony despite hierarchy, or what Cannel (1999:254) calls “unequal relations for people of equal value.”

Because of the expectation of mutual support, friendships may have personal or strategic uses. Many Filipinos seem to agree this to be the case. Table 9 also points out that some 55 percent of the respondents strongly agree or agree that “it is all right to develop friendships with people just because you know they can be of use to you.” While a sizable 33

Table 8. Percent Distribution of Important Characteristics of a Close Friend - Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Importance	Characteristics of friends			
	Intelligence	Helps get things done	Really understands	Enjoyable company
Extremely important	38%	50%	65%	62%
Very important	36	36	28	29
Fairly important	12	9	5	6
Not too important	13	4	1	2
Not at all important	2	1	1	1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
(N)	(1,200)	(1,200)	(1,200)	(1,200)
Margin	+36%	+49%	+64%	+61%

Note: The margin is the difference in percentage points between the two tails of the response categories, in this case between “Extremely important” and “Not at all important.”

percent of the sample disagree or strongly disagree with the statement, the margin of difference (+22) stays positive or in favor of agreement.

This strategic view of friendship must be understood in the context of the “alliance system” and the quest for survival in Philippine society. As Lynch (1959) observes, a Filipino strategy to attain a respectable place in the social hierarchy is to build a network of family and friends who can be called upon for support in times of need. Filipinos who form a large network of allies, which ideally includes a large number of influential or wealthy persons, possess great “prowess” in the community. Having influential godparents during baptisms and weddings, new allies or

friends in one’s network, is part of this process of building “vertical networks” or “linking social capital,” a process that marks religious ceremonies like baptisms or weddings, and the feasting that follows these rites, as “performances” in progress (Mathews 1974; Pertierra 1997).

But families are more stable than friendships as refuges of security, and Filipinos seek many ways to maintain that stability. One is to expect children to take care of their parents. Table 9 reveals that an overwhelming majority of respondents, 91 percent of them, agree or strongly agree that “*adult children have a duty to look after their elderly parents.*” Just as telling is extent to which Filipinos will go to in support of their families. Table 9 again shows that an equally

Table 9. Percent Distribution of Extent of Agreement on Statements Regarding Family and Friendship — Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Reply	Statements			
	Adult children have a duty to look after their elderly parents.	You should take care of yourself and your family first, before helping other people.	<i>People who are better off should help friends who are less well off.</i>	<i>It is all right to develop friendships with people just because you know they can be of use to you.</i>
Strongly agree/ Agree	91%	93%	88%	55%
Neither agree nor disagree	5	5	9	12
Disagree/Strongly disagree	4	2	3	33
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
(N)	(1,199)	(1,199)	(1,199)	(1,199)
Margin	+87%	+91%	+85%	+22%

Notes: The margin is the difference between the extreme response categories of a question, in this case between the “Strongly agree/Agree” category and the “Disagree/Strongly disagree” category. A positive sign means that the responses favor agreement, while a negative sign indicates the responses lean towards disagreement.

The missing cases replied “Can’t choose” or had no answer to the question.

substantial proportion of Filipinos, 93 percent, agree or strongly agree that “you should take care of yourself and your family first before helping other people.” Many observers have asserted that while this norm of familism strengthens family ties, an extreme expression of this norm, which “affirms familial concerns at the expense of the public good” (Zialcita 1997:42; also see Carroll 1993; Miralao 1997; and Mulder 1997) can also be detrimental to the formation of a strong civic consciousness. In turn, a lack of civic consciousness, or an active associational life, makes it difficult for societies to obtain what Putnam (1993, 2002) and Fukuyama (1995) refer to as the “public goods” of social capital, among them a flourishing democracy or a general sense of well-being.

How do Filipinos stand in their associational life? How does their “bonding social capital” compare with their bridging” social capital?”

Organizations

Involvement in organizations is one form of bridging social capital as it enables citizens to establish mutual trust and norms of cooperation with persons outside the confines of private networks (e.g., Putnam 1993, 1995, 2002; Fukuyama 1995; Badescu and Uslaner 2003; Body-Gendrot and Gittel 2003). This associational vigor, which results in what Narayan (2002) a density of “cross-cutting ties,” has been found to be a consistent presence in flourishing democracies.

The SWS survey presented respondents with a list of seven types of associations—political, trade union, church, sports, charitable, neighborhood,

and other types—and asked them: “Please tell me whether you have participated in the activities of this group in the past 12 months.” The response choices were: “does not belong to this group,” “belongs to but never participates,” “attend meetings once or twice,” and “attend meetings more than twice.” The organizations are not identified as governmental or non-governmental, voluntary or involuntary, local or international. Thus, it is not possible to isolate those organizations that comprise what is known as “civil society,” or those groups which are distinct from family or friendship groups on one hand, and the state and market on the other (Ferrer 1997), the kind of associational life that is often associated with civic engagement. This paper can only address in a general way the notion of organizational ties, and its distribution across demographic locations, though at some point a distinction will be made about organizations that belong to the private and public spheres.

Membership in Organizations. The survey item enables us to distinguish respondents who join associations (those who belong to at least one type of organization) and those who do not join associations (persons who do not belong to any of the seven types of groups asked for in the survey). Table 10 presents the final tally: it shows that 47 percent of adult Filipinos do not belong to any organization, while a slight majority or 53 percent are members of at least one type of organization. Of those who are members of an organization, over a third or 36 percent belong to one or two types of organizations, and some 15 percent belong to three or more types of organizations.

Table 10. Ever a Member of an Organization-Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

<i>No. of types of organizations</i>	<i>Percent Member of at least one type of organization</i>
None	47%
At least one	53
One	24
Two	14
Three	7
Four	4
Five	2
Six	1
Seven	1
Total	100%
(N)	(1,200)

In turn, Table 11 offers data on membership in specific types of organizations, regardless of one's level of participation in each type. First, membership by type of organization ranges from a low seven percent in trade unions to 35 percent for church-related groups. These proportions suggest that adult Filipinos who are members of an organization do not cluster in one or a few types but are instead spread out over a wide variety of groups. Second, as suggested above, Filipinos are more likely to belong to church groups than any other type. Membership in a church group commands 35 percent or over a third of the sample. A distant second come sports groups and neighborhood associations that capture about 18 percent of the sample.

In an analysis of cross-national survey data, Haerpfer et al. (2005:255-259; also Knack and Keefer 1977) distinguish two types of organizations related to social

capital. "Type One" organizations, the authors say, pertain more to the private sphere, specifically to personal beliefs, personal morality, arts, culture, leisure, charities, and social concerns like the environment or women's rights. "Type Two" organizations, in turn, relate more to the politics and economics, groups associated with the public realm, among them political parties, trade unions. Of these two, Filipinos are more likely to belong to Type One organizations—church groups, sports groups, neighborhood associations, and charitable organizations—than they are to be members of Type Two organizations like political groups and labor unions.

But what subgroups in the population are more likely to belong to particular types of organizations - and thus more likely to own this form of bridging social capital?

Table 12 cross-classifies overall membership in an organization with selected demographic characteristics. The figures disclose that in general, people with a higher socio-economic status are more likely than those in lower socio-economic status to belong to organizations. A person's chances of being a member of an organization, for instance, increases with education ($G = .39, p < .001$) and family income ($G = .17, p < .001$). Place of residence also matters: those who live in small or large cities are more likely than those who live in farms or rural villages to be members of an association ($G = .17, p < .001$). Gender, however, is not a factor: while males (56%) are more likely than females (51%) to become members of an organization, the percentage difference is not statistically significant.

Age, as well, is not associated with membership.

But do these patterns hold for *specific types* of organization? Seven types were considered: political, trade, church, sports, charitable, neighborhood, and other associations. The disaggregated results (not presented here) present three main findings:

- First, whatever the type of organization, the two indicators of socioeconomic status, namely educational attainment and family income, remain significant correlates of organizational membership. The higher the socioeconomic status, the greater the likelihood of membership in Type One and Type Two organizations. Place of residence also makes a significant difference in membership in five of seven types of organization, the exceptions being political groups and trade unions. Despite these exceptions, the results reinforce the previous impression that elite status and urban residence stand out as among the strongest predictors of organizational membership.
- Second, gender differences now appear important than they did in the aggregated results shown on Table 12. This time, the disaggregated data show that males are more likely than females to be members in five of seven types of organizations, and significantly likely to be members in four of these five types: political groups, trade unions, sports groups, charitable organizations, and other associations. While females are more likely than males to be members of church groups, a reverse pattern in the gender set, the difference is not statistically significant. In general, then, males are more likely to dominate groups that concern both

the private (Type One) and the public (Type Two) spheres.

- Third, age has some importance. Previously unrelated to overall membership (see Table 12), age now exhibits significant relationships in two of the seven types of organizations: sports and neighborhood groups. In contrast, the reverse holds for neighborhood groups, where older people more likely than young people to be members. The positive and negative effects of age cancelled each other out and did not register as a significant factor in the aggregated table.

In sum, while a little more than half the sample belongs to an organization, the chances of becoming a member vary according to their social locations. People who are well off are more likely to join associations than those who are not so well off. Males are more likely to join organizations than females, and urban residents are more likely to be members of groups than those who live in the suburbs or rural villages. In turn, the membership of young or old people varies by the type of organization: sports for the young, neighborhood groups for the older set.

Will the patterns of *membership* in associations differ from the patterns of participation in these organizations?

Participation in Organizations. The respondent's degree of participation was measured on a scale from 0 to 10, with a score of "0" standing for "not belonging to an organization" and a score of "10" for "attending meetings twice or more" within the past 12 months. Each respondent had a set of seven such scores, one for each type of organization. The total was then divided by seven (the seven

Table 12. Organizational Membership by Demographic Characteristics – Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Characteristics	Percentage Member of an organization	Gamma
TOTAL	53	--
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	56	
Female	51	-.10, ns
<i>Age</i>		
18-24	54	
25-34	51	
35-44	54	
45 & over	54	.02, ns
<i>Marital status</i>		
Unmarried	65	
Presently married	51	
Once married	55	-.13*
<i>Educational attainment</i>		
None or elementary	41	
High school /Vocational	53	
College / Post college	74	.39***
<i>Monthly family income</i>		
Under P3,000/month	48	
P3,000-5000	48	
P5,001-10,000	54	
Over P10,000	63	.17***
<i>Place of residence</i>		
Rural village	49	
Small city, suburb	58	
Large city	61	.17***

Notes: Statistical significance determined by the z-test.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ ns = not significant

types of associations asked for in the survey), and a mean score derived. This average represents a respondent's "organizational participation score." Thus calculated, the overall mean participation score for adult Filipinos is a low 1.1, with a fairly narrow standard deviation of 1.5

How will the overall organizational participation score vary by indicators of social location? Table 13 echoes results

for organizational membership. Again, measures of socioeconomic status, specifically educational attainment ($\eta^2 = .27, p < .001$) and family income ($\eta^2 = .17, p < .001$), are significant correlates of organizational participation. The higher the level of education and the greater the family income, the greater will be the likelihood of active participation in organizations. Similarly, urban

residence ($\eta^2 = .12$, $p < .001$) significantly increases the chances of active participation. Gender also affects participation with males having a higher mean score of 1.2 compared to the female's score of 0.9 ($\eta^2 = .08$, $p < .01$). Age, however, is again unrelated to participation – at least in overall, aggregated terms.

How do these overall patterns fare out when disaggregated by type of organization? The disaggregated results (table not presented here) reinforce earlier results:

- First, Filipinos are more active in church groups (mean of 2.5), followed by sports groups (1.2), neighborhood groups (1.2), and charitable organizations (0.9). They are least active in political groups (0.7) and trade unions (0.4). Following Haerpfer et al.'s (2005) distinction, Filipinos are more active in Type One organizations that relate to the private sphere than in Type Two organizations that pertain to the political and economic realms.
- Second, socio-economic status remains a strong predictor of participation in organizations. Persons with high educational attainment are more likely than people with lower educational attainment to participate actively in organizations. This relationship is statistically significant across all seven types of organization, notably sports groups and charitable organizations. Similarly, persons whose family income levels are in the upper quartiles are more likely than those who belong to the lower quartiles to participate actively in associations. This relationship occurs in all seven types of organizations, and is

statistically significant in five of these seven groups, notably charitable associations and sports groups.

- Third, urban residence increases the probability of participation in some groups but not in others. In general, urban residents have larger mean participation scores than those from suburban areas and rural villages, specifically in three of the seven associations: neighborhood groups, and charitable groups, and church groups.
- Fourth, males are in general more active than females in organizations. Males have higher mean scores than females in six of seven types of organizations. In five of these six organizations, the results are statistically significant, with the sharpest differences found in sports groups. The reverse pattern appears, however, for church groups where females participate a little more actively than males do.
- Fifth, the effect of age on participation varies by type of organization. The data disclose that in five of the seven types, older people participate more actively in groups than younger people do. In three of these five organizations, the differences are statistically significant: church groups, charitable organizations, and other associations. In contrast, younger people have higher participation scores than older people when it comes to political organizations and sports groups. However, it is only in sports groups where the age differences are statistically significant in favor of younger persons.

In summary, Filipinos appear to underuse organizations as a source of social capital. While a little more than half or 53 percent of adult Filipinos are

Table 13. Mean Overall Organizational Participation Scores by Demographic Characteristics – Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Characteristics	Mean Organizational Participation Score	eta
TOTAL	1.1	--
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	1.2	
Female	0.9	.08**
<i>Age</i>		
18-24	1.1	
25-34	1.0	
35-44	1.1	
45 & over	1.2	.04, ns
<i>Marital status</i>		
Unmarried	1.4	
Presently married	1.1	
Once married	1.1	.08*
<i>Educational attainment</i>		
None or elementary	0.7	
High school /Vocational	1.1	
College / Post college	1.8	.27***
<i>Monthly family income</i>		
Under P3,000/month	0.8	
P3,000-5,000	0.9	
P5,001-10,000	1.2	
Over P10,000	1.5	.17***
<i>Place of residence</i>		
Rural village	0.9	
Small city, suburb	1.2	
Large city	1.4	.12***

Notes: Mean contact scores range from 0 to 10.

Statistical significance of means determined by the one-way F-test

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ ns = not significant

members of at least one organization, only between 7 to 27 percent can be considered participating members, while a smaller proportion, between 3 to 13 percent depending on the type of organization, are "active members." Most Filipinos are either non-members or nominal members, and the mean

participation score, on a scale of 0 to 10, is a very modest 1.1. The organization that attracts the most members is church-related groups. About a third or 35 percent of the sample are members of church groups, with 27 percent reporting to be active members. The high level of religiosity among Filipinos (Abad 1994,

2002) relate perhaps to the comparatively high level of membership and relatively high level of participation among Filipinos in church groups.

Observed differences in membership and participation by social location show that bridging social capital is not equally distributed in society: certain groups in the population are more likely than others to possess it (see Putnam 2002; Foley and Edwards 1998; Degenne et al. 1997). In Philippine society, persons with more years of schooling and larger family incomes, for instance, as well as those who live in urban areas, are most likely to join and be active in organizations. As well, the dominance of males in most types of organizations reflect the gender divisions in traditional Philippine society where males dominate the public realm while females are expected to operate within society's private sphere – the world of home and family (Pertierra 1993). The Church, in fact, may also be seen as an extension of the private sphere, the world of personal devotions that lie separate from the outer-worldly concerns of state and market, the traditional domains of men. Hence, church participation is significantly higher for females than males, and serves as a source of moral power that women may assert in the private or public domain. In turn, older people are generally more advantaged than younger people are, and this pattern replays itself in several types of organizations where older people play more active roles than young people do. Young people only have the edge over older people in sports groups.

According to the social capital literature, these kinds of patterns in organizational membership and

participation do not augur well for the formation of a strong civil society (see, for example, Body-Gendrot and Gittell 2003). In this light, efforts of development agencies to persuade the poor to organize into cooperatives, savings group, credit unions, agricultural teams, and the like are laudable since these resources can help release disadvantaged groups from the tentacles of social exclusion. Some of these disadvantaged groups have benefited from participation in associations (e.g., Korten and Siy 1989; Jimenez, n.d.). Others, however, find that many organizations exert tight control over their members (Ruiz 1987) or have been formed in compliance of a mandate from central government (Po and Montiel 1980; de Guzman 2000) – conditions that do not exactly generate a vibrant associational life. Despite these, the Philippines, as Serrano (2003) observes, continues to have a plethora of civil society organizations. How to reconcile the prominence of civil society groups in the country with the low amount of bridging social capital in large pockets of the population requires further study. Serrano (2003:112) suggests that more than additional civil society organizations, Philippine needs “appropriate enframing institutions and cultural practices” to generate a stronger impact on society.

The strength of bonding over bridging social capital among Filipinos, or the pervasiveness of strong ties over weak ties, again comes to the fore when looking at sources of social support for Filipinos.

NETWORKS AND SOCIAL SUPPORT

The SWS/ISSP 2001 survey included three sets of items to learn about the kinds

of assistance people received and gave to others. The first set of items asked people who they would approach for assistance when they are in need. The second set concerned sources of information about jobs. The third set dealt with types of assistance people gave to others within the past year. Who or what group people will tap in these situations will reveal their reliance on particular networks.

Seeking help from others

Three specific survey items sought to find out who people would turn to if they found themselves in situations that required help from others. The items placed respondents in three hypothetical situations: getting sick, needing a large sum of money, and feeling depressed.

Getting sick. The first situation posed this question: *“(S)uppose you had the flu and had to stay in bed for a few days and needed help around the house, with shopping and so on. Who would you turn to first for help?* A list of possible responses was shown to the respondent, and after he or she made a choice, a follow-up question was asked: *“And who would you turn to second if you had the flu and needed help around the house?”*

Table 14 presents the results for both choices for the total sample and then by marital status. In times of physical distress, the figures show that overall, people will first turn to their spouses (58%) and their mothers (15%) for help, while their next choices would be parents, siblings, and even children. Patterns by marital status will expectedly differ from this general pattern. For their first choice, unmarried persons, because they have no spouses,

prefer to turn to their parents, specifically their mothers (52%), and then their siblings, specifically sisters (14%) over brothers (5%). In turn, three-fourths or 75 percent of currently married persons first choose their spouses, while 57 percent of the once married—persons separated, widowed, or divorced—turn to their children, and more often the daughter (39%) more than the son (18%). The first preference for mother over father, daughter over son, and even sister over brother across all marital status categories reflects gender norms at work, norms that equip females with skills in nurturing and domestic tasks.

How about the respondent's second choices? Table 14 shows that the never married who first turned to their mothers, now turn to their fathers as their second choice (19%) along with their siblings, again selecting sisters (19%) over brothers (14%). The presently married who first chose their spouses, now select as second choice, their mothers (20%) over their fathers (4%), then daughters (17%) over sons (10%). In turn, once married persons, who largely went first to their daughters more than their sons, now as second choice, go to their sons (24%) more than their daughters (8%). Overall, then, in times of physical distress, adult Filipinos seek assistance from members of the immediate family, preferably female members who are expected to possess greater care giving qualities. Only perhaps when female family members are unavailable do persons turn to close male relatives for assistance.

Borrowing money. The second situation concerns finances. The survey question asked respondents: *“Now, suppose you needed to borrow a large*

Table 14. Percent Distribution of Source of Help when Ill: First Two Choices by Respondent's Marital Status, Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Source of help	Suppose you had the flu and had to stay in bed for a few days and needed help around the house, with shopping and so on. Who would you turn to first for help? And who would you turn to second?				Second choice by marital status			
	First choice by marital status		Second choice by marital status		First choice by marital status		Second choice by marital status	
	Total	Never Married	Currently Married	Once Married	Total	Never Married	Currently Married	Once Married
<u>No one</u>	< 1%	0%	< 1%	< 1%	10%	12%	9%	17%
<u>Immediate family</u>								
Spouse/partner	58	5	75	3	5	< 1	6	< 1
Mother	15	52	9	12	17	7	20	3
Father	2	5	1	2	6	19	4	< 1
Daughter	8	< 1	5	39	14	0	17	8
Son	4	0	3	18	10	2	10	24
Sister	4	14	2	5	10	19	9	8
Brother	< 1	5	< 1	2	5	14	3	3
<u>Other relatives</u>								
Other blood relative	3	10	1	6	4	9	4	5
In-laws	1	0	1	5	2	0	2	4
Godparents	< 1	0	< 1	< 1	< 1	3	< 1	3
<u>Non family</u>								
Close friend	1	5	< 1	2	5	8	4	10
Neighbor	1	< 1	< 1	3	6	3	6	5
Someone you pay to help	< 1	< 1	< 1	0	< 1	0	< 1	< 1
Someone you work with	0	0	0	0	< 1	< 1	< 1	0
Social services agency	0	0	0	0	< 1	0	< 1	< 1
Someone else	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	2	2	2	3
Total (n)	100% (1,200)	100% (152)	100% (928)	100% (120)	100% (1,200)	100% (155)	100% (926)	100% (119)

sum of money. Who would you turn to first for help?" A list of choices was presented to the respondent who, after selecting, was asked: *"And who would you turn to second if you needed to borrow a large sum of money?"* The same list of response choices was again shown.

Table 15 displays the results, again for the total sample and then broken down by marital status. The total figures reveal that overall, respondents first approach members of the immediate family – notably the mother (14%), the spouse (11%), and the sister (12%). This time, however, respondents are also starting to open up to persons outside that intimate unit, specifically other blood relatives (8%) and close friends (7%), to seek help.

Variations by marital status appear. When they need to borrow a large sum of money, never married persons first turn to their parents, a combined total of 37 percent, preferring to go to the mother (26%) than the father (11%). They then see siblings, preferring the sister (14%) to the brother (9%), and then to other blood relatives (14%). The second choice for unmarried persons again centers on parents, siblings and a new source, close friend (14%). The gender factor surfaces once more as respondents prefer sisters over brothers, and mothers over fathers.

Presently married people first turn to their siblings (18%), choosing sisters (12%) over brother (6%); then go their parents, preferring mothers (13%) over fathers (3%), and then their spouse (14%). About 7 percent each turn to other blood relatives and close friends. The second choice for currently married people remains with siblings, with a larger

preference for sisters (11%), mothers (9%), close friends (10%), and other blood relatives (8%). Again, respondents favor sisters over brothers, and mothers over fathers.

Once married people—the widowed, separated, and divorced—first turn to their children, a total of 31 percent, with a slightly higher preference for daughters over sons; then siblings (14 percent, with a clear preference for sisters over brothers), and then close friend (9%). Their second choice stay with other children and siblings, then close friends and other blood relatives. As above, respondents choose close female relatives more often than close male relations.

In sum, when needing to borrow a large sum of money, adult Filipinos first turn to their immediate family members, but do not hesitate to approach other blood relations or close friends when necessary. The gender factor, observed earlier, remains a crucial factor: across all marital status categories: Filipinos tend to choose female relatives over male relatives when they need help. The cultural expectation that females often act as the treasurer of the household, or that wives generally control the household's purse strings, or that females have greater abilities in handling money may also underlie the preference for approaching females over males when borrowing a large sum of money (Medina 2001:161-181).

Of equal interest in Table 15 is the low turnout of public agencies as sources of funds. Only two percent of the sample, for example, would first go the bank or credit union, while only one percent would first approach a government or

**Table 15. Percent Distribution of Source of Money in Times of Need: First Two Choices by Respondent's Marital Status
Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey**

Source of help	Now, suppose you needed to borrow a large sum of money. Who would you turn to first for help? And who would you turn to second?											
	First choice by marital status					Second choice by marital status						
	Total	Never Married	Currently Married	Once Married	Total	Never Married	Currently Married	Once Married	Total	Never Married	Currently Married	Once Married
<u>No one</u>	8%	5%	8%	12%	19%	15%	19%	27%				
<u>Immediate family</u>												
Spouse/partner	11	3	14	0	3	0	3	0				
Mother	14	26	13	5	8	12	9	<1				
Father	4	11	3	<1	6	12	5	0				
Daughter	6	2	5	17	4	0	5	8				
Son	5	1	5	14	5	6	5	11				
Sister	12	14	12	10	11	13	11	12				
Brother	6	9	6	3	8	9	8	4				
<u>Other relatives</u>												
Other blood relative	8	14	7	5	8	8	8	9				
In-laws	3	1	4	<1	4	2	5	8				
Godparents	<1	0	<1	0	<1	<1	<1	0				
<u>Non family</u>												
Close friend	7	7	7	9	11	14	10	9				
Neighbor	4	<1	4	8	4	1	5	6				
Someone you work with	1	1	1	0	2	3	2	<1				
Employer	3	1	3	4	1	1	<1	<1				
Gov't/soc. services agency	1	<1	1	3	<1	<1	<1	0				
Bank or credit union	2	1	3	2	1	<1	1	<1				
Private money lender	2	<1	2	4	2	<1	1	3				
Someone else	2	1	2	2	<1	<1	<1	0				
Total (n)	100% (1,200)	100% (153)	100% (926)	100% (119)	100% (1,102)	100% (144)	100% (851)	100% (107)				

social service agency. Only three percent of the sample selected these agencies their second choice. The main sources of funds thus remain locked in a private network of family and friends. Even the decision to tap private moneylenders, an option for two percent of the sample, may still be considered part of an informal financial network. A source of bridging social capital for funds, namely links with institutions and groups outside the family network, remains distant for many adult Filipinos.

Feeling depressed. Do the same patterns appear when people search out others for help when they feel depressed? The SWS/ISSP survey made these inquiries: *Now suppose you felt just a bit down or depressed, and you wanted to talk about it. Who would you turn to first for help?* After the respondents has made a choice based on a list of possible answers, the survey then asked: *And who would you turn to second if you felt a bit down or depressed and wanted to talk about it?*

Table 16 presents the results, again for the total sample and by marital status. Overall, adult Filipinos first turn towards their spouse (46%) or a close friend (15%) for help. Their second choice would be a close friend (16%), and then female family members – mothers (15%), sisters (11%), and daughters (9%). The relatively strong presence of friends, usually persons outside the immediate family unit, in difficult emotional situations is a noteworthy addition to the network.

Marital status differences are sharp across the three categories. Unmarried or single people first turn to friends (41%), then go to parents, again preferring the mother (25%) over the father (4%); and

then to siblings, where sisters (12%) are chosen over brothers (4%). Siblings, friends, and parents are also top second choices, with female relatives generally chosen over male relatives.

The majority of respondents (i.e., currently married persons) largely turn to their spouses (58%), after whom they approach close friends (10%), and then parents, more the mother (8%) than the father (< 1 or 0.5 percent). Second choices follow the same pattern, with parents, and mothers in particular (16%), getting a slight edge over friends (15%) and daughters (10%). In turn, the once married group tends to approach their children first, daughters in particular (30%), then close friends (16%) and sisters (11%). Their second choices are largely sons, perhaps because they have already been to daughters and then close friends (12%).

All in all, when feeling depressed, or when seeking help while one is ill or in need of money, adult Filipinos tap a private network of significant others, a web of immediate family members and friends, for assistance. The gender factor remains an important source of social support with respondents who generally prefer to approach mothers over fathers, sisters over brothers, daughters over sons. The cultural belief that expressive character traits such as warmth, sensitivity to the needs of others, and the ability to express tender feelings are more likely to reside in females over males (Lamanna and Reidman 1994, cited in Medina 2001) underlie the gender differences observed here. What has been observed as sources of assistance when feeling depressed echoes findings for the other two hypothetical situations, getting sick

Table 16. Percent Distribution of Source of Assistance when Depressed: First Two Choices by Respondent's Marital Status - Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Source of help	Now suppose you felt just a bit down or depressed, and you wanted to talk about it. Who would you turn to first for help? And who would you turn to second?				Second choice by marital status			
	First choice by marital status		Second choice by marital status		First choice by marital status		Second choice by marital status	
	Total	Never Married	Currently Married	Once Married	Total	Never Married	Currently Married	Once Married
	3%	4%	3%	7%	14%	12%	14%	21%
<u>No one</u>								
<u>Immediate family</u>								
Spouse/partner	46	3	58	2	6	1	8	<1
Mother	10	24	8	6	15	16	16	4
Father	1	4	<1	<1	3	5	3	<1
Daughter	6	<1	4	30	9	2	10	7
Son	2	<1	2	8	7	0	6	2
Sister	6	12	5	11	10	15	10	8
Brother	2	4	2	2	5	12	4	5
<u>Other relatives</u>								
Other blood relative	3	3	2	8	5	6	5	6
In-laws	1	0	1	3	3	3	3	4
<u>Non-family</u>								
Close friend	15	41	10	16	16	21	15	12
Neighbor	2	1	2	6	4	2	4	7
Someone you work with	<1	<1	<1	0	<1	3	<1	0
Priest or member of clergy	<1	<1	<1	0	<1	<1	<1	0
Psychologist	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	<1	2
Self-help group	<1	<1	<1	0	<1	<1	<1	<1
Someone else	1	<1	1	2	<1	<1	<1	<1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(n)	(1,200)	(154)	(927)	(119)	(1,161)	(146)	(901)	(114)

and needing a large sum of money. The near invisibility of formal, professional or official sources of assistance again reflect the relative scarcity of non-family contacts, or bridging social capital, among Filipinos.

Sources of information about jobs

Another aspect of seeking assistance lies in obtaining information about jobs. The SWS/ISSP survey posed this item: *There are many ways people hear about jobs – from other people, from advertisements or employment agencies, and so on. Please indicate how you first found out about work at your present employer.* The interviewer then presented to respondents a show card containing possible answers. Moreover, if the respondent did not have a present job, the interviewer was instructed to ask the respondent about her or his last job.

Where then do people acquire information about their present jobs, or if they have no present jobs, their last job? The total column of Table 17 shows that overall, one half or 50 percent of the sample obtained work-related information from family members: 32 percent from immediate family members and 18 percent from other relatives. Important sources also included close friends (22%), and acquaintances (13%). Less important were public sources like employment agencies, schools, advertisements, and the like: each was each used less than 3 percent of the time. In turn, about 6 percent obtained the information themselves by calling and asking for work.

Differences by educational attainment reveal the impact of class in gaining access to information. While

family sources are widely used among respondents regardless of education attainment, Table 17 shows that those with lower level of schooling tend to rely more on the family as source of information about jobs compared to those with higher levels of schooling. The comparative figures are 61 percent for these with elementary education or less, 47 percent for those high school backgrounds, and 34 percent of those who finished college or beyond. In turn, the use of close friends is a more likely occurrence for those with high school and college backgrounds than those with less education: 15 percent for elementary or no schooling, 26 percent for high school, and 27 percent for college.

A similar pattern applies to the use of formal sources like employment agencies or schools. In these cases, those with college education are more likely than those with high school or elementary education to get information about jobs from public or private employment agencies, schools, or from advertisements or signs. The finding reinforces earlier observations about organizations, namely, that while Filipinos have modest reserves of bridging social capital, this form of social capital is generally more accessible to people of higher social status. In this case, while the use of formal agencies is not popular overall, and whatever uses it has largely falls in the hands of people with more schooling.

In a classic work on social networks, Granovetter (1973) distinguishes between “strong ties” and “weak ties.” Strong ties are contacts to people characterized by high levels of emotional intensity and intimacy, such as contacts with significant others, while a weak ties being contacts

Table 17. Percent Distribution of Source of Information about Jobs, Total Sample and by Educational Attainment - Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Source of information	Educational attainment			
	Total Percent	None/ Elementary	High School/ Vocational	College/ Post college
<u>Family</u>				
Immediate family	32%	44%	27%	20%
Other relatives	18	18	20	14
<u>Non-family</u>				
Close friend	22	15	26	27
Acquaintance	12	14	14	12
Public employment agency	3	< 1	1	8
Private employment agency	2	1	2	3
School or university office	2	0	< 1	3
Advertisement or sign	3	< 1	2	7
Contacted by employer	2	2	1	2
Called or asked for work	6	5	7	6
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
(N)	(1,034)	(442)	(494)	(265)

Note: Excluded from the table are those who had never worked at the time of the survey as well as those who did not answer the question.

to people not characterized as such, such as links with less intimate or impersonal sources. These weak ties, however, have the advantage of being connected with many more networks, particularly those outside the world of family and friends, and serve to increase a person's chance of acquiring scarce resources, like information for possible employment, as Granovetter (1973) argues, or the likelihood of obtaining cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986; Southerton 2004). In societies where people lack weak ties, a dependence on strong ties for many needs becomes necessary to survive. The Philippine situation illustrates such a lack: strong ties are more frequently used than weak ties as the source of information

about jobs. Moreover, many kinds of weak ties available in networks, especially those obtained by joining associations, fall in the laps of privileged people.

Because Filipinos often rely on a network of family and close friends to meet basic needs and reach goals, the demands made on them by family members, other relatives and friends may be an onerous one to bear. One item in the SWS survey asked respondents: *Do you feel that your family, relatives, and/or friends make too many demands on you?* The replies (see Table 18) show that only 18 percent of the sample says that kin members and friends do not, or never

make, many demands on them. But while the majority admits that many demands are made upon them, the pressures are not severe: a plurality of 44 percent say the demands are “seldom” made, while 29 percent report that the demands are made “sometimes.” About 8 percent say the demands come “often,” but only a tiny one percent admits that the demands are made “very often.” These patterns do not vary by gender, age, socio-economic status, and other demographic characteristics.

Table 18. Percent Distribution of R’s Perception of Family Demands – Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

<i>Do you experience too many demands from family members and relatives?</i>	Percent
No, never	18%
Yes, but seldom	44
Yes, sometimes	29
Yes, often	8
Yes, very often	1
Total (N)	100% (1,200)

Assistance given to others

In addition to items about assistance sought from others, the SWS/ISSP survey also inquired about the forms of assistance given to others. The survey question was: *During the past 12 months, how often have you done any of the following things for people you know personally, such as relatives, friends, neighbors or other acquaintances?* Four kinds of assistance were considered: helped someone outside of your household with housework or shopping, lent quite a bit of money to another person, spent time

talking with someone who was a bit down or depressed, and helped somebody to find a job. The six reply categories ranged from “more than once a week” to “not at all in the past year.”

Are Filipinos, by and large, helpful towards other people? The results shown in Table 19 suggest that the answer depends on the situation. On a scale of 0 to 10, with the lowest score of “0,” standing for not helping anyone at all during the past year, and the highest score of “10” standing for helping others more than once a week, Filipinos are relatively more helpful when it comes to talking with someone who is depressed (mean = 4.4) and least helpful when it comes to lending money (mean = 1.9). The mean scores for the other two situations fall between these two ends, with Filipinos more likely to help with housework (mean = 3.4) than helping someone find a job (mean = 2.4). The overall average based on these four situations is 3.1, which is at the low end of a scale of 10, as it stands for helping others be somewhere “between 1-3 times a year.”

But which group is more likely to help others? The statistically significant results of several cross-tabulations, not shown here, show these:

- Males are significantly more helpful than females but only in helping someone get a job. On all other situations, gender is not a significant factor.
- Older people are more helpful than younger people only in helping others find a job. In the other two situations, helping with housework and talking to someone who is depressed, younger people have the edge.

- The results for socio-economic status replay earlier observations: people who are better off in life are more likely to help others. In all four situations, those with more education are significantly more likely to help with housework, lend money, talk to a friend, and help someone find a job. Likewise, persons in higher income families have a greater probability to help others than those in lower family income levels. This difference applies to all help situations but remains statistically significant only in three instances: lending money, talking to a friend, and helping someone to find work.
- Living in cities also makes a significant difference in three of the four situations. Persons residing in large or small cities are more likely than those who live in rural villages to lend money, talk to a friend, and help someone find a job.

Thus, people and groups with more resources (including information resources) do tend to help other people more often than those with lesser resources. While we have no information on the magnitude of this assistance, or on the kinds of people helped the available data reveal that the amount of social capital arising from involvement in social networks is unevenly distributed in the population. However, before suggesting ways to understand this inequality further, let us take a brief look at "trust," another key component of social capital, and how it pans out across population subgroups.

Trust

Trust, says Piotr Sztompka (1999:25), is a "bet about the future contingent actions of others." Ostrom and Ahn's (2003:xvi; also see Misztal 1996 and

Gambetta 2000) definition follows Sztompka's: "a particular level of subjective probability with which an agent assesses that another agent or group of agents will perform a particular action." This bet or assessment entails a belief and a commitment. Thus, by saying "I trust that person," states Sztompka (1999:18-24), we mean two things: first, a belief that the other person will act well towards me, and second, a commitment to act favorably towards that person, as in "I trust that person, so I will lend her my cell phone." The commitment to act is done with full awareness that it entails a risk or loss, but also represents an opportunity for both trustor and trustee to enhance their welfare (Ostrom and Ahn, 2003: xvi-xvii). Trust, Sztompka (1999:24) also argues, differs from "hope" or "confidence," both of which fall within the "discourse of fate," referring to something good happening without our active participation. In contrast, trust falls within the "discourse of agency" demanding that we actively anticipate and face an unknown future, take a risk, and make a bet to act favorably towards the other.

In social capital literature, trust is often viewed as the "lubricant" of social relations or as the "glue" in the social bond (Koniordos 2005:4). In this sense, trust does improve the efficiency of society, to echo Putnam's definition of social capital, by enabling people to engage in collective action. Fukuyama (1995:26) sees trust as "the expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest, and cooperative behavior based on commonly shared norms," a quality of social relations that, when applied to the workplace, represents a new form of discipline, one that is internalized and

self-maintaining (Schuller et al. 2000:37). This is the kind of trust developed between people in modern, highly differentiated societies, what is called “institutional trust” (Koniordos 2005:5) or “extended trust” (Raiser 1999, cited in Haerpfer 2005:244). Thus, in societies characterized by a high degree of institutional or extended trust, one can expect higher levels of civic engagement, as Putnam (1993) demonstrates, or experience higher levels of economic performance, as Fukuyama (1995) contends. In contrast, societies characterized as hierarchical or rigidly stratified will exhibit low trust (Seligman 1997:36-37, 41; also Putnam 1993), and following the logic of Putnam’s and Fukuyama’s theses, will more likely have weaker democracies and lower levels of economic growth.

It is debatable, however, whether trust should be seen as a form of social capital, or the *independent variable* that leads to

a particular kind of collective action, or as an outgrowth of a form of social capital, hence an *intervening variable* that links forms of social capital (like social network) and collective action. Ostrom and Ahn (2003: *xvi-xix*) endorse the notion of trust as the intervening variable, though there is still no consensus among scholars on this matter.

One should also be alert, however, to the “downside” of trust. As a “lubricant” of social relations, trust can foster civic participation and economic prosperity, just as much as it can spawn social apathy and economic underdevelopment. Similarly, as Kovalainen (2005) forewarns, trust in its operation is far from being gender-blind: levels of trust shown to men, for example, may be higher than those shown to women. Structures of power and wealth, after all, shape trust relations (Fox 1974, cited in Schuller et al. 2002:18-19), and these forces can militate against the expansion of trust in a system.

Table 19. Percent Distribution of Frequency of Help R Gave Others – Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Frequency of help	During the past 12 months, how often have you done any of the following things for people you know personally, such as relatives, friends, neighbors or other acquaintances?			
	Helped with housework	Lent money	Talked with someone depressed	Helped someone find a job
More than once a week	8%	1%	10%	3%
Once a week	9	5	15	7
Once a month	15	9	17	10
At least 2-3 times in past year	18	14	21	17
Once in past year	15	17	15	15
Not at all in past year	35	54	22	48
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
(N)	(1,200)	(1,200)	(1,200)	(1,200)

Several ways of measuring trust appear in the literature. The most widely used are measures of "generalized trust," also called "interpersonal trust," or the extent to which one trusts strangers or people in general (Badescu 2003: 128-130). By defining this "radius of trust" (Fukuyama 1995) as extending beyond face-to-face ties, measures of generalized trust draw attention to the conditions essential for trust to reach out throughout the system. In this sense, measures of generalized trust serves as a "baseline expectation" (Yamagishi 2001:143, cited in Ostrom and Ahn 2003: xx) of systemic or extended trust. Another measure of trust may be termed "particularized trust," also called "institutional trust," or the extent of trust towards specific kinds of people or institutions, among them, trust in members of one's immediate environment, political officials, trust in agencies, and trust in a business community (Narayan and Cassidy 2001; Badescu 2003; Uslaner 2003).

The SWS/ISSP Survey on Social Relations included three measures of generalized trust. All three were statements which respondents rated on a five-point Likert agreement-disagreement scale. "To what extent," the survey asked, "do you agree or disagree with the following statements?" The first statement was direct: *There are only a few people I can trust completely.* The second statement sought to corroborate the first: *If you are not careful, other people will take advantage of you.* The third statement accentuated the positive as it sought for more corroboration: *Most of the time you can be sure that other people want the best for you.*

Table 20 shows the results. On the first statement, over three-fourths or 76 percent of the sample "agree" or "agree strongly" that there are only a few people that they trust completely. About 14 percent said that they disagreed or disagree strongly with the statement, giving a margin of agreement of around 62 percent. The second statement reinforces the first, at least at first glance. Similar to the above results, more than three-fourths or 77 percent of the sample agreed or strongly agreed that one can trust only a few people and that one must be careful in dealing with others, lest those people take advantage of you. As well, 16 percent disagreed or disagreed strongly with each of the two statements. The margin of agreement is again a high +61 percent. The second item corroborates the first: Filipinos are not generally trusting of strangers.

Because of the similarity of the percentage distributions in these two items, one suspects a strong correlation between these two measures. Not so. Cross-classifying the two items did yield a positive and significant correlation ($G = .45, p < .001$), but the size of the coefficient is not large enough to say that one measure is a mirror image of the other. Moreover, a reliability analysis of the two items yielded a Cronbach's alpha value of .45, a coefficient below the acceptable value of .70 for constructing an index of the two measures. The two questions apparently convey different meanings to respondents,

This image of Filipinos as persons not highly trusting other people gets confounded, however, with replies to the question about how much respondents agreed with the statement "*Most of the*

time, you can be sure that other people want the best for you." Now, since most respondents agreed that they can completely trust only a few people and also, that we must be careful of people lest they take advantage of us, one expects that a similarly large proportion will *disagree* with this third statement. But the results reveal the contrary. Only about 17 percent of the sample did disagree or strongly disagree; the majority or 63 percent had favorable, trust-inducing impressions of other people. The margin of agreement remains a respectably high positive value, +46 percent. Filipinos may thus feel that they cannot put their trust in many people and fear that others may take advantage of them, but also perceive, oddly enough, that other people in general want the best for them. What explains this seeming inconsistency?

In his sociological theory of trust, Sztompka (1999:26) distinguishes the concept of "distrust" from that of "mistrust." Distrust, he says, is the negative mirror image of trust. It connotes "negative expectations about the actions of others" and a kind of "negative defensive commitment" whose manifestations include avoidance, escape, distancing of self, or taking protective measures. By comparison, "mistrust" refers to a "neutral position, when both trust and distrust are suspended." It means "the lack of clear expectations" or belief and at the same time, a "hesitation about committing oneself." This formulation suggests that Filipinos do not really distrust other people – after all, many feel that other persons want the best for them. Filipinos, however, may tend to *mistrust* other people, initially suspicious of the other

people's intentions and a bit cautious in committing themselves to act favorably towards other people.

Do levels of trust vary according to certain groups in the population? To facilitate these comparisons, mean scores were computed for each trust measure. These means range from 0 to 10, with the lowest score of "0" indicating the least amount of trust and the highest score of "10" representing the highest amount of trust. On this range, Filipinos obtained a mean of 2.6 in the item trusting other people, a mean of 2.4 in trusting people not to take advantage of you, and a relatively high 6.9 in perceiving that other people want the best of you.

How do these measures of generalized trust vary by social location? Table 21 presents the mean scores, and the key results are as follows:

- Gender, age, and marital status do not significantly affect levels of trust.
- The effect of education is fuzzy. In two of three indicators of generalized trust, those with elementary or no formal education have significantly higher trust scores than those who have had a high school or college education. However, no significant differences by education appear on the "trust few people" item.
- The effect of family income also shows mixed results. On two trust measures, persons with low family incomes have *higher* mean scores than those who come from families with higher income. However, on the "trust few people" item, those in lower family income levels have *lower* mean trust scores compared to those in high income levels.

- The effect of residence is consistent: on all three measures, those who live in large cities have higher trust scores than those in other places. The finding runs counter to Durkheim's (1964) notion that small communities have a stronger "moral density," and by inference, have people who are more trusting towards each other. Perhaps people in large cities, and to some extent small cities, have more reason than rural dwellers to engage in generalized trust in order to meet the demands of urban life.

What about institutional trust? Since the SWS/ISSP survey did not contain an item on institutional or extended trust, we turn to another data set, the World Values Survey (WVS), to answer this question. This national survey, also administered by the SWS in July 2001, had the same sample size of 1,200 adult Filipinos with

a sampling error of +/- 3 percent. In this survey, respondents were presented with a list containing types of organization (e.g., churches, the press, the police, and so on), and were asked this question: *For each one, can you tell me how much confidence you have in them – is it a great deal, quite a lot, not very much, or not at all?* Now the word "confidence" in the question may not mean trust in Sztompka's (1999) understanding of the term, but the translation of the word "confidence" in Filipino, as used in the SWS interview situation, uses the root word *tiwala* which means trust. The same root word was used in the WVS questionnaire item on generalized or interpersonal trust. On linguistic grounds, then, we treat the question on institutional confidence as a measure of institutional trust.

Table 20. Percent Distribution of Indicators of Generalized Trust – Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Reply	To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?		
	(a) There are only a few people I can trust completely.	(b) If you are not careful, other people will take advantage of you.	(c) Most of the time you can be sure that other people want the best for you.
Agree strongly/Agree	76%	77%	63%
Neither agree nor disagree	10	7	20
Disagree/Disagree strongly	14	16	17
Total	100%	100%	100%
(N)	(1,200)	(1,200)	(1,200)
Margin	+62	+61	+46

Note: The margin of agreement represents the difference between the two agreement categories (strongly agree/agree) and the two disagreement categories (disagree/strongly disagree). A positive sign is favorable towards agreement.

To summarize the responses, we again transformed the answers into a range of scores from 0 to 10, with "0" standing for no confidence in the institution and "10" representing the highest level of confidence in that particular institution. Table 22 presents the mean trust score per institution, and shows that in general Filipinos put a great deal of trust in churches (8.5), followed by trust in nongovernmental organizations like the environmental protection movement (6.7) and the women's movement (6.6), and then the armed forces (6.6). Least trusted, relatively speaking, are political parties (4.8), the government in Manila (5.1), labor unions (5.4), and major companies (5.5). Filipinos thus appear more trusting of Type One organizations that belong to the private realm than to Type Two organizations that belong to the sphere of politics and economics.

One also notices that the mean scores, ranging from a low of 5.1 to a high of 8.5, surpasses the means for two measures generalized trust, the "trust few people" (2.6) and "take advantage" items (2.4), and is about par with the "want the best" item (6.9). Though the measures of interpersonal and institutional trust are not directly comparable, and use different samples, one still senses that that among adult Filipinos, the degree of institutional trust may be higher than the level of interpersonal trust.

Why Filipino rate institutional trust higher than interpersonal trust, and why Type One organizations are rated higher than Type Two groups are difficult to answer in this paper. Sztompka, however, suggests an approach. In adopting his theory to understand the fluctuations in

trust in Poland, Sztompka (1999:151-190) finds that levels of trust dwindle under conditions of uncertainty and risk, as it did during the periods of communist rule and the anti-communist revolution, and rises when social conditions become more secure, as it did during the recent period of democratic consolidation. Now when interpersonal trust has reached low ebb, Sztompka (1999:115) adds, "the resulting vacuum will be filled with some alternative arrangements providing similar functions and meeting universal cravings for predictability, certainty, order, and the like."

One of these alternative arrangements, or "functional substitutes," is "paternalization," that is, a craving for a system that would restore order and security with a strong hand (Sztompka 1999:118). Or as Ekiert and Kubik (1997:26, cited in Sztompka 1999:163) say, there arises among the people an expectation that "the state is responsible for all aspects of economic and social life and, therefore should solve all problems." Based on this notion, it may be hypothesized that the higher trust scores that Filipinos give to institutions than to their interpersonal relations reflect some desire for paternal care, or a yearning of support from a powerful figure that will take care of needs unmet on the personal or family level.

The available data cannot test this hypothesis, only hint at this desire. The SWS/ISSP survey, for example, asked respondents two items indicative of paternalization: *On the whole, do you think it should or should not be the government's responsibility to provide... child care for everyone who wants it?, a decent standard of living for the old?*

**Table 22. Mean Trust Scores to Selected Institutions – Philippines
SWS/WVS July 9-27, 2001 Survey**

Institution	Mean trust score
Churches	8.5
Environmental protection movement	6.7
Women’s movement	6.6
Armed Forces	6.6
Television	6.5
Press	6.3
Civil Service	6.2
Police	5.8
Congress	5.7
Major companies	5.5
Labor unions	5.4
Government in Manila	5.1
Political parties	4.8

Note: Mean trust scores range from 0 to 10, with “0” standing for least trust and “10” standing for most trust. The original categories were “a great deal,” “quite a lot,” “not very much,” and “none at all.”

Table 23 reports that nearly four-fifths of 79 percent said that it is “definitely” or “probably” the government’s charge to provide childcare to everyone who wants it. As well, a more sizable 90 percent state the same preference for the state to provide a decent standard of living for the old. Similar claims for state support appeared in an earlier study of Filipino attitudes toward welfare and inequality (Abad 1995). In that study, the resounding expressions of state support among Filipinos paralleled the levels shown in socialist states and social democracies where citizens heavily depend on the state’s welfare system to provide basic social services. In the context of Sztompka’s theory of trust, however, this strong expectation of state intervention may reflect paternal dependence – a form of support that in countries like the Philippines may come in trickles, if at all, owing to tight government resources.

It is ironic that adult Filipinos expect so much from the state yet are relatively alienated from political life. The SWS/ISSP survey asked: “*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement – People like me don’t have any say about what the Government does.*” A total of 39 percent strongly agreed or agreed to the statement, while 28 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed (see Table 24). This yields a margin of +11 percent in favor of people saying, in effect, that they are relatively voiceless in state affairs. At the same time, people are not deeply immersed in political talk. Asked “*how often do you discuss politics with friends?*,” 6 percent replied “almost all of the time” while 21 percent said “almost never.” This leaves a margin of -15% in favor of not being too engaged in political discussions; indeed, the majority or 66 percent discuss politics only occasionally.

Table 23. Percent Distribution of Attitudes toward Government Initiatives – Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Reply	On the whole, do you think it should or should not be the government's responsibility to provide...?	
	... child care for everyone who wants it	... a decent standard of living for the old
Definitely should be	53%	66%
Probably should be	26	24
Probably should not be	12	6
Definitely should not be	9	4
Total	100%	100%
(N)	(1,194)	(1,196)

Yet, despite having little say in government affairs and a relative disinterest in political talk, Filipinos still feel that they can do something to improve their situation. The SWS/ISSP survey posed this situation to respondents: *Suppose you wanted the local government to bring about some improvements in your local community, how likely is it that you would be able to do something about it?* The results: 64 percent claimed that it is “very likely” or “somewhat likely” that they can do something about it, while 36 percent said it is “not very likely” or “not at all likely” that they can do something about it. This leaves a margin of + 28 percent in favor of being able to effect a change. Is this a sign of political efficacy, or simply an expression of optimism?

Optimism is a sign of hope. So is happiness. And Filipinos are generally a happy lot. *If you were to consider your life in general these days, the SWS/ISSP survey asked, how happy or unhappy would you say you are on the whole?* Nearly three-fourths or 72 percent (see

Table 25) claimed that they are “very happy” or “fairly happy.” But hope is not a form of social capital, and as much hope can ease suffering, renew inner strength, or lead people to trust others more, it is not the kind of resource that will yield private returns and public effects. Hope may, in fact, represent a response to situations where social capital is wanting and scarce.

Table 25. Percent Distribution of R's Reported Happiness – Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

If you were to consider your life in general these days, how happy or unhappy would you say you are, on the whole ?	Percent
Very happy	31
Fairly happy	53
Not very happy	12
Not at all happy	4
Total	100%
(N)	(1,196)

Table 24. Percent distribution of responses to indicators of political efficacy - Philippines, SWS September 1-18, 2001 Survey

Questions/Statement		Percent	Percent	Percent
"How likely is it that you would be able to (bring about some improvement in your local community)?"				
Very or Somewhat likely	Strongly agree/Agree	64	39	17
Not very or not at all likely	Neither agree nor disagree	36	33	62
Not at all likely	Disagree/Strongly disagree	100%	28	21
Total (N)	Total (N)	(1,127)	(1,145)	100% (1,160)
Margin ^a	Margin ^b	+28%	+11%	Margin ^c
				-4%

^aThe margin is the difference between the percentage of the "Very or Somewhat likely" category (64 percent) and the percentage of the "Not very/Not at all likely" category (36 percent).

^bThe margin represents the difference between the percentages in the extreme categories: the "Strongly agree/Agree" category (39 percent) and the percentage of the "Disagree/Strongly disagree" category (28 percent).

^cThe margin is the difference between the percentages in the extreme categories: the "Almost all or Most of the time" category (17 percent) and the "Almost never" category (21 percent).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This paper has explored the configurations of two key notions of social capital, social networks and trust, as revealed by national survey data on social relations. Its findings can be grouped into three themes. The first theme, entrenched in the Philippine social science literature, concerns the pervasiveness and strength of family and friendship ties—the “double F-connection” (Fawcett et al. 1987)—in Filipino society. What social scientists have noted five or so decades ago (see, for instance, Pal 1966; Carroll 1968) remain as strong in the new millennium. Then as now, Filipinos build strong binding social capital with family members and depend upon them for material, psychic, and symbolic needs throughout the life cycle. Close friends are part of this network of significant others; they can also be counted upon to provide what a family cannot offer or augment what the family can meagerly give (Morais 1980, 1981; Dumont 1995; Kiefer 1971).

Cultural norms support this exchange of assistance among network members, and few see these acts of service as repressive or burdensome, perhaps because these acts, as Ann Oakley (1992) has suggested for motherhood, are couched in the rhetoric of duty, love, and caring. It is a ripe situation for what Putnam (2000:136) calls “thick trust,” or “trust embedded in personal relations that are strong, frequent, and embedded in wider networks.” In such circumstances, a network of family and friends becomes important – and in the Philippine case, may be the only way to find a caregiver, secure funds, seek consolation, get a job, and even perhaps to gain a promotion.

The weakness of strong ties, however, lies precisely in what may become an acute dependence among persons on family and friends (or on a paternal state) as well as an inability to build ties with persons outside this circle of significant others, an essential requirement of an active public life

Many studies point out that family relations, or strong kin ties, also take center stage in social networks across different societies. But the importance of these ties varies from one society to another. These strong ties, for example, are particularly striking in communities where trust is low (Cheale 2000), where people’s options are relatively limited (Phillipson et al. 2004:11), where the “culture of the public world” is weak (Mulder 2000), and where the state is weak (Carroll 1993). All four apply to the Philippines, and so does another factor, and the second major theme of this paper, namely the relative lack of bridging social capital or ties to wider networks, among Filipinos, the kind of connections obtained from membership and participation in organizations. Filipinos have not taken much advantage of the strength of weak ties, one consequence perhaps being a general attitude of mistrust toward strangers.

Filipino involvement in associations, this data suggest, remains minimal despite the proliferation of civil society groups in the Philippines, and despite the tireless efforts of many public and private agencies to get people to organize into credit unions, agricultural groups, cooperatives, and the like. While slightly more than half the sample are members of an organization, only a quarter or so can be said to be active. Moreover,

Filipinos are more likely to participate in organizations that relate to the private realm of religion and sports, than in groups that relate to the realm of economics and politics, the realm that directly relates to improvements in material life. Why this is so remains an issue for subsequent research. It is enough to note here that in the social capital literature, civic engagement, or strong associational ties, is one solid marker for flourishing democracies. Indeed, part of the country's civic woes may lie in personalistic nature of political life – a state of affairs aided and abetted by an abundance of bonding social capital and the paucity of bridging social capital. The woes also stem from the tendency among organizations, as suggested by this paper, to fall under the leadership and control of elite groups.

This point brings us to the paper's third major theme, namely the asymmetry of social capital. This report has consistently shown disparities by gender, socioeconomic status, and residence, and to some extent, inequalities by age, marital status. In general, people of privilege—males, urban residents, better educated persons, those with higher family incomes, and to some extent older people—possess a better stock of social capital than their less privileged counterparts. Other studies (e.g., Phillipson 2004) report different sources of disparities – by household type, for example, or by race,

ethnicity, and even sexual orientation. Reviewing trends in social capital in eight advanced societies, Putnam (2002:414-415) observes the “growing inequality in the distribution of social capital.” And the evidence keeps mounting: people who trust more, join more, and bond more tend to come from the ranks of the privileged. In turn, people least likely to trust more, join more, and connect more find themselves in the fringes of society, short of human capital and lacking access to financial capital. The penalty for diminished social capital is social exclusion.

Efforts to involve the poor and powerless in building social capital can help reduce or eliminate these disparities. If these efforts also succeed in altering the ways in which the larger society distributes scarce goods, then these disparities can be held in check for a longer period of time. Other things being equal, people with limited social capital will have lower life chances compared to those who are better connected. The task of change will thus come from expanding social capital at the bottom, and shaking the “other things” from above so that the system can dismantle its strategies of exclusion. The research task, from a sociological perspective, is to illuminate how social capital operates in the context of culture, structure, and an agency that is subject to, but not enticed by, culture and structure.

**Appendix A Demographic Characteristics of Respondents
SWS/ISSP 2001 National Survey on Social Relations**

Characteristics	Percent or value	N
REGION (<i>population weight</i>)		
National Capital Region	25	300
Balance of Luzon	25	300
Visayas	25	300
Mindanao	25	300
PLACE OF RESIDENCE		
Large city	18	213
Small city, town, or suburb	21	255
Rural village	61	732
NO. OF PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD		
1-2	12	140
3-4	34	410
5-6	32	384
7-8	15	183
9-10	5	64
11 or more	2	19
<i>Median</i>	<i>5.0</i>	-
<i>Mean</i>	<i>4.9</i>	-
<i>S.D.</i>	<i>2.2</i>	-
GENDER (<i>pre-determined</i>)		
Male	50	600
Female	50	600
AGE GROUP		
18-29	24	283
30-45	41	490
46-60	23	281
61 & more	12	147
<i>Median Age</i>	<i>40.0</i>	-
<i>Mean</i>	<i>41.4</i>	-
<i>S.D.</i>	<i>14.6</i>	-
MARITAL STATUS		
Never married	13	152
Presently married	77	928
Widowed, Separated, Divorced	10	120
RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION		
None	< 1	3
Roman Catholic	78	936
Islam	4	50
Protestant	5	57
Philippine church	2	29
Other Christian	7	83
Other non-Christian	3	39

Characteristics	Percent or value	N
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT		
No formal education	2	28
Some elementary	15	176
Completed elementary	19	236
Some high school/vocational	16	188
Completed high school/vocational	26	306
Some college	9	114
Completed college/Post college	13	151
R's OCCUPATION		
<i>Non-Manual</i>	29	296
Upper Professionals	17	174
Lower Professionals	12	122
<i>Manual</i>	55	567
Upper Skilled	25	252
Lower Skilled	31	315
<i>Farm, Fishing, Forestry</i>	15	157
WORK STATUS		
<i>Working</i>		
Full-time	40	478
Part-time	18	220
Less than part-time	5	48
Unpaid family worker	< 1	7
<i>Not working</i>		
Unemployed	13	157
Housewife	17	207
Student	1	17
Retired	4	45
Disabled	< 1	5
Other, not in labor force	< 1	11
MONTHLY FAMILY INCOME		
P3,000 & below	22	262
P3,001-P5,000	29	348
P5,001-P10,000	26	308
Over P10,000	23	281
<i>Median family income</i>	<i>P5,000</i>	-
<i>Mean</i>	<i>P8,710</i>	-
<i>S.D.</i>	<i>P11,283</i>	-
PLACE OF RESIDENCE		
Rural village, farm	61	732
Small city, suburb	21	255
Large city	18	213
LENGTH OF STAY IN COMMUNITY		
<i>Median</i>	25.1	-
Mean	26.0	-
S.D.	18.3	-

NOTE

- * This is an abridged version of a paper prepared for the Frank Lynch, S.J. Professorial Chair, School, Year 2003-2004, Ateneo de Manila University and submitted as part of *the SWS Occasional Paper Series*. I wish to thank the Social Weather Stations, especially Mahar Mangahas and Linda Luz Guerrero, for inviting me to join the meetings of International Social Survey Programme on Social Relations and Social Networks. My gratitude also goes to Jerry Apolonio of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ateneo de Manila University, for helping me explore the data set during the early stages of research, as well as to Gerardo Sandoval and Jeanette Ureta of the Social Weather Stations for assistance in securing and processing data files.

REFERENCES

Abad, Ricardo

- 1994 "Filipino Religiosity: Some International Comparisons." *Social Weather Bulletin* 94/1-2 January). Reprinted in *Philippine Studies* (Second Quarter, 1995).
- 1997 "Attitudes toward Inequality and Welfare: The Philippines and Six Industrial Nations." *SWS Occasional Paper*, Social Weather Stations. Abridged in *Philippine Studies* (First Quarter, 1998).
- 2000 "Social Networks: Overview of Philippine Studies." Paper prepared for the meeting of the Draft Committee on Social Networks, International Social Survey Programme. Lisbon, Portugal. 5-10 May.
- 2002 "Religion in the Philippines." *Philippine Studies* 49 (3):337-367 (2001). Reprinted as *SWS Occasional Paper*. Social Weather Stations. January.
- 2006 "Aspects of Social Capital in the Philippines: Findings from a National Survey." *SWS Occasional Paper*, Social Weather Stations.

Abad Ricardo and Elizabeth Eviota (eds.)

- 1985 *Philippine Poverty: An Annotated Bibliography, 1970-1983*. Quezon City: Philippine Institute of Development Studies and Institute of Philippine Culture.

Aberg, Martin and Mikael Sandberg

- 2003 *Social Capital and Democratisation*. Hampshire. England: Ashgate.

Adler, Paul S. and Seok-Woo Kwon

- 2002 "Social Capital: Prospects for a New Concept." *Academy of Management. The Academy of Management Review* 27:17-40.

Arce, Wilfredo

- 1973 "The Structural Bases of Compadre Characteristics in a Bikol Town." *Philippine Sociological Review* 21(1):51-71.

- Almirol, Edwin
 1986 "Filipino Immigrants and Voluntary Associations." *Philippine Studies* 34: 41-60.
- Badescu, Gabriel
 2003 "Social Trust and Democratization in the Post-Communist Societies." In Gabriel Badescu and Eric M. Uslaner (eds.) *Social Capital and the Transition to Democracy*. London and New York: Routledge, 120-139.
- Badescu, Gabriel and Eric Uslaner (eds.)
 2003 *Social Capital and the Transition to Democracy*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Barbera, Filippo
 2005 "Social Networks, Collective Action and Public Policy: The Embeddedness Idea Reconsidered." In Sokratis Koniordos (ed.) *Networks, Trust and Social Capital: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations from Europe*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate, 119-142.
- Baron, Stephen, John Field, and Tom Schuller (eds.)
 2000 *Social Capital: Critical Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Body-Gendrot, Sophie and Marilyn Gittell (eds.)
 2003 *Social Capital and Social Citizenship*. Lanham and New York: Lexington Books.
- Bourdieu, Pierre
 1986 "The Forms of Capital." In J. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood, 241-248.
- Burt, Roland
 1992 *Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Excerpt entitled "The Structure of Competition" in Elinor Ostrom and T. K. Ahn (eds.) *Foundations of Social Capital*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 197-219. 2003.
- 1997 "The Contingent Value of Social Capital." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42:339-365.
- Cannell, Fenella
 1999 *Power and Intimacy in the Christian Philippines*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Carroll, John
 1968 *Changing Patterns of Social Structure in the Philippines 1896-1963*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- 1993 "Social Theory and Social Change in the Philippines." In *SA21 Selected Readings*. Quezon City: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ateneo de Manila University.

Castillo, Gelia

1979 *Beyond Manila: Philippine Rural Problems in Perspective*. Ottawa, Canada: International Development Research Centre.

Cheale, D.

2002 *Sociology of Family Life*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Coleman, James

1988 "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94/Supplement: S95-S120.

1990 *Equality and Achievement in Education*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Dasgupta, Partha

2003 "Social Capital and Economic Performance: Analytics." In Elinor Ostrom and T. K. Ahn (eds.) *Foundations of Social Capital*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 274-290.

De Guzman, Emmanuel

2000 "Power and the Implementation of the Local Government Code in Quezon, Nueva Ecija." Master's Thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

Degenne, Alain, Marie Lebeaux, and Yannick Lemel

1997 "Social Capital in Everyday Life." *Document de travail* no. 9827. Centre de Recherché en Économie et Statistique, Institut-National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques.

Dumont, Jean-Paul

1995 "The Visayan Male Barkada." *Philippine Studies* (Fourth Quarter).

1993 *Visayan Vignettes*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Durkheim, Emile

1964 *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: Free Press, 1893.

Estuar, Jose

forthcoming *Savings, Credit, Insurance and Social Capital in Eastern Samar: Women's Notions of Microfinance Based on the Group Methodology*. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture.

Fawcett, James et al.

1978 "The Double F-connection: Friends and Family in Migrant Adjustment." Papers of the East-West Population Institute, University of Hawaii.

Ferrer, Miriam Coronel

1997 "Civil Society: An Operational Definition." In Maria Serena I. Diokno, (ed.) *Democracy and Citizenship in Filipino Political Culture* Vol. 1. Quezon City: Third World Studies Center, 5-16.

- Fine, Ben
 2001 *Social Capital versus Social Theory: Political Economy and Social Science at the Turn of the Millennium*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Fine, Ben and Francis Green
 2000 "Economics, Social Capital, and the Colonization of the Social Sciences" In Stephen Barron et al. (eds.) *Social Capital: Critical Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 78-93.
- Foley, M. and B. Edwards
 1998 "Beyond Tocqueville: Civil Society and Social Capital in Comparative Perspective: Editor's Introduction." *American Behavioral Scientist* 41(1): 5-20.
 1999 "Is it Time to Disinvest in Social Capital?" *Journal of Public Policy* 19 (2):141-173.
- Fukuyama, Francis
 1995 *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gambetta, Diego
 2003 "Can we Trust Trust?" In Diego Gambetta (ed.) *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*. Electronic Edition. Oxford, Department of Sociology, University of Oxford. Reprinted in Elinor Ostrom and T. K. Ahn (eds.) *Foundations of Social Capital*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 274-290.
- Grabher, Gernot and Walter Powell (eds.)
 2004 *Networks* vols. 1-2. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Granovetter, Mark
 1973 "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (6):1360-80.
- Grootaert, Christiaan et al.
 2004 "Measuring Social Capital: An Integrated Questionnaire." *The World Bank Working Paper no. 18*. Washington, D.C.: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/World Bank.
- Haerpfer, Christian, Claire Wallace and Martin Reiser
 2005 "Social Capital and Economic Performance in Post-Communist Societies." In Sokratis Koniordos (ed.) *Networks, Trust and Social Capital: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations from Europe*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate, 243-278.
- Harriss, John
 2002 *Depoliticizing Development: The World Bank and Social Capital*. London: Anthem Press.

- Harriss, John and P. de Renzio
 1997 "‘Missing Link?’ or Analytically Missing?: The Concept of Social Capital, An Introductory Bibliographic Essay." *Journal of Economic Development* 9 (7):919-937.
- Hart, Donn
 1977 *Compadrazco: Ritual Kinship in the Philippines*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Höllinger, Franz and Max Haller
 1990 "Kinship and Social Networks in Modern Societies: A Cross-Cultural Comparison among Seven Nations." *European Sociological Review* 6:103-124.
- Hollnsteiner, Mary Racelis
 1963 *The Dynamics of Power in a Philippine Municipality*. Quezon City: Community Development Research Council.
- Ingelhart, Ronald
 1997 *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Isham, Jonathan, Thomas Kelly, and Sunder Ramaswamym (eds.)
 2002 *Social Capital and Economic Development: Well-Being in Developing Countries*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Jimenez, Ma. Carmen
 n.d. *Transformation through Involvement in Rural Women’s Organizations. Participation and Changes*. Quezon City: College of Social Science and Philosophy, University of the Philippines and the Center for Asian Studies Amsterdam-UP Joint Research Project on Agrarian Issues in Central Luzon.
- Kerkvliet, Benedict
 1980 "Classes and Class Relations in a Philippine Village." *Philippine Sociological Review* 26(1-4):31-50.
 1990 *Everyday Politics in the Philippines: Class and Status Relations in a Central Luzon Village*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Keifer, Thomas
 1968 *The Tausug*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.
- Knack, Stephen and Philip Keefer
 1997 "Does Social Capital have an Economic Pay-off? A Cross-Country Investigation." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112:4 (November):1251-88. Reprinted in Elinor Ostrom and T. K. Ahn (eds.) *Foundations of Social Capital*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 489-528. 2003.
- Koniordos, Sokratis (ed.)
 2005 *Networks, Trust and Social Capital: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations from Europe*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate.

Korten, Frances and Robert Siy Jr.

1989 *Transforming a Bureaucracy: The Experience of the Philippine National Irrigation Administration*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Kovalainen, Anne

2005 "Social Capital, Trust, and Dependency." In Sokratis Koniordos (ed.) *Networks, Trust and Social Capital: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations from Europe*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate, 71-90.

Lin, Nan

1999 "Social Networks and Status Attainment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:467-87.

2001 *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, Frank

1959 "Perspective on Filipino Clannishness." *Philippine Sociological Review* 20:73-77.

1973 "Social Acceptance Reconsidered." In Frank Lynch and Alfonso de Guzman II (eds.) *Four Readings on Philippine Values*. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.

Maloney, William A., Graham Smith, and Gerry Stoker

2000 "Social Capital and Associational Life." In Stephen Baron, John Field, and Tom Schuller (eds.) *Social Capital: Critical Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 212-225.

Marsden, Peter

1990 "Network Data and Measurement." *Annual Review of Sociology* 16:435-463.

Marsden, Peter and J.S. Hurlbert

1988 "Social Resources and Mobility Outcomes: A Replication and Extension." *Social Forces* 66 (4):1038-1059.

Martinez-Esquillo, Natividad

1978 "Conjugal Interaction and Social Networks." Master's thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

Mathews, Paul

1994 "Compadrazco: Culture as Performance." In Raul Pertierra and Eduardo Ugarte (eds.) *Cultures and Texts: Representations of Philippine Society*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Matiasz, Sophie

1980 "Social Networks: An Exploratory Analysis." Master's Thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

Medina, Belen

1991 *The Filipino Family*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Miralao, Virginia (ed).

1994 *Philippine Sociological Review* 42(1-4). This issue assembles papers on Filipino family and households.

Miralao, Virginia

1997 "The Family, Traditional; Values, and the Sociocultural Transformation of Philippine Society." *Philippine Sociological Review* 45(1-4):189-215.

Misztal, Barbara

1996 *Trust in Modern Societies: The Search for the Basis of Social Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Morais, Robert

1980 "Reciprocity in Alternative Form and Ritual." *Philippine Sociological Review* 28:73-80.

1981 "Friendship in the Rural Philippines." *Philippine Studies* 29:66-76.

Mulder, Niels

1997 *Inside Philippine Society: Interpretations of Everyday Life*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.

2000 *Filipino Images*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.

Narayan, Deepa

2000 *Voices of the Poor: Can Anyone Hear Us?* New York: Oxford University Press.

2002 "Bonds and Bridges: Social Capital and Poverty." In Jonathan Isham et al. (eds.) *Social Capital and Economic Development: Well-Being in Developing Countries*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 58-81.

Narayan, Deepa and Michael Cassidy

2001 "A Dimensional Approach to Measuring Social Capital: Development and Validation of Social Capital Inventory." *Current Sociology* 49 (2):49-93.

Oakley, Ann

1992 *Social Support and Motherhood*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Orpiada, Rogelio

forthcoming "Social Capital and Housing Development: A Case Study of the CFC-GK Housing Development Program in Amparo Village, Kalookan City." Master's thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

Ostrom, Elinor and T. K. Ahn (eds.)

2003 *Foundations of Social Capital*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Pal, Agaton

1966 "Aspects of Lowland Philippine Social Structure." *Philippine Sociological Review* 14 (1):31-39.

Pertierra, Raul

- 1993 "Viscera Suckers and Female Sociality: The Philippine Asuang." In *SA21 Selected Readings*. Quezon City: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ateneo de Manila University.
- 1995 *Philippine Localities and Global Perspectives: Essays on Society and Culture*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- 1997 *Explorations in Social Theory and Philippine Ethnography*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines University Press.

Phillipson, Chris, Graham Allan, and David Morgan (eds.)

- 2004 *Social Networks and Social Exclusion: Sociological and Social Policy Perspectives*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate.

Po, Blondie and Cristina Montiel

- 1980 *Rural Organizations in the Philippines*. Edited by Marie S. Fernandez. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.

Porio, Emma P. et al.

- 1978 *The Filipino Family, Community, and Nation*. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.

Portes, Alejandro

- 1998 "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22:1-24.

Portes, Alejandro and P. Landolt

- 1996 "The Downside of Social Capital." *The American Prospect* 26:18-21.

Potter, David

- 1974 "Compadrazco in Dumaguete: The Strategy of Selection." *Silliman Journal* 21 (11):1-29.

Putnam, Robert

- 1995 "Bowling Alone: American's Declining Social Capital." *Journal of Democracy* 61:65-78.
- 1996 "The Strange Disappearance of Civic America." *The American Prospect* 24:34-48.
- 2003 "The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life." *American Prospect* 13(Spring 1993):35-42. Reprinted in Elinor Ostrom and T. K. Ahn (eds.), *Foundations of Social Capital*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 529-536.

Putnam, Robert (ed.)

- 2000 *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- 2002 *Democracies in Flux*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

- Rauch, James and Alessandra Casella (eds.)
 2001 *Networks and Markets*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Romero, Margarita
 forthcoming "Rebuilding Networks in Resettlement Communities: The Case of Towerville Resettlement Site." Master's thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.
- Ruiz, Roland
 1987 "Comparing Rural Organizations: Outcomes of Vertical and Horizontal Linkages." M.A. Thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.
- Schlegel, Stuart
 1964 "Personal Alliance in Lowland Philippine Situations." *Anthropology Tomorrow* 10:50-65.
- Seligman, A.B.
 1997 *The Problem of Trust*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Scott, John
 2000 *Social Network Analysis*. 2nd ed. London: Sage.
 2002 "General Introduction." In John Scott (ed.) *Social Networks: Critical Concepts in Sociology* vol. 1. London and New York: Routledge, 1-22.
- Serrano, Isagani
 2003 "Civil Society in the Philippines: Struggling for Sustainability." In Schak, David C. and Wayne Hudson (eds.) *Civil Society in Asia*. Hampshire, England Ashgate, 103-113.
- Stockard, Jean
 2000 *Sociology: Discovering Society*. 2nd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Streeten, Paul
 2002 "Reflections on Social and Antisocial Capital." In Jonathan Isham, Thomas Kelly, and Sunder Ramaswamy (eds.) *Social Capital and Economic Development: Well-Being in Developing Countries*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 40-57.
- Southerton, Dale
 2004 "Cultural Capital, Social Network, and Social Contexts: Cultural Orientations Toward Spare-Time Practices in a New Town." In Chris Phillipson et al. (eds.) *Social Networks and Social Exclusion: Sociological and Social Policy Perspectives*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate, 97-116.
- Szanton, Maria Cristina Blanc
 1979 *The Right to Survive: Subsistence Marketing in a Lowland Philippine Town*. University Park: Penn State University.

Sztompka, Piotr

1999 *Trust: A Sociological Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trigilia, C.

2001 "Social Capital and Local Development." *European Journal of Social Theory* 4 (4).

Uslaner, Eric

2003 "Trust and Civic Engagement in East and West." In Badescu, Gabriel and Eric M. Uslaner (eds.) *Social Capital and the Transition to Democracy*. London and New York: Routledge, 81-94.

Vancio, Joseph

1981 "Social Networks and Crisis Situations: A Study of Marikina Working-Class Families." Master's Thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

Woolcock, Micheal

1998 "Social Capital and Economic Development: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework: *Theory and Society* 27 (1):151-208.

1999 "Managing Risk, Shocks, and Opportunity in Developing Economies. The Role of Social Capital." In Gustav Ranis (ed.) *Dimensions of Development*. New Haven, CT: Yale Center for International and Area Studies, 197-212.

2002 "Social Capital in Theory and Practice: Where Do We Stand?" In Jonathan Isham, Thomas Kelly, and Sunder Ramaswamy (eds.) *Social Capital and Economic Development: Well-Being in Developing Countries*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Woolcock, Micheal and Deepa Narayan

2003 "Social Capital Implications for Development Theory, Research, and Policy." *World Bank Research Observer* 15:2 (August 1964):225-249. Reprinted in Elinor Ostrom and T. K. Ahn (eds.) *Foundations of Social Capital*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 416-440.

World Bank

2000 *World Development Report 2000/2001*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Zialcita, Fernando

1997 "Barriers and Bridges to a Democratic Culture." In Maria Serena I. Diokno, (ed.) *Philippine Democracy Agenda volume 1: Democracy and Citizenship in Filipino Political Culture*. Quezon City: Third World Studies Center, University of the Philippines, 39-68.