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1 Introduction

Social networks play a crucial role in one’s economic well-being and social mobility. Many find their jobs through acquaintances’ referrals or learn essential information from their friends. People’s friends and acquaintances do not only serve instrumental functions of course. They are also a source of emotional and psychological support for the individual. Sociologists refer to these networks and the resources embedded within them as social capital.

What exactly is meant by social capital is not entirely clear as it has become somewhat of a trend in recent decades as an analytical tool in sociology. This soaring popularity should be no surprise – social capital theories and network analysis offer a uniquely clear way to scale micro-level understanding of an individual’s interactions into macro-level, structural outcomes.

In this thesis, the aim was to investigate the specific effects of gender and ethnicity on social capitals various facets. These facets correspond to different theories of social capital, such as the emotional capital viewpoint, or more instrumentality-focused approaches such as the importance of weak, bridging ties.

A multi-stage quantitative analysis was conducted by first comparing simple group means to understand the difference between an average man and an average woman, and an average Roma and average non-Roma person. Next, in order to understand whether the differences seen (or the lack of differences) are the result of other, correlated processes, multiple linear regression models were used to isolate the effects of gender and ethnicity. Lastly, an attempt was made to discover interaction effects between these two social factors.

This paper does not deal with the economic returns of social capital as there is extensive literature describing those processes. Nor does it deal with the potential deficit women and Roma see in these returns.

2 Literature review

2.1 Are there other types of capital than economic?

As with most things in sociology, capital has multiple competing theorizations. Pierre Bourdieu (1986) talks about three distinct but transmissible types of capital. The first of these is economic capital, the kind that immediately springs to mind when one hears the
word. This “species,” as Bourdieu puts it, is directly convertible to money and is thus readily quantifiable. He argues, however, for two more categories: cultural and social capital. The former refers to long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body (embodied), objects relating to cultures such as books, pictures, etc. (objectified) and academic credentials (institutionalised). More interesting for this thesis, however, is his account of social capital which he defines as the aggregate of the actual or potential resources the individual has access to through their personal connections. Moreover, these connections have to be maintained through the specific labour of sociability. Furthermore, all of these three types are transmissible from one species to the other, i.e. social capital holds economic potential (Bourdieu, 1986).

2.2 Enter network analysis
A specific and perhaps most famous account of how this transmission from one type of capital to the other might happen is given by Granovetter in his article, the Strength of Weak Ties (1973). He realised the potential that network analysis holds for sociological theory as it provides the analytic link between the micro level, such as interpersonal interactions and structural phenomena present on the macro level.

Network analysis in the case of sociology is the modelling of individuals and their social links as nodes and edges, respectively, in a mathematical model of communities. There is no catch-all definition for edges between two individuals; the criteria for the existence of a link are always defined according to research goals. Furthermore, researchers might add additional mathematical properties to edges: weight might capture the strength of the tie, sign can be positive or negative, e.g. sympathy or antipathy between two people and direction whereby edges might be asymmetrical, e.g. where one person likes the other who does not like them back. Since social research uses network models to simplify social reality, only a subset of these characteristic tends to be used (Borgatti and Halgin, 2011).

2.3 Granovetter’s Strength of Weak Ties
Mark Granovetter was interested in how network analysis can be applied to various phenomena and sought to provide a partly unified model that can contribute to the explanation of them. He dealt with acquaintance ties with differentiated intensity: strong, weak or absent. Strength is the function of four characteristics describing the relationship: the amount of time, emotional intensity, intimacy and reciprocal services.
Granovetter also asserted that the strength of the tie increases the proportion of acquaintances and friends the two individuals share. (Granovetter, 1973, p. 1360-1361) The paper’s “fragment of a theory”, as he puts it, points to an apparent paradox: weak ties are crucial for the cohesion of a community while strong ties (and the lack of weak ties) lead to fragmentation. This is because the abundance of strong ties tends to create cliques within communities that get in the way of diffusion phenomena (Granovetter, 1973, p. 1378).

This blockage in diffusion can lead to various negative outcomes, and Granovetter chooses three earlier pieces of research as case studies to illustrate the usefulness of this simple model. These three studies deal with three distinct results of network structure: the ability to organise against outside political forces, ease in finding a new job, and the adoption of innovation. He finds that in all of these cases the existence of weak ties has substantially contributed to the phenomenon (Granovetter, 1973).

### 2.4 Putnam’s Bowling Alone

Social capital does not only benefit the individual, however, but also the community. This is perhaps most famously discussed in Robert D. Putnam’s *Bowling Alone* (1995). Putnam works with a slightly different definition of social capital to that of Granovetter, in that social capital to him “refers to features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit” (Putnam, 1995, p. 20). Very important to note here that the definition includes the more abstract notions of norms and trust which are markedly different from the ego-focused conceptualisation that would make it possible to measure social capital on the individual level.

In this work, Putnam surveys the developments of social capital during the end of the twentieth century in American society. He notes a general decline in social capital in the U.S. evidenced by decreasing participation in political life (e.g. voting, town hall meetings) and formal organisations (churches, labour unions, literary societies etc.). The title here refers to a specific example of the latter, namely bowling leagues: the overall number of bowlers has increased in the United States, but bowling league membership has decreased, which is just another example of this decline, albeit a very symbolic one. Another one of Putnam’s contributions which is then widely adopted is the distinction between ‘bonding’ and ‘bridging’ social capital. This is somewhat analogous to Granovetter’s (1973) tie strength concept but focuses on a slightly different facet.
Bonding capital is the cement of groups, as it is the form that reinforces exclusive identity. Examples include participation in activities that are membership based, be that based on religious congregation, ethnicity or class. This is the form that is most often utilized for financial or nonmaterial support. Bridging social capital on the other hand, encompasses people across diverse social groups. It works better for linking the individual to external assets, such as the Granovetterian example of finding jobs (Putnam, 2000).

Later authors (e.g. Woolcock, 2001) expanded this bonding-bridging scheme by distinguishing a third type, namely ‘linking’ capital. This is used to distinguish between the relationships that connect the individual to actors that are hierarchically distinct from them, i.e. NGO-s, institutions and those with power. Messing and Molnár also note that bonding capital tends to be stronger in the case of highly marginalised ethnic groups, both in proportion (due to the lack of bridging capital) and in absolute terms. (Messing and Molnár, 2011).

2.5 Reconciling the rift between homo economicus and homo sociologicus

Homo economicus and homo sociologicus are two fictional subspecies of humans; the former refers to the infinitely utility-maximizing and rational model of individual action often employed in economic analysis, while the latter refers to the individual whose actions are fully conditioned by their social environment and essentially lacks free will. These two models are usually cited as a rhetorical device to mock one school of thought or the other. Nonetheless, many authors seek to reconcile these two seemingly incompatible perspectives. One of those authors is James Coleman, who in his work, Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital (1988) tried to introduce elements of the economists’ model to the analysis of various social systems, going beyond markets. He chose the tool of social capital aid in this and described three forms of it.

The first of the three forms are obligations and expectations which Coleman compares to financial credit relations: if actor A does something for actor B, that usually gives rise to an obligation on the side of B and an expectation on the side of A for reciprocating that favour in the future. Similarly to money markets, the amount of outstanding “credit slips” can vary between individuals but also show remarkable differences between social environments. In a given environment a person might have substantially more possibilities to draw on obligations (e.g. a father in a family) than others. Social
environments might differ in the “density of obligations”, that is to say, the overall amount of outstanding expectations and obligations. This might be because of the presence of other sources of aid (e.g. social welfare), cultural differences, degree of affluence, etc. The point is that where there is a higher average amount of these credit slips, any given individual has more of these reciprocative relations to call upon thus increasing their social capital.

But concrete favours are not the only way to benefit from one’s connections. The cost of information in certain fields of life can be very high, but the right friends and acquaintances can drive that down thus serving as the second form of social capital. The last element in Coleman’s theoretical approach are norms that are effective, in that they facilitate certain types of activities while inhibiting others. For example, a society that supports and rewards high achievers greatly helps the education system’s work (Coleman, 1988).

2.6 Gendering social capital

The theories of social capital mentioned above all approach the issue somewhat differently, yet they share an essential characteristic. Underpinning each of them is an assumption of instrumentality, that is to say, there is assumed to be a somewhat conscious process of investment either on the individual or on the community level into one form of capital or the other. Economic theories demonstrate the usefulness of this axiom when the aim is connecting individual actions to macro-level outcomes. Like all models, however, these are not perfect either. These simplifications all miss the role of emotions in social life, which is important because at the least, emotions can inhibit rational action, and at the most ‘emotional capital’ can be conceptualised as another type of capital in its own right.

The benefit of lifting emotional capital to a level of equal importance is the acknowledgment of the gendered nature of emotional labour in our analysis. After all within traditional families, it usually falls on women to “invest” into emotional capital, that is to say they tend to take responsibility for others’ emotional well-being and mitigate distress much more than men do (Reay, 2004). And while Bourdieu concedes that “it has often been observed that women fulfil a cathartic, quasi-therapeutic function in regulating men’s emotional lives, calming their anger, helping them accept the injustices and difficulties of life” (2001, p. 77.), he never talks about emotional capital explicitly. Helga Nowotny is often cited as the first notable challenger of emotional
capital’s sidelining by social scientists. She saw emotional capital as a genre of social capital but one that manifests in private relationships more than public ones. Furthermore, she viewed it as somewhat of a coping mechanism, something that develops since the obtainment of other types of capital is denied to women (Nowotny, 1981 cited in Reay, 2004, p. 60).

2.7 Racial/ethnic differences in social capital

Inequalities of social capital do not only present themselves along gender lines. Racial minority groups in the US (blacks, Latinxs) have also been documented to have access to a lower diversity of network connections (Marsden, 1988), and thus to a lower level of social capital in general. As Smith (2000) points out, residential segregation naturally also plays a role in shaping social networks: a substantial minority of blacks and Latinxs live in segregated neighbourhoods, which results in an unstable and low-quality connection to the labour market. Furthermore, the wage premium that disadvantaged white youth access when getting a job through their contacts is not present for black and Latinx youngsters (Smith, 2000). Overall, the topic of racial differences in the structure and composition of personal networks is under-researched even in the United States. Shifting our attention to Hungary, there is often a parallel drawn between the social exclusion of blacks in the US and the exclusion of Roma in Hungary. Usually, this parallel serves as the basis for generalizing research conducted about the former to be valid for the latter. While this might be justifiable in some cases, the differences between the histories of the two groups and their environments make this generalization reasonably questionable for this present inquiry. Nevertheless, if the exclusion of blacks is under-researched and under-theorised in this respect, that is massively true for the Roma in Hungary.

A summary of research until 2011 on the social networks of Roma in Hungary is provided by Messing and Molnár (2011). Dávid and Albert (2006) found that Roma tend to have richer networks than the total population’s average and a lower ratio of them tend to be disadvantaged from a network perspective. Other research (Messing, 2006) contradicted this and questioned the widespread assumption that Roma are more secure in the face of poverty and the resulting crises than non-Roma in similar economic standing due to their extensive support networks. The same research concluded that the very strength of ethnic identity might influence the size and utilization of networks: more of the Roma who considered themselves either Beás, Oláh
or Romungro, instead of “Gypsy, in general” tended to have support relationships but their networks were also much more ethnically homogenous. Judit Durst (2002) observed in a romungro community that while strong family ties protect people in times of economic hardship, they can also be barriers of mobility. As the community becomes more diverse income-wise, those better off start to weaken the ties to family members living in poverty and open or strengthen new ones towards distant family members in similar status. This research focused on a single Roma community, so to assume this effect is exclusive to members of Roma communities is not justified.

Bridging social capital is also shrunk by the maintenance of ethnic and cultural boundaries. As Ryder (2017) describes based on his work in a Gypsy site in the UK, marginalised ethnic groups tend to have identity managers, people with the right symbolic social capital to pass judgment regarding group membership and thus maintain and recreate ethnic boundaries. Too much bridging social capital, too many connections to outside groups and the individual finds themselves on the boundary with a stark choice to make to avoid pressure: conform to the community norm or leave (Ryder, 2017).

2.8 Social capital is not an absolute positive asset

So far, the potential positive effects of social capital have been discussed but one has to wonder whether there is a flipside to this. Putnam (1995) notes that just as any other form of capital, social capital can be used for anti-social ends as well. But perhaps the most notable summary of its potential adverse effects comes from Portes (1998), who lists the following phenomena: exclusion of outsiders, excess claims on group members, restrictions on individual freedom, and downward levelling norms.

The first of these is perhaps the most self-evident. By definition, group cohesion and benefits to kin members result in the exclusion of non-kin persons based on non-meritocratic bases. As examples, Portes mentions ethnic monopolies on particular trades (e.g. Jews on diamond trade in New York), or white ethnics’ control of construction trades and the fire and police unions of New York. The second effect relates to tight communities with strong norms for mutual assistance. Successful members of these communities might get assaulted by job and loan-seeking kin whose requests need to be fulfilled due to the aforementioned strong norms. Thus, the future success of the enterprise is impeded.
The third effect is again, somewhat trivial, in that active participation in a community or group with firm social control can lead to the detriment of individual freedom. The fourth of these potential adverse outcomes however is the most relevant to this current inquiry. This stems from the notion that often group solidarity is strengthened by an adversarial and oppositional relationship to mainstream society. As Portes puts it, “in these instances, individual success stories undermine group cohesion because the latter is precisely grounded on the alleged impossibility of such occurrences” (1998, p. 17). Thus he warns us about an assumption of all-encompassing “goodness” of social capital, and encourages the analysis of both sides (Portes, 1998).

2.9 Modelling social capital

Naturally before one can operationalise social capital, they need to arrive at a single definition of it. This thesis is going to approach the measurement of social capital from a network theory perspective. As such, the definition adopted going forward is going to be that of Nan Lin, namely that “the notion of social capital contains three ingredients: resources embedded in a social structure; accessibility to such social resources by individuals; and use or mobilization of such social resources by individuals in purposive actions“ (Lin, 1999). Resources in this respect specifically refer to wealth, power and status.

While Lin refers to “expressive” returns such as physical and mental health, as well life satisfaction, these seem more like afterthoughts, and instrumentality is the main driver. Although when writing about inequalities of social capital, Lin acknowledges gender-based differences, but he does not propose explanations for the reasons of these (Lin, 2000). As such, in the data analysis part, an extended version of his conceptualisation is going to be used that also extensively refers to emotional capital.
Lin summarizes his theory of social capital in the following model.

![Lin's model of the theory of social capital (reproduction of figure from Lin, 1999)](image)

In this process, the starting condition is the inequality of social capital: communities differ in their collective assets relating to social capital (Coleman, 1988) and individuals within those also differ in their network positions, cultural, political and economic standing.

These inequalities result in inequal access to resources. Accessibility to resources, however, does not directly determine outcomes, it only facilitates them. This model emphasises individual choice in actually mobilizing the resources one has potential access to. Nonetheless, the general expectation is that better accessible resources, the better resources will mobilised in purposive action by people.

Finally, the whole point of Lin’s model, social capital should lead to either instrumental returns (wealth, power, status) or expressive returns, such as physical or mental health, life satisfaction (Lin, 1999).

### 2.10 Operationalising social capital

Having arrived to a suitable definition of the concept, one needs to find a way to operationalise it. Kmetty and Koltai (2015) provide a thorough overview of the most extensively used measurement methods for social capital in surveys. I’ll provide a brief introduction of the ones that are relevant to this thesis.

The first and oldest of them is the so-called name generator. In this method the respondent is asked who they can rely on in specific hypothetical scenarios (e.g. who do you ask advice from, who do you ask money from). Its aim is to measure mostly affective support or discussion network, i.e. strong ties or bonding capital.
The second is the so-called position generator which measures the types of occupations the respondents’ contacts have by reading off a predefined list of occupations and asking whether the respondent knows anyone of that profession. The method was developed by Nan Lin and thus is mostly interested in instrumental action and is subsequently well operationalised through an occupational ladder. Furthermore, the prestige of the professions can be measured as well and when these prestige scores are coupled with the position generator data, a number of further indicators can be derived (e.g. highest prestige reached, average prestige, etc.).

The next is the resource generator which aims to elaborate on the very instrumentality-focused position generator. Here, the format is similar but instead of asking about occupations, the interviewee is asked about other things, e.g. whether they know anyone who is active politically, knows literature, has a car etc. The questions can cover a wide range of topics, which is the main pitfall of this method: the social capital concept underpinning it is too broad.

Lastly, the size generator that tries to gauge the overall number of the acquaintances of the respondent. It works by first going through a list of few names and asking how many people with that name does the respondent know. Since the distribution of the most frequent names is known in the population, the total size of the network can be calculated. Next, the same exercise is repeated but instead of names, other features are listed, such as homosexuality, membership in a church, former prison inmate status etc. The aim of this method is not the analysis of the individual’s network, but to understand cleavages in the given population (Kmetty and Koltai, 2015).

2.11 ‘Integrative and Desintegrative Processes in the Hungarian Society’

This thesis is going to rely on data collected in the large-scale ‘Integrative and Desintegrative Processes in the Hungarian Society’ research project (Kováč et al., 2017). This dataset offers a unique opportunity for the analysis of social capital as it features a name generator, a position generator and a size generator, so very different facets of social capital can be looked at in tandem.

This, however, also means that there is a sizeable amount of literature that rests on this same data. Below is a description of two of the papers published in the aforementioned research project. All other articles either did not use the data source and instead offered theoretical basis for other papers or had very different foci than the topic present
2.11.1 Status attainment, social support, social cleavages - the integrational aspects of social networks (Kmetty and Koltai, 2016)

In this paper the authors segmented the sample into 7 clusters based on personal network characteristics and analysed the correlations of status attainment, social support and macro-level integration via regression models. While the demographics of the clusters (“milieus”) were described in the paper, the specific effect of gender and ethnicity on social capital was not described.

2.11.2 Integration, poverty, social capital (Albert and Hajdu, 2016)

Albert and Hajdu looked at the effect of poverty on different dimensions of social capital. They found that poverty seemingly impedes the poor’s ability to build and maintain relationships. Not surprisingly, severe material deprivation has a larger negative effect on social relationships than the more widely used income poverty indicators. They also found that those in poverty have a lower number of connections than those better off, although this is mostly true for connections aimed at instrumental returns rather than expressive ones (Albert and Hajdu, 2016).

While initially the research question posed by this thesis seems very similar to the one in the paper there are crucial differences in terms of focus. The authors focused on the effect of economic variables on social capital dimensions. The analysis presented in the later part of this thesis goes one step further towards the beginning of the process and asks: what social characteristics condition the quantity and quality of resources embedded in one’s network?

2.12 Gaps in previous literature

In the reviewed literature there have been a number of references made to gender- or ethnicity-based differences in social capital. These references however suffer from problems. They tend to be dated (mostly from the 1970-s, 1980-s) and focus on the United States or the United Kingdom. This potentially means that findings of this research cannot be generalized to Hungary.

Social capital research that did focus on Hungary, rarely offers an integrated view of social capital, with its different aspects appreciated and analysed. In some analyses (e.g. Albert and Hajdu, 2016) the effect of gender and ethnicity is acknowledged as they are included as control variables, but their effects are not described. As such, this thesis set out to investigate the effects of these two factors.
3 Methodology

Early on in the writing process, a decision was made to primarily rely on data collected by previous researchers and to use quantitative methods. The latter seemed trivial as I was mostly interested in macro-level, generalizable phenomena, to which quantitative analysis lends itself well. This did not, in and of itself, rule out primary data collection, but the dataset described below presented a unique opportunity in that it contains three distinct social capital measurement instruments, which allows for a full investigation of these effects.

Plus, the measurement instruments are fairly strict in their implementation, so relying on survey data collected by myself would not have demonstrated much in the way of creating surveys, as the questions are pre-set. Additionally, data collection would have faced serious difficulties, had I attempted to recreate a smaller dataset with identical questions. This is because the administration of these surveys is always done by interviewers, as they simply tend to be too tedious for the respondent and as such would face a really high abandonment rate in e.g. an online survey environment.

3.1 The sample and data collection

The data was collected by TÁRKI Zrt. from a two-stage sample of Hungarian society. First settlements were chosen based on a probability proportional to the adult aged (18+) population and then randomly choosing the individuals from each settlement. For a more detailed description of the sampling method, see Kovách et al., (2017). After the data collection a four-dimensional weight was applied based on gender, age, settlement type and educational attainment level. This weight was used throughout the analysis presented below.

The mode of data collection was personal structured interviews. The sample size is 2687 from 166 settlements.

3.2 Access and ethics

The dataset resides in the open archives of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Centre for Social Sciences. Early on in the research process, access was contingent on explicit permission from the authors. This permission has been obtained from the Research Documentation Centre.

In my analysis, I strived to remain factual and to avoid generalised negative characterizations of social groups.
3.3 Social capital indicators constructed

As stated earlier, the dataset used contains data collected using the name generator, the position generator and the size generator methods. A rough translation of the relevant section of the survey is provided in Appendix A which is accurate enough to be suitable for understanding the nature and content of the questions, even if not the nuance of the questions’ wordings.

A diverse array of social capital indicators can be constructed using the data.

- Number of acquaintances
  - **What is it?** The total number of people that the respondent knows
  - **How does one measure this?** Using the responses given to the size generator technique, and official records on the number of people with certain first names in Hungary one can arrive to a rough estimate of the total network size.
  - **Why?** The total network size represents the total potential for building strong relationships that can then lead to instrumental or expressive returns.

- Core discussion network size
  - **What is it?** It refers to the number of people (max. 5) who the respondent can talk to regarding personal issue.
  - **How does one measure this?** The number of names given in response to the first question of the name generator (“who are the people, with whom you discussed your more important issues, problems?”)
  - **Why?** This is the closest proxy that these techniques offer to the strength of emotional capital the respondent can *draw upon*. Note that in this operationalisation the emotional labour of people (primarily women) shows up as emotional capital for the ones that they help rather than for themselves. While this type of relationship is often reciprocal to some extent, asymmetry in effort is also an important feature (see section “Gendering social capital” of the literature review)

- Number of strong ties
  - **What is it?** The number of individuals that the respondent can rely on for personal discussion, fun or help.
- **How does one measure this?** The total number of unique “alters” named for either of the name generator questions
- **Why?** This indicator represents the bonding element of social capital and can be contrasted with the bridging dimensions.

- **Share of kin in strong ties**
  - **What is it?** The proportion of relatives in the individual’s strong ties
  - **How does one measure this?** Since the name generator asks for the relationship the named people have to the respondent, one can quantify the total number of kin strong ties. Then this number can be divided by the total number of strong ties.
  - **Why?** If someone’s entire support network is made up of family that means they are not well

- **Prestige diversity**
  - **What is it?** Range of the prestige reached in instrumental relationships
  - **How does one measure this?** The difference between the maximum and the minimum prestige scores obtained from the position generator.
  - **Why?** A high spread of prestige scores reached means that the individual has access to more diverse social groups. This in turn can mean that they can use the help of the most appropriate help for returns. Furthermore, this also signals the level of integration of the individual.

- **Highest prestige available**
  - **What is it?** The highest the prestige reached in instrumental relationships
  - **How does one measure this?** The maximum prestige score from the position generator.
  - **Why?** Overall, this is an important measure of how high the respondent can reach in the “social ladder”. That is how valuable their connections can be from a status viewpoint.

### 3.4 Measurement of the explanatory variables

Ethnicity has been measured in two different ways in the survey. The first relied on self-identification and asked the respondent which nationality or ethnicity they consider themselves members of (one or two nationalities/ethnicities could be chosen). At the end of the questionnaire, the interviewer also had to note whether they thought the
respondent was Roma. For the sake of this analysis, the self-identification data will be used and a dummy variable calculated with ‘Roma’ and ‘Non-Roma’ values. While this might seem overly simplistic, this inquiry is only concerned about the effect of being Roma and not other, mostly white ethnicities captured in the data. Furthermore, the frequencies of the other ethnicities in the data were fairly low, so extracting meaningful information would have difficult due to high estimates of errors.

Gender is a somewhat simpler term in that respondents identified themselves as either male or female. While this might not be the most welcome typology due to its somewhat restrictive binary nature, nevertheless, the incidental misgendering due to the direct sex-gender link introduces only minor inaccuracies. Additionally, the sample size would probably not support any statements about people with non-conforming gender identities, even if accurate measurement was present.

### 3.5 Methods

The tool of choice was multiple linear regression in all of these cases given that all of these variables are continuous or quasi-continuous. The core discussion network size ranges from 0 to 5 and as such would be a candidate for multinomial logistic regression but. Running both models however, one finds that the explanatory power of the multinomial logistic regression model is not higher so the multiple linear regression model was used for the sake of interpretability.

Since both ethnicity and gender correlate with a host of factors that have been demonstrated or theorized to have effects on social capital, these variables are included as control variables:

- Type of settlement
- Age
- Number of people in the household
- Educational attainment
- Partnership status
- Financial stability of the household (self-reported)
  - The decision has been made to not rely on income data, as there has been a substantial number of non-responses to the household income question in the survey. Furthermore, the literature has demonstrated that income per se does not have a very significant effect on social capital, but rather material deprivation does (see the following control variable).
This relies on the question ‘In your opinion, how easily can your household cover regular expenses?’.

- Severe material deprivation
  - Relying on the Eurostat and EU-SILC definition of severe material deprivation.
- Employment status
- Disability
  - Measured by the question ‘Do you have difficulties in your daily activities as the result of long-term illness, bad health or mental problem? If so, to what extent?’
- Whether the respondent has a child

4 Findings

4.1 Hypotheses
This thesis looks at the effects of two social positions’ effects on social capital. The variety of definitions of the topic at hand require a variety of empirical expectations put forward.

The general expectation is that while there will be differences between women and men, Roma and non-Roma in a way that the women and Roma will have lower level of instrumental and more of expressive social capital. The rationale is that both of these groups experience some level of economic social exclusion and as Nowotny (see discussion above - Reay, 2004) predicted, this will push them towards establishing emotional capital as a coping mechanism. There are also distinct effects for the two groups: women might have more bonding social capital as a result of the gender division of labour and expectations of femininity; and low-status Roma tend to live in residentially segregated areas which should decrease bridging capital.

As such, the specific empirical expectations are the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social capital indicator</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Roma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of acquaintances</td>
<td>▼ Lower</td>
<td>▼ Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core discussion network size</td>
<td>▲ Higher</td>
<td>▲ Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of strong ties</td>
<td>▲ Higher</td>
<td>▲ Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of kin in strong ties</td>
<td>▲ Higher</td>
<td>▲ Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige diversity</td>
<td>▼ Lower</td>
<td>▼ Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest prestige available</td>
<td>▼ Lower</td>
<td>▼ Lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 Dependent variable distributions

Firstly, let us take a look at the distributions of the dependent variables to get a sense of what values they can take. This is also going to help interpret the regression coefficients later.

![Histograms of dependent variables](image)

*Figure 2. Distributions of the dependent variables shown as histograms*

Note that these charts are histograms, so the discrete values have been binned into a finite number of categories.

The number of acquaintances variable resembles a Gamma distribution with its binned mode at 75-100 and a long tail. There were a number of outliers going into the range of 150 000. These outliers were filtered out for all further analyses involving this variable.
by defining a cut-off point of 790 acquaintances. This threshold number was defined by finding points that were influential on the multiple linear regression model. This was done in an iterative process of filtering based on influence (measured by Cook’s distance) and rerunning the regression model to check for new influential points. This cycle was repeated 3 times, after which there were no points with disproportionately high influence.

The core discussion network variable has a practical maximum of 5 (as the survey maximised the number of people named at 5) but the mode is 2. The strong ties variable’s maximum was 15, but this was not reached in the sample. The highest prestige reached instrument shows that there are maximums on the full possible range of prestige scores, ranging from 31 (utility worker) to 69, which corresponds to university lecturers, researchers. Similarly, the full range of possible prestige diversity scores is present, which means there were individuals in the sample who only knew people with same-status occupations, but also people who knew both utility workers and university professors.

Before moving on to the linear regression models, a brief view of bivariate relationships is presented.

### 4.3 Bivariate analysis

I was not only interested in the isolated effect of gender and ethnicity but also how the social capital of an average member of these groups looks, including suppression and amplification effects. Below is a chart depicting those group differences.
Differences between women and men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of acquaintances</th>
<th>Discussion network size</th>
<th>Number of strong ties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>184.04</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>175.89</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Share of kin in strong ties</th>
<th>Highest prestige reached</th>
<th>Prestige diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>57.24</td>
<td>24.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>55.44</td>
<td>23.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between Roma and non-Roma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of acquaintances</th>
<th>Discussion network size</th>
<th>Number of strong ties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Roma</strong></td>
<td>179.39</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roma</strong></td>
<td>185.83</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Share of kin in strong ties</th>
<th>Highest prestige reached</th>
<th>Prestige diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Roma</strong></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>56.61</td>
<td>24.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roma</strong></td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>49.53</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Red bars mark significant differences between means (two-sample t-test, $p<0.05$)

Figure 3. Differences in group means between men and women, Roma and non-Roma

As the chart shows there are no enormous discrepancies between these pairs of groups overall. Nonetheless, there are statistically significant differences between the group averages, specifically in the share of kin in strong ties and prestige diversity for women and Roma both, and the highest prestige reached for Roma. These differences are in line with the empirical expectations outlined above.

Notably, however, some of the theorised effects are missing. Emotional capital effects do not show up in this comparison, group means of core discussion network size and the number of strong ties are not statistically different for either of the groups. This might
very well be because of suppressor effects present. In order to isolate those effects from
the effects of our primary explanatory variables we need to run the multiple linear
regression models.

### 4.4 Regression results

Running the linear regressions models one-by-one with the two primary explanatory
variables (gender and ethnicity) plus the above control variables as independents and
the individual social capital indicators as dependents gives the following results.

![Figure 4. Chart depicting effect sizes of gender and ethnicity on social capital indicators.](chart)

*Figure 4. Chart depicting effect sizes of gender and ethnicity on social capital indicators.*

Each row of the above figure corresponds to a single model, whose dependent variable
is shown in the leftmost column. The two sets of bars in the middle describe the effect
sizes of two explanatory variables (gender and ethnicity). Since both of these variables
are dichotomous, only the relevant categories (women and Roma) are shown here. Bar
lengths show the standardised regression coefficients while labels show the
unstandardized values. This allows the reader to gauge relative effect sizes between
models but also interpret the results more easily. The rightmost bars show the
explanatory power of the models (as measured by adjusted $R^2$), with labels showing the
same value.
Overall the results fit the empirical expectations laid out above although only a minority of the hypotheses are corroborated with effects that are statistically significant. Let us look at the results separately for the two groups.

4.5 **How does being a woman affect one’s social capital?**

Only 3 of the hypotheses stand up based on this data. Specifically, women tend to have larger core discussion networks than men by approx. 0.16 persons, or perhaps in a more sensible phrasing: every sixth woman has one more person they can discuss their issues with than an average man. Additionally, women tend to have more strong ties in general by about the same margin (0.17) which means that the core discussion network increase accounts for the increase in the number of strong ties as well. To confirm this, the regression was run with the core discussion network size included in the independent variable list, and the effect of gender disappeared.

This reinforces the emotional capital thesis, specifically in that women do tend to have more of the connections whose aims are expressive returns, specifically emotional support and community bonding. Another possible explanation for this is simply the gendered nature of relying on the support of others for emotional relief. In Hungary gender norms might prevent men from sharing emotional stress and allowing for social support.

Women also tend to have around 4% more kin amongst their strong ties than men. The explanation for this rest firmly in the emotional capital theory. After all, women tend to care for children more and play the role of the emotional link in the family. This naturally also means that they themselves have more kin connections to call upon, thus increasing this proportion of those kin connections in their overall strong ties. Interestingly, even though there are some negative effects of gender observed on instrumental connections measured in the position generator, these effects are not statistically significant, i.e. they can be the result of random processes, e.g. the sampling involved. Important to note here, that there is literature documenting women’s exclusion from these forms of connections, but these tend to be from the United States, and quite dated. The present data differs in two very important ways: firstly, it was collected in 2015 and so lot of the advancement in terms of gender equality might show. Another explanation, or perhaps part of it, is that the legacy of socialism’s forced integration of women into the workforce means a higher level of instrumental equality between the genders.
4.6 Are Roma worse off?

Only one of the hypotheses that were formulated about ethnicity hold up in the face of this dataset. This is that Roma tend to reach lower status people (as measure by the prestige of those people’s occupations). This is somewhat unsurprising given the level of exclusion of Roma from Hungarian society. The unstandardized regression coefficient here is -2.11, meaning that the maximum status score a Roma person can reach in their network is lower than their non-Roma peers. Note, that this is after we controlled for the host of factors described above, so this can be fully attributed to ethnic exclusion. Nonetheless the effect size is fairly small: a difference of 2 is the difference between an accountant and a company executive or a journalist and an actor. Perhaps even more interestingly however, no other hypothesis checks out. Based on this data, the first impression is that Roma do not have more acquaintances, do not have more people to talk to, do not have more strong ties, do not have more kin in those strong ties and they do not have lower diversity of prestige scores they can reach. This is surprising given the vast knowledge of the various forms of exclusion the Roma face. So why might this be?

First of all, note, that this finding does not mean that the average Roma has very similar social capital to the average non-Roma. There is a myriad of factors that contribute to less convertible social capital and that affect Roma disproportionately, e.g. severe material deprivation or long-term health problems. The effect size found here, is after we’ve controlled for all of these factors.

4.7 What about Roma women?

The previous results left me wondering whether there is a difference between the effects of gender in Roma communities and non-Roma communities. If the previous models are rerun with the inclusion of an interaction term of gender and ethnicity, we get the following coefficients.
As seen, in all of these cases, either the original effect, or the interaction term is not significant. This means that this dataset shows no significant difference between the effects of being a woman in a Roma community versus a non-Roma community. This however might be due to the limitations of this specific dataset: within the entire sample there are only 52 Roma women and so with the inclusion of all of the control variables, the statistical certainty simply cannot be great enough.

5 Conclusion

This thesis has aimed to provide an up-to-date snapshot of gender’s and ethnicity’s effects on social capital. Previous literature either emphasised the interplay between social and economic capital or tended to focus on a single dimension of social capital. The goal of this inquiry was to provide a more rounded picture of the different aspects, by considering instrumental and expressive features of social capital. While gender and ethnicity were found to shape the individual’s social capital, they by no means determine it. Women tend to have more emotional capital, that is more connections to discuss personal issues and problems with, and slightly more kin amongst their strong ties. Based on this dataset, the networks of Roma do not differ
significantly from non-Roma, except in that the instrumental connections of the former tend to be of lower prestige.

There are certain limitations of this analysis, most notably that the number of observations for Roma were fairly low so it did not permit an analysis of the interplay between ethnicity and gender, i.e. a specific look at Roma women. Due to volume limitations it also did not deal with *return deficits* of these groups, i.e. how different are the returns they can draw from the same social capital as the reference groups. These limitations are not small and as such, specific research into these areas should be conducted with properly balanced sample sizes for Roma and non-Roma so that the intersection of these two differences can be viewed in its own merit. Additionally, the topic would benefit from a mixed methods approach with ethnographic elements, as the literature clearly shows that social capital is inextricably linked to exclusion in the case of Roma. If that is not possible qualitative interviews would still greatly benefit the analysis, especially for the interpretation of quantitative research findings.

In the US and the UK social capital has already become a “trendy” facet of development policies, but Hungary (so far) did not follow suit, even in the face of renowned work by Hungarian social capital researchers. Social policy would greatly benefit from a more informed approach in Hungary whereby the multiplicity of capitals is acknowledged and as such, the efficiency of development efforts is improved.
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7 Appendix

7.1 Appendix A – Relevant pages of the survey

V. Connections

In the following couple of questions, I’d like to ask you about the persons who you are in your family or in close connection with you otherwise.

51.a How many friends do you have?

51. Most people discuss important things with others from time to time. If you think about the past 6 months: who are the people, with whom you discussed your more important issues, problems? It’s enough to mention their first names or their initials. You can mention five people at most.

|--------------------|-------------------|---------|-----------|------------|------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex (F/M)</th>
<th>Age (if not sure, approx.)</th>
<th>Educational attainment</th>
<th>Relationship to you (see codes above)</th>
<th>Do they live in the same settlement as you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. Now I’d like to ask you about the persons with whom you can make plans together, go out to have fun, come together to relax, perhaps be a guest of, when you have the time. You can mention five people at most.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If mentioned in</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age (if not sure, approx.)</th>
<th>Educational attainment</th>
<th>Relationship to you (see codes above)</th>
<th>Do they live in the same settlement as you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
the previous question | (F/M) | not sure, approx. | attainment | you (see codes above) | in the same settlement as you?
---|---|---|---|---|---
Name, sex, age | 1 | | | |
Name, sex, age | 2 | | | |
Name, sex, age | 3 | | | |
Name, sex, age | 4 | | | |
Name, sex, age | 5 | | | |

53. And who can you rely on, who can you receive help from for minor jobs around the household, or for smaller-or-larger everyday errands (e.g. moving, painting, repair works etc.). Who would you mention?

| If mentioned in the previous question | Name | Sex (F/M) | Age (if not sure, approx.) | Educational attainment | Relationship to you (see codes above) | Do they live in the same settlement as you? |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
Name, sex, age | 1 | | | |
Name, sex, age | 2 | | | |
Name, sex, age | 3 | | | |
Name, sex, age | 4 | | | |
Name, sex, age | 5 | | | |

55. I’m going to read off a couple of professions. Please tell me for each one of them if you personally know someone who works in them. ‘Personally’ means that you greet each other if you meet and know each others’ names.

55.a If you do know one or more, can you ask any of them for help or advice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>55. Knows</th>
<th>55.a If knows: There is one they can ask for help or advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. High school teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Driver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. IT technician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Accountant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Mayor, municipal repr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Plumber, gas repairperson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions are regarding persons, who you know by name and if you met at chance, you’d stop for a conversation. Please think of all your acquaintances in Hungary! The second part of the question refer to the number of people of these who you trust. Some of the questions might seem “strange” but it’s important for us that we understand the connections of Hungarians the best we can.

56. Please, tell me, how many people do you know who’s called Milán? And how many who…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>56. Knows</th>
<th>56.a Trusts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. are called Milán?</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. are called Judit</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. are called Krisztián</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. are called Barbara</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. are called Sándor</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. are called Júlia</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now I’d like to ask a couple different questions…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>56.a Trusts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. you know is unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. has been to prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. has a weekend house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. is gypsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. regularly goes to church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. is gay or lesbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. moved abroad in the last decade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. is homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. has a foreign currency mortgage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. is the member of any type of civil organisation, association or foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. votes for Jobbik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. votes for LMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. votes for Demokratikus Koalíció</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. votes for Együtt 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2 Appendix B – Copy of the correspondence granting permission to use the dataset in secondary research
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István
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Enikő