DISSERTATIONES
SOCIOLOGICAE
UNIVERSITATIS
TARTUENSIS
13

MAI BEILMANN

Social Capital and Individualism – Collectivism at the Individual Level

DISSERTATIONES SOCIOLOGICAE UNIVERSITATIS TARTUENSIS

13

DISSERTATIONES SOCIOLOGICAE UNIVERSITATIS TARTUENSIS
13

MAI BEILMANN

Social Capital and Individualism – Collectivism at the Individual Level

UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
Press

Institute of Social Studies, University of Tartu, Estonia

This dissertation was accepted for the award of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology on 10 May 2017, by the Board of the Institute of Social Studies, the University of Tartu.

Supervisor: Professor Anu Realo, University of Tartu, Estonia, University of Warwick, United Kingdom

Opponent: Professor Claire Wallace, University of Aberdeen, United Kingdom

The dissertation will be defended on 5 July 2017.

The publication of this dissertation is granted by the Institute of Social Studies, University of Tartu.

ISSN 1736-0307
ISBN 978-9949-77-457-9 (print)
ISBN 978-9949-77-458-6 (pdf)

Copyright: Mai Beilmann, 2017

University of Tartu Press
www.tyk.ee

Pühendatud minu isale
Dedicated to my father

For it is mutual trust,
even more than mutual interest that holds human associations together.
Our friends seldom profit us but they make us feel safe.
– Henry Louis Mencken

CONTENTS

LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS 8

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 9

INTRODUCTION 11

1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 13
   1.1. Social Capital – A Short Intellectual History 13
   1.2. What is Social Capital? 14
   1.3. Individualism and Collectivism in Social and Cross-Cultural Psychology 18
   Cultural versus Individual Level 18
   Subtypes of Individualism and Collectivism 19
   1.4. Increasing Individualism, Decreasing Social Capital? 21

2. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS 25
   2.1. How to Measure Social Capital 25
   2.2. How to Measure Individualism–Collectivism 27
   2.3. Data and Methods Used in the Present Dissertation 28

3. FINDINGS 32

4. DISCUSSION 35
   Impact of Individualism–Collectivism: Cultural vs. Individual Level 35
   How much does Individualism–Collectivism Explain Individual-Level Variance in Social Capital? 36
   Challenges in Studying the Relationship between Social Capital and Individualism–Collectivism 37

CONCLUSIONS 40

REFERENCES 43

SUMMARY IN ESTONIAN 53

PUBLICATIONS 57

CURRICULUM VITAE 141

ELULOOKIRJELDUS 143

LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

This study is based on the following original publications, which are referred to in the dissertation by their respective Roman numerals.

I **Beilmann, M.**, Realo, A. (2012). Individualism–collectivism and social capital at the individual level. *Trames: Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences, 16,* 3, 205–217.

II **Beilmann, M.**, Mayer, B., Kasearu, K., and Realo, A. (2014). The relationship between adolescents' social capital and individualism–collectivism in Estonia, Germany, and Russia. *Child Indicators Research, 7,* 3, 589–611.

III **Beilmann, M.**, Kööts-Ausmees, L., and Realo, A. (2017). The relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism in Europe: A multilevel analysis. *Social Indicators Research*. doi: s11205-017-1614-4.

IV **Beilmann, M.**, and Lilleoja, L. (2015). Social trust and value similarity: The relationship between social trust and human values in Europe. *Studies of Transition States and Societies, 7,* 19–30.

Author's Contribution

The author of this dissertation made the following contribution to the four studies listed below:

Study I: The author was responsible for developing the theoretical framework of the study. In addition, the author was a major contributor to the data analysis and the interpretation of the results, as well as the write-up of the article.

Study II: The author was a major contributor to all phases of the study and took the lead in formulating the research questions, producing the theoretical framework, analysing the data, interpreting the results, and writing the article.

Study III: The author took the lead in formulating the research questions, producing the theoretical framework, interpreting the results, and writing up of the article. The author also contributed to the data analysis.

Study IV: The author contributed to the development of the theoretical framework of the study. Furthermore, the author contributed to the data analysis and was responsible for the interpretation of the results and for the writing of the article.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

When I first started my doctoral studies in my early twenties, I could not understand people who were not able to complete their doctoral studies on time, because four years seemed like such a long time back then. Nearly ten years later, I really admire people who are able to finalise their dissertation on time, because four years now seems like such a short period of time. I can only hope that taking twice as long as planned to write my dissertation has made it twice as good, and me twice as smart. However, I am quite sure that, without the advice, support, and constant encouragement I received from so many people, the finalisation of my doctoral dissertation would have taken even longer. These people really form the core of my stocks of social capital and I value their support highly.

First and foremost, I would like to express my greatest appreciation to my supervisor and co-author, Anu Realo, for her guidance and invaluable contribution in writing and rewriting the manuscripts, for sharing with me her knowledge and experience in the field, and for her patience, trust, support, and encouragement throughout the preparation of this dissertation. Her profound insights on different aspects of theory and methodology have been extremely helpful and have greatly shaped the ways in which I do research. It has been my pleasure and privilege to work together with such a dedicated and talented researcher.

I convey my sincere thanks to my lecturers from the former Institute of Sociology and Social Policy at the University of Tartu who have tolerated this long quest. In particular, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Liina-Mai Tooding, who believed in me, even at those times when I myself had lost all hope that I would ever complete my doctoral studies. I am deeply indebted to Liina-Mai Tooding for her valuable advice and encouragement to stay on the academic path after the unfortunate loss of my initial supervisor, as well as for the brilliant idea to ask Anu Realo to supervise my doctoral dissertation. I am also much obliged to Mare Ainsaar, who provided me with the opportunity to be a part of the Estonian team of the European Social Survey project, which has been a great learning experience as well as an inspiration for my research.

I am also very grateful to several other colleagues and fellow doctoral students for their help and support. In particular, I am much obliged to my dear colleagues and co-authors, Laur Lilleoja, Liisi Kööts-Ausmees, and Kairi Kasearu, for their valuable input into our articles and for being great research partners. Besides my co-authors, I especially would like to thank my dear friends Ave Roots and Kadri Soo for their academic companionship over the years and, even more, for being there for me and keeping my spirit up.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Boris Mayer, Gisela Trommsdorff, and the rest of their research group at the University of Konstanz, who warmly welcomed me into their team for a whole academic year. I am very grateful for the interesting discussions, inspiring colloquiums and workshops,

and detailed feedback on my work. My gratitude belongs also to The German Academic Exchange Service for their generous scholarship during my stay at the University of Konstanz in Germany.

My doctoral studies have been an exceptional journey, not only in an academic sense, but as life experience and, without little help from my friends and family, I would not have got very far. Therefore, last, but definitely not least, I would like to thank the people who form the very foundations of my family and peer group social capital: my mother, my sisters, and Uncle Ummi for their never-failing support and faith in my endeavours, my little nephews for their constant and contagious smile-therapy, my granny for begging and praying for years that I would start producing babies instead of scientific research – and with that inadvertently motivating me to go on with my dissertation – my dear friends Annika and Karolin for keeping me sane with their humour and reassuring conversations, and my late father for believing and repeating until his very last day that his girls can do anything.

INTRODUCTION

Social capital has been one of the most widely used concepts in the social and behavioural sciences, including sociology, economics, political science, and psychology, for about the last three decades (Halpern, 2005; Herreros, 2004; Lin, 2008; Lin and Erickson, 2010; Realo and Allik, 2009). Many researchers (e.g., Halpern, 2005; Putnam, 2000) believe that social capital is the much longed-for solution to the question of what it is in a community that brings people together for common purposes, a question much older than the social sciences themselves.

Over the years, many (and sometimes excessive) hopes have been placed on social capital. It has been seen as 'an all-purpose elixir for the ills of society' because 'a heavy dose of social capital supposedly makes a society healthier, wealthier, and perhaps wiser, or at least more tolerant' (Uslaner and Dekker, 2006, p. 176). It is has also been seen as 'a missing link' that allows us to explain why some societies prosper and others do not (Grootaert, 2006). Indeed, social capital has been proven to be associated with many positive outcomes for both the individual and society. Hence, social capital is not just the private property of those who benefit from it, but 'simultaneously a private good and a public good' (Putnam, 2002, p. 7).

In this study, I intend to focus on the individual-level relationships between social capital and one of its possible sources – individualism–collectivism. The relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism presents an intriguing research question which, so far, has been posed for empirical inquiry mainly at the cultural level of analysis. Several studies have shown that people in countries that emphasise individualistic strivings are also more likely to trust other people and be more engaged in different social networks (Allik and Realo, 2004; Realo and Allik, 2009; Realo, Allik, and Greenfield, 2008). However, the question of whether this relationship holds also at the individual level has, to date, not captured a great deal of the attention of researchers. Thus, this doctoral dissertation takes the research on this fascinating topic back to the individual level, where the research on social capital, in fact, once started (Bourdieu, 1985; Coleman, 1988), and aims to examine whether the relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism follows similar patterns at the individual level of analysis as those that have been found at the cultural level.

The current doctoral dissertation is organised around four original studies. As stated above, the main aim of the dissertation is to contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism at the individual level. The more specific objectives of the dissertation are the following:

I. To explore the individual-level relationship between social capital and different sub-forms of individualism and collectivism (**Study I**).
II. To analyse the relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism during adolescence, that is, during the life period when

relationships outside the family are becoming increasingly prevalent in young people's lives (**Study II**).

III. To determine if there are cross-cultural differences in the strength of the association between social capital and individualism–collectivism (**Study III**).

IV. To examine how prevailing cultural values affect the individual-level relationship between values and social capital, in particular generalised social trust (**Study IV**).

The structure of the dissertation is as follows. First, I give an overview of several theoretical insights into social capital and individualism–collectivism and explain why it is important to investigate the association between these concepts at the individual level. Section two provides some methodological considerations and describes the data used in the studies. This is followed by a summary of the main findings of each study. The dissertation ends with the discussion, concluding remarks, and summary in Estonian.

1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1.1. Social Capital – A Short Intellectual History

It seems that the concept of social capital has been discovered and rediscovered on several occasions. The intellectual history of the concept of social capital goes back to the beginning of the 20th century, when American educator and the state supervisor of rural schools, Lyda Judson Hanifan (1916), used the term to emphasise the central role of education and schools in creating community spirit in small rural communities. However, the term social capital may even be older: Farr (2004) suspects that the first to use the term was actually an American philosopher and educator, John Dewey, to whom Hanifan often referred. Throughout the 20th century, the term of social capital was reinvented, for example, by Jane Jacobs (1961), who described the necessity to consider the preserving of social capital in the context of city planning, or by Glenn Loury (1977), who talked about useful resources in social relations and organisations. However, one of the most heated opponents of social capital theory, Ben Fine (2010), claims that social capital does not have an intellectual history at all, and accuses promoters of social capital (particularly Robert Putnam) of creating a fairy tale. He suggests that the intellectual history of social capital that goes beyond Bourdieu and Coleman is a mere invention that had to be 'discovered' to give more weight to the concept.

However, there is no doubt that the history of social capital departed its mythological phase when Pierre Bourdieu and James Coleman adopted it independently from one another in 1980s for the theoretical explanations of their empirical findings, after which the concept gained prompt attention and interdisciplinary popularity. Bourdieu (1985, p. 248) defined social capital as 'the sum total of the resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual (or a group) by virtue of being enmeshed in a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition'. Coleman (1988) stated that social capital facilitates certain actions of actors within the social structure, and emphasised the importance of closed groups for generating social capital that benefits group members.

Since then, social capital has been treated in the literature and research both as an individual asset as well as a feature of communities and nations. Originally Pierre Bourdieu (1985) and James Coleman (1988) both focused on individuals (or small groups) as the unit of analysis. The concept of social capital was later extended to the level of larger groups by Robert Putnam (1993, 2000); in his interpretation, social capital became an attribute (or even asset) of communities and nations. In *Bowling Alone*, which made social capital quickly one of the most often used concepts in the social sciences, Robert Putnam (2000) defined social capital through connections among individuals and emphasised the importance of the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from social networks. One of the basic premises of Putnam's theory of social capital is that social networks are valuable because collective action

depends strongly upon social networks and the trustworthiness of fellow citizens. Cooperation and coordination for mutual benefit are facilitated by reciprocity and trust. Therefore, social capital is not just personally experienced by those who benefit from it (Coleman, 1988), but is, rather, both individual and collective asset (Putnam, 2002).

1.2. What is Social Capital?

Although the exact meaning of social capital is still widely debated (if not contested), most authors seem to agree that the concept of social trust or trustworthiness and social networks constitute the core of social capital (Bartkus and Davis, 2010; Esser, 2008; Herreros, 2004; Ostrom and Ahn, 2009; Paxton, 2002; Portes, 1998; Rothstein, 2005; Stickel, Mayer, and Sitkin, 2010; Svendsen and Svendsen, 2009; van Deth, 2008). According to Paxton (1999), social capital involves at least two important components, that is, objective associations between individuals (i.e., individuals are tied to each other in social life) and a specific, subjective type of tie (ties between individuals must be trusting and reciprocal). Similarly, Dekker and Uslaner (2006) suggest that social capital can be found in social networks and norms of reciprocity that bond similar people and bridge diverse people.

There is, of course, some disagreement on the relative importance of objective and subjective types of ties. Some authors find that merely objective ties are meaningless and that only related values – such as social trust – convert social ties into social capital. Francis Fukuyama (1995, p. 26), for example, suggests that 'social capital is a capability that arises from the prevalence of trust in a society or certain parts of it.' Eric Uslaner (1999) supports the view that values, particularly social trust, constitute the very core of social capital.

On the other hand, Lin and Erickson are rather critical of considering trust as part of social capital (Lin, 2008; Lin and Erickson, 2010). Lin (2008, p. 6) argues that social capital is 'investment in social relations with expected returns' and social capital should be distinguished from norms and trust, which he considers not to be part of social capital, although he recognises that trust may promote the formation of networks. In sum, Lin (2008) suggests that social capital theory should apply only to social networks.

Finally, there are some theorists who are critical of considering trust and social networks as part of social capital. Herreors (2004), for example, argues that no social relationship itself constitutes social capital. Social capital, rather, consists of certain resources (like obligations of reciprocity or information) that can be derived from belonging to social networks. Therefore, in the end, he still considers trust and social networks to be building blocks in social capital.

However, such conceptual variety has made some scholars very cautious about the potential danger for the concept of social capital to become a 'handy catch-all, for-all, and cure-all sociological term' (Lin and Erickson, 2010, p. 1), as it means so many different things to so many people (Meulemann, 2008, p. 3;

Narayan and Pritchett, 1997, p. 2). Although many theorists and researchers have been worried about the unclear definition and measurement of social capital (Fishman, 2010; Guillen, Coromina, and Saris, 2011; Portes and Vickstrom, 2011) and its dilution into an all-embracing concept that seeks to comprise more or less everything (De Souza Briggs, 1997; Hirsch and Levin, 1999; Johnston and Percy-Smith, 2003; Lappe and Du Bois, 1997; Montgomery, 2000; Robinson, Schmid, and Siles, 2002), most critics do not go as far as Ben Fine (2010), who describes social capital as the 'McDonaldisation of social sciences' (p. 17) and degradation of social theory (p. 205), and calls for the rejection of social capital altogether.

While Castiglione (2008, p. 15) agrees that it is neither useful nor acceptable to use social capital 'as a black-box macromechanism producing social goods', Castiglione, van Deth, and Wolleb (2008) remain more lenient towards the ambiguity of the concept of social capital, and state that the validity of social capital should not be judged on the basis of the existence of its generally accepted conceptual definition, because hardly any key concept in the social sciences has such a definition. Rothstein and Stolle (2003a, p. 2) have used a similar line of argumentation to defend social capital as an acceptable social scientific concept, and argue that, although much of the criticism is valid and has helped to improve research, the lack of a generally accepted conceptual definition and consensus on measurement issues is not exclusively reserved for social capital, but are rather typical problems in the social sciences.

Having established that social capital is a valid sociological concept and that social trust and social networks constitute the core of social capital – although there is room for debate on their exact role and scope – the question of why we should talk about social relations in terms of capital remains. It has been argued that it is even inappropriate to use economic concepts such as capital, for instance, to describe and explain the social world (Baron and Hannan, 1994). These criticisms are partly justified, as social capital certainly differs from other forms of capital in many ways (Araujo and Easton, 1999), first of all, because social capital is not located in the individual or in some property, but in relationships between individuals (Burt, 1992). Nevertheless, there is also a remarkable resemblance between social capital and other forms of capital. According to Putnam (2002), it makes sense to describe social networks and the associated norms of reciprocity as social capital, because, exactly like other forms of capital (e.g., physical and human capital), social networks create value for individuals and collectives. And it is also true that it is possible to invest in one's networks with the expectation that these investments are going to be useful in the future (Adler and Kwon, 2002; Putnam, 2002). Social capital scholars also emphasise the resources that are made available for actors through social connections. Adler and Kwon (2002), for example, claim that social capital is a resource which may make other resources available to the actor. Moreover, like other types of capital, social capital can be converted or appropriated into other types of capital (Bourdieu, 1985; Coleman, 1988).

Conceptualising something as a type of capital automatically raises questions about the profits that this capital can earn for the owner and, in that regard, social capital clearly does not fail the owner, because both individuals and countries have been shown to profit in many ways from their stocks of social capital. Higher levels of social capital at the country level have been associated with many desirable outcomes, such as strong economic performance (Neira, Portela, and Vieira, 2010), a well-functioning labour market (Freitag and Kirchner, 2011), innovation (Kaasa, 2009), more effective government (Zmerli and Newton, 2008), higher political participation (Lippl, 2007), higher rates of education (Coleman, 1988), healthy citizens (Dragano and Siegrist, 2005; Rostila, 2007; von dem Knesebeck, Dragano, and Siegrist, 2005), and lower suicide (Kelly et al., 2009) and crime (Akcomak and ter Weel, 2011) rates. However, it is important to note that it is not always completely clear whether social capital is the source or the outcome of these desirable social conditions, and some other authors (e.g., Rothstein, 2005) see good and trustworthy governance, for example, as a precondition of social capital, not as an outcome of it.

Mirroring country-level findings, studies have shown that social capital at the individual level is related to a wide array of socioeconomic and contextual factors, such as income (Cox, 2002; Halpern, 2005; Offe and Fuchs, 2002; Putnam, 2000 and 2002; Skocpol, 2002; van der Meer, Scheepers, and de Grotenhuis, 2008; Wuthnow), employment status (Fidrmuc and Gérxhani, 2005; van der Meer, Scheepers, and de Grotenhuis, 2008), education (Halpern, 2005; Lin and Erickson, 2010; Montgomery, 1990; Neller, 2008; Putnam, 2000 and 2002; van der Meer, Scheepers, and de Grotenhuis, 2008), health (Fujiwara and Kawachi, 2008; Olsen and Dahl, 2007; Poortinga, 2006), age (Fidrmuc and Gérxhani, 2004; Halpern, 2005; Putnam, 2000 and 2002; Rothstein, 2002; van der Meer, Scheepers, and de Grotenhuis, 2008; Worms, 2002), gender (Burt, 1998; Fidrmuc and Gérxhani, 2005; Lin, 2000; Lin and Erickson, 2010), marital status (Bolin el al., 2003; van der Meer, Scheepers, and de Grotenhuis, 2008), and place of residence (Fidrmuc and Gérxhani, 2004; Putnam, 2000; van der Meer, Scheepers, and de Grotenhuis, 2008). People with more social capital tend to be happier (Arts and Halman, 2004) and more satisfied with their life (Hooghe and Vanhoutte, 2011). Furthermore, people with higher levels of social capital find a better job more easily (De Graaf and Flap, 1988; Marsden and Hurlbert, 1988; Ruiter and De Graaf, 2008), gain more information about job opportunities (Burt, 1992; Granovetter, 1973 and 1974; Lin, Ensel, and Vaughn, 1981; Meyerson, 1994), and are among the first to find out about innovations (Burt, 1987). And even if social capital cannot guarantee infinite bliss, it can make everyday life run more smoothly. Halpern (2005) concludes that social networks may not exempt you from the normal adversities of life, but they help you survive them intact. This list of factors related to social capital is sufficient to explain why Putnam (2002) suggested that social capital may be more important to human wellbeing than material goods. Nevertheless, despite such overwhelmingly positive results, one should remain critical and keep in mind that most of these studies actually do not allow us to make any firm conclusions

about the direction of cause and the effect, and it is not clear whether health, wealth, and happiness lead to more social capital, or social capital is a prerequisite of better health and more wealth, happiness, and other positive outcomes.

Unfortunately, social capital may also be related to somewhat less desirable consequences. It is widely acknowledged that, in some instances, social capital can cause social 'bads', because closed social networks and particularised trust (e.g., bonding social capital) are involved in facilitating corruption, organised crime, and other forms of social malaise (see, for example, Field, 2008 or Warren, 2008, for a review). Another problem is that people do not have equal amounts of social capital and the social capital that different people possess may differ in value. Wuthnow (2002) reminds us that social capital, like other forms of capital, may be distributed unequally and that people need other resources in order to create social capital, such as an adequate income, sufficient safety, and amenities such as child care and transportation. That means that social capital may function in an exclusionary way, leading to exclusion rather than inclusion. Several other researchers have also expressed the concern that social capital may become more and more a luxury of the wealthier, as the less privileged are less likely to take part in civic associations and benefit from their activities (Cox, 2002; Halpern, 2005; Offe and Fuchs, 2002; Skocpol, 2002; Wuthnow, 2002). It is self-evident that the uneven distribution of social capital has serious societal consequences, as inequality in social capital contributes to social inequality, and lack of social capital may have serious consequences for socioeconomic achievement and quality of life (Lin, 2000). Furthermore, it has been recognised that it is very difficult to create social capital in places where it does not exist, since anyone who tries to cooperate in a society that is lacking social capital will simply be exploited (Whiteley, 2000). Therefore, there is reason to believe that differences in social capital levels do not only grow at the individual, but also at the regional, level. Indeed, empirical research has confirmed that social capital may significantly differ by individual, group, and country (Jungbauer-Gans and Gross, 2007; Lin, 2000; Lin and Erickson, 2010; Meulemann, 2008; Putnam, 2002).

There are two main approaches to explaining such differences in the levels of social capital: some authors (e.g., Fidrumuc and Gerxhani, 2005) focus more on the role of individual factors (such as income, education, and family status), while others (e.g., Rothstein and Stolle, 2003b; Delhey and Newton, 2005) emphasise the effect of institutional factors (such as income inequality and prior patterns of cooperation) more. However, there is reason to believe that socioeconomic and institutional factors do not entirely explain variance in social capital. It has been suggested that individualism–collectivism may also explain some of the variance in social capital levels (e.g., Allik and Realo, 2004).

1.3. Individualism and Collectivism in Social and Cross-Cultural Psychology

Similarly to social capital, individualism–collectivism is a concept that gained vast popularity in the 1980s. Furthermore, when studying the relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism, it is important to keep in mind the other essential similarity between the two concepts; namely, both social capital and individualism–collectivism have been greatly criticised in recent decades for becoming so broad and popular that they have lost their original meaning – or, according to the most fierce opponents, any meaning at all (Bond, 2002; Brewer and Chen, 2007; De Souza Briggs, 1997; Fine, 2010; Fishman, 2010; Fiske, 2002; Hirsch and Levin, 1999; Johnston and Percy-Smith, 2003; Kagitcibasi 2007, 2005; Lappe and Du Bois, 1997; Miller 2002; Montgomery, 2000; Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier, 2002; Robinson, Schmid, and Siles, 2002; Voronov and Singer, 2002).

The concepts of individualism and collectivism gained popularity in psychology after Geert Hofstede (1980, 1983) found individualism versus collectivism to be one of the most distinctive dimensions of cultural variation. In his extensive study of more than 50 national cultures and regions (formed of several countries), he identified four dimensions of cultural variation: power distance, individualism–collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity–femininity (Hofstede, 1980, 2001). According to Hofstede (1991, p. 51), 'individualism pertains to societies in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family'. Collectivism, on the other hand, 'pertains to societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, which throughout people's lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty' (Hofstede, 1991, p. 51).

Cultural versus Individual Level

Since Hofstede's monumental study (1980), the construct of individualism–collectivism has been widely elaborated in further research. Whereas, in the case of social capital, the originally individual-level concept was extended to group level analysis, the concept of individualism–collectivism was first used to describe differences between cultures and, only later, applied at the individual level to describe individual differences within cultural groups (Realo, 2003; Realo and Allik, 2009; Schimmack, Oishi, and Diener, 2005). Although, in some studies, these two levels of description have been found to be closely interrelated and congruent (Bond, 1988), it is recognised that individualism–collectivism may manifest itself differently at the cultural and individual levels (Hofstede and Spangenberg, 1987; Kim et al., 1994). Moreover, many researchers argue that cultural and individual values need to be regarded as conceptually and methodologically distinct (e.g., Hofstede, 2004; Smith and

Schwartz, 1997; Triandis, 1989; Trommsdorff, Mayer, and Albert, 2004), and that the values of individuals do not necessarily aggregate into those of groups and societies (Dakhli, 2009; Trommsdorff, Mayer, and Albert, 2004; Vinken, Soeters and Ester, 2004). Therefore, it is crucially important to distinguish both conceptually and methodologically between individualism–collectivism at the culture level and its corresponding constructs at the individual level (Triandis, 1989; Trommsdorff, Mayer, and Albert, 2004). To distinguish individual from cultural measurements, Triandis and colleagues (Triandis, 2011; Triandis et al., 1985) proposed the use of the terms idiocentrism and allocentrism as individual-level constructs corresponding to the cultural constructs of individualism and collectivism, but these terms never gained the popularity of the ones proposed by Hofstede. Therefore, I adhere to the terms collectivism and individualism throughout this dissertation.

Subtypes of Individualism and Collectivism

While Hofstede (1980) considered individualism and collectivism to be a one-dimensional construct at the cultural level, characterising the closeness of the relationship among individuals within a society, later studies (Hui, 1988; Taras et al., 2014; Triandis et al., 1986, 1988; Triandis, McCusker, and Hui, 1990) suggested that individualism and collectivism are not two opposite poles of a single dimension, but rather two separate attributes that 'can coexist and are simply emphasised more or less in each culture, depending on situation' (Triandis, 1993, p. 162). It has also been recognised that, at the cultural level, individualism might in fact be the polar opposite of collectivism (Brewer and Venaik, 2011; Triandis and Suh, 2002; Zhang, Liang, and Sun, 2013), whereas, at the individual-level of analysis, the two constructs are found to be orthogonal to each other (e.g., Gelfand, Triandis, and Chan, 1996; Realo et al., 2002), and that one person can simultaneously carry both individualistic and collectivistic values (Chen et al., 2015; Le and Stockdale, 2005; Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmaier, 2002; Shulruf et al., 2011).

At least at the individual level, it can be analytically very enriching to view individualism–collectivism as a higher order value with a multidimensional nature. The idea that collectivism is a multifaceted and target-specific construct was first introduced by Hui and Triandis (1986), who argued that many different kinds of collectivism could be identified, depending on the target of interpersonal concern. In their view, an individual might be concerned about, and feel emotional involvement with, one particular group, but not others.

Since then, there have been several attempts to identify *core themes* related to individualism and collectivism (e.g., Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier, 2002; Realo et al., 2002). For example, Triandis and colleagues (1986) identified four dimensions that characterise individualism–collectivism at both the individual and cultural levels. The orientation of interpersonal relations has been identified as one of the most important characteristics of the individualism

and collectivism constructs. It was proposed that horizontal and vertical social relationships are the most important attributes to distinguish among different kinds of individualism and collectivism (Singelis et al., 1995; Triandis, 2001 and 2011). Thus, not a specific target group, but more general social relations and attitudes, appear to specify distinctive types of collectivism. However, there has been no definite consensus among cross-cultural researchers about the core themes or the measurement of individualism–collectivism to date (see Realo and Allik, 2009, for review).

The existence of particular types of individualism or collectivism, however, does not preclude the existence of a general notion or universal core of individualism or collectivism that is shared by all types of individualism or collectivism, respectively. In order to describe the relationships between a general core and specific sub-forms of collectivism, a hierarchical model of the construct was proposed by Realo, Allik, and Vadi (1997).

Realo and colleagues (1997) demonstrated the existence of at least three interrelated, yet clearly distinguishable, subtypes of collectivism focused on relationships with family *(Familism)*, peers *(Companionship)*, and society *(Patriotism)*. Individuals and social groups may be more collectivistic in regard to one category of social relations but less collectivistic in regard to others. Cultures and subcultures may vary in the main target of the social relationship to which collectivism is linked. Indeed, it was also shown by the authors that various criterion groups have remarkably different patterns of collectivism. Later, a similar triad division was applied to individualism, revealing it to be a combination of autonomy, mature self-responsibility, and uniqueness (Realo et al., 2002).

Previous research suggests that individualism–collectivism is present in many different value systems, even if different authors have named the respective values differently in their theoretical models (Oishi et al., 1998). Shalom Schwartz (Cieciuch and Schwartz, 2012; Schwartz and Bilsky, 1990; Schwartz et al., 2014; Vecchione et al., 2015) distinguishes between ten (or 19 in some more recent works like Schwartz et al., 2012) basic values which are intended to include all core values recognised in cultures around the world. Each of the ten basic values can be characterised by its central motivational goal. The conflicts and congruities among all ten basic values yield an integrated structure of values which can be summarised on two dimensions: Openness to Change *versus* Conservation and Self-Enhancement *versus* Self-Transcendence. Openness to Change refers to pursuing one's intellectual or emotional goals, no matter how unpredictable or uncertain the outcomes. Conservation, at the same time, refers to preserving the status quo and the certainty this provides in relationships with close others, institutions, and traditions. Self-enhancement refers to enhancing one's own personal interests (even at the expense of others) whereas self-transcendence refers to transcending one's own selfish concerns and promoting the welfare of others, both close and distant, and that of nature.

Different conceptualisations of individualism–collectivism (e.g., Oishi et al., 1998; Realo, Allik, and Vadi, 1997; Realo et al., 2002; Triandis and Leung, 1998) have been related to Schwartz's value types of Openness and Conser-

vation at the individual level. The Openness to Change vs. Conservation dimension contrasts novelty and expression of intellectual, behavioural, and emotional autonomy on the one hand with communally tied preferences for self-restriction and order on the other (Schwartz, 1994). At the cultural level, it has been shown that the Openness to Change vs. Conservation dimension and Hofstede's individualism (1980; 1991), as well as Inglehart's self-expression value dimension, all tap 'a common dimension of cross-cultural variation, reflecting relative emphasis on human emancipation and choice' (Inglehart and Oyserman, 2004, p. 82). Schwartz (2004) has agreed that his autonomy–embeddedness dimension (a culture-level counterpart to his individual-level Openness to Change vs. Conservation dimension) overlaps conceptually with Hofstede's individualism–collectivism to some degree, as 'both concern with relations between the individual and the collective and both contrast an autonomous with an interdependent view of people' (p. 51).

1.4. Increasing Individualism, Decreasing Social Capital?

There is nothing particularly new about worries about rapid changes in society and prevailing value systems. Throughout history, critical thinkers have lamented the downfall of old values, and for the last couple of centuries, individualism has often been one of the main enemies of traditional values, social cohesion, and the organic unity between individuals and community (Lukes, 1971).

At the end of the nineteenth century, the question of declining social capital was as hot a topic as it is more than a hundred years later. Although the term social capital was not yet in use, recognition of the changing nature of social structure and human relations is obvious in Ferdinand Tönnies's (2009/2005 [1887]) distinction between *Gemeinschaft* (community) and *Gesellschaft* (society), Georg Simmel's (1976 [1903]) comparison of town and metropolis, and Emile Durkheim's (1969 [1893]) differentiation between mechanical and organic solidarity. Tönnies's (2009/2005 [1887]) theory is a particularly good example here, as in the *Gemeinschaft* tight social ties and strong social control prevail and the interests of the community are always put before those of the individual. In the *Gesellschaft*, on the contrary, the importance of social control diminishes, the individual becomes more important than the group, and people are left alone with their egoistic interests and without emotionally enriching relationships. It is clear that social development leads us closer and closer to the ideal typical construct of *Gesellschaft*, which never really displaces the *Gemeinschaft*-type of relations in small non-formal groups. In short, the decline of *Gemeinschaft* and the rise of *Gesellschaft* can be viewed as a theory of individualisation and social alienation. However, this was not the only way to see the nature of changing social relations. Durkheim (1969 [1893]) had already directed attention to the paradox of the relationship between society and the individual in modern industrial societies, noting that growth of autonomy conjointly entails even more dependence on society.

Regardless of the terms used, the fear that social capital and individualism are somehow antithetical has remained, and maybe even strengthened, as social capital in Western countries is, arguably, declining (Putnam, 2000), and individualism increasing (Halpern, 2005; Putnam, 2000). After all, it can be tempting and convenient to accuse the vaguely defined individualism for every social malaise. Therefore, the question of the relationship between individualism and social capital is still far from resolved.

Putnam (2000) warned us that many national-level indicators of social capital showed signs of decline during the last few decades of 20th century in most Western countries. He interprets this as a major shift in social cohesion, the erosion of practically everything that holds society together. Although Putnam himself does not blame increasing individualism for the decline in social capital, many theorists have seen the growth in individualism as a threat to the organic unity between individuals and community. Ironically, one thing that is often not recognised when worries about declining social capital are expressed, is that it is not certain that it is actually in decline. There is the possibility that social capital is not fading away, but just changing shape. Inglehart and Welzel (2005) have remarked on the changing nature of social capital. They claim that the debate about whether social capital is declining in post-industrial societies overlooks an important point: social capital is actually not declining in these societies, but is shifting from one form to another. There has never been and there is never going to be, they argue, a society without social ties, but the character of those ties may differ a great deal across different societies. According to Inglehart and Welzel (2005), growing individualisation makes people increasingly socially independent. It is not therefore a surprise that the shaping of social ties in post-industrial societies is becoming increasingly a matter of autonomous choice. This means that ties are becoming more intrinsically shaped, rather than externally imposed. Putnam (2002, p. 412), too, has argued that 'the newer forms of social participation are narrower, less bridging, and less focused on collective or public regarding purpose [….] The newer forms may be more liberating but less solidaristic – representing a kind of privatisation of social capital'. Therefore, the changing nature of social capital has not made him less worried about the future of social capital.

The fear that growing individualism necessarily leads to a weakening in social capital and civil society probably has a lot to do with the fact that individualism is often seen in a very negative light, as 'amoral individualism', and the more positive features of individualism (such as taking responsibility for your own actions, for example) are overlooked. According to Woolcock (1998, pp. 170–171) "'amoral individualism' exists where there is neither familial nor generalised trust, where narrow self-interest literally permeates all social and economic activity, and where members are isolated – either by circumstance or discrimination – from all forms of cohesive social networks. It is thus characterised by the absence of both integration and linkage". Put like this, individualism indeed seems to be detrimental for social capital.

However, there are also very different interpretations of individualism. Beck (2000, pp. 171–172) describes ‘a co-operative or altruistic individualism’ that rejects total subjection to homogenisation by either the market system or a communitarianism which favours a personal life project, whereas pursuing one’s own life project does not necessarily mean having no empathy toward others. Rothstein (2002, 2005) advocates a similar idea that an individualistically minded person does not have to be, necessarily, an egoistic one. He has adopted the term ‘solidaristic individualism’ to describe the value orientations of individuals who are supportive towards others but also accept that these others may have different values and engage themselves in different causes. Realo and colleagues (2002) also argue that one of the essential components of individualism is mature self-responsibility, suggesting that potentialities for both individualism and altruism may be present in the one person.

Indeed, when looking at the empirical evidence about the relationship between individualism–collectivism and social capital, it becomes evident that individualism may actually foster social capital. It might well be the case that Durkheim (1969 [1893]) got it right from the beginning, in that individualism forces individual members of society to become more dependent on each other and each other’s actions. Realo and colleagues (2002) have argued that the growth of individuality, autonomy, and self-sufficiency can be perceived as necessary conditions for the development of interpersonal cooperation, mutual dependence, and social solidarity. At the country- or state-level of analysis, it has been shown that, contrary to the widely held belief, individualistic values appear to contribute to social capital and social capital appears to be conducive to individualism (Allik and Realo, 2004; Hofstede, 2001; Realo, Allik, and Greenfield, 2008; Realo and Allik, 2009). Therefore, the consequences of individualism are not always detrimental to social cohesion (see Allik and Realo, 2004).

Although previous research has shown that people in countries that emphasise individualistic goals are also more likely to trust other people and be more engaged in different social networks (Allik and Realo, 2004; Realo, Allik, and Greenfield, 2008; Realo and Allik, 2009), the corresponding relationship at the individual level has, so far, received less attention. There are only a handful of studies (Dakhli, 2009; Finkelstein, 2010 and 2011; Gheorghiu, Vignoles, and Smith, 2009; Kemmelmeier, Jambor, and Letner, 2006) that have examined the relationship and, to date, have yielded inconclusive findings. Kemmelmeier and colleagues (2006), for instance, found both formal and informal volunteering (which could be seen as indicators of social capital) to be more closely associated with individualism than collectivism. Finkelstein (2010, 2011), however, explored the relationship between individualism–collectivism and volunteering, and found that collectivism was more strongly related to altruistic motivations and the desire to strengthen social ties than individualism. Gheorghiu and colleagues (2009) demonstrated that, across 31 European nations, individualism (operationalised via two of Schwartz’s value dimensions) is more likely to foster generalised social trust among people than collectivism. Thus, although the positive relationship between individualism and social capital

seems to hold in some respects at the individual level, the relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism appears to be rather multifaceted. The current dissertation aims to fill this gap in the literature by further investigating the individual-level relationship between social capital and the different sub-facets of individualism and collectivism.

2. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

2.1. How to Measure Social Capital

There are at least as many ways to measure social capital as there are different definitions for the concept. Thus, rigorous measurement of social capital can prove challenging (Farrell, Tayler, and Tennent, 2004); there is no consensus on its definition or measurement and different scholars have used different items to construct their social capital indices (Bartkus and Davis, 2010; Schmitt-Beck, 2008). The selection of possible measures for social capital should be driven by theoretical considerations, but this is often restricted by data availability (van der Gaag and Snijders, 2002). Therefore, the selected measurement of social capital may sometimes fail to capture different relevant characteristics of the construct.

As noted above, there is no doubt that social capital is indeed a multifaceted phenomenon that cannot be captured by one single measure (Halman and Luijkx, 2006). Measurement issues are made more complicated by the fact that studies clearly demonstrate that the different dimensions of social capital do not exert a uniform effect on the same phenomenon (Kaasa, 2009; Saxton and Benson, 2005). Earlier research has also shown that the relationship between different dimensions of social capital (e.g., informal participation, formal participation, trust, etc.) and other social phenomena may vary across different social groups (Kroll, 2011). Thus, it is important to distinguish between the different social capital dimensions, as was demonstrated by Guillen and colleagues (2011). They found that informal and formal participation, for example, related rather differently to other variables (e.g., age, education, political action, and happiness) and that there was hardly any relationship between either formal or informal participation and different important components of the social capital construct, such as social and political trust. In sum, Guillen and colleagues (2011) suggest that participation and trust should be considered essential components, or formative indicators, of social capital.

Indeed, generalised social trust (which is the central variable in **Studies III** and **IV**) is frequently seen as one of the key elements of social capital (Putnam, 2000 and 2002; Schmitt-Beck, 2008; Whiteley, 2000). However, as van Deth (2008) contends, it may not be sufficient to use generalised social trust as a single proxy for social capital. The author acknowledges that measures of generalised social trust owe their popularity in social capital research, to a great extent, to a lack of other viable social capital indicators in use in the most popular and widely accessible datasets, such as the World Value Surveys and the European Social Survey. Indeed, **Studies I–III** affirm that it is difficult to find other appropriate social capital measures in available datasets.

Another central premise of social capital, as indicated above, concerns social networks among people and the norms of reciprocity in those networks. Social participation may be characterised in terms of quantity (i.e., frequency of contact) and quality (i.e., content) of contact (van der Meer, Scheepers, and de

Grotenhuis, 2008, p. 41). Different items have been used to measure the quantity and quality of networks, including questions about the frequency of meeting socially with friends, relatives, and colleagues (Meulemann, 2008; Schmitt-Beck, 2008; van der Meer, Scheepers, and de Grotenhuis, 2008), providing help for others (Schmitt-Beck, 2008; van der Meer, Scheepers, and de Grotenhuis, 2008), having anyone to have intimate discussions with (van der Meer, Scheepers, and de Grotenhuis, 2008), taking part in social activities (Meulemann, 2008), and membership in voluntary organisations (Schmitt-Beck, 2008). It has been claimed that the focus on participation in formal networks (i.e., civic participation) in social capital research is excessive, and that more attention to participation in informal networks (i.e., social participation) is needed (van der Meer, Scheepers, and de Grotenhuis, 2008). Some authors have suggested that direct participation in the informal social networks of everyday life is more important in generating social capital than formally organised voluntary associations (Yamagishi and Yamagishi, 1994).

Measurement of social capital becomes even more challenging in the case of children and adolescents (as in **Study II**). Many adult social capital measures are not relevant to children's and adolescents' lives because, at these ages, participation in civic life is restrained (for example, people are unable to vote until the age 18 and very few children are interested in politics), and they are usually a member of a smaller number of groups (Leonard, 2005). Therefore, most studies have concentrated on the social capital which is available to children through their parents and the surrounding community (Leonard, 2005), ignoring the fact that children and adolescents themselves may initiate relationships and create social capital. It is one of the biggest shortcomings in measuring children's and adolescents' social capital that there are only a few studies which have attempted to measure children's social capital using children as the main informants. Instead of children themselves, parents and teachers are asked about the social capital at the children's disposal. The few studies which have attempted to measure children's or adolescents' social capital using young people themselves as the main informants have confirmed that children are as reliable informants as adults about their own everyday lives (Casas, 2011; Casas et al., 2013). Therefore, it may be considered one of the strengths of **Study II** that adolescents themselves are asked about their social capital.

The choice of appropriate indicators is an extremely complex issue in cross-cultural comparisons (as in **Study II, III and IV**) and we have to consider cultural differences in the expressions of social capital (Halpern, 2005). It has been proposed that living in a particular country strongly influences the form and amount of social capital available to an individual (Meer, Scheepers, and de Grotenhuis, 2008; Meulemann, 2008) and that historical events (e.g., interventions from external powers) have lasting effects on a nation's social institutions generations later (Halpern, 2005). The strong impact of the past becomes evident when looking at the levels of social capital in the former Eastern Bloc and other parts of Europe. Totalitarianism is considered destructive for social capital and research clearly suggests that, in Eastern European countries with a

Soviet past (like Estonia), people have lacked social capital when compared to Western European countries which did not experience this long period of totalitarianism (Halpern, 2005; Howard, 2003; Neller, 2008).

2.2. How to Measure Individualism–Collectivism

Many of the above mentioned measurement issues and concerns apply to individualism–collectivism as well. Similarly to social capital, there is no agreement on the definition or measurement of individualism–collectivism (John, 1990; Carere and Maestripieri, 2008; Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier, 2002; Realo and Allik, 2009; Schimmack, Oishi and Diener, 2005). Indeed, there is a myriad of different individualism and collectivism measures (e.g., Freeman and Bordia, 2001; Hofstede, 1980; Hui, 1988; Hui and Triandis, 1986; Realo, Allik, and Vadi, 1997; Realo et al., 2002; Singelis, 1994; Triandis et al., 1986), and different researchers have and continue to use different sets of measures and indicators to capture individualism–collectivism (Carere and Maestripieri, 2008; Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier, 2002; Realo and Allik, 2009; Schimmack, Oishi and Diener, 2005).

Furthermore, similarly to social capital research, researchers also have to deal with the conceptual leap between theoretical concepts and empirical indicators in the case of individualism–collectivism (Carere and Maestripieri, 2008; Realo and Allik, 2009), and it is difficult to include all aspects of individualism–collectivism in one measure so that every aspect is given the appropriate weighting (Chen and West, 2008). Indeed, one of the biggest dangers in measuring individualism–collectivism is treating a multifaceted construct as unidimensional, which can lead to many problems, like cancellation of, or inconsistency in, group effects, and over- or under-representation of certain dimensions of the construct (Chen and West, 2008). Furthermore, Chen and West (2008) argue that, while most individualism–collectivism measures and subscales appear to be multidimensional, ultimately, they have been treated as unidimensional. However, not all available datasets provide multidimensional measures of individualism–collectivism and as such my co-authors and I had to settle for unidimensional measures in **Study II** and **Study III**. In **Study I,** we were fortunate to be able to apply multidimensional individualism–collectivism measures (Realo, Allik, and Vadi, 1997; Realo et al., 2002) and investigate the relationship between social capital and different individualism and collectivism dimensions.

Another concern that is common in social capital and individualism–collectivism measures is the challenge of cross-cultural research itself. Some authors claim that individualism–collectivism measures often fail to reveal the expected cultural differences (Chen and West, 2008; Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier, 2002; Voronov and Singer, 2002). It has been suggested that different components of individualism–collectivism do not relate to different cultures in the same way (Chen and West, 2008; Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier, 2002). This is due to the fact that specific components of individualism–

collectivism affect the level of global individualism–collectivism in different directions (Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier, 2002). Furthermore, when doing cross-cultural research, one also has to keep in mind that individualism–collectivism scales are sensitive to response styles (Chen and West, 2008; Hui and Triandis, 1986). Therefore, it is important to test for measurement invariance across cultures, even though it may prove challenging to achieve measurement invariance in cross-cultural research (Chen and West, 2008).

2.3. Data and Methods Used in the Present Dissertation

The multifaceted nature of social capital and the fact that the relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism may vary across age and cultural groups have been considered when choosing the research methods for the studies in this dissertation. I analyse three different datasets and employ various quantitative methods in analysing the relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism.

In the **Study I,** data from the Estonian Survey of Culture and Personality (ESCP) – a large study of cultural value dimensions and ethnic identity in Estonia in 2002 – are used. The questionnaire consisted of several sections, of which only the social capital and individualism–collectivism measures were relevant to the study. The sample was randomly selected from the National Census and was representative of the Estonian population in terms of place of residence, ethnicity, age, gender, and educational level. The respondents were interviewed face-to-face. The data set included 1,451 respondents (812 females and 693 males), with a mean age of 43.9 years (*SD* = 17.6), ranging from 15 to 74 years, who filled in the questionnaire in Estonian. On average, respondents had completed 11.8 years of full-time education (*SD* = 3.1). Thirty-one percent of respondents had post-secondary education.

Study II is based on data from the Value of Children Study (Trommsdorff and Nauck, 2005) from Estonia, Germany, and Russia. The VOC study is a three-generation study conducted in more than 15 countries and includes about 300 adolescents, their mothers, and about 100 maternal grandmothers in each participating country. For Study II, only the adolescent participants from the three countries were selected. In all three countries, participants were surveyed by members of the local collaborating team, completing a questionnaire either at home or school. In Russia, families were recruited through the schools of the target adolescents; in Germany and Estonia, participants were chosen through resident registration lists. The sampling was restricted to only a few locations within Germany and Russia, but all counties were represented in Estonia. Nevertheless, the samples came from regions that are diverse in geographical and socioeconomic terms. The data collection took place in the years 2002 and 2003 in Germany, 2006 and 2007 in Russia, and 2009 in Estonia. We analysed data from 786 respondents: 228 from Estonia, 278 from Germany, and 280 from Russia.

In the **Studies III and IV** data from the sixth round of the European Social Survey (ESS) were used. ESS is an academically driven social survey to map long-term attitudinal and behavioural changes in over 20 European countries that has been carried out every 2 years since 2002. The ESS provides comparable data for nationally representative samples collected to the highest methodological standards across countries and the data are freely available. The data from Round 6, collected from 54,673 respondents from 29 European countries in 2012, were used for Studies III and IV. The sample sizes varied from 730 (Iceland) to 2,901 (Germany) individuals per country. The survey was representative of all persons aged 16 and over (no upper age limit) resident in private households in all participating countries, regardless of their nationality, citizenship, or language. The sample was selected by strict random probability methods at every stage and respondents were interviewed face-to-face. Complete answers on social capital and individualism–collectivism measures were available for 50,417 respondents, with a mean age of 48 years (*SD* = 18). Females made up 54% of participants. On average, respondents had completed 12.5 years of full-time education (*SD* = 4.04).

Measures (Study I)

Social Capital:

(1) The Social Capital Index:
- Trust: 'Do you agree that most people can be trusted?' (1 = 'I don't agree at all that most people can be trusted' – 4 = 'I fully agree that most people can be trusted');
- Honesty: 'Do you agree that most people are honest?' (1 = 'I don't agree at all that most people are honest' – 4 = 'I fully agree that most people are honest');
- Interest in politics: 'How much are you interested in politics?' (1 = 'Not at all interested" – 4 = 'Very interested').

Individualism and Collectivism

(2) The ESTCOL Scale (Realo, Allik, and Vadi, 1997) measures three interrelated, yet distinguishable, subtypes of collectivism, focusing on relationships with family, peers, and society. These subtypes share a common core, which is superordinate to these particular forms of collectivism. The scale consists of 24 items and participants were asked to indicate their response on a 5-point Likert-type scale.

(3) The Three Component Individualism Scale (Realo et al., 2002) measures three distinct aspects of individualism, focusing on autonomy (10 items), mature self-responsibility (7 items), and uniqueness (7 items). Some statements were oppositely worded so that agreement with the statements indicated low individualism. Participants were asked to indicate their agreement with the items on a 6-point Likert-type scale.

Measures (Study II):

Social Capital

(1) Parental Social Capital Index
- Ten items from the Parental Acceptance-Rejection scales (Rohner and Cournoyer, 1994; only Acceptance items were included) were used to measure parenting quality (e.g., 'My mother makes me feel wanted and needed'). Items were rated on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 = 'Almost never true' to 4 = 'Almost always true'.
- Six items from Furman and Buhrmester's (1985) Quality of Relationship scales to measure quality of parent-child relations were administered. We used only the subscales Intimacy (e.g., 'How often do you tell your mother/father everything that is on your mind?') and Admiration (e.g., 'How often does your mother/father like or approve of the things you do?'). Items were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = 'Never' to 5 = 'Always'. All six items were rated twice: once in relation to the mother and once in relation to the father; thus, all in all, 12 items were rated.

(2) The peer-group social capital index
- The 10-item Peer Acceptance scale (Epstein, 1983) was used to measure the quality of peer relations (e.g., 'People my age like to ask me to hang out with them'). Items were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = 'Strongly disagree' to 5 = 'Strongly agree'.

Individualism and Collectivism

(3) The COLINDEX Scale (Chan, 1994): seven items assessed individualistic values and six items measured collectivistic values. Sample items for Individualism included 'Creativity (uniqueness, imagination)' and 'Freedom (freedom of action and thought)'; sample items for Collectivism included 'Honor of your parents and elders (showing respect)' and 'Self-discipline (self-restraint, resistance to temptation)'. Participants answered the items on a 5-point scale (from 1 = 'Not important at all' to 5 = 'Very important').

Measures (Study III):

Social Capital:

(1) The Generalised Social Trust Index was used (also in **Study IV**):
- Trust: 'Would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?' (0 = 'You can't be too careful' – 10 = 'Most people can be trusted');
- Fairness: 'Do you think that most people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance, or would they try to be fair?' (0 = 'Most people would try to take advantage of me' – 10 = 'Most people would try to be fair');

- Helpfulness: ‘Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful or that they are mostly looking out for themselves?’ (0 = ‘People mostly look out for themselves’ – 10 = ‘People mostly try to be helpful’).

(2) Social Network indicator:

- Social relations: ‘How often do you meet socially with friends, relatives or work colleagues?’ (C2: 1 = ‘Never’ – 7 = ‘Every day’).

Individualism-Collectivism

(3) The 21-item Portrait Value Questionnaire (PVQ21; Schwartz, 2007) was used. The PVQ21 includes short verbal portraits of 21 different people in terms of the goals and aspirations important to them. Similarity judgments were made on a 6-point numerical scale ranging from 1 = ‘Very much like me’ to 6 = ‘Not like me at all’. We used Openness to Change–Conservation dimension factor scores as a proxy for individualism–collectivism, with negative scores indicating higher Openness (i.e., individualism) and positive scores higher Conservation (i.e., collectivism).

Measures (Study IV):

Social Capital

(1) For the components of the Generalised Social Trust Index, see the measures for **Study III**.

Basic Values

(2) As in **Study III**, the PVQ21 (Schwartz, 2007) was used to measure values. To assess the similarity between individual value preferences and the central value profile of a given society, an individual-level value similarity measure was created. For each individual, rank order values for all 21 value indicators were estimated, which were then correlated with the value hierarchy based on country-level average scores. Country-level value similarity is calculated as the mean of respondents’ value similarity measures.

3. FINDINGS

The first objective of this dissertation was to examine the relationships between social capital and different sub-forms of individualism and collectivism at the individual level (**Study I**). To this end, a correlational analysis was used in **Study I** to test the relationship between social capital (operationalised as general trust, honesty, and interest in politics) and three subtypes of individualism (Realo et al., 2002) and collectivism (Realo, Allik, and Vadi, 1997). The results were quite intriguing, as only one component of individualism, Mature Self-responsibility, was positively associated with social capital. The correlations between the other individualism components – Autonomy and Uniqueness – and social capital were negative. On the other hand, all three components of collectivism were positively associated with the social capital index (although the correlation between Familism and the social capital index was not statistically significant), most notably for Patriotism but also for Companionship. Thus, it seems that people who accept responsibility for themselves and for their actions (mature self-responsibility), have tight and supportive relationships with their friends and peers (Companionship), and are dedicated to and ready to serve their nation (Patriotism) also have higher levels of social capital. Controlling for age and education, the correlations were reduced, some to non-significance, but the general pattern remained the same.

The second objective of the dissertation was to analyse the relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism in adolescence (that is, during the life period when relationships outside the family are becoming increasingly prevalent in young people's lives) (**Study II**). We also aimed to examine whether the relationships between social capital and individualism–collectivism are consistent across different cultures. Therefore, we analysed differences and similarities in mean scores of social capital and individualism–collectivism between Estonian, German, and Russian adolescents by way of an analysis of variance (ANOVA). Only small differences were observed in the level of social capital in Estonian, German, and Russian adolescents and there were no differences in the level of individualism–collectivism. Next, we set up a multi-group structural equation model with the exogenous latent variables Individualism and Collectivism predicting the endogenous latent variables Parental Social Capital and Peer-Group Social Capital. In all three countries, collectivistic values predicted parental social capital, whereas individualistic values predicted peer-group social capital. There were also a few country-specific relationships between the constructs, with collectivism and peer-group social capital being positively related in Estonia and individualism and parental social capital significantly negatively correlated in Russia.

The third objective of the dissertation was to compare if there are cross-cultural differences in the strength of association between social capital and individualism–collectivism (**Study III**). As it was found in **Study II** that the relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism varies in

different countries, we wanted to find out in **Study III** how big this variation in Europe is, and what country-level predictors could explain this variation.

In **Study III,** we first analysed cross-national variation in the relationships between the social capital indexes and the individualism–collectivism measure, using hierarchical linear modelling (HLM 6.02; Raudenbush and Bryk, 2002). Analyses were conducted at two levels – that of individuals (Level 1) nested within the 29 countries, and that of the countries (Level 2). First, the relationships between social capital indexes and the individualism–collectivism measure were analysed. The simplest (unconditional) model – without any predictors or moderators – indicated that most of the variance in generalised social trust and social networks lies within countries, whereas less than 10% of variance lies between countries.

Adding the individualism–collectivism measure as an individual-level predictor of social capital index outcomes explained less than 1% of the variance in generalised social trust and about 4% of the variance in social networks at the individual level. Therefore, people with higher levels of generalised social trust and stronger social ties were also more individualistic (though the effect was weak). In the adjusted model (where individual age, gender, education level, and domicile were taken into account), the relationship between social capital indexes and individualism–collectivism remained significant. Individualism–collectivism together with the control variables explained less than 2% of the individual-level variance in generalised social trust and about 6% of the variance in social networks.

The relationship between generalised social trust and individualism–collectivism as well as between social networks and individualism–collectivism differed significantly across countries. However, the individual-level relationship between social capital indexes and individualism–collectivism was not moderated by a country's Human Development Index, gross domestic product, or Democracy Index, although education, health, wealth, and political liberties in a country have all been found to be positively related to country-level social capital in previous studies.

Finally, to examine how prevailing cultural values affect the individual-level relationship between values and social capital measures, in particular generalised social trust, the relationship between social trust and value congruity at the individual level was examined in **Study IV**. The study was inspired by the results of the **Study III,** where the individual-level relationship between social capital indexes and individualism–collectivism was weak and not moderated by any country-level predictors. Therefore, we looked for alternative country-level explanations, such as prevailing cultural values, that could explain the differences in social capital levels.

Results suggest that value similarity is more important in generating individual-level social trust in countries where the overall levels of social trust are higher. There is a stronger positive relationship between value similarity and social trust in Scandinavian countries, which have high social trust levels, while in countries with a low level of social trust, congruity between personal value

structure and the country-level value structure tends to decrease individuals' trustfulness. This suggests that the individual-level relationship between social capital indicators (e.g., generalised social trust) and values (e.g., individualism–collectivism) is dependent on the value structure at the country level.

4. DISCUSSION

Social capital has been proven to be an extremely useful resource for individuals, groups, and countries (see Halpern, 2005 for a review). At the same time, it is unequally distributed both within and between societies (e.g., Lin, 2000; Lin and Erickson, 2010; Meulemann, 2008; Putnam, 2002; Wuthnow, 2002). That, of course, raises the question of what the sources and determinants of social capital at the individual as well as group levels that could explain these inequalities are.

Impact of Individualism–Collectivism: Cultural vs. Individual Level

One of the possible determinants of social capital is the impact of cultural values, in particular individualism–collectivism. Cultural level analysis has shown that people in more individualistic countries belong to a larger number of different voluntary associations and believe more often that 'most people can be trusted' than people in collectivistic countries (Allik and Realo, 2004; Realo, Allik, and Greenfield, 2008; Realo and Allik, 2009). As the results at the cultural level are so unambiguous, there is reason to inquire further whether similar patterns also exist at the individual level. However, individual-level findings do not necessarily have to mirror the results at the aggregate level of analysis (culture, nation, etc.), and the relationship between variables can be different, missing, or even completely opposite to theoretical expectations based on findings at another level (Mõttus, Allik, and Realo, 2010; Ostroff, 1993). Indeed, previous research has yielded somewhat contradicting results at the individual level: the relationship between individualism–collectivism and different social capital measures (e.g., trust, participation in voluntary organisations) at the individual level has been found to be positive in some studies (Gheorghiu et al., 2009; Kemmelmeier et al., 2006), while other studies (Finkelstein, 2010 and 2011) indicate that people with collectivistic values participate in some activities of civil society (e.g., voluntary organisations) at least as much as people with individualistic values.

The findings of this dissertation confirm that the relationship between individualism–collectivism and social capital may not be as unambiguous and straightforward as it is at the cultural level. Although, there is support for the hypothesis that a positive association between individualism and social capital exists at the individual level (**Study III**), the results also indicate that different subtypes of individualism have rather different and sometimes even opposite effects on social capital, that certain dimensions of collectivism can actually promote social capital at the individual level (**Study I**), and that both collectivistic and individualistic values are important in generating different types of social capital (**Study II**). These findings are in accord with Finkelstein's (2010) assumption that, although individualistic and collectivistic people volunteer to

the same extent, they do it for different reasons – that is, sometimes rather different values may lead to very similar conduct in individuals. If we extend this assumption about volunteering to some of the core aspects of social capital, we can hypothesise that both individualistic and collectivistic people will trust generalised others and invest in their networks to the same extent, but they likely do it for different reasons. The first part of this hypothesis is supported by the fact that different subtypes of both individualism and collectivism are positively related to social capital (**Study I**). However, an analysis of the nature of the reasons and motivations behind more individualistic *versus* more collectivistic individuals remains beyond the scope of the current dissertation.

Another important issue to keep in mind when interpreting and explaining the different results at the individual and cultural levels is the fact that individualism and collectivism are not orthogonal to each other at the individual level (Brewer and Venaik, 2011; Triandis and Suh, 2002; Zhang, Liang, and Sun, 2013), and individualism and collectivism fulfil different functions of the individual's value system (Trommsdorff, Mayer, and Albert, 2004). As there are hardly any 'pure' individualists and collectivists, it makes sense that the effect of individualism–collectivism on social capital at the individual level is not as strong and straightforward as it is at the cultural level. However, it would also be not correct to claim that the relationship between individualism–collectivism and social capital is completely different at the individual and cultural levels, because some individual-level findings do replicate culture-level outcomes. For example, the only measure of collectivism that was not significantly correlated with social capital in **Study I** was Familism, and this is in accord with culture-level findings which have shown that Familism exhibits negative associations with social capital (Realo, Allik, and Greenfield, 2008).

How much does Individualism–Collectivism Explain Individual-Level Variance in Social Capital?

Individualism–collectivism and sociodemographic variables (i.e., age, gender, education, and domicile) explain only a small fraction of individual-level variance in social capital **(Study I, II, and III)**. Although previous research (Halpern, 2005; Lin, 2000; Lin and Erickson, 2010; Meulemann, 2008; Putnam, 2000 and 2002) has shown that age, gender, education, and place of residence are all related to social capital at the individual level, the results of this dissertation **(Study I, II, and III)** suggest that there must be something else that explains differences in the level of social capital at the individual level.

What is more, **Study III** demonstrated that the strength of the relationship between individualism–collectivism and social capital significantly varies across different European countries. This is in accordance with the findings of **Study IV**, which revealed that the relationship between generalised social trust (which is considered one of the core aspects of social capital) and a more general value structure significantly varies in the same set of countries.

Therefore, the findings of **Study IV** suggest that not only individualism–collectivism, but also a more general value structure, may be among the possible explanatory factors behind country-level differences in social capital levels. The results indicate that congruence between a personal value structure and a country-level value structure is more important in generating individual-level generalised social trust in countries where the overall levels of social trust are higher. Therefore, it seems that, in some countries, there must be something in the general value structure that favours the generation of social capital, and individualism–collectivism may constitute a fraction of this broader value structure that makes people more receptive towards social trust, norms of reciprocity, and cooperation. In sum, people's everyday experiences in their collectives and communities must have a stronger effect on their generalised social trust and social participation levels than their personal characteristics. This is in accord with recent findings by van Lange and colleagues (2015; 2014), which demonstrate that a genetic influence on generalised trust is virtually absent and that, instead, we should look to social interaction experiences, networks, and the media for the determinants of generalised trust. Therefore, culture-level social capital (or at least some important aspects of it) seems to have an impact on individual outcomes in social capital (or at least some important aspects of it).

Challenges in Studying the Relationship between Social Capital and Individualism–Collectivism

Measurement issues are extremely important when studying the relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism, because both are very ambiguous constructs that have been defined and measured in many different ways in the literature. The studies on which this dissertation is based clearly demonstrate that using different measures for social capital and individualism–collectivism can yield rather different results. One of the reasons for this is that, sometimes, there is hardly any relationship among components of the social capital construct, such as social and political trust and formal and informal participation (Guillen, Coromona, and Saris, 2011). Furthermore, different components of the social capital construct do not manifest a uniform effect on the same phenomena (Guillen, Coromona, and Saris, 2011; Kaasa, 2009; Saxton and Benson, 2005), and the relationship between different dimensions of social capital and other social phenomena may vary across different social groups (Kroll, 2011). Considering that social capital, which was operationalised differently across **Studies I, II, III and IV**, was analysed together with another ambiguous construct, that of individualism–collectivism, which was also operationalised differently across the studies, it is quite astonishing that the results of the studies are not in fact completely contradicting.

An issue that cannot be ignored is that, although the selection of indicators of social capital and individualism–collectivism should be strictly based on

theoretical considerations, data availability and constraints often affect the choice of the measures. My co-authors and I often confronted a situation in which, based on our theoretical understandings, we would have wanted to measure as many core aspects of social capital as possible, but due to data availability and statistical issues, we were not able to do so. There were two major problems to tackle. First of all, of course, there is the possibility that the required items are not in the data set. However, a second problem was in fact more common: I had rich datasets which contain many questions about different aspects of social capital, but these different items just do not form a coherent index with satisfactory statistical parameters. Therefore, my co-authors and I had to make some concessions when choosing social capital measures. In **Study I,** we settled on a social capital index that unfortunately ignores the social network aspect of social capital. **Study IV** captures only one core aspect of social capital–social trust. In **Studies II and III,** we solved the problem of having to choose between different aspects of social capital by using two different social capital measures in the same study.

Data availability issues were also present for individualism–collectivism constructs. My co-authors and I were lucky enough to have individualism–collectivism measures in the datasets used for **Studies I and II**, but there was no direct individualism–collectivism measure in the European Social Survey, used for **Studies III and IV**. The Schwartz value scale, which was used for operationalising individualism–collectivism in **Study III**, is a rather good instrument, as different conceptualisations of individualism–collectivism (e.g., Oishi et al., 1998; Realo, Allik, and Vadi, 1997; Realo et al., 2002; Triandis and Leung, 1998) have been related to Schwartz's value types of Openness to Change and Conservation at the individual level. However, Schwartz's value types of Openness to Change and Conservation dimensions do not allow for differentiating between different subtypes of individualism–collectivism, as was done in **Study I**, which demonstrated that different subtypes of individualism and collectivism might have rather different associations with social capital.

Another important methodological issue to discuss (which also helps to explain the difficulties forming solid social capital indexes) is the measurement of social capital across cultures. It is widely acknowledged that the content and meaning of social capital is probably rather culture-specific. Communities and nations can have quantitatively and qualitatively different forms of social capital, and expressions of social capital are, therefore, often dissimilar across countries and regions (Halpern, 2005); thus, there is the need for tailored assessments of social capital in different cultural settings (Ostrom, 2010). However, the standard social capital measures have traditionally been imported from the USA, following the research of Putnam (2000). Considering that social capital is often culture-specific, it should not be surprising that these measures do not always form a solid index in other cultures. Different history and cultural, political, and institutional contexts have formed rather different patterns of social and institutional participation, as well as institutional and generalised social trust levels, in different countries. For example, the long-lasting consequences

of the historical experience of Soviet rule on social capital levels in Eastern Europe demonstrate that political and institutional contexts played an important role in eroding social capital, especially participation in civic society and generalised social trust (Halpern, 2005), but also led to different types of social participation, e.g., informal networks instead of more formal participation in associations (Letki, 2009). Thus, it is important to always keep in mind that social capital is a culture-specific construct which also, therefore, needs culture-specific measures.

In conclusion, although the positive relationship between individualism and social capital seems to hold in some respects at the individual level, the relationship between social capital and the different components of individualism–collectivism appears to be rather multifaceted, partly because the various studies use different measures of both social capital and individualism–collectivism.

CONCLUSIONS

Social capital is an extremely useful resource for individuals, groups, and countries (Halpern, 2005). Therefore, the question of the possible determinants or sources of social capital at the individual as well as group levels is of great interest to social scientists. One of the possible determinants of social capital is the impact of individualism–collectivism and indeed, there is more social capital in individualistic countries than in collectivistic countries (Allik and Realo, 2004; Realo, Allik, and Greenfield, 2008; Realo and Allik, 2009). However, individual-level findings have not been completely unambiguous, and, even if a positive association between social capital and individualism is found, it is not as strong as at the cultural level of analysis (Finkelstein, 2010 and 2011; Gheorghiu, Vignoles, and Smith, 2009; Kemmelmeier, Jambor, and Letner, 2006).

The results of this dissertation demonstrate that the relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism is indeed not as straightforward at the individual level as at the cultural level. Only one component of individualism, Mature Self-responsibility, was found to be positively associated with social capital and peer- and society-related forms of collectivism also exhibited positive associations with social capital **(Study I)**. This suggests that people who accept responsibility for themselves and for their actions (mature self-responsibility), have tight and supportive relationships with their friends and peers (Companionship), and are dedicated to and ready to serve their nation (Patriotism) also have higher levels of social capital. This is in accord with culture-level findings, which have shown that social capital levels are higher in countries that exhibit lower levels of Familism and higher levels of institutional collectivism (Realo, Allik, and Greenfield, 2008).

It also seems that, at the individual level, at least for adolescents, individualism and collectivism are related to different forms of social capital in distinctive ways **(Study II)**. When analysing the relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism specifically during the adolescence, it was found that collectivistic values are more likely to be related to higher levels of parental social capital and individualistic values to higher levels of peer-group social capital. This is hardly surprising, as individualism and collectivism fulfil different functions for the individual value system (Trommsdorff, Mayer, and Albert, 2004). Collectivistic values are found to be strongly associated with family values at the individual level, whereas individualistic values are important for adolescents to successfully establish relationships outside the family. **Study II** acknowledges that becoming an autonomous individual who maintains her/his own social relations is an important developmental task, and suggests that individualistic values can facilitate the establishing of those relations.

The **Study III** shows that the positive relationship between social capital and individualism that has been found at the cultural level also holds at the individual level, but that the relationship is, nevertheless, quite weak and the

strength of association varies significantly across different European countries. This variation, however, cannot be explained by country differences in the level of democracy, human development, or wealth, which have often been found to be positively associated with both country-level social capital and individualism (e.g., Hofstede, 2001; Neira, Portela, and Vieira, 2010; von dem Knesebeck, Dragano, and Siegrist, 2005; Whiteley, 2000; Zmerli & Newton, 2008). Interestingly, the 'usual suspects' for individual-level differences in social capital (i.e., sociodemographic variables, such as gender, age, education level, and place of residence) do not explain individual-level variation in social capital either. Therefore, it is tempting to agree with Newton (2001) and van Lange (2015), who argue that the sources of social capital and generalised social trust at the individual level must be located in people's everyday experiences and immediate social surroundings, as well as their everyday social interactions, and not so much in people's own personal characteristics.

Finally, when examining how prevailing cultural values affect the individual-level relationship between values and social capital measures, in particular generalised social trust, it was found that value similarity is more important in generating individual-level social trust in countries where the overall level of social trust is higher **(Study IV)**. This suggests that the individual-level relationship between social capital indicators (e.g., generalised social trust) and values (e.g., individualism–collectivism) is likely to be dependent on the value structure at the country level.

In sum, the results of this dissertation provide some support for the assumption that more individualistically minded individuals have more social capital. However, individual-level findings are far more complex than culture-level findings, and different subtypes of individualism and collectivism do have rather different and sometimes opposing effects on different social capital dimensions at the individual level. Furthermore, results suggest that individualism–collectivism together with sociodemographic variables explain only a small fraction of individual differences in social capital. All in all, this indicates that there must be other factors (e.g., income, employment status, and health) that have a greater impact on individual differences in the accumulation of social capital. Considering that congruence between personal and country-level value structures plays some role in the formation of individual social capital levels, it seems plausible that there is something in the general value structure that makes people more or less receptive towards social trust, norms of reciprocity, and cooperation. Furthermore, culture-level social capital seems to have an impact on individual outcomes in social capital. However, the impact of culture-level social capital (and individualism–collectivism) on individual-level social capital is something that requires further investigation.

All in all, the results presented in this dissertation show that neither personal value preferences (i.e., individualism–collectivism) nor sociodemographic variables explain much of the variation in individual social capital levels. This is in accord with previous theories and empirical findings that suggest that the sources of individual-level social capital must be located, not so much in the

characteristics of the individual, but rather his/her social surroundings (Newton, 2001; Van Lange, 2015). Therefore, although the challenge of finding individual-level determinants of social capital is still far from complete, it seems plausible that the 'culprits' are not only found at the individual level.

REFERENCES

Adler, P. S., and Kwon, S.-W. (2002). Social capital: prospects for a new concept. *The Academy of Management Review, 27:* 17–40.

Akcomak, S., and ter Weel, B. (2011). The impact of social capital on crime: evidence from the Netherlands. *Regional Science and Urban Economics, 42:* 323–340.

Allik, J., and Realo, A. (2004). Individualism–collectivism and social capital. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 35:* 29–49.

Arts, W., and Halman, L. (2004). *European values at the turn of the Millennium.* Leiden: Brill.

Bartkus, V. O., and Davis, J. H. (2010). Introduction: the yet undiscovered value of social capital. In V. O. Bartkus and J. H. Davis (Eds.), *Social capital: reaching out, reaching in* (pp. 1–14). Cheltenham, Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Beck, U. (2000). Living your life in a runaway world: individualisation, globalisation and politics. In W. Hutton and A. Giddens (Eds.), *On the edge: living with global capitalism.* London: Jonathan Cape.

Bolin, K., Lindgren, B., Lindström, M., and Nystedt, P. (2003). Investments in social capital – implications of social interactions for the production of health. *Social Science and Medicine, 56:* 2379–2390.

Bond, M. H. (1988). *The cross-cultural challenge to social psychology.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bond, M. H. (2002). Reclaiming the individual from Hofstede's ecological analysis – a 20-year odyssey: comment on Oyserman et al. (2002). *Psychological Bulletin, 128:* 73–77.

Bourdieu, P. (1985). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York: Greenwood Press.

Brewer, M. B., and Chen, Y.-R. (2007). Where (who) are collectives in collectivism? Toward conceptual clarification of individualism and collectivism. *Psychological Review, 114(1):* 133–151.

Brewer, P., and Venaik, S. (2011). Individualism–collectivism in Hofstede and GLOBE. *Journal of International Business Studies, 42:* 436–445.

Burt, R. S. (1987). Social contagion and innovation: cohesion versus structural equivalence. *American Journal of Sociology, 92:* 1287–1335.

Burt, R. S. (1992). *Structural holes: the social structure of competition.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Burt, R. S. (1998). The gender of social capital. *Rationality and Society, 10:* 5–46.

Carere, C., and Maestripieri, D. (2008). The behavioural repertoire approach in comparative personality research: inconsistencies between theory and practice. *European Journal of Personality, 22:* 457–474.

Casas, F. (2011). Subjective social indicators and child and adolescent well-being. *Child Indicators Research, 4(4):* 555–575.

Casas, F., Bello, A., Gonzalez, M., and Aligue, M. (2013). Children's subjective well-being measured using a composite index: what impacts Spanish first-year secondary education students' subjective well-being? *Child Indicators Research*, *6(3):* 433–460.

Castiglione, D. (2008). Introduction: conceptual issues in social capital theory. In D. Castiglione, J. van Deth, and G. Wolleb (Eds.), *The handbook of social capital,* (pp. 13–21). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Castiglione, D., van Deth, J., and Wolleb, G. (2008). Social capital's fortune: an introduction. In D. Castiglione, J. van Deth, and G. Wolleb (Eds.), *The handbook of social capital,* (pp. 1–10). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chan, D. K.-S. (1994). Colindex: a refinement of three collectivism measures. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S.-C. Choi, and G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: theory, methods, and applications* (pp. 200–210). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chen, F. F. and West, S. G. (2008). Measuring individualism and collectivism: the importance of considering differential components, reference groups, and measurement invariance. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42:* 259–294.

Chen, X., Gong, J., Yu, B., Li, S., Striley, C., Yang, N., and Li, F. (2015). Constructs, concept mapping, and psychometric assessment of the concise scale of individualism–collectivism. *Social Behavior and Personality, 43 (4):* 667–684.

Cieciuch, J., and Schwartz, S. H. (2012). The number of distinct basic values and their structure assessed by PVQ-40. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 94(3):* 321–328.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94:* 95–120.

Cox, E. (2002). Australia: making the lucky country. In R. Putnam (Ed.), *Democracies in flux: the evolution of social capital in contemporary society* (pp. 334–358). New York: Oxford University Press.

Dakhli, M. (2009). Investigating the effects of individualism–collectivism on trust and cooperation. *Psychology Journal, 6:* 90–99.

De Graaf, N. D., and Flap, H. D. (1988). 'With a little help from my friends': social resources as an explanation of occupational status and income in West Germany, the Netherlands, and the United States. *Social Forces, 67:* 452–472.

Dekker, P., and Uslaner, E. M. (2006). Introduction. In P. Dekker and E. M. Uslaner (Eds.), *Social capital and participation in everyday life,* (pp. 1–8). London, New York: Routledge.

Delhey, J., and Newton, K. (2005). Predicting cross-national levels of social trust: global patterns or Nordic exceptionalism. *European Sociological Review, 21:* 311–327.

De Souza Briggs, X. (1997). Social capital and the cities: advice to change agents. *National Civic Review, 86:* 111–117.

Durkheim, E. (1969 [1893]). *The division of labor in society.* New York: The Free Press.

Epstein, S. (1983). The mother-father-peer scale. Unpublished manuscript. Amherst: University of Massachusetts.

Esser, H. (2008).The two meanings of social capital. In D. Castiglione, J. Van Deth and G. Wolleb (Eds.), *The handbook of social capital,* (pp. 21–49). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Farr, J. (2004). Social capital: a conceptual history. *Political Theory, 32:* 6–33.

Farrell, A., Tayler, C., and Tennent, L. (2004). Building social capital in early childhood education and care: an Australian study. *British Educational Research Journal, 30:* 623–632.

Field, J. (2008). *Social capital.* London, New York: Routledge.

Fine, B. (2010). *Theories of social capital: researchers behaving badly.* London, New York: Pluto Press.

Finkelstein, M. A. (2010). Individualism/collectivism: implications for the volunteer process. *Social Behavior and Personality, 38:* 445–452.

Finkelstein, M. A. (2011). Correlates of individualism and collectivism: predicting volunteer activity. *Social Behavior and Personality, 39(5):* 597–606.

Fishman, R. M. (2010). On the costs of conceptualizing social ties as social capital. In V. O. Bartkus, and J. H. Davis (Eds.), *Social capital: reaching out, reaching in,* (pp. 66–83). Cheltenham, Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Fiske, A. P. (2002). Using individualism and collectivism to compare cultures – a critique of the validity and measurement of the constructs: comment on Oyserman et al. (2002). *Psychological Bulletin, 128:* 78–88.

Freeman, M. A., and Bordia, P. (2001). Assessing alternative models of individualism and collectivism: a confirmatory factor analysis. *European Journal of Personality, 15:* 105–121.

Freitag, M., and Kirchner, A. (2011). Social capital and unemployment. A macro-quantitative analysis of the European regions. *Political Studies, 59:* 389–410.

Fujiwara, T., and Kawachi, I. (2008). A prospective study of individual-level social capital and major depression in the United States. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 62:* 627–633.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: the social virtues and the creation of prosperity.* London: Hamish Hamilton.

Furman, W., and Buhrmester, D. (1985). Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in their social networks. *Developmental Psychology, 21:* 1016–1024.

Gelfand, M. J., Triandis, H. C., and Chan, D. K.-S. (1996). Individualism versus collectivism or versus authoritarianism? *European Journal of Social Psychology, 26:* 397–410.

Gheorghiu, M. A., Vignoles, V. L., and Smith, P. B. (2009). Beyond the United States and Japan: testing Yamagishi's emancipation theory of trust across 31 nations. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 72:* 365–383.

Granovetter, M. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *The American Journal of Sociology, 78:* 1360–1380.

Granovetter, M. (1974). *Getting a job.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Grootaert, C. (2006). Social capital. The missing link? In P. Dekker and E. M. Uslaner (Eds.), *Social capital and participation in everyday life,* (pp. 9–29). London, New York: Routledge.

Guillen, L., Coromina, L., and Saris, W. E. (2011). Measurement of social participation and its place in social capital theory. *Social Indicators Research, 100:* 331–350.

Halman, L., and Luijkx, R. (2006). Social capital in contemporary Europe: evidence from the European Social Survey. *Portuguese Journal of Social Science, 5:* 65–90.

Halpern, D. (2005). *Social capital.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Hanifan, L. J. (1916). The rural school community center. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 67:* 130–138.

Herreros, F. (2004). *The problem of forming social capital: why trust?* New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hirsch, P. M., and Levin, D. Z. (1999). Umbrella advocates versus validity police: a life-cycle model. *Organization Science, 10:* 199–212.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: international differences in work-related values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1983). Dimensions of national cultures in fifty countries and three regions. In J. Deregowski, S. Dziurawiec, and R. C. Annis (Eds.), *Expiscations in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 335–355). Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: software of the mind.* London: McGraw-Hill.
Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: comparing values, behaviours, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd vol.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
Hofstede, G. (2004). Epi-dialogue. In H. Vinken, J. Soeters, and P. Ester (Eds.), *Comparing cultures: dimensions of culture in a comparative perspective,* (pp. 270–278). Leiden: Brill.
Hofstede, G., and Spangenberg, J. (1987). Measuring individualism and collectivism at occupational and organizational levels. In Kagitcibasi (Ed.), *Growth and progress in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 113–122). Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
Hooghe, M., and Vanhoutte, B. (2011). Subjective well-being and social capital in Belgian Communities. The impact of community characteristics on subjective well-being indicators in Belgium. *Social Indicators Research, 100:* 17–36.
Hui, C. H. (1988). Measurement of individualism–collectivism. *Journal of Research in Personality, 22:* 17–36.
Hui, C. H., and Triandis, H. C. (1986). Individualism–collectivism: a study of cross-cultural researchers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 17:* 225–248.
Inglehart, R., and Oyserman, D. (2004). Individualism, autonomy, self-expression: the human development syndrome. In H. Vinken, J. Soeters, and P. Ester (Eds.), *Comparing cultures: dimensions of culture in a comparative perspective* (pp. 74–96). Leiden: Brill.
Inglehart, R., and Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities.* New York: Vintage Books.
John, O. P. (1990). The 'Big Five' factor taxonomy: dimensions of personality in the natural language and questionnaires. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (pp. 66–100). New York: The Guilford Press.
Johnston, G., and Percy-Smith, J. (2003). In search of social capital. *Policy and Politics, 31(3):* 321–334.
Jungbauer-Gans, M., and Gross, C. (2007). Verteilung des sozialen Kapitals. Eine makrosoziologische Analyse des European Social Survey 2002 und 2004. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Soziapsychologie, 59:* 211–240.
Kaasa, A. (2009). Effects of different dimensions of social capital on innovative activity: evidence from Europe at the regional level. *Technovation, 29:* 218–233.
Kagitcibasi, C. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context: implications for self and family. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 36:* 403–422.
Kagitcibasi, C. (2007). *Family, self, and human development across cultures. Theory and applications.* New York: Psychology Press.
Kelly, B. D., Davoren, M., Mhaolain, A. N., Breen, E., and Casey, P. (2009). Social capital and suicide in 11 European countries: an ecological analysis. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 44:* 971–977.
Kemmelmeier, M., Jambor, E. E., and Letner, J. (2006). Individualism and good works: cultural variations in giving and volunteering across the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 37:* 327–344.
Kim, U., Triandis, H. C., Kagitcibasi, C., Choi, S. C., and Yoon, G. (1994). *Individualism and collectivism: theory, method, and applications.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kroll, C. (2011). Different things make different people happy: examining social capital and subjective well-being by gender and parental status. *Social Indicators Research, 104:* 157–177.
Lappe, F. M., and Du Bois, P. M. (1997). Building social capital without looking backward. *National Civic Review, 86:* 119–128.
Le, T. N. and Stockdale, G. D. (2005). Individualism, collectivism, and delinquency in Asian American adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 34:* 681–691.
Leonard, M. (2005). Children, childhood and social capital: exploring the links. *Sociology, 39:* 605–622.
Letki, N. (2009). Social capital in East-Central Europe. In G. T. Svendsen and G. L. H. Svendsen (Eds.), *Handbook of social capital: the troika of sociology, political science and economics,* (pp. 162–176). Cheltenham, Northampton: Edward Elgar.
Lin, N. (2000). Inequality in social capital. *Contemporary Sociology, 29:* 785–795.
Lin, N. (2008). Building a network theory of social capital. In N. Lin, K. Cook, and R. S. Burt (Eds.), *Social capital: theory and research,* (pp. 3–29). New Brunswick, London: Aldine Transaction.
Lin, N., Ensel, W. M., and Vaughn, J. C. (1981). Social resources and strength of ties: structural factors in occupational status attainment. *American Sociological Review, 46:* 393–405.
Lin, N., and Erickson, B. H. (2010). Theory, measurement, and the research enterprise on social capital. In N. Lin and B. H. Erickson (Eds.), *Social capital: an international research program,* (pp. 1–24). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lippl, B. (2007). Soziales Engagement und politische Partizipation in Europa. *Sozialkapital: Grundlagen und Anwendungen. Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Sonderheft, 47:* 420–449.
Loury, G. C. (1977). A dynamic theory of racial income differences. In Phyllis A. Wallace and Annette LaMond (Eds.), *Women, minorities, and employment discrimination* (153–186). Lexington, MA: Heath.
Lukes, S. (1971). The meanings of individualism. *Journal of the History of Ideas, 32:* 45–66.
Marsden, P. V., and Hurlbert, J. S. (1988). Social resources and mobility outcomes. A replication and extension. *Social Forces, 66:* 1038–1059.
Meulemann, H. (2008). Is altruism more effective where it is required more? Collectivity-orientation and involvement in interest, issue, and religious associations. In H. Meulemann (Ed.), *Social capital in Europe: similarity of countries and diversity of people? Multi-level analysis of the European Social Survey 2002* (pp. 73–102). Leiden & Boston: Brill.
Meyerson, E. M. (1994). Human capital, social capital and competition: the relative contribution of social contacts to managers' incomes. *Acta Sociologica, 37:* 383–399.
Miller, J. G. (2002). Bringing culture to basic psychological theory – beyond individualism and collectivism: comment on Oyserman et al. (2002). *Psychological Bulletin, 128:* 97–109.
Montgomery, J. (1990). *Values in education: social capital formation in Asia and the Pacific.* Hollis, New Hampshire: Hollis Publishing Company.
Montgomery, J. (2000). Social capital as a policy resource. *Policy Sciences, 33(3/4):* 227–243.

Mõttus, R., Allik, J., and Realo, A. (2010). An attempt to validate national mean scores of conscientiousness: no necessarily paradoxical findings. *Journal of Research in Personality, 44:* 630–640.

Narayan, D., and Pritchett, L. (1997). *Cents and sociability: household income and social capital in rural Tanzania.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

Neira, I., Portela, M., and Vieira, E. (2010). Social capital and growth in European regions. *Regional and Sectoral Economic Studies, 10:* 19–28.

Neller, K. (2008). Explaining social trust: what makes people trust their fellow citizens. In H. Meulemann (Ed.), *Social capital in Europe: similarity of countries and diversity of people? Multi-level analysis of the European Social Survey 2002* (pp. 103–133). Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Newton, K. (2001). Trust, social capital, civil society, and democracy. *International Political Science Review, 22(2):* 201–214.

Offe, C., and Fuchs, S. (2002). A decline of social capital? The German Case. In R. Putnam (Ed.), *Democracies in flux: the evolution of social capital in contemporary society* (pp. 189–243). New York: Oxford University Press.

Oishi, S., Schimmack, U., Diener, E., and Suh, E. M. (1998). The measurement of values and individualism–collectivism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24:* 1177–1187.

Olsen, K. M., and Dahl, S. A. (2007). Health differences between European countries. *Social Science and Medicine, 64:* 1665–1678.

Ostroff, C. (1993). Comparing correlations based on individual-level and aggregated data. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78:* 569–582.

Ostrom, E. (2010). What is social capital? In V. O. Bartkus and J. H. Davis (Eds.), *Social capital: reaching out, reaching in,* (pp. 17–38). Cheltenham, Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Ostrom, E. and Ahn, T. K. (2009). The meaning of social capital and its link to collective action. In G. T. Svendsen and G. L. H. Svendsen (Eds*.), Handbook of social capital: the troika of sociology, political science and economics*, (pp. 17–35). Cheltenham, Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., and Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 128 (1):* 3–72.

Paxton, P. (1999). Is social capital declining in the United States? A multiple indicator assessment. *American Journal of Sociology, 105:* 88–127.

Paxton, P. (2002). Social capital and democracy: an interdependent relationship. *American Sociological Review, 67:* 254–277.

Poortinga, W. (2006). Social capital. An individual or collective resource for health. *Social Science and Medicine, 62:* 292–302.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology, 24:* 1–25.

Portes, A., and Vickstrom, E. (2011). Diversity, social capital, and cohesion. *The Annual Review of Sociology, 37:* 461–479.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work. Civic traditions in modern Italy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Putnam, R. D. (2002). *Democracies in flux: the evolution of social capital in contemporary society.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Raudenbush, S. W., and Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models. Applications and data analysis methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
Realo, A. (2003). Comparison of public and academic discourses: Estonian individualism and collectivism revisited. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 9:* 47–77.
Realo, A., and Allik, J. (2009). On the relationship between social capital and individualism–collectivism. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 3:* 1–16.
Realo, A., Allik, J., and Greenfield, B. (2008). Radius of trust: social capital in relation to familism and institutional collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 39:* 447–462.
Realo, A., Allik, J., and Vadi, M. (1997). The hierarchical structure of collectivism. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31:* 93–116.
Realo, A., Koido, K., Ceulemans, E., and Allik, J. (2002). Three components of individualism. *European Journal of Personality, 16:* 163–184.
Robinson, L. J., Schmid, A. A., and Siles, M. E. (2002). Is social capital really capital? *Review of Social Economy, 60(1):* 1–21.
Rohner, R. P., and Cournoyer, D. E. (1994). Universals in youths' perceptions of parental acceptance and rejection: evidence from factor analyses within eight sociocultural groups worldwide. *Cross-Cultural Research, 28:* 371–383.
Rostila, M. (2007). Social capital and health in European welfare regimes: a multilevel approach. *Journal of European Social Policy, 17:* 223–239.
Rothstein, B. (2002). Sweden: social capital in the social democratic state. In R. Putnam (Ed.), *Democracies in flux: the evolution of social capital in contemporary society* (pp. 289–331). New York: Oxford University Press.
Rothstein, B. (2005). *Social traps and the problem of trust.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rothstein, B., and Stolle, D. (2003a). Introduction: social capital in Scandinavia. *Scandinavian Political Studies, 26(1):* 1–26.
Rothstein, B., and Stolle, D. (2003b). Social capital, impartiality, and the welfare state: an institutional approach. In M. Hooghe and D. Stolle (Eds.), *Generating social capital: civil society and institutions in comparative perspective,* (pp. 191–209). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Ruiter, S., and De Graaf, N. D. (2008). Socio-economic payoffs of voluntary association involvement. A Dutch life course study. *European Sociological Review, 21:* 1–18.
Saxton, G. D., and Benson, M. A. (2005). Social capital and the growth of the nonprofit sector. *Social Science Quarterly, 86:* 16–35.
Schimmack, U., Oishi, S., and Diener, E. (2005). Individualism: a valid and important dimension of cultural differences between nations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9(1):* 17–31.
Schmitt-Beck, R. (2008). Mass media and social capital in Europe: evidence from multilevel analyses. In H. Meulemann (Ed.), *Social capital in Europe: similarity of countries and diversity of people? Multi-level analyses of the European Social Survey 2002* (pp. 159–187). Leiden & Boston: Brill.
Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the content and structure of values? *Journal of Social Issues, 50:* 19–45.
Schwartz, S. (2004). Mapping and interpreting cultural differences around the world. In H. Vinken, J. Soeters and P. Ester (Eds.), *Comparing cultures: dimensions of culture in a comparative perspective,* (pp. 43–73). Leiden: Brill.
Schwartz, S. H. (2007). Value orientations: Measurement, antecedents and consequences across nations. In R. Jowell, C. Roberts, and R. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Measuring*

attitudes crossnationally – lessons from the European Social Survey (pp. 161–193). London, United Kingdom: Sage.

Schwartz, S. H., and Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58:* 878–891.

Schwartz, S. H., Caprara, G. V., Vecchione, M., Bain, P., Bianchi, G., Caprara. M. G., Cieciuch, J., Kirmanoglu, H., Baslevent, C., Lönnqvist, J.-E., Mamali, C., Manzi, J., Pavlopoulos, V., Posnova, T., Schoen, H., Silvester, J., Tabernero, C., Torres, C., Verkasalo, M., Vondrakova, E., Welzel, C., and Zaleski, Z. (2014). Basic personal values underlie and give coherence to political values: a cross national study in 15 countries. *Political Behavior, 36:* 899–930.

Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., Ramos, A., Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J.-E., Demirutku, K., Dirilen-Gumus, O., and Konty, M. (2012). Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103:* 663–688.

Shulruf, B., Alesi, M., Ciochină, L., Faria, L., Hattie, J., Hong, F., Pepi, A.-M., and Watkins, D. (2011). Measuring collectivism and individualism in the third millennium. *Social Behavior and Personality, 39:* 173–187.

Simmel, G. (1976 [1903]). *The metropolis and mental life. The sociology of Georg Simmel.* New York: Free Press.

Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20:* 580–591.

Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. P. S., and Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism: a theoretical and methodological refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research, 29:* 240–275.

Skocpol, T. (2002). United States: from membership to advocacy. In R. Putnam (Ed.), *Democracies in flux: the evolution of social capital in contemporary society* (pp. 103–136). New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, P. B., and Schwartz, S. H. (1997). Values. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, and C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology,* (Vol. 3, pp. 77–118). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Stickel, D., Mayer, R. C., and Sitkin, S. B. (2010). Understanding social capital: in whom we trust? In V. O. Bartkus and J. H. Davis (Eds.), *Social capital: reaching out, reaching in* (pp. 304–318). Cheltenham, Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Svendsen, G. T. and Svendsen, G. L. H. (2009). The troika of sociology, political science and economics. In G. T. Svendsen and G. L. H. Svendsen (Eds.), *Handbook of social capital: the troika of sociology, political science and economics,* (pp. 1–13). Cheltenham, Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Taras, V., Muchinsky, M., Sarala, R., Avsec, A., Kemmelmeier, M., Aygun, Z. K. and Singelis, T. M. (2014). Opposite ends of the same stick? Multi-method test of the dimensionality of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 45:* 213–245.

Tönnies, F. (2009 [1887]). *Community and Civil Society.* Cambridge: University Press/ Tönnies, F. (2005[1887]). *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review, 96:* 506–520.

Triandis, H. C. (1993). Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. *Cross-Cultural Research, 27:* 155–180.

Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism–collectivism and personality. *Journal of Personality, 69:* 907–924.

Triandis, H. C. (2011). Culture and self-deception: a theoretical perspective. *Social Behavior and Personality, 39(1):* 3–14.

Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M. H., Leung, K., Brenes, A., Georgas, J., Hui, C. H., Martin, G., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J. P. B., Verma, J., Spangenberg, J., Touzard, H., and de Montmollin, G. (1986). The measurement of ethic aspects of individualism and collectivism across cultures. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 38:* 257–267.

Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., and Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54:* 323–338.

Triandis, H. C., and Leung, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74:* 118–128.

Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M. J., and Clack, F. L. (1985). Allocentric versus idiocentric tendencies: convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research in Personality, 19:* 395–415.

Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., and Hui, C. H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59:* 1006–1020.

Triandis, H. C., and Suh, E. M. (2002). Cultural influences on personality. *Annual Review of Personality, 53:* 133–160.

Trommsdorff, G., Mayer, B. and Albert, I. (2004). Dimensions of culture in intracultural comparisons. Individualism/collectivism and family-related values in three generations. In H. Vinken, J. Soeters, and P. Ester (Eds.), *Comparing Cultures: dimensions of Culture in a Comparative Perspective* (pp. 157–179). Leiden: Brill.

Trommsdorff, G., and Nauck, B. (2005). *The value of children in cross-cultural perspective. Case of studies from eight societies.* Lengerich: Pabst Science.

Uslaner, E. M. (1999). Democracy and social capital. In M. E. Warren (Ed.), *Democracy and trust* (pp. 121–150). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Uslaner, E. M., and Dekker, P. (2006). The 'social' in social capital. In P. Dekker and E. M. Uslaner (Eds.), *Social capital and participation in everyday life,* (pp. 176–187). London, New York: Routledge.

van der Gaag, M., and Snijders, T. (2002). An approach to the measurement of individual social capital. Groningen: Groningen University. [https://gaag.home.xs4all.nl/work/SCM_paper.pdf; 20.12.2016].

van der Meer, T., Scheepers, P., and de Grotenhuis, M. (2008). Does the state affect the informal connections between its citizens? New institutionalist explanations of social participation in everyday life. In H. Meulemann (Ed.), *Social capital in Europe: similarity of countries and diversity of people? Multi-level analyses of the European Social Survey 2002* (pp. 41–72). Leiden & Boston: Brill.

van Deth, J. W. (2008). Measuring social capital. In D. Castiglione, J. van Deth, and G. Wolleb (Eds.), *The handbook of social capital,* (pp. 150–176). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Lange, P. A. M. (2015). Generalized trust: four lessons from genetics and culture. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 24:* 71–76.

van Lange, P. A. M., Vinkhuyzen, A. A. E., and Posthuma, D. (2014). Genetic influences are virtually absent for trust. PloS ONE, *9(4),* e93880. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0093880.

Vecchione, M., Schwartz, S. H., Caprara, G. V., Schoen, H., Cieciuch, J., Silvester, J., Bain, P., Bianchi, G., Kirmanoglu, H., Baslevent, C., Mamali, C., Manzi, J., Pavlopoulos, V., Posnova, T., Torres, C., Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J.-E., Vondrakova, E., Welzel, C. and Alessandri, G. (2015). Personal values and political activism: a cross-national study. *British Journal of Psychology, 106:* 84–106.

Vinken, H., Soeters, J. and Ester, P. (2004). Cultures and dimensions. Classic perspectives and new opportunities in 'dimensionalist' cross-cultural studies. In H. Vinken, J. Soeters, and P. Ester (Eds.), *Comparing cultures: dimensions of culture in a comparative perspective* (pp. 5–27). Leiden: Brill.

von dem Knesebeck, O., Dragano, N., and Siegrist, J. (2005). Social capital and self-rated health in 21 European countries. *GMS Psycho-Social-Medicine, 2:* 1–9.

Voronov, M., and Singer, J. A. (2002). The myth of individualism–collectivism: a critical review. *Journal of Social Psychology, 142:* 461–480.

Warren, M. E. (2008). The nature and logic of bad social capital. In D. Castiglione, J. van Deth and G. Wolleb (Eds.), *The handbook of social capital,* (pp. 122–149). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whiteley, P. F. (2000). Economic growth and social capital. *Political Studies, 48:* 443–466.

Woolcock, M. (1998). Social capital and economic development. Toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and Society, 27:* 151–208.

Worms, J.-P. (2002). France: old and new civic and social ties in France. In R. Putnam (Ed.), *Democracies in flux: the evolution of social capital in contemporary society* (pp. 137–188). New York: Oxford University Press.

Wuthnow, R. (2002). The United States: bridging the privileged and the marginalized. In R. Putnam (Ed.), *Democracies in flux: the evolution of social capital in contemporary society* (pp. 59–102). New York: Oxford University Press.

Yamagishi, T., and Yamagishi, M. (1994). Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motivation and Emotion, 18(2):* 129–166.

Zhang, X., Liang, X., and Sun, H. Y. (2013). Individualism–collectivism, private benefits of control, and earnings management: a cross-culture comparison. *Journal of Business Ethics, 114:* 655–664.

Zmerli, S., and Newton, K. (2008). Social trust and attitudes toward democracy. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 72:* 706–724.

SUMMARY IN ESTONIAN

Sotsiaalne kapital ja individualism–kollektivism indiviidi tasandil

Sotsiaalne kapital – usaldusel ja normidel põhinevad inimestevahelised sidemed ja sotsiaalsed võrgustikud – on äärmiselt kasulik ressurss nii üksikisikutele, kogukondadele kui ka riikidele (Arts ja Halman 2004, Halpern 2005, Zmerli ja Newton 2008). Samas on sotsiaalne kapital nii riikide vahel kui ka riikide sees ebavõrdselt jaotunud (Jungbauer-Gans ja Gross 2007, Meulemann 2008, Putnam 2002). See tekitab loomulikult küsimuse, mis on sotsiaalse kapitali allikad ehk millised tegurid võimaldaksid nii indiviidide kui ka gruppide tasandil seda ebavõrdsust seletada. Sotsiaalse kapitali ebavõrdset jagunemist on riigi tasandil seletatud muuhulgas sellega, et individualistlikke väärtusi kandvates ühiskondades võib valmisolek koostööks väga erinevate gruppidega olla kõrgem kui kollektivistlikke väärtusi kandvates ühiskondades (Allik ja Realo 2004).

Käesolevas doktoritöös on uuritud indiviidi taseme seost sotsiaalse kapitali ja individualismi–kollektivismi vahel. Seost sotsiaalse kapitali ja individualismi–kollektivismi vahel on seni uuritud eeskätt riigi ja piirkonna (nt USA osariigid) tasandil. Mitmed uuringud on näidanud, et riikides, kus inimesed hindavad kõrgelt individualistlikke püüdlusi, usaldavad inimesed ühtlasi ka teisi inimesi rohkem ning nad on seotud rohkemate sotsiaalsete võrgustikega (Allik ja Realo 2004, Realo ja Allik 2009; Realo, Allik ja Greenfield 2008). Küsimus, kas seosed sotsiaalse kapitali ja individualismi–kollektivismi vahel järgivad indiviidi tasandil samasuguseid mustreid nagu on leitud riigi tasandil, pole seni uurijate tähelepanu eriti pälvinud. Varasemad uuringud on indiviidi tasandil andnud veidi vastuolulisi tulemusi: indiviidi tasandi seos individualismi–kollektivismi ja erinevate sotsiaalse kapitali mõõdikute (nt üldistatud sotsiaalne usaldus, osalus vabatahtlikes organisatsioonides) vahel on osades uuringutes leitud olevat positiivne (Gheorghiu jt 2009, Kemmelmeier jt 2006), samas kui teised uuringud (Finkelstein 2010 ja 2011) on näidanud, et inimesed, kes peavad enam oluliseks kollektivistlikke väärtuseid, osalevad kodanikuühiskonna tegevustes (nt osalus vabatahtlikes organisatsioonides) võrdsel määral inimestega, kes pigem rõhutavad individualistlikke väärtusi.

Väitekiri põhineb neljal empiirilisel uurimusel, mis on avaldatud artiklitena rahvusvahelise levikuga eelretsenseeritavates ajakirjades. Väitekirja aluseks olevate uuringute eesmärgid olid:

- Uurida indiviidi tasandi seost sotsiaalse kapitali ja individualismi–kollektivismi erinevate alatüüpide vahel (Uurimus I).
- Analüüsida indiviidi tasandi seost sotsiaalse kapitali ja individualismi–kollektivismi vahel teismeeas ehk eluperioodil, mil suhted väljaspool perekonda muutuvad noore inimese elus kasvavalt oluliseks (Uurimus II).
- Võrrelda sotsiaalse kapitali ja individualismi–kollektivismi indiviidi tasandi seose riikidevahelist varieeruvust (Uurimus III).

- Uurida, kuidas ühiskonnas valitsevad väärtused mõjutavad indiviidi tasandi seost sotsiaalse kapitali (üldistatud sotsiaalse usalduse) ja väärtuste vahel (Uurimus IV).

Tulemused näitavad, et seos individualismi–kollektivismi ja sotsiaalse kapitali vahel ei pruugi indiviidi tasandil olla nii selge ja ühene kui riigi tasandil. Hüpotees, et sotsiaalse kapitali ja individualismi vahel on ka indiviidi tasandil positiivne seos, leidis küll mõningast kinnitust (Uurimus III), kuid tulemused näitavad ka seda, et seosed sotsiaalse kapitali erinevate dimensioonide ning individualismi–kollektivismi alatüüpide vahel on üsna erinevad ja kohati lausa vastuolulised (Uurimused I ja II). Nii näiteks selgus, et indiviidi tasandil on sotsiaalne kapital individualismi alatüüpidest positiivselt seotud üksnes enda tegude eest vastutuse võtmise ehk küpse vastutustundega, samas kui sotsiaalse kapitali seos individualismi teiste komponentide – autonoomia ehk iseseisva mõtlemise ja otsustamisega ning oma unikaalsuse tajumisega – oli negatiivne. Teiselt poolt on sotsiaalse kapitaliga positiivselt seotud kaks kollektivismi alatüüpi: patriotism ehk enda pühendamine rahvale või ühiskonnale ning kaaslaste-kollektivism ehk tihedad sidemed sõprade ja kaaslastega. Seega võib nentida, et rohkem sotsiaalset kapitali kaldub olema inimestel, kes võtavad vastutuse enda ja oma tegude eest (küps vastutustunne), kellel on tihedad ja toetavad suhted sõprade ja kaaslastega (kaaslaste-kollektivism) ning kes on pühendunud oma riigile (patriotism). Samas ei saa kindlasti väita, et seos individualismi–kollektivismi ja sotsiaalse kapitali vahel on indiviidi tasandil täiesti erinev riigi tasandi seosest, sest mõned indiviidi tasandi tulemused sarnanevad varasemate riigi tasandi tulemustega. Nii näiteks on perekonna-kollektivism (perekonna heaolu seadmine enda eesmärkidest ettepoole) Uurimuses I ainus kollektivismi dimensioon, mis ei ole sotsiaalse kapitaliga statistiliselt oluliselt seotud, ning see on kooskõlas riigi tasandi tulemustega, mis on näidanud negatiivset seost perekonna-kollektivismi ja sotsiaalse kapitali vahel (Realo, Allik ja Greenfield 2008).

Seda, et indiviidi tasandil on individualism ja kollektivism erinevate sotsiaalse kapitali vormidega seotud erineval viisil, näitas ka Uurimus II. Analüüsides seost sotsiaalse kapitali ja individualismi–kollektivismi vahel teismeeas, selgus, et kollektivistlikud väärtused soosivad pigem perekondliku sotsiaalse kapitali teket ning individualistlikud väärtused pigem rohket sotsiaalset kapitali eakaaslaste seas. See on seletatav sellega, et individualism ja kollektivism teenivadki indiviidi väärtussüsteemis erinevaid eesmärke (Trommsdorff, Mayer ja Albert 2004). Kollektivistlikud väärtused on indiviidi tasandil seotud perekonna väärtustamisega, samas kui individualistlikud väärtused on teismelistele olulised uute suhete rajamiseks väljaspool perekonda.

Uurimus III näitas, et individualismi–kollektivismi ja sotsiaalse kapitali vahelise seose tugevus indiviidi tasandil erineb oluliselt Euroopa riikide lõikes. See on kooskõlas Uurimuse IV tulemustega, mis näitasid, et seos üldistatud usalduse (mis on üks sotsiaalse kapitali põhikomponente) ja üldisema väärtusstruktuuri vahel varieerus samades riikides olulisel määral. Uurimuse IV tulemused osutavad, et mitte üksnes individualism–kollektivism, vaid ka üldisem

väärtusstruktuur võib aidata seletada riikidevahelisi erinevusi sotsiaalse kapitali määras. Tulemused näitavad, et riikides, kus üldistatud sotsiaalse usalduse tase on kõrgem, on teiste inimeste suhtes usaldavamad need inimesed, kelle väärtused sarnanevad riigis üldlevinud väärtustele. Seega näib, et osades riikides on üldlevinud väärtustes midagi sellist, mis soosib sotsiaalse kapitali teket, ning individualism–kollektivism võib moodustada üksnes väikese osa sellest üldisemast väärtusstruktuurist, mis soosib üldistatud usaldust, vastastikku heatahtlikku ja ausat käitumist ning koostööd.

Tuleb rõhutada, et individualism–kollektivism ja sotsio-demograafilised tunnused (nt vanus, sugu, haridus ja elukoht) seletavad üksnes väga väikese osa inimeste vahelistest erinevustest sotsiaalse kapitali määras (Uurimused I, II ja III). Kuigi varasemad uuringud (Halpern 2005, Lin 2000, Lin ja Erickson 2010, Meulemann 2008, Putnam 2000 ja 2002) on näidanud, et vanus, sugu, haridus ja elukoht on indiviidi tasandil kõik seotud sotsiaalse kapitaliga, näitavad selles väitekirjas esitatud tulemused (Uurimused I, II ja III), et indiviidi tasandi erinevusi sotsiaalses kapitalis tuleb otsida kusagilt mujalt, ja Uurimuse IV tulemused viitavad, et indiviidi tasandi sotsiaalse kapitali erinevuste taga võivad vähemalt osaliselt olla ka kogukonna või riigi tasandi väärtused.

Kokkuvõttes pakuvad selle väitekirja tulemused mõningast toetust seisukohale, et mitte ainult individualistlikumates ühiskondades, vaid ka individualistlikumatel inimestel on rohkem sotsiaalset kapitali. Samas on individualismi ja kollektivismi erinevate alatüüpide mõju sotsiaalse kapitali erinevate dimensioonidele indiviidi tasandil kohati erinev või lausa vastupidine. See on oluline tulemus, sest riigi ja piirkonna tasandi uuringutes ei ole kuigivõrd tähelepanu pööratud individualismi–kollektivismi ja sotsiaalse kapitali erinevatele vormidele (va Realo, Allik ja Greenfield 2008). Lisaks individualismi–kollektivismi ja sotsiaalse kapitali seose uurimise indiviidi tasandile toomisele seisneb selle töö uudsus seega ka selles, et kasutusel on väga suur hulk erinevaid spetsiifilisi sotsiaalse kapitali ja individualismi–kollektivismi ning sotsiaalse kapitali mõõdikuid.

PUBLICATIONS

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: Mai Beilmann
Date of birth: May 5, 1984
Address: University of Tartu, Institute of Social Studies, Lossi 36, 51003 Tartu
Phone: 737 6156
E-mail: mai.beilmann@ut.ee

Education

2007–2014	University of Tartu, PhD studies in sociology
2011–2012	University of Konstanz (Germany), Exchange student in psychology
2008–2009	University of Konstanz (Germany), Exchange student in sociology
2005–2007	University of Tartu, Master studies in sociology *(cum laude)*
2002–2005	University of Tartu, Bachelor studies in sociology

Work Experience

Since 2014	Junior research fellow, Institute of Social Studies, University of Tartu
2012–2014	Analyst, EuroCollege, University of Tartu

Research Interests

Social capital, generalised social trust, individualism–collectivism, values, attitudes, youth studies

Participation in Relevant Research and Development Projects

2015–2018	Member of the Estonian research team of the Horizon 2020 project "CATCH-EyoU – Constructing AcTive CitizensHip with European Youth: Policies, Practices, Challenges and Solutions"
2014–2015	Member of the Estonian research team of the European Social Survey

Selected Publications

Beilmann, M. (2017). Dropping out because of the others: Bullying among the Students of Estonian Vocational Schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* doi: 10.1080/01425692.2016.1251302.

Beilmann, M., Kööts-Ausmees, L., and Realo, A. (2017). The Relationship between Social Capital and Individualism–Collectivism in Europe. *Social Indicators Research,* doi: s11205-017-1614-4.

Kalmus, V., Kõuts-Klemm, R., Beilmann, M., Rämmer, A. and Opermann, S. (2017). Long-lasting shadows of (post)communism? Generational and ethnic

divides in political and civic participation in Estonia. In Wallner, C., Wimmer, J., Winter, R. and Oelsner, K. (Eds.), *(Mis-)Understanding Political Participation*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Ltd.

Beilmann, M. and Espenberg, K. (2016). The reasons for the interruption of vocational training in Estonian vocational schools. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training, 68 (1),* 87−101, doi: 10.1080/13636820.2015.1117520.

Beilmann, M. and Lilleoja, L. (2015). Social Trust and Value Similarity: the Relationship between Social Trust and Human Values in Europe. *Studies of Transition States and Societies, 7 (2),* 19−30.

Beilmann, M., Mayer, B., Kasearu, K. and Realo, A. (2014). The Relationship between Adolescents' Social Capital and Individualism-Collectivism in Estonia, Germany, and Russia. *Child Indicators Research, 7 (3),* 589−611, doi: 10.1007/s12187-014-9232-z.

Beilmann, M. and Realo, A. (2012). Individualism-collectivism and social capital at the individual level. *Trames: Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences, 16 (3),* 205−217, doi: 10.3176/tr.2012.3.01.

Received Scholarships and Benefits

2014	Scholarship from the Deutschbaltische Studienstiftung
2011	DAAD (German Academic Exchange Service) research grant for doctoral candidates and young academics and scientists
2011	Research stipend from University of Constance

Membership in Professional Organisations

Since 2016	Member of The European Network for Social Policy Analysis Baltics Network
Since 2014	Estonian Association of Sociologists – member of the board
Since 2013	Estonian Association of Sociologists – member
2007−2012	Association of Estonian Sociology Students – member of the board
Since 2007	Association of Estonian Sociology Students – member

ELULOOKIRJELDUS

Nimi: Mai Beilmann
Sünniaeg: 5. mai 1984
Aadress: Tartu Ülikooli ühiskonnateaduste instituut, Lossi 36, 51003 Tartu
Telefon: 737 6156
E-post: mai.beilmann@ut.ee

Haridustee

2007–2014 Tartu Ülikool, doktoriõpe sotsioloogia erialal
2011–2012 Konstanzi Ülikool (Saksamaa), vahetusüliõpilane psühholoogia erialal
2008–2009 Konstanzi Ülikool (Saksamaa), vahetusüliõpilane sotsioloogia erialal
2005–2007 Tartu Ülikool, magistri kraad sotsioloogia erialal *(cum laude)*
2002–2005 Tartu Ülikool, bakalaureuse kraad sotsioloogia erialal

Teenistuskäik

Alates 2014 Nooremteadur, Tartu Ülikooli ühiskonnateaduste instituut
2012–2014 Analüütik, Tartu Ülikooli Euroopa Kolledž

Peamised uurimisvaldkonnad

Sotsiaalne kapital, üldistatud usaldus, individualism–kollektivism, väärtused, hoiakud, noorteuuringud

Osalemine olulisemates uurimis- ja arendusprojektides

2015–2018 Horisont 2020 projekti "CATCH-EyoU – Kodanikuaktiivsuse kujundamine koos Euroopa noortega: poliitikad, praktikad, väljakutsed ja lahendused" Eesti töögrupi liige
2014–2015 Teaduse rahvusvahelistumise programmi projekti "Eesti osalemine Euroopa Sotsiaaluuringus" Eesti töögrpi liige

Olulisemad publikatsioonid

Beilmann, M. (2017). Dropping out because of the others: Bullying among the Students of Estonian Vocational Schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* doi: 10.1080/01425692.2016.1251302.

Beilmann, M., Kööts-Ausmees, L., ja Realo, A. (2017). The Relationship between Social Capital and Individualism–Collectivism in Europe. *Social Indicators Research,* doi: s11205-017-1614-4.

Kalmus, V., Kõuts-Klemm, R., Beilmann, M., Rämmer, A. ja Opermann, S. (2017). Long-lasting shadows of (post)communism? Generational and ethnic divides in political and civic participation in Estonia. Wallner, C., Wimmer,

J., Winter, R. ja Oelsner, K. (toim.), *(Mis-)Understanding Political Participation*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Ltd. [Ilmumas].

Beilmann, M. ja Espenberg, K. (2016). The reasons for the interruption of vocational training in Estonian vocational schools. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training, 68 (1),* 87−101, doi: 10.1080/13636820.2015.1117520.

Beilmann, M. ja Lilleoja, L. (2015). Social Trust and Value Similarity: the Relationship between Social Trust and Human Values in Europe. *Studies of Transition States and Societies, 7 (2),* 19−30.

Beilmann, M., Mayer, B., Kasearu, K. ja Realo, A. (2014). The Relationship between Adolescents' Social Capital and Individualism-Collectivism in Estonia, Germany, and Russia. *Child Indicators Research, 7 (3),* 589−611, doi: 10.1007/s12187-014-9232-z.

Beilmann, M. ja Realo, A. (2012). Individualism-collectivism and social capital at the individual level. *Trames: Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences, 16 (3),* 205−217, doi: 10.3176/tr.2012.3.01.

Saadud uurimistoetused ja stipendiumid

2014	Deutschbaltische Studienstiftungi stipendium
2011	DAAD (Saksa Akadeemiline Vahetusteenistus) teadusstipendium doktorantidele ja järeldoktoritele
2011	Konstanzi Ülikooli uurimistöö stipendium

Erialased organisatsioonid

Alates 2016	Euroopa Sotsiaalpoliitika Analüüsi Võrgustiku Balti haru liige
Alates 2014	Eesti Sotsioloogide Liidu juhatuse liige
Alates 2013	Eesti Sotsioloogide Liidu liige
2007−2012	SÜLEM (Sotsioloogia Üliõpilaste Liit Eestimaal) juhatuse liige
Alates 2007	SÜLEM (Sotsioloogia Üliõpilaste Liit Eestimaal) liige

DISSERTATIONES SOCIOLOGICAE UNIVERSITATIS TARTUENSIS

1. **Veronika Kalmus**. School textbooks in the field of socialisation. Tartu, 2003, 206 p.
2. **Kairi Kõlves**. Estonians' and Russian minority's suicides and suicide risk factors: studies on aggregate and individual level. Tartu, 2004, 111 p.
3. **Kairi Kasearu.** Structural changes or individual preferences? A study of unmarried cohabitation in Estonia. Tartu, 2010, 126 p.
4. **Avo Trumm**. Poverty in the context of societal transitions in Estonia. Tartu, 2011, 215 p.
5. **Kadri Koreinik**. Language ideologies in the contemporary Estonian public discourse: With a focus on South Estonian. Tartu, 2011, 128 p.
6. **Marre Karu.** Fathers and parental leave: slow steps towards dual earner/dual carer family model in Estonia. Tartu, 2011, 125 p.
7. **Algi Samm**. The relationship between perceived poor family communication and suicidal ideation among adolescents in Estonia. Tartu, 2012, 121 p.
8. **Tatjana Kiilo.** Promoting teachers' efficacy through social constructivist language learning: challenges of accommodating structure and agency. The case of Russian-speaking teachers in Estonia. Tartu, 2013, 156 p.
9. **Ave Roots.** Occupational and income mobility during post-socialist transformation of 1991–2004 in Estonia. Tartu, 2013, 130 p.
10. **Tarmo Strenze.** Intelligence and socioeconomic success A study of correlations, causes and consequences. Tartu, 2015, 119 p.
11. **Mervi Raudsaar.** Developments of social entrepreneurship in Estonia. Tartu, 2016, 141 p.
12. **Ero Liivik.** Otsedemokraatia Eestis: õigussotsioloogilisi aspekte. Tartu, 2017, 166 p.