



Contents lists available at [Journal IICET](#)

Journal of Counseling, Education and Society

ISSN: 2716-4896 (Print) ISSN: 2716-4888 (Electronic)

Journal homepage: <https://jurnal.iicet.org/index.php/jces/index>



How social capital become energy strengthening social cohesion in a plural society?

Nilma Zola^{*)}, Firman Firman, Riska Ahmad
Universitas Negeri Padang

Article Info

Article history:

Received Jan 06th, 2022
Revised Feb 26th, 2022
Accepted Mar 22nd, 2022

Keyword:

Social capital
Social cohesion
Plural society

ABSTRACT

Differentiation and diversity are highly valued in a plural society. Despite this, a plural society need a binder to reinforce interpersonal relationships, often known as social cohesiveness. Social cohesion is a social process aimed at eliminating disparities, socioeconomic inequalities, and societal rifts in order to consolidate plurality of citizenships. To survive, social cohesion requires reinforcing energy, one of which comes from social capital. This paper will explain how social capital is a source of energy that helps to strengthen social cohesion in multiple societies.



© 2022 The Authors. Published by IICET.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-SA license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>)

Corresponding Author:

Nilma Zola,
Universitas Negeri Padang
Email: zola@konselor.org

Introduction

Building social interactions is beneficial to one's physical and psychological well-being (Berkman & Syme, 1979; Keyes & Michalec, 2010; Thoits, 2011; Umberson & Karas Montez, 2010). Social cohesion, social capital, social networks, and social support are all phrases used to describe social relationships. The strength of relationships and a sense of solidarity among community members are referred to as social cohesiveness (Kawachi & Berkman, 2000). Building shared values and communities of interpretation, minimizing economic and income disparities, and letting people to feel that they are part of a single enterprise, facing common issues, and belonging to the same community are all part of social cohesiveness. The amount of social capital owned by a society is one indicator of social cohesion.

The good outcome of human connection is referred to as social capital. Positive outcomes can be physical or intangible, such as important information, new ideas, or future opportunities. It can be used to define the contribution of personal ties and networks, both within and outside the business, to organizational performance. (Kawachi & Berkman, 2000) Social capital is linked to shared group resources, such as friends' awareness of job openings (Granovetter, 1982). Individuals get social capital through their social network, which is made up of a web of social connections (Berkman, Glass, Brissette, & Seeman, 2000). Social networks provide a variety of social support, including emotional and instrumental support (Berkman, et al., 2000).

Indonesia is a multicultural country with ethnic groups, languages, cultures, religions, and customs from all over the world. The majority of Indonesians are aware of pluralism, which is defined as the existence of mutual acceptance for social differences while allowing diverse groups to keep their culture as their identity.

Understanding pluralism also inspires Indonesians to desire to live in a more tolerant society. This paper's goal is to perform a literature review and define "social capital as an energy that strengthens social cohesiveness in a plural society."

Discussions

Social Capital

The term "social capital" refers to a collection of shared beliefs that enable people to work together in groups to achieve common goals (Halpern, 2005). The concept is commonly used to describe how members of a society might come together to live in peace. A group of people's social capital permits them to work together effectively to attain a common purpose or goal. Through shared ideas and identities, conventions, values, and reciprocity, it enables communities or organizations, such as corporations or nonprofits, to function as a whole. Simply said, through social interactions, social capital benefits society as a whole (Robison, Schmid, & Siles, 2002).

Individuals' potential to benefit and find solutions to issues through involvement in social networks is referred to as social capital in social science. The network of interconnected relationships between individuals and groups (social ties or social participation), the level of trust that characterizes these ties, and the resources or benefits accrued and transferred based on social ties and social participation are the three dimensions that make up social capital (Matsaganis & Wilkin, 2015).

The majority of definitions of social capital have one thing in common: they focus on beneficial social ties. For substantive and ideological grounds, social capital lacks a clear and unmistakable definition (Dolfsma & Dannreuther, 2003; Edwards & Foley, 1997). As a result, there is no universally accepted definition of social capital, and the precise terminology used by a study will be determined by the discipline and research level (Robison, Myers, & Siles, 2002). The value of social networks, which unite like people and provide a bridge between them, is referred to as social capital. It is based on reciprocity principles (Badescu & Uslaner, 2003; Uslaner & Dekker, 2003).

Social Cohesion

The degree of closeness and solidarity among groups in society is referred to as social cohesiveness. It identifies two key dimensions: 1) a sense of belonging to a community; and 2) interpersonal ties among community members. Democratic attempts to develop social balance, economic dynamism, and national identity result in social cohesiveness, with the goal of constructing an equitable system, sustaining the push for uncontrolled economic expansion, and avoiding social rifts (Friedkin, 2004).

Social cohesion is a social process aimed at eliminating disparities, socioeconomic inequalities, and societal rifts in order to consolidate plurality of citizenships. It expresses society's need for personal growth and a sense of belonging, and it connects individual liberty and social justice, economic efficiency and equitable resource sharing, as well as pluralism and common principles for resolving all problems (Jenson, 2010).

Social Capital as Energy for Strengthening Social Cohesion in a Plural Society

The Indonesian nation is made up of a collection of distinct community groupings, which contributes to the country's diversity (Susanti, 2017). There are 656 nations and 300 varieties of local (regional) languages to choose from when it comes to ethnicity. Indonesians freely acknowledge and welcome variety in communal groupings as a result of the country's diversity. Religion, ethnicity, race, culture, and other factors all contribute to the diversity. This diversity generates circumstances that necessitate strong interpersonal bonds, or what is known as social cohesiveness.

The degree to which people in a society are connected together and integrated, as well as share common ideals, is referred to as social cohesiveness. Positive social interactions — the bonds or 'glue' that holds individuals together — are referred to as social cohesiveness. A socially cohesive community promotes the well-being of all of its citizens, combats exclusion and marginalization, fosters a sense of belonging, builds trust, and provides possibilities for upward mobility.

Social capital is a key indicator of social cohesion and has important health implications. One study, for example, looked at the association between four social capital variables (perceived justice, helpfulness, group membership, and trust), economic disparity, and death (Kawachi & Berkman, 2000). The findings revealed that all four indicators of social capital were linked to mortality. They also discover that the link between income inequality and mortality can be explained in part by a decrease in social capital as income disparity rises (Gilbert, et al., 2013; Kawachi & Berkman, 2000).

According to recent study, social capital is linked to a number of undesirable qualities. Although some forms of social capital have favorable outcomes for some social groupings, they can have negative consequences for

others. Although deeply interconnected networks help members to achieve specific goals, this inner cohesion can prohibit access and deny non-members benefits. Strong links can also lead to overwhelming societal pressure to conform, putting personal independence at risk. Individuals who make up the majority have the ability to pursue their own agendas, but those who break the norms may find themselves in the shoes of outsiders.

Collective success is based on mutual trust and indicates a community's ability to make change and exercise informal social control (i.e., influence behavior through social norms) (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997). Browning & Cagney (2002) link collective success to improved health self-assessment, decreased levels of environmental violence (Sampson et al., 1997), and better access to health-promoting resources such as medical care, good food options, and a place to exercise (Matsaganis & Wilkin, 2015). Social capital and social control, such as social networks and social support, are frequent sources of social capital and social control, such as religion and family (Idler, 2014; Maselko, Hughes, & Cheney, 2011).

In addition to social capital, social networks can transmit behavior and health, a phenomenon known as "social contagion" (Christakis & Fowler, 2013). If a person's friend, family, or partner is obese, the chances of that person becoming obese increase as well (Christakis & Fowler, 2007). Smoking (Christakis & Fowler, 2013) and drinking (Christakis & Fowler, 2013) showed similar tendencies (Rosenquist, Murabito, Fowler, & Christakis, 2010).

Through behavioral and psychological mechanisms, high amounts of social support can have a positive impact on health outcomes. Social support, for example, can help people keep to a healthy diet and minimize mental stress (Uchino, 2006). (Thoits, 2011). Both of these pathways can affect the cardiovascular, neuroendocrine, and immune systems' biological functioning (Berkman, et al., 2000; Uchino, 2006). As a result, social support can both directly benefit people and indirectly protect them from health-damaging risk factors (Cohen & Wills, 1985). Social support was found to contribute to decreased rates of atherosclerosis (plaque in the arteries) in women at a high risk of heart disease in a study on the relationship between social support and atherosclerosis (plaque in the arteries). For minority populations, the protective element of social support may be especially essential.

Conclusions

Plural society values distinctions and diversity, as well as religious tolerance, culture, language, and a variety of other factors. Despite this, a plural society need a binder to reinforce interpersonal relationships, often known as social cohesiveness. Social cohesion is a social process aimed at eliminating disparities, socioeconomic inequalities, and societal rifts in order to consolidate plurality of citizenships. To survive, social cohesion requires reinforcing energy, one of which comes from social capital. Individuals' potential to benefit and find answers to issues through involvement in social networks is referred to as social capital. So that the continued development of social capital in society can offer energy to strengthen social cohesion in a plural society.

References

- Badescu, G., & Uslaner, E. M. (2003). *Social capital and the transition to democracy*: Routledge London.
- Berkman, L. F., Glass, T., Brissette, I., & Seeman, T. E. (2000). From social integration to health: Durkheim in the new millennium. *Social science & medicine*, 51(6), 843-857.
- Berkman, L. F., & Syme, S. L. (1979). Social networks, host resistance, and mortality: a nine-year follow-up study of Alameda County residents. *American journal of Epidemiology*, 109(2), 186-204.
- Browning, C. R., & Cagney, K. A. (2002). Neighborhood structural disadvantage, collective efficacy, and self-rated physical health in an urban setting. *Journal of health and social behavior*, 383-399.
- Christakis, N. A., & Fowler, J. H. (2007). The spread of obesity in a large social network over 32 years. *New England journal of medicine*, 357(4), 370-379.
- Christakis, N. A., & Fowler, J. H. (2013). Social contagion theory: examining dynamic social networks and human behavior. *Statistics in medicine*, 32(4), 556-577.
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological bulletin*, 98(2), 310.
- Dolfsma, W., & Dannreuther, C. (2003). Subjects and boundaries: Contesting social capital-based policies. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 37(2), 405-413.
- Edwards, B., & Foley, M. W. (1997). Social capital and the political economy of our discontent. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(5), 669-678.
- Friedkin, N. E. (2004). Social cohesion. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*, 30, 409-425.

- Gilbert, K. L., Quinn, S. C., Goodman, R. M., Butler, J., & Wallace, J. (2013). A meta-analysis of social capital and health: a case for needed research. *Journal of health psychology, 18*(11), 1385-1399.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1982). Granovetter The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited PV Marsden, N. Lin (Eds.), *Social structure and network analysis*: Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Halpern, D. (2005). *Social capital*: Polity.
- Idler, E. L. (2014). *Religion as a social determinant of public health*: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Jenson, J. (2010). *Defining and measuring social cohesion*: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Kawachi, I., & Berkman, L. (2000). Social cohesion, social capital, and health. *Social epidemiology, 174*(7), 290-319.
- Keyes, C. L., & Michalec, B. (2010). Viewing mental health from the complete state paradigm. *A handbook for the study of mental health: Social contexts, theories, and systems*, 125-134.
- Maselko, J., Hughes, C., & Cheney, R. (2011). Religious social capital: Its measurement and utility in the study of the social determinants of health. *Social science & medicine, 73*(5), 759-767.
- Matsaganis, M. D., & Wilkin, H. A. (2015). Communicative social capital and collective efficacy as determinants of access to health-enhancing resources in residential communities. *Journal of Health Communication, 20*(4), 377-386.
- Robison, L. J., Myers, R. J., & Siles, M. E. (2002). Social capital and the terms of trade for farmland. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy, 24*(1), 44-58.
- Robison, L. J., Schmid, A. A., & Siles, M. E. (2002). Is social capital really capital? *Review of social economy, 60*(1), 1-21.
- Rosenquist, J. N., Murabito, J., Fowler, J. H., & Christakis, N. A. (2010). The spread of alcohol consumption behavior in a large social network. *Annals of internal medicine, 152*(7), 426-433.
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *science, 277*(5328), 918-924.
- Susanti, A. (2017). Relevansi Finalitas Kristus Di Tengah-Tengah Arus Pluralisme Dan Pluralitas Masyarakat Indonesia. *Evangelikal: Jurnal Teologi Injili dan Pembinaan Warga Jemaat, 1*(1), 85-102.
- Thoits, P. A. (2011). Mechanisms linking social ties and support to physical and mental health. *Journal of health and social behavior, 52*(2), 145-161.
- Uchino, B. N. (2006). Social support and health: a review of physiological processes potentially underlying links to disease outcomes. *Journal of behavioral medicine, 29*(4), 377-387.
- Umberson, D., & Karas Montez, J. (2010). Social relationships and health: A flashpoint for health policy. *Journal of health and social behavior, 51*(1_suppl), S54-S66.
- Uslaner, E. M., & Dekker, P. (2003). *The 'social' in social capital*: Routledge.