

In the memory of Dénes Benkhard

KATALIN FÜZÉR

**THE ROLE OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN SOCIAL EXCLUSION:
THE SEGREGATING DISTRICT OF PÉCS EAST
IN THE LIGHT OF EU-SILC 2006**

During the 1990s and over the turn of the millennium the concepts of social capital and social exclusion had parallel careers in the social sciences. Social capital is vested in the networks that weave people into a social fabric where norms of trust and reciprocity prevail in various forms. The empirical research of social capital extends to classical fields of sociological investigations such as integration and social norms (including deviance), but engages most intensively the study of social and political participation and the social networks that range from family and friends to civil associations, companies and nations. Social exclusion is the complex contemporary approach to the classical problem of social inequalities and poverty, its empirical research covering divergent fields such as income, education, housing, segregation, and increasingly, the disadvantages associated with exclusion from social bonds.

The aspiration of linking the two fields of research has been more pronounced on the part of students of social exclusion (Castel, Sen) but studying the overlaps between the two areas has been also present in the theory and empirical research of social capital (Lin 2001, Field 2003). However, the year 2006 was the first time that a complex, large scale international empirical research on social exclusion took place, one in which the perspective of social capital was included as well.

Since 2005, Eurostat, the statistical service of the European Union has examined social inequalities in general and social exclusion in particular in the societies of the EU27 in a survey called Statistics on Living and Income Conditions (EU-SILC).¹

¹ Regulation (EC) Nr. 1177/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council. The survey replaces former household panel surveys of the EU. Data for EU-SILC, as all other data processed by Eurostat, is provided by the national statistical services of the member states.

Every year there is a thematic section added to the EU-SILC standard questionnaire, which in 2006 concentrated on social networks and social participation. This was a great opportunity for the Department of Sociology of the University of Pécs (UP) and the Department of Social Statistics of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office to run a joint survey in the segregating district of Pécs East on an 8% random sample of households (N=533) with the personal and household questionnaires of EU-SILC 2006. This survey usefully supplemented research conducted in the district just the year before, in 2005 that concentrated specifically on measuring social capital among socially excluded groups residing in the district's crisis neighbourhoods. Back in 2005, we applied the majority of the tools developed by the social statisticians of the United Nation's Siena Group, a task force of the UN's Statistical Division.² Our questionnaire of 2005 was essentially an adaptation to local circumstances of the Siena questionnaire and, for the sake of comparability, its major sections were also included into our 2006 survey to supplement the EU-SILC tools for measuring social networks and social participation, i.e. social capital.

The field work for the research in 2005 and 2006 was carried out in the framework of the Interreg IIIC project, Cities against Social Exclusion (CASE) and the collected data was analysed in the interest of providing the social science background to the social rehabilitation of the district. The current analysis has a slightly different objective: instead of offering findings that can be directly translated into the terms of urban policy, we seize the exceptional possibility to study empirically a more academic problem, namely the role of social capital in social exclusion.

First, however, a short introduction to the empirical terrain of Pécs East is in order. This will be followed by an explanation of the various sources of empirical data for our analysis. The analysis itself will be divided into three main parts: first, findings in several dimensions of social exclusion will be presented, followed by findings for two types of social capital. Finally, the role of bonding and bridging social capital will be examined in the lives of excluded groups residing in the segregated neighbourhoods of Pécs East.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH FIELD

The aim of this brief historical account is to explain how Pécs East's prosperous miners' colonies and housing estates turned into a segregating district spotted with ghettos of the poor. For the past 150 years, mining has been the formative force that

² <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/citygroup/sienna.htm>. One of the most important areas of focus for the Siena Group's activities in recent years has been the development of empirical research tools for measuring social capital and the harmonization of the research practice of countries and communities of researchers. As a result of many years of cooperation, the tool that can be considered to be internationally standardized is the survey worked out experimentally by the social statisticians of the Office for National Statistics of the United Kingdom. Cf. <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/socialcapital>.

has shaped the district's face. The First Danube Steamship Company, with its headquarters in Vienna, „colonized” the area starting in the middle of the 19th century:³ it acquired the nearby mines and in their vicinity built apartment houses (colonies) which were later organized into new neighbourhoods equipped with public buildings. Administrative, educational, health, commercial, sports, cultural, religious facilities were maintained by the mining company which also stood behind the area's major infrastructural developments: public utilities, roads, and a railway line connecting the area to the Danube and its waterway were constructed. The thrust of contemporary housing in the district was built in the wake of the extensive development of heavy industry, mining in particular, during the early period of communist rule and the state ownership of the mining company. Modern housing estates were built and public facilities continued to be maintained by the mines until the early 1990s.

The local society of the district was characterized by strong social cohesion among miners for 150 years in spite of high inward mobility of various ethnic groups from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, interwar small Hungary and its detached territories, as well as from abroad during socialism (e.g. Polish miners). Mining always involves a quasi-military milieu due to the dangers associated with conquering natural elements but strict social control on the one hand and care on the other had also characterized life in the miners' colonies and housing estates of Pécs East. A complex set of institutions guarded the lives of employees from cradle to grave. Strong social integration of the whole district was tilted first when groups of travelling Roma were settled in worn-out residential and other kinds of buildings in some of the more peripheric colonies. Upon the closing of the mines around the early 1990s, segregation accelerated as a result of a two-way spatial mobility: higher status families moved out, lower status families (many of them Roma) moved (or were moved) into the district. As the mining company left and the municipality was to take charge of the district, people living here had to face the deterioration of infrastructure, lack of renovations, and the spatial concentration of low status households, all of which created a segregating district from a high prestige, dynamically developing urban area. The only exception to processes of deterioration is provided by the location of the district: since the area lies in a beautiful green natural environment at the foot of the Mecsek Hills, it has recently attracted middle class families who created small enclaves of (inner) suburbs extending over a few streets of newly built homes. The district on the whole, however, is still to be „digested” by the city, and its integration into the urban fabric continues to be a challenge.

³ Based on the studies of Zoltán Huszár, whose chief field of research is the history of the mining companies in the coal basin around Pécs. Cf. especially Huszár 2001.

SOURCES OF EMPIRICAL DATA FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION AND SOCIAL CAPITAL IN PÉCS EAST

The contemporary local society of Pécs East preserved traits of its historical past, interwoven with elements of the recent past: the result is a compound society with social groups of divergent backgrounds such as former miners (and their widows), resettled Roma families, residents of inner suburbs, manual workers or entrepreneurs in the car trade/repair business. Neighbourhoods with the most deteriorated housing stock, typically those built by the mining company until the early 1920s, clearly stand apart from the rest of the district, as do the recently built suburban houses of middle class families. The district, in short, is complex which calls for a differentiated handling of its widely different neighbourhoods. The University of Pécs research team of CASE selected four of the neighbourhoods with deteriorated housing stock and public spaces, deficient public utilities, poor services and a population composed predominantly of poor households. These four crisis neighbourhoods -- Pécsbánya, Hősök tere, Györgytelep and István-akna – require their own data bases that can be compared to those of the district, the city, and where available to the country's and the EU's.

For our investigations, empirical data is available today on the level of the whole country of Hungary, the city of Pécs, the district of Pécs East and its crisis neighbourhoods. Data is partly available from published sources (such as the 2001 census with its city and some district level data and some of the EU-SILC 2005 survey results), partly had to be bought from the Central Statistical Office in the framework of CASE for the district and its neighbourhoods (again, from the 2001 census), while a good part of it had to be collected in the framework of CASE by surveying the district and its neighbours with EU-SILC 2006 and Siena questionnaires. Table 1 summarizes availability of data sources and levels of aggregation.

| | 2001 census | EU-SILC 2006 | Siena |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Crisis neighbourhoods | Yes (unpublished) | No | Yes (UP survey) |
| Pécs East | Yes (unpublished) | Yes (UP survey) | Yes (UP survey) |
| Pécs | Yes (published) | No | No |
| Hungary | Yes (published) | Yes (published) | No |

Table 1 Availability of data sources and levels of aggregation

For the purposes of the various aspects of our analysis, the source of empirical data is as follows.

For the analysis of the dimensions and indicators of social exclusion we draw on data from:

- the 2001 census's individual and household questionnaires:
 - demography (age structure, household composition)
 - exclusion from acquiring knowledge
 - labour market
 - housing
- EU-SILC 2006 individual and household questionnaires:
 - unemployment
 - income
 - deprivation
 - welfare deficit
 - ethnicity
- Siena questionnaire:
 - ethnicity

For the analysis of the two types of social capital and their indicators we draw on data from:

- EU-SILC 2006 and Siena questionnaires for bonding social capital:
 - social networks of relatives, friends, neighbours
 - household transfers
 - neighbourhood integration
- EU-SILC 2006 and Siena questionnaires for bridging social capital:
 - generalized trust
 - social participation

DIMENSIONS AND INDICATORS OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION

Demography

Census data from 2001 show that the local societies of the crisis areas display demographic process that are contrary to the main demographic trends of Hungary. While one of the most critical social pressures on Hungarian society is ageing, the segregated areas are characterized by the predominance of child and youth generations. Crisis neighbourhood residents below 40 years of age are not only in majority in comparison to older generations, there are also great differences between these areas, Pécs East and the city of Pécs with respect to the distribution of people in every age group. Especially significant is the proportion of children below 14 years of age: while their proportion is considerably higher in Pécsbánya (20%) and in Hősök tere

(25%) than in the district or the city, the values of István-akna (33%) and Györgytelep (49%) exceed by far anything encountered elsewhere. Similarly great differences show with respect to the proportion of the age group above 65. Where the thrust of local societies are composed of the youngest generations, the presence of those above 65 is very low.

This results in extreme values on the composition of households: in all crisis neighbourhoods, especially in Györgytelep and István-akna, households are much more populous than in the city of Pécs.

| Residential areas | | Total | Age groups | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|--------|------------|-------|-------|------|
| | | | 0-14 | 15-39 | 40-64 | 65-x |
| Crisis neighbourhoods | Pécsbánya | 896 | 20,4 | 35,4 | 31,7 | 12,5 |
| | Hősök tere | 1149 | 25,3 | 34,3 | 29,4 | 11 |
| | Györgytelep | 71 | 49,3 | 28,2 | 21,1 | 1,4 |
| | István-akna | 318 | 33,3 | 42,5 | 20,4 | 3,8 |
| Pécs East | | 10310 | 16,5 | 32,5 | 33,3 | 17,7 |
| Pécs total | | 162498 | 14,5 | 37,7 | 32,6 | 15,2 |

Table 2 Distribution of population by age groups in Pécs East, %

Source: 2001 Census. Calculations by author.

| Residential areas | | Total number of households | Out of which | | Members in 100 households |
|-----------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| | | | single member | multi-family | |
| | | | households % | | |
| Crisis neighbourhoods | Pécsbánya | 335 | 25,7% | 2,7% | 267,5 |
| | Hősök tere | 391 | 18,2% | 5,1% | 294 |
| | Györgytelep | 22 | 36,4% | - | 323 |
| | István-akna | 91 | 13,2% | 3,3% | 349 |
| Pécs East | | 4136 | 27,9% | 3,2% | n.a. |
| Pécs total | | 64221 | 29,6% | 2,4% | 240 |

Table 3 Household characteristics in Pécs East, %

Source: 2001 Census. Calculations by author.

Although crisis neighbourhood residents in the child-bearing age group of 15-39 were overrepresented only by a few percents in 2001 in comparison to the rest of the city, still it is to be assumed that they provide a sufficient background to reproducing the youngest generations or can even increase their proportion. This is further reinforced by the survey finding that among those, who moved into these areas in the last four years, this age group shows one of the highest percents.

| Age groups | István-akna | Pécsbánya | Györgytelep | Hősök tere |
|------------|------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| | number of people | | | |
| 0-4 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 16 |
| 5-14 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 |
| 15-39 | 10 | 8 | 12 | 9 |
| 40-64 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 13 |
| 65- | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Total | 15 | 29 | 16 | 48 |
| | In % | | | |
| 0-4 | 0,0% | 24,1% | 0,0% | 33,3% |
| 5-14 | 0,0% | 10,3% | 0,0% | 14,6% |
| 15-39 | 66,7% | 27,6% | 75,0% | 18,8% |
| 40-64 | 26,7% | 27,6% | 18,8% | 27,1% |
| 65- | 6,7% | 10,3% | 6,3% | 6,3% |

Table 4 Distribution by age groups of those who moved to the crisis areas of Pécs East in the last four years

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

In sum, in contrast to demographic trends of the city, the country and the EU, the local societies of Hősök tere and Pécsbánya but especially those of István-akna and Györgytelep continue to become younger in their composition, raising serious concerns about the welfare of their members as one of the constant findings of poverty research in Hungary (FN) has been the disproportionate poverty of children.

Exclusion from acquiring knowledge

The local society of the district of Pécs East is characterized by a low level of education. Locals with secondary school qualifications without a degree or a lower level of education are overrepresented in comparison with the rest of Pécs, while at the same time the ratio of those with higher degrees is much lower than in Pécs.

The situation with respect to this dimension of social exclusion is even more severe in the crisis neighbourhoods where the thrust of local societies do not have secondary school degrees and what is worse, about a third of each have not finished 8 grades of elementary school either. There are a few locals with higher degrees living in Hősök tere and Pécsbánya (not more than 30 in each neighbourhood), whereas this qualification is practically missing in Györgytelep and István-akna. Residents of Györgytelep are in the worst situation as the most educated 18% attended secondary school but did not earn a degree and almost every other local aged 7 or older has not even finished elementary school.

| Residential areas | | Total | Less than 8 grades | 8 grades | Secondary school without degree | Secondary school degree | University /college without degree | University /college degree |
|-----------------------|-------------|--------|--------------------|----------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Crisis neighbourhoods | Pécsbánya | 807 | 24,9 | 41,5 | 19,1 | 11,5 | 0,4 | 2,6 |
| | Hősök tere | 999 | 29,4 | 40,2 | 20,4 | 7,2 | 0,1 | 2,6 |
| | Györgytelep | 56 | 46,4 | 35,7 | 17,9 | - | - | - |
| | István-akna | 265 | 32,1 | 37,4 | 26,8 | 3 | - | 0,8 |
| Pécs East | | 9577 | 21 | 34 | 22,7 | 16,3 | 1,2 | 4,7 |
| Pécs total | | 152730 | 14,8 | 22,2 | 19,5 | 24 | 5,3 | 14,3 |

Table 5 Distribution of population aged 7 and older by highest level of education and training in Pécs East

Source: 2001 Census. Calculations by author.

Very low levels of education in the crisis neighbourhoods tie into disadvantages in labour market positions, the next dimension of social exclusion to be analysed.

Labour market, unemployment

In comparison with the district of Pécs East or the city of Pécs, the crisis neighbourhoods show high proportions of unemployed, inactive and dependant groups. The less educated a neighbourhood is, the worse its residents labour market positions are: this is most notably to be seen in the case of Györgytelep, where the impact of the age structure only partly explains why there are so few people employed. It is obvious that children, who make up about half of the local population, count as dependants. At the same time, however, while those above 65 constitute only 1.4% of the population, the proportion of economically inactive is 22.5% and there is 8.5% unem-

ployed as well. The result of this extremely disadvantageous labour market position on a neighbourhood level shows itself in the value of an indicator that probably best describes the extent of exclusion from the labour market among the poor: the distribution of the employed among households. This is a compact indicator that shows both the frequency of participation in the labour market as well as its distribution according to households, the key units of income, consumption and social integration. The value of this indicator is by far the lowest in Györgytelep (59) and suggests that only in every other household do we find a person with a job. This indicator is low for the other crisis neighbourhoods as well but shows nicely that in spite of notable disadvantages in the dimension of education, the whole district of Pécs East cannot be described as suffering from exclusion from the labour market vis-à-vis the urban society of Pécs. In fact, in terms of the distribution of the employed by households, its position is almost identical to what is typical of Pécs households – which, one has to note, themselves do not have very good labour market positions either as there are only 93 employed in every 100 households. The latter is a function of the South Transdanubian Region's poor economic performance and the associated low rate of employment.⁴

| Residential areas | | Total | Out of which | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|--------|--------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| | | | employed | unemployed | inactive | dependant |
| Crisis neighbourhoods | Pécsbánya | 896 | 29,7 | 7,5 | 34,4 | 28,5 |
| | Hősök tere | 1149 | 22,9 | 6,3 | 36,4 | 34,5 |
| | Györgytelep | 71 | 18,3 | 8,5 | 22,5 | 50,7 |
| | István-akna | 318 | 24,5 | 6,3 | 23,3 | 45,9 |
| Pécs East | | 10310 | 31,9 | 3,6 | 38,9 | 25,6 |
| Pécs total | | 162498 | 37,5 | 3,2 | 31,3 | 28,0 |

Table 6 Population by economic activity in Pécs East, %

Source: 2001 Census. Calculations by author.

The high rate of dependants in the crisis neighbourhoods raises the challenge of their future integration into the labour market. It is probably one of the greatest potentials as well as dangers of these areas, how the children of today will fare when coming of active age. Will they be able to enter the labour market at all and if yes, where would they find employment: on its periphery or in one of the jobs that promise secure, long term employment?

⁴ Barany megye statisztikai évkönyve 2006. CD-ROM supplement on the South Transdanubian Region. Pécs: KSH Pécsi Igazgatóság, 2007.

| Residential areas | | Total | Employed in 100 households |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------|----------------------------|
| Crisis neighbourhoods | Pécsbánya | 335 | 79 |
| | Hősök tere | 391 | 67 |
| | Györgytelep | 22 | 59 |
| | István-akna | 91 | 86 |
| Pécs East | | 839 | 94 |
| Pécs total | | 64221 | 93 |

Table 7 Distribution of employed by households in Pécs East

Source: 2001 Census. Calculations by author.

The present positions of the young in the labour market are clearly unfavourable: relevant national and district data show that in spite of the shortness of time they have spent in the labour market, about every second young person under 40 has already experienced unemployment. Even though older generations have a much longer employment career, unemployment had been virtually unknown in Hungary until one and a half decades ago, as it appeared with the dismantling of Socialist structures. Thus it is alarming, that a high rate of those above 40 had already been unemployed (40%).

| Age groups | Has never been unemployed | Has been unemployed |
|----------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| 29 and younger | 61,4 | 38,6 |
| Aged 30-39 | 34,9 | 65,2 |
| Aged 40-49 | 54,3 | 45,7 |
| Aged 50-59 | 59,8 | 40,2 |

Table 8 Age groups between 17 and 59 years old by unemployment experience until May 2006 in Pécs East, %

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

| Age groups | Experienced unemployment | | | | | Total |
|----------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|--|-------|
| | never | once | | several times | has been unemployed for unknown period | |
| | | for maximum 3 months | at least for 4 months | | | |
| 29 and younger | 55,1 | 8,3 | 20,9 | 12,6 | 3,2 | 100,0 |
| Aged 30-39 | 49,1 | 7,1 | 23,9 | 19,3 | 0,6 | 100,0 |
| Aged 40-49 | 54,0 | 4,2 | 23,5 | 18,0 | 0,4 | 100,0 |
| Aged 50-59 | 62,6 | 3,7 | 20,1 | 13,2 | 0,4 | 100,0 |

Table 9 Age groups between 17 and 59 years old by unemployment experience until April 2005 in Hungary, %

Source: VÉKA 2005. Jelentés a Változó Életkörülmények Adatfelvétel 2005-ös hullámáról. [Report on the 2005 Survey of EU-SILC 2005] Budapest: KSH, 2006: 59.

The labour market position of a household determines to a great extent not only the income but also the social integration of household members. In this sense, jobs are just as crucial as schools in facilitating the embeddedness of families into the social fabric by establishing and maintaining bridge like connections to people from various social backgrounds. Local societies that have a high concentration of households which have no or only temporary connection to the labour market have to reckon with various further disadvantages, among which income is only the most obvious one.

Income

The income situation can first be depicted by classifying households into income classes constructed according to various percentages of the households' median net income. Income classes provide an indicator that defines the poor (or the rich) not along objective or external criteria, but according to the majority of a society and explains the situation of those in the most disadvantageous (or advantageous) income positions vis-à-vis this majority.

This indicator ranks those households into the worst off income class – i.e. among the poor – whose income is less than 50% of the sample's net monthly median household income. In the district of Pécs East, 17% of the households belonged to this income class in 2006, their monthly net income did not exceed appr. 250 EUR. The income of the next class was between 50 and 80% of the sample's median income and 20% of households belonged to it. Those who earned between 80 and 120% of the net

income's median made up another 20% of all households, while the two classes in the most advantageous positions, earning between 120 and 200%, and above, made up 28% and 14% of all households, respectively.

| Income groups | | Households |
|--|----------------------|------------|
| In % of median of household's net monthly income | In currency amounts | |
| Less than 50% | Less than 62.500 Ft | 17,1 |
| 50-80% | 62.501-99.999 Ft | 20,1 |
| 80-120% | 100.000-149.999 Ft | 20,6 |
| 120-200% | 150.000-249.999 Ft | 28 |
| More than 200% | More than 250.000 Ft | 14,3 |

Table 10 Distribution of households according to income groups in Pécs East, %
Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

In the judgement of respondents, the minimal household income to make ends meet, largely equals the actual income of the respondent's household, which bears witness to an effect well-known from the literature on subjective poverty: the subjective judgement on one's own income situation depends not so much on whether it is above or below an objective limit, but on one's own previous situation and judgement of the most immediate social milieu. The coincidence of the minimal and the actual is interesting from the point of view that our survey findings show that a third of the households pursue subsistence consumption, which is a much higher rate than that surveyed in the 2005 national survey which was 17% (VÉKA 2005: 36). Subsistence consumption means that a household uses at least 80% of its income toward housing and food expenses and therefore cannot really spend on anything else or save. Poverty in this sense conveys the notion of exclusion from pursuing objectives due to a lack of resources.

| Ratio of housing and food expenses in % of household's net monthly income | Households |
|---|------------|
| Less than 80%: above subsistence consumption | 66 |
| More than 80%: subsistence consumption | 34 |

Table 11 The ratio of households with subsistence consumption in Pécs East, %
Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

Deprivation, welfare deficit

While traditional poverty research agendas consider income as the main indicator of poverty, analysis of social exclusion apply a more complex approach to grasp the material situation. They acknowledge that the current income position of a household determines the thrust of its material position and sharply defines the group of the poor. However, by the analysis of individual and household way of life, disadvantages accumulating in a longer period of time can also be grasped. The deprivation indicator brings together these various aspects of way of life such as housing, durable goods, etc. The welfare indicator uses deficiencies in socially accepted, customary or expected way of life and examines whether households can afford certain consumption or life style customs.

Deprivation indicators of the local society of Pécs East in 2006 in comparison with the 2005 national data of EU-SILC bear witness to the fact that on the district plane great internal differences are levelled off due to the mixed social composition of the local society. Only two indicators show a comparatively unfavourable position for Pécs East households while the rest of the indicators are similar or even better than those for Hungarian society.

| | Hungarian population* | Pécs East** |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Lack of bathroom | 8,4 | 4,1 |
| No toilet inside the apartment | 9,5 | 5,8 |
| Lack of washing-machine | 3,7 | 24,6 |
| Lack of refrigerator | 1,8 | 2,1 |
| Lack of telephone | 7,7 | 32,4 |

Table 12 Deprivation indicators: deficiencies of housing and durable goods, %

* Source: VÉKA 2005. Jelentés a Változó Életkörülmények Adatfelvétel 2005-ös hullámáról.

[Report on the 2005 Survey of EU-SILC 2005] Budapest: KSH, 2006: 39.

** Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

When we move from the district level to those of the neighbourhoods, deprivation indicators for housing suddenly come to convey a very different image. Apartments in the crisis areas are small and extremely crowded: in István-akna twice as many people live in a single room of an apartment (1,8) than in Pécs (0,9), whereas this figure in Györgytelep is almost three times more (2,6) in comparison with Pécs's value.

| Residential areas | | Total | Rooms by apartments | Residents by rooms | m ² per resident |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| Crisis neighbourhoods | Pécsbánya | 333 | 2 | 1,4 | 21 |
| | Hősök tere | 402 | 1,8 | 1,6 | 16,8 |
| | Györgytelep | 21 | 1,3 | 2,6 | 12,6 |
| | István-akna | 92 | 2 | 1,8 | 16,5 |
| Pécs East | | 4220 | 2,31 | 1,1 | n.d. |
| Pécs total | | 65562 | 2,6 | 0,9 | 28,2 |

Table 13 Deprivation indicators: apartments by size and by residents in Pécs East

Source: 2001 Census. Calculations by author.

| Residential areas | | Total | Piped water | Sewerage system | Private drain | Piped gas |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------|
| Crisis neighbourhoods | Pécsbánya | 333 | 98,5 | 12,9 | 85,9 | 36,9 |
| | Hősök tere | 402 | 77,6 | 13,9 | 73,9 | 25,9 |
| | Györgytelep | 21 | 9,5 | 0 | 9,5 | 0 |
| | István-akna | 92 | 100 | 98,9 | 1,1 | 0 |
| Pécs East | | 4220 | 96,8 | 61,5 | 35,7 | 68,4 |
| Pécs total | | 65562 | 96,7 | 87,8 | 10,2 | 69,6 |

Table 14 Deprivation indicators: public utilities in Pécs East, %

Source: 2001 Census. Calculations by author.

In terms of welfare deficits, our data sets make it possible to compare the local society of Pécs East to Hungarian society, and on two accounts, to societies of EU member states. Two central indicators grasp the terrains of consumption and life style, respectively: the first indicator assesses whether households can afford to eat meat (or an equivalent quality food) every other day, while the second concerns a component of households' way of life, namely whether day can afford to travel away for a week of holiday (that they have to pay for). Pécs East and Hungarian result are very similar for households that cannot afford these customary welfare items (with values of Pécs East being even slightly better than the Hungarian ones). In contrast, European values are much better for both indicators and only in Portugal and Greece do a comparable proportion of households face the welfare deficit that they cannot afford a holiday. In sum, Pécs East as a whole does not lag behind in a Hungarian context, but Hungarian society in a European context reveals considerable deficiencies in the life style dimension of social exclusion.

| The household can afford to... | Yes | | No |
|--|----------------|-----------------------|------|
| | and they do so | but they do not do so | |
| eat meat every other day (in case of vegetarians, the equivalent of meat). | 36,8 | 33,0 | 30,2 |
| buy new clothes regularly. | 20,1 | 18,0 | 61,9 |
| change decrepit furniture. | 13,9 | 17,3 | 68,9 |
| travel for holiday at least for a week. | 25,3 | 13,9 | 60,8 |
| save money regularly. | 37,3 | 4,1 | 58,5 |
| invite friends over for dinner once a month. | 28,7 | 18,2 | 53,1 |
| dine out in a restaurant with the family once a month. | 11,4 | 20,5 | 68,1 |
| go out to the movies, theatre, concert or museum once or twice in a month. | 15,4 | 20,8 | 63,8 |
| give presents to beloved ones on the occasion of holidays. | 90,6 | 1,5 | 7,9 |

Table 15 Elements of welfare deficit index in Pécs East, %

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

| The household can afford to... | Yes | | No |
|--|----------------|-----------------------|------|
| | and they do so | but they do not do so | |
| eat meat every other day (in case of vegetarians, the equivalent of meat). | 42,1 | 25,8 | 31,9 |
| buy new clothes regularly. | 16,9 | 16,5 | 66,4 |
| change decrepit furniture. | 6,4 | 12,5 | 80,9 |
| travel for holiday at least for a week. | 23,6 | 10,2 | 66,0 |
| save money regularly. | 35,9 | 2,7 | 61,2 |
| invite friends over for dinner once a month. | 24,6 | 13,5 | 61,6 |
| dine out in a restaurant with the family once a month. | 12,0 | 14,1 | 73,7 |
| go out for to the movies, theatre, concert or museum once or twice in a month. | 22,0 | 15,9 | 61,9 |
| give presents to beloved ones on the occasion of holidays. | 90,3 | 1,2 | 8,4 |

Table 16 Elements of welfare deficit index in Hungarian society, %

Forrás: VÉKA 2005. Jelentés a Változó Életkörülmények Adatfelvétel 2005-ös hullámáról.

[Report on the 2005 Survey of EU-SILC 2005] Budapest: KSH, 2006: 42.

| Country | The household cannot afford to... | |
|----------------|---|--|
| | eat meat every other day (in case of vegetarians, the equivalent of meat) | travel for holiday at least for a week |
| Belgium | 5 | 27 |
| Denmark | 2 | 13 |
| Germany | 2 | 20 |
| Greece | 13 | 52 |
| Spain | 2 | 38 |
| France | 2 | 22 |
| Ireland | 3 | 26 |
| Italy | 5 | 36 |
| Luxemburg | 3 | 13 |
| Netherlands | 2 | 12 |
| Austria | 9 | 24 |
| Portugal | 3 | 61 |
| Finland | 3 | 25 |
| United Kingdom | 8 | 22 |

Table 17 Two elements of welfare index in members states of the European Union, %

Source: EUROSTAT, 2001, 2003. Quoted in Jelentés a Változó Életkörülmények Adatfelvétel 2005-ös hullámáról [Report on the 2005 Survey of EU-SILC 2005]. Budapest: KSH, 2006: 41.

Data on indicators of deprivation and welfare deficits show that beside households that pursue subsistence consumption and experience a serious tension between their income and expenses, a good part of households in the district of Pécs East enjoy an advantageous position in terms of way of life, one that reaches and at times surpasses that of Hungarian society. These results unambiguously indicate a favourable situation, namely that the local society of the district is mixed: alongside very low status families whose residential areas lock them into small, high concentration neighbourhoods (poor ghettos), the presence of middle class families in other neighbourhoods is significant.

Ethnicity

In order to determine the ethnic composition of the district of Pécs East and the crisis neighbourhoods, three different approaches had to be considered against the background of practice in the field of studying the Roma. There is a well-known

distortion in applying 1. the method of self-declaration, which otherwise is the least disputed approach to determining „who is Roma.” This was the method used in the 2001 census,⁵ and a mere 190,000 people declared themselves to be of Roma origin. In contrast, a series of research carried out on the basis of samples, estimated the Hungarian Roma society to number a minimum of 500,000 (cf. Kemény et al. 2004). In the course of this investigation researchers used 2. the method of the milieu’s judgement, i.e. people in the respondents’ immediate surroundings (such as neighbours or social workers) determined „who was Roma.” There have been three waves of surveying (in 1971, 1993 and in 2003) but applying this method produces a process that is rather complicated, expensive and lengthy. Thus in designing our survey of Pécs East, we relied on the methodology of the recent large scale comparative research of Central and Eastern European Roma societies (cf. Ladányi, Szelényi 2004). This comparative analysis had among its objectives the very testing of methodological alternatives and ended up endorsing 3. the method of classification by interviewers immediately after completing the survey with a respondent.

According to our survey results, there are two types of crisis neighbourhoods: while in the local societies of István-akna and Györgyetelep residents of Roma origin are in a majority, their proportion being around 60%, in Hősök tere and Pécsbánya they make up about one third of the local society. In the whole district of Pécs East, people of Roma background make up 16% of the local society. Accordingly, the crisis neighbourhoods are not characterized by full ethnic segregation, even though the rate of the Roma is much higher in these areas than in the country, the city or in the district.

| | Pécsbánya | Hősök tere | György- telep | István-akna | Pécs East |
|----------|-----------|------------|------------------|-------------|-----------|
| Roma | 34,3 | 33,4 | 65,0 | 56,3 | 15,7 |
| Not Roma | 65,7 | 66,6 | 35,0 | 43,7 | 84,3 |

Table 18 Distribution of population by ethnic background, %

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005
and Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

⁵ Although respondents were not obliged to answer questions related to their ethnic background, as such information was judged to be sensitive personal data, still more than 90% of them gave answers. Because of this, data on ethnic background can be analysed as all other census data, cf. http://www.nepszamlalas.hu/hun/kotetek/04/04_modsz.pdf.

TWO TYPES AND INDICATORS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL

By looking previously at income and life style, we examined social inequalities in a material perspective, and identified the group of the poor with respect to disadvantages in material goods at their disposal. From the point of view of social capital, however, positions within the physical and social space are just as important.

The social phenomenon of segregation refers to separation in the physical space of the city and the spatial concentration of the lowest status households – these are the problems studied by urbanists. The social capital approach examines the qualities of social space made up of social networks. For the empirical analysis of networks, a number of methods have been developed in the social sciences out of which the empirical research and theory of social capital has become dominant since the 1990s.

In comparison with other kinds of capital, the chief characteristic of social capital is that it cannot be possessed individually as money or human capital can be: it is a resource of essentially social nature, making possible cooperation among people within and among various groups. According to researchers (Fukuyama 1995, Putnam 2000) increase in the stock of social capital goes together with a number of favourable changes: better health conditions, improving crime statistics, better school performance, increasing social integration, improved government performance can be observed in societies supplied with ample of social capital. But just how can the presence of social capital be grasped? In the social networks that place people into the web of micro-social solidarity and onto the institutionalized macro-social terrain (Utasi 2002). In short, social capital is about the density of the social fabric, constructed from networks and the connections among networks. Beside networks, the social phenomenon belonging to the prespective of social capital, are trust (interpersonal and institutional) and the field of norms (along with the questions of deviance and sanctions). These elements appear in various ways in the three types of social capital (Halpern 2005).

Bonding social capital is inherent to social networks that build on a high degree of personal trust as well as honesty, reciprocity and trustworthiness in such relations as among family, relatives and close friends. Those who do not belong to these networks are closed off from them. Bonding social capital plays a vital role in the lives of all social groups since it is a guarantee of wellbeing, interpreted as realizing various levels of satisfaction with life, as opposes to the material dimension of welfare. In the everyday lives of socially excluded groups, however, bonding social capital plays an indispensable role and therefore has an outstanding significance.

The relations belonging to bridging social capital are predicated upon a generalized trust among people, and require a considerable degree of honesty and reciprocity. These relations connect us to people belonging to social groups other than our own, such as our class mates or acquaintances. Bonding social capital is vital to social in-

tegration on the one hand and constitutes a resource on the other hand which is supportive of getting ahead in the individual career.

The concept of linking social capital is applied to the relations within the hierarchical structures of society which connect us to people in positions of influence („good connections”). In the case of these relations, expectations of honesty and reciprocity do prevail but in very different configurations compared to the two previous types. It is evident that linking social capital plays a central role in attaining and retaining advantageous social positions.

Various tools have been developed in the contemporary social sciences to measure the concentration of social capital. In the course of our recent field researches, we adapted those elements that became internationally standardized. Our surveys provide the opportunity to study bonding and bridging social capital. We cannot undertake the assessment of linking social capital partly because its research is still a disputed in the research practice and in the literature, but partly also because we can take it as a starting point that in the lives of socially excluded groups, the concentration of this kind of social capital can be assumed to be meagre.

The research tools that we had applied contain a number of indicators for both bonding and bridging social capital but these in an of themselves do not immediately convey the strength (or the weakness) of social capital. Indexes compiled from these indicators, however, concentrate information and can even show the relationship between the two types of social capital.

Before turning to the indexes, let us review the indicators in the local societies of the crisis neighbourhoods and in the district of Pécs East.

Bonding social capital

The presence of bonding social capital is to be detected foremost in the various networks of micr-social solidarity, such as relatives, friends, neighbors.

| | Pécs-bánya | Hősök tere | György-telep | István-akna | Pécs East |
|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|
| None | 2,6 | 4,7 | 7,8 | 3,6 | 4,9 |
| 1-3 | 15,4 | 19,8 | 23,5 | 18,2 | 25,7 |
| 4-9 | 42,3 | 34,0 | 45,1 | 29,1 | 33,8 |
| More than 10 | 39,7 | 41,5 | 23,5 | 49,1 | 35,7 |

Table 19 The number of close relationships to relatives (household totals) in Pécs East, %

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005
and Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

| | Pécs-bánya | Hősök tere | György-telep | István-akna | Pécs East |
|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|
| None | 23,3 | 13,2 | 20,5 | 21,8 | 16,7 |
| 1-2 | 16,4 | 15,1 | 15,9 | 16,4 | 11,3 |
| 3-10 | 37,0 | 49,1 | 47,7 | 20,0 | 43,6 |
| More than 10 | 23,3 | 22,6 | 15,9 | 41,8 | 18,5 |

Table 20 The number of friends (household averages) in Pécs East, %
Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005
and Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

| | Pécs-bánya | Hősök tere | György-telep | István-akna | Pécs East |
|-------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|
| None | 2,5 | 5,7 | 17,0 | 7,4 | 18,0 |
| 1-2 | 13,9 | 27,4 | 34,0 | 24,1 | 30,0 |
| More than 3 | 83,5 | 67,0 | 49,1 | 68,5 | 51,9 |

Table 21 The number of close neighbour relationships (household totals) in Pécs East, %
Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005
and Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

Among socially excluded groups, relationships that make up the network of micro-social solidarity are significantly stronger than in the mixed local society of Pécs East. In the crisis areas, with the exception of Györgytelep, the rate of households without close relationships to relatives is somewhat lower than in Pécs East, and at the same time the rate of those with extended close connections to relatives is significantly higher. Results are similar with respect to neighbors: with the exception of Györgytelep, the rate of crisis area households that do not have close relationships to neighbors is lower, while the rate of those who keep close contact to more than three neighbors is higher than in Pécs East. In contrast, with respect to friendships, we found that in crisis neighbourhoods, slightly more households have no friends than in Pécs East. At the same time, the rate of households with extensive circle of friends is higher in the crisis areas than in Pécs East, again with the exception of Györgytelep.

Györgytelep stands apart from the rest of the crisis neighbourhoods from the perspective of the breath of micro-social solidarity networks that make up bonding social capital. Residents here have a narrower network both in terms of relatives, friends, but especially as regards neighbors. In fact, the households of Györgytelep are more like those of Pécs East with regard to networks of micro-social solidarity.

Also indicative of how much bonding social capital is accumulated by a household, are the ways in which and the extent to which a household can rely on other households to satisfy their everyday needs.

| Type of support | crisis neighborhoods | support received | | | support given | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------|--------------|-------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| | | regularly | occasionally | never | regularly | occasionally | never |
| Cash support | Hősök tere | 7,2 | 43,2 | 49,5 | 12,6 | 50,5 | 36,9 |
| | Györgytelep | 3,6 | 55,4 | 41,4 | 3,6 | 44,6 | 51,8 |
| | Pécsbánya | 6,2 | 39,5 | 54,3 | 12,3 | 53,1 | 34,6 |
| | István akna | 7,3 | 40,0 | 52,7 | 9,3 | 40,7 | 50,0 |
| Household work | Hősök tere | 6,3 | 23,4 | 70,3 | 4,5 | 39,6 | 55,9 |
| | Györgytelep | 7,1 | 19,6 | 73,2 | 8,9 | 23,2 | 67,9 |
| | Pécsbánya | 9,9 | 27,2 | 63,0 | 8,6 | 38,3 | 53,1 |
| | István akna | 7,4 | 22,2 | 70,4 | 9,6 | 21,2 | 69,2 |
| child care | Hősök tere | 7,6 | 19,0 | 73,3 | 14,4 | 23,4 | 62,2 |
| | Györgytelep | 17,9 | 17,9 | 64,3 | 5,5 | 16,4 | 78,2 |
| | Pécsbánya | 9,9 | 8,6 | 81,5 | 12,3 | 25,9 | 61,7 |
| | István akna | 12,7 | 25,5 | 61,8 | 9,4 | 5,7 | 84,9 |
| lookinf after the ill | Hősök tere | 4,5 | 20,0 | 75,5 | 9,0 | 25,2 | 65,8 |
| | Györgytelep | 7,1 | 21,4 | 71,4 | 1,8 | 21,8 | 76,4 |
| | Pécsbánya | 6,2 | 25,9 | 67,9 | 4,9 | 33,3 | 61,7 |
| | István akna | 7,5 | 7,5 | 84,9 | 5,5 | 3,6 | 90,9 |
| shopping | Hősök tere | 13,6 | 14,5 | 71,8 | 6,3 | 36,9 | 56,8 |
| | Györgytelep | 10,7 | 33,9 | 55,4 | 16,4 | 21,8 | 61,8 |
| | Pécsbánya | 7,4 | 25,9 | 66,7 | 8,6 | 40,7 | 50,6 |
| | István akna | 10,9 | 23,6 | 65,5 | 11,1 | 13,0 | 75,9 |
| construction and reparation works | Hősök tere | 6,3 | 42,3 | 51,4 | 3,6 | 37,3 | 59,1 |
| | Györgytelep | 7,1 | 19,6 | 73,2 | 8,9 | 23,2 | 67,9 |
| | Pécsbánya | 4,9 | 43,2 | 51,9 | 4,9 | 33,3 | 61,7 |
| | István akna | 9,1 | 14,5 | 76,4 | 5,6 | 11,1 | 83,3 |
| helping with errands and giving a lift | Hősök tere | 4,5 | 29,7 | 65,8 | 5,5 | 35,8 | 58,7 |
| | Györgytelep | 3,6 | 25,0 | 71,4 | 5,4 | 23,2 | 71,4 |
| | Pécsbánya | 11,1 | 35,8 | 53,1 | 6,2 | 35,8 | 58,0 |
| | István akna | 10,9 | 18,2 | 70,9 | 5,5 | 16,4 | 78,2 |

Table 22

| Type of support | crisis neighborhoods | support received | | | support given | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------|-------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| | | regularly | occasionally | never | regularly | occasionally | never |
| food | Hősök tere | 8,3 | 18,3 | 73,4 | 8,3 | 31,2 | 60,6 |
| | Györgytelep | 5,4 | 37,5 | 57,1 | 3,6 | 8,9 | 87,5 |
| | Pécsbánya | 8,6 | 23,5 | 67,9 | 6,2 | 43,2 | 50,6 |
| | István akna | 12,7 | 21,8 | 65,5 | 9,3 | 11,1 | 79,6 |
| other consumer goods | Hősök tere | 3,7 | 23,1 | 73,1 | 5,5 | 29,4 | 65,1 |
| | Györgytelep | 5,4 | 32,1 | 62,5 | 3,6 | 10,9 | 85,5 |
| | Pécsbánya | 2,5 | 19,8 | 77,8 | 4,9 | 34,6 | 60,5 |
| | István akna | 16,4 | 27,3 | 56,4 | 9,3 | 3,7 | 87,0 |

Table 22 Household transfers: support received and given, %

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005.

| | Cash received regularly | Cash given regularly |
|-----|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Yes | 9,2 | 16,9 |
| No | 90,8 | 83,1 |

Table 23 Household transfers in cash in Pécs East (without crisis neighbourhoods), %

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

From among transfers between households, support with cash stands out which is surprising as one would assume cash to be the most scarce resource among socially excluded households. Our results, however, coincide with similar national research findings (Utasi 2002: 150). About half of the households in the crisis neighbourhoods receive regular or occasional financial support from other households, and interestingly, the same proportion also helps other households this way. These findings suggest that the poor groups of Pécs East enjoy a relatively high degree of integration into networks of micro-social solidarity. At the same time, regular cash support is given to a somewhat lower rate of households in the crisis areas than in Pécs East.

There are interesting findings in the case of Györgytelep, which we recall, was in the worst position in terms of the extent of its households micro-social solidarity networks: transfers favoured households here more than elsewhere, as households here received more help in cash, child care, in looking after the sick, shopping, and

food than in other crisis neighbourhoods. Thus households in Györgytelep do not have very extensive networks of relatives, friends and neighbours, but they are vital to getting by in everyday life.

The next dimension of bonding social capital is the integration of households into the neighbourhood. One of the most important elements of that, the number of close neighbour relationships was already discussed, so we turn now to other indicators that assess the extent to which a household finds a supportive, acceptable environment in its neighbourhood and can therefore identify itself with it.

| Statements | Pécs-bánya | Hősök tere | György-telep | Istvánakna | Pécs East |
|---|------------|------------|--------------|------------|-----------|
| „Neighbours here help each other” | 35 | 26,4 | 18,2 | 25,4 | 33 |
| „ Neighbours here help each other only if trouble is great” | 20 | 19,8 | 18,2 | 12,7 | 17,6 |
| „All care only for himself here” | 45 | 53,8 | 63,6 | 61,8 | 47,6 |

Table 24 Neighbourhood integration in Pécs East: subjective assessment of support from neighbours

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005 and Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

| Statement | | Pécs-bánya | Hősök tere | György-telep | Istvánakna | Pécs East |
|---|------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|-----------|
| “Please imagine that you lose your ID card here in the neighbourhood. How likely it is that it would be returned to you if someone from around here were to find it?” | Likely | 40 | 19,2 | 27,8 | 34,6 | 51 |
| | Not likely | 60 | 80,8 | 72,2 | 65,4 | 43,3 |

Table 25 Neighbourhood integration in Pécs East: subjective assessment of minimal solidarity from neighbours, %

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005 and Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

| | Pécs-bánya | Hősök tere | György-telep | István-akna | Pécs East |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|
| Typical of the neighbourhood | 41,3 | 18,5 | 32,7 | 18,5 | 74,7 |
| Not typical of the neighbourhood | 58,8 | 81,5 | 67,3 | 81,5 | 25,3 |

Table 26 Neighbourhood integration in Pécs East: vandalism, crime in the neighbourhood, %
Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005
and Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

| | Pécs-bánya | Hősök tere | György-telep | István-akna | Pécs East |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|
| Typical of the neighbourhood | 23,8 | 7,4 | 5,6 | 16,4 | 62,7 |
| Not typical of the neighbourhood | 76,2 | 92,6 | 94,4 | 83,6 | 37,3 |

Table 27 Neighbourhood integration in Pécs East: drunk and loud people on the streets, %
Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005
and Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

| | Pécs-bánya | Hősök tere | György-telep | István-akna | Pécs East |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|
| Typical of the neighbourhood | 51,2 | 60 | 55,4 | 41,5 | 68,3 |
| Not typical of the neighbourhood | 48,8 | 40 | 44,6 | 58,5 | 31,7 |

Table 28 Neighbourhood integration in Pécs East: loud neighbours, %
Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005
and Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

| | Pécs-bánya | Hősök tere | György-telep | István-akna | Pécs East |
|---------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|
| Satisfied | 42,5 | 20 | 23,2 | 31,5 | 72,1 |
| Not satisfied | 57,5 | 80 | 76,8 | 68,5 | 26,4 |

Table 29 Neighbourhood integration in Pécs East: satisfaction with place of residence, %
Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005
and Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

One of the dimensions of neighbourhood integration is the subjective judgement of locals on how much they can rely on each other. From this point of view, about half of the residents of Pécs East's neighbourhoods expect locals to be supportive, while a third think that in their neighbourhood people are especially helpful. In contrast, in the local societies of the crisis neighbourhoods, with the exception of Pécsbánya, only in about a third of the households do people expect locals to be supportive. At the same time, surprisingly few people expect their lost ID cards to be returned to them: even in the district of Pécs East the rate approximates 50% and is much higher in the crisis areas. In István-akna and Pécsbánya two thirds of households do not expect this minimal solidarity from locals, whereas this rate is already as high as 70-80% in Györgytelep and Hősök tere.

The integration of local societies depends to a great extent on how locals perceive the violation of social norms, i.e. deviance: in what volume are they present and are they characteristic of their neighbourhoods. Our findings provide the most intensive contrast between the local society of Pécs East and those of the crisis neighbourhoods. While one fourth of households consider vandalism and a third the presence of drunk on the streets to be typical of their neighbourhoods in Pécs East, in the crisis areas, with the exception of Pécsbánya, three times more locals consider these forms of deviance to be typical of their neighbourhoods.

In close connection with the subjective judgement of locals' solidarity and the deviance typical of the neighbourhood, satisfaction with the place of residence is much better in the district as a whole than in the crisis neighbourhoods. While almost three fourths of Pécs East households are satisfied with their place of residence, in Györgytelep and Hősök tere only about every fifth household is satisfied, in István-akna close to a third and even in Pécsbánya less than half. The main source of the sharp contrast between Pécs East and the crisis neighbourhoods, according to our findings, is the deviance locals consider to be typical of their neighbourhood, remedying of which could greatly improve locals attachment to their place of residence.

The various indicators of neighbourhood integration reviewed thus far present a complex image of the district and the crisis neighbourhoods – findings can be integrated into an index by which overall comparisons are possible.

| Levels of neighbourhood integration | Pécs-bánya | Hősök tere | Györgytelep | István-akna | Pécs East |
|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| Weakly integrated | 33,3 | 56,8 | 48,2 | 50,9 | 15,0 |
| Average integration | 40,7 | 35,1 | 48,2 | 40,0 | 66,8 |
| Strongly integrated | 25,9 | 8,1 | 3,6 | 9,1 | 18,2 |

Table 30 Distribution of households by levels of neighbourhood integration in Pécs East, %

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005 and Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

In the local society of Pécs East two thirds of the population experiences average integration, while the remaining one third is divided almost equally between those who are strongly and those who are weakly integrated. In contrast, in the crisis areas, with the exception of Pécsbánya, about half of the population is weakly integrated while the rate of those strongly integrated is only 5-10%. The local society of Pécsbánya shows a different face when compared to the other crisis areas: instead of half, only one third of the population is weakly integrated, while the rate of strongly integrated is about one fourth which is the highest rate in the whole district of Pécs East.

Bridging social capital

The sine qua non of bridging social capital is generalized trust which serves as the background to our bridge like, voluntary relationships that are much less tight than our bonding networks but still realize a high level of honesty and reciprocity. In the absence of trust, people would not form associations to achieve their aims or just to spend their free time together – all group activity presumes that members can rely on one another to some extent.

Generalized trust is thus a crucial factor, but its measurement has been carried out on a poorly operationalized basis for decades in important surveys such as the World Values Survey or the European Values Survey. In the interest of comparability, we attempted to measure generalized trust in the usual way and asked our respondents to select the statement on trust that they agreed with: „Most people can be trusted”; „It depends on the people/ situation whether whether people can be trusted”; „People cannot be trusted, one cannot be too careful.”

| Area | People in general can be trusted |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| Pécsbánya | 11,1 |
| Hősök tere | 4,6 |
| Györgytelep | 3,8 |
| István-akna | 3,6 |
| Pécs East | 9,6 |
| Hungary | 22,0 |
| Romania | 10,0 |
| Denmark | 67,0 |
| EU average | 31,0 |

Table 31 Generalized trust in Pécs East and Europe

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005 and European Values Survey 2004. Quoted in Körösényi 2005.

Data show that in comparison to the Hungarian and the European averages (the latter levelling out great differences within the EU), generalized trust in the crisis areas is very low. Pécsbánya is an exception to the extent that here almost every tenth person agreed that people in general could be trusted which is twice the rate measured in the other tree crisis neighbourhoods. In the whole district of Pécs East, generalized trust is present to an extent that approximates that measured in Pécsbánya: 9.6% or respondents stated the people in general could be trusted.

The most tangible manifestation of bridging social capital is the system of group activities that provide connections among various social strata and stretch over tighter relationships (like those of bonding social capital). Such group activities feature more or less organisedness and continuity, and include civil organisations, various community or group activities (such as participation at religious ceremonies, collective sporting, and team games, collective excursions, gatherings of those who have the same hobby), various forms of interest representation and political activity (membership, participation at demonstrations, campaign work, etc.).

| Group activities/membership | Résztevéők aránya |
|---|-------------------|
| Political party | 4,1 |
| Trade union | 5,8 |
| Professional association | 4,5 |
| Religious group | 10,1 |
| Interest group | 8,3 |
| Sports club | 7,1 |
| Hobby and leisure group | 8,4 |
| Charity or welfare organisation | 4,9 |
| Environmental group | 3,8 |
| Other group activity (such as excursion, rooting for a sports team) | 24,4 |

Table 32 Social participation in Pécs East, %

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

In the local society of Pécs East, only very few people took part in group activities of an organized sort since the rate of the most frequent activity of this sort, religious activity, was only slightly above 10%. In some form of group activity outside the confines of organizations, about one fourth of the local society participated.

The indexes of bonding and bridging social capital

After evaluating the indicators of bonding and bridging social capital, let us see how these elements can be reduced into two indexes.

The index of bonding social capital was compiled from the following elements: 1. networks (relatives, friends, neighbors), 2. household transfers, 3. neighbourhood integration. The index of bridging social capital was compiled from generalized trust and social participation, i.e. group activities. We can make a comparison among the crisis neighbourhoods and with the district by the index whose value is a percentage of the index's maximum value.

| Residential areas | | Bonding | Bridging | Bonding and bridging in % of Pécs East (100%) | |
|----------------------------|-------------|---------|----------|---|----------|
| | | | | Bonding | Bridging |
| Crisis neighbour- hoods | Pécsbánya | 51,6% | 22,2% | 91,8% | 120,2% |
| | Hősök tere | 52,1% | 16,5% | 92,6% | 89,3% |
| | Györgytelep | 44,2% | 15,7% | 78,6% | 85,0% |
| | István-akna | 49,0% | 13,6% | 87,2% | 73,4% |
| Crisis area | | 51,3% | 17,4% | 91,2% | 93,9% |
| Pécs East | | 56,2% | 18,5% | x | x |

Table 33 Social capital in the four crisis neighbourhoods

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005
and Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

Györgytelep and István-akna are in the worst position in terms of the concentration of bot types of social capital. In comparison to the mixed local society of Pécs East, both the bonding and the bridging social capital indexes are significantly lower in these two neighbourhoods. The indexes for the local societies of Hősök tere and Pécsbánya suggest that the strength of their micro-social solidarity network, as well as the web of their bridge like relationships approximate those of the Pécs East, or even exceed it, as in the case of Pécsbánya's bridging social capital index.

THE ROLE OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN SOCIAL EXCLUSION

In order to explore the problem of the role of social capital in social exclusion, we have to look at the concentration of two types of social capital in various status groups of society.

Against the background of the above presented investigations into social exclusion, including its effects on income positions and way of life, we were interested in how the concentration of the two types of social capital figures according to two previously discussed dimensions of social inequalities, income classes and welfare groups created on the basis of welfare deficit indicators.

| Income classes, in % of median of household's net monthly income | Bonding | Bridging |
|--|----------------------|----------|
| | social capital index | |
| less than 50% | 88 | 80 |
| 50-79% | 95 | 92 |
| 80-119% | 101 | 96 |
| 120-199% | 104 | 116 |
| more than 200% | 111 | 116 |

Table 34 Indexes of bonding and bridging social capital by income classes in Pécs East

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005 and Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

| Welfare groups | Bonding | Bridging |
|--------------------|----------------------|----------|
| | social capital index | |
| extrem deficits | 81 | 84 |
| strong deficites | 96 | 88 |
| average deficit | 107 | 104 |
| weak deficit | 109 | 120 |
| no welfare deficit | 112 | 128 |

Table 35 Indexes of bonding and bridging social capital by welfare groups In Pécs East

Source: UP, Department of Sociology, Social capital research of 2005 and Social exclusion and social capital research of 2006.

Data nicely underlies the connection that the contentration of both bonding and bridging social capital show an increasing tendency as we go along a scale of social statuses towards those in better and better positions. Thus social capital seems to be distributed among the large social groups in a similar way to other types of capital, namely in a traditional hierarchical manner: those in better positions possess more

of this capital (as well), while those in more disadvantageous positions possess less of it (as well).

However, bonding social capital is of greater importance than bridging social capital in the lives of socially excluded groups and the connection clearly reverses in case of groups of the higher statuses. The differences suggest on the one hand the indispensable role of tight networks in supporting survival and getting by in everyday life among the excluded, and indicate on the other hand the role of loose connections in getting ahead in the lives of upper social groups.

Any rehabilitation measures in the crisis neighborhoods have to recognise the importance of bonding social capital in the lives of excluded groups and must not incur changes that would weaken these networks as this would eliminate one of the few resources at the disposal of segregated groups. At the same time, rehabilitation measures could have one of the probably furthest reaching effects in the lives of crisis neighbourhoods if programs were devised for strengthening bridging social capital⁶ by which local societies would be enabled to improve their own situation.

⁶ The development of social capital has become a prime field of public policy recently. Cf. the projects of the World Bank against poverty (<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/EXTTSOCIALCAPITAL/0,,contentMDK:20193068~menuPK:418218~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:401015,00.html>), the policy of OECD (The Well-being of Nations 2001), public policy advising by the Saguaro Seminar established by Robert Putnam in the United States (<http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/saguaro>), (former) government strategy in the United Kingdom by the Performance and Innovation Unit (Social Capital 2002), government strategy in Canada (*Social Capital as a Public Policy Tool* 2005), government policy in Ireland (*The Policy Implications of Social Capital* 2003) and public policy in Australia (Winter 2000). For an attempt at drawing conclusions for the field of social urban rehabilitation cf. Füzér 2005, Füzér et al 2005, and Füzér et al. 2006.

Bibliography

- Field, John (2003) *Social Capital*. London: Routledge.
- Fukuyama, Francis (1995) *Trust: the Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: Free Press.
- Füzér, Katalin (2005) „A társadalmi tőke szerepe a városrehabilitációban” in *Acta Sociologica (Pécsi Szociológiai Szemle)* 1 (1): 5-17.
- Füzér, Katalin, M. Gerő, E. Sik, G. Zongor (2005) *A társadalmi tőke növelésének lehetőségei fejlesztéspolitikai eszközökkel*. Budapest: TÁRKI.
- Füzér, Katalin, M. Gerő, E. Sik, G. Zongor (2006) „Társadalmi tőke és fejlesztés.” In *Társadalmi Riport 2006*. Budapest: TÁRKI.
- Halpern, David (2005) *Social Capital*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Huszár, Zoltán „Pécs és a Dunagőzhajózási Társaság (DGT) kapcsolata.” In *Búcsúzik a mecseki szénbányászat*, edited by B. Szirtes. Pécs: Pécs Erőmű Rt., 2001.
- Kemény István, Janky Béla, Lengyel Gabriella (2004): *A magyarországi cigányság, 1971-2003*. Budapest: Gondolat
- Ladányi János, Szelényi Iván (2004): *A kirekesztettség változó formái*. Budapest: Napvilág.
- Putnam, Robert *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon&Schuster.
- Social Capital: a Discussion Paper* (2002). London: Performance and Innovation Unit. <http://www.number-10.gov.uk/su/social%20capital/spcialcapital.pdf> (on 1/11/2005)
- Social Capital as a Public Policy Tool* (2005) Policy Research Initiative, Canada www.policyresearch.gc.ca/doclib/SC_Synthesys_E.pdf (on 1/11/2005)
- The Policy Implications of Social Capital* (2003) Forum Report No. 28, The National Economic and Social Forum, Dublin. www.nesf.ie/dynamic/docs/nesf_28.pdf (on 1/11/2005)
- The Well-being of Nations* (2001). Paris: OECD.
- Winter, Ian (ed.) (2000) *Social capital and public policy in Australia*. Australian Institute of Family Studies, Melbourne.
- Utasi, Ágnes (2002) *A bizalom hálója*. Budapest: Új Mandátum.