

Davor Vidaković¹

Faculty of Law

University of PIM

Banja Luka

Original scientific paper

UDK 371.12.011.3:316.472.4

DOI 10.7251/SOCEN1916023V

Accepted: 15/03/2019

Students' Dorms as Agents of Social Capital

Abstract

In this paper, we will try to prove one of our hypotheses, which is that the construction of social capital is present in students' dorms. The social capital of an educational institution such as a students' dorm is reflected in the mutual trust and cooperation of all elements of the education system. These are primarily pupils, educators and parents. Of great importance is the degree of mutual trust of students and educators, especially the perception of students about it. Cooperation among students does not exclude the rivalry. In the very concept of this paper, a case study will be applied to the example of secondary school students' homes on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Key words: *social capital, students' dorms, social networks, actors of "domicile" social capital.*

Introduction

The combination of co-operation and competition improves educational and educational efficiency and contributes to the acquisition of social competencies of co-operation and competition in adulthood. The educational character of educational institutions is reflected in the intensity and quality of interaction between pupils, educators and parents, which can be explained by the concept of social capital of the students' dorm as a social organization. Putnam (Putnam) found that the educational achievements of the pupils were more determined by the level of social capital of the school than other individual factors, the so- the pedagogical standard of pupils in the number of pupils in the classroom, teacher qualifications, monetary inputs per student and other elements of the pedagogical standard (Pastuović, 210: 2012). Tom

¹ PhD of sociological sciences, assistant professor in the scientific field of Theoretical sociology. e-mail: vidakovicdavor@gmail.com

Schuler in his work *Social capital and young people* distinguishes the instrumental and intrinsic dimension of social capital. The instrumental dimension means the way in which social capital influences the necessary transition of young people into adulthood, whereby the necessity of intentions to exploit social capital for a particular goal here is not implied here. The intrinsic dimension, which we are interested in in this paper, relates to the extent to which young people can contribute to the social quantity of social capital through expressed social trust or interconnection. In that sense, the specifics of the home population as an integral part of the young generation are the reason for the focus of this research to determine the level and distribution of some dimensions of their social capital, such as generalized trust. Putnam (Putnam) believes that the generalization of trust serves just social networks that make it possible to make the trust “transient and widespread: I trust you because I trust her, and she assures me to trust you.”² Therefore, we will use Putnam’s approach to social capital that is more appropriate to our goal, because analyzing this subgroup of young approaches from a perspective that emphasizes active participation in the building of both personal and own, as well as group social capital, which makes them a significant social resource. We intend to establish and analyze the level and distribution of social capital of the high school population in terms of its dimensions, social status, connectivity networks and participation in associations. Social capital built in conditions of extraterrestrial environment and growing up to a young man leaves a great impression and a trail for future adaptation in society. The built social capital can be used in the future, and one of the prerequisites of this work is that the population of former residents of dormitories uses social capital, but also on the basis of earlier construction, building some new social capital in a new environment, but with the acquired habits that an individual He is wearing the time he was a resident of the students’ dorm.

Students’ dormitory and social capital

Pupils in high school pupils stay in their dorms during their schooling, they socialize in conditions of extra-social social environment, build interconnected networks of relationships and mutual connections based on social trust, and they do it necessarily because it is almost impossible to live in one such institution and not build social relations which in fact are the dimensions of social capital. Personal contacts face-to-face within various

² Robert D. Putnam, *Kako demokraciju učiniti djelotvornom*. Zagreb: Fakultet političkih znanosti. 2003.str.181.

groups within the home broader, by Fukuyama³, the radius of trust to those with whom the actor is not in direct relation. Dorms' education is one of the forms of upbringing that in concrete and daily practice in practice becomes the "school of life" and the work in which it can work on the upbringing of values.⁴ In such circumstances, it is quite certain that trust plays an important if not crucial role for an individual's life in a home environment and as such is a product of constant social interactions among actors.

From constant social interactions and trust as a key element for networking individuals, and at the same time their survival in conditions of out-of-date socialization, it follows that built trust is more useful. When we say that we trust someone or that someone is reliable, it implicitly means that the probability of taking action that is useful or at least not harmful to us is high enough to consider some form of cooperation with that person⁵. Students in the dorm are in the foreground looking for security, trust, satisfaction and information, which is achieved by the mutual work of students and educators, which is designated as one aspect of cooperation. Cooperation is inevitable, and if there is no, it is difficult to achieve further relations. Collaboration develops reciprocal relations that are not limited to the experience of working with specific individuals, but also the general reciprocity that Putnam (Putnam) attaches to the features of the norm. At the individual level, the number of established low-intensity connections characterized by a certain degree of trust can be an instrument of promotion on the social scale.⁶ More precisely, it is almost impossible for the individual to integrate into the social community without achieving inclusion in certain networks in social groups, but it is primarily that the individual has some kind of trust, because without confidence it is impossible to get involved in a network of connections and by himself to build social capital.

When we talk about the social capital, a particular type of trust is general or "thin" as Putnam (Putnam) calls it, which primarily refers to people whom the individual does not know personally, which in fact represents the majority of people in a society. Trust that is expressed on a horizontal level according to known people we know, with whom we establish close and regular contacts, is called partialized or "dense" trust. General confidence is created within secondary groups through norms of civilization and backward,

³ Frensis Fukuyama, *Trust: Social virtues and the creation of well-being*. Zagreb: Sources, 2000.

⁴ Hartmunt Hentig, *Kakav odgoj želimo*. Zagreb: Educa. 2007

⁵ Diego Gambetta, *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*. London: Blackwell Ltd. 1988. pp. 239.

⁶ Social capital of youth is an indicator of the degree of their social integration and readiness to take responsibility.

general trust enhancing cooperation, civil participation and norms. General trust is not based on immediate experience, but “implicitly in some experience of common social networks and the expectation of reciprocity.”⁷ In the context of living in students’ dorms, confidence is acquired directly, silently and almost imperceptibly, but on the other hand it is sensitive, because participated trust can not be built. Therefore, in the students’ dorms, in terms of building social capital, it is quite certain that general and particularized confidence is identified, and its degree depends on the readiness of the individual to integrate into various groups within the collectivity. Fukuyama’s (Fukuyama) trust⁸ also exists within the framework of building social capital in the home and is an important factor in establishing the basic function of trust and involving individuals in networks of connectivity in terms of future actions within various groups. In addition to the radius of trust, general trust strengthens the function of building functional networks of connectivity and strengthens the building of social capital in the dorm. In the social sphere, a higher level of general trust promotes the acceptance of diversity and tolerance, and therefore general trust is highly desirable in the everyday life of the dorm.

In the students’ dorms, educators have one of the key roles in the process of socializing children and achieving the given educational goals. Educators are in the students’ dorms according to the nature of the work, but also according to the legal regulations are obligatory highly educated personnel who have a formal higher education in the profession-pedagogical profession. The completeness of the personality of the educator must be determined to the extent determined by the established rules, but also in the circumstances in which the educator wants to see and experience his educator, which is much more than that professor’s relationship. In fact, the educator largely takes over the role of parents or caregivers, but much of the older brother or sister. Only social trust and inclusion in various networks among actors that are built with the supervision of the educator greatly contributes to the development of a complete basic structure that is necessary for the accumulation of social capital. The students’ dorm has a social, psychological and pedagogical function. The social function of the students’ dorm is determined by the social conditioning of the origin, development and role of the home in the entire system of education. The psychological function is based on the creation of a favorable home climate in which students will be able to participate, decide, meet their needs and develop their own personality. In order to achieve a positive climate in the life of the student dormitory, it is necessary to determine

⁷ Robert D. Putnam, *Kuglati sam*. Novi Sad: Mediterran publishing, 2008. pp. 178.

⁸ Frensis Fukuyama, *Trust: social virtues and the creation of well-being*. Zagreb. 2000.

the rules of behavior respected day by day in small things without which character is not formed and the person is not prepared to face the temptations that await them in the future.⁹ The pedagogical function¹⁰ is based on the achievement of goals and tasks of education and it seeks to meet the development needs of students, to create a climate of work. These functions are the basic determinants of the functioning of the students' dorm in terms of his educational and educational function.

Students' dorms have a great potential and a development function which, in itself, represents a fertile ground for the emergence of social capital, and in that sense we can conclude that the students' dorms are a potential agent of social capital. The basic functions of dormitory and all that dormitory life brings with them is an important basis for the emergence of the right networks of connectivity, reciprocity and trust, which ultimately has a strong predisposition for the construction of social capital. Sociologically speaking, in the students' dorms in terms of creating the preconditions for building social capital, we can safely conclude that the whole micro structure of social activities, phenomena and relationships among students in the dorm is actually the basis for the emergence, and the construction of social capital.

Students' dormitory through the prism of Goffman's concept of "total institutions"

Scientific study of students' dormitory from the standpoint of sociology is quite neglected. In recent sociological literature, we have no greater interest in this problem that is present in the world, because students' dormitory and interns exist in almost all developed societies. In the area of the former Yugoslavia in the field of sociology there was no noticeable study of this problem, except for one example of a doctoral dissertation.¹¹ Unfortunately, not much has been done in this field after that.

One of the few sociologists who studied these institutions and life in them from the point of view of sociology is Erving Goffman, who called such and similar institutions "total institutions". Goffman (Goffman) takes the term

⁹ Savagnone, G., Briguglia, Il coraggio di educare. Leumann: Elledici. 2009. p. 76

¹⁰ Anita Klapan, Organization of learning in the students' dormitory as a factor of school success: doctoral dissertation, Rijeka, Faculty of Education, 1994.

¹¹ At the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo, October 22, 1974. Muhamed Dervišbegović, entitled "Educational Effects of Family and Home Accommodation for Children Deprived of Parental Care", which was a significant step towards contributing to the development of thoughts about the problem of these institutions.

“total institution” from Everett Hughes¹², a Chicago teacher who defines institutions in a traditional way as “fixed social arrangements” whose rules, membership, resources, and procedures are known to all members of the given societies. This Goffman learning improves and adds a significant level of deeper thought to perception and goes further, interpreting these institutions as places where something more significant and deeper than a mere social relationship occurs in specific circumstances.

The key that Goffman discovers is in the process of transforming an individual who was “lonely”, but with the arrival of another he enters the gathering, and then he becomes pre-deaf in a certain way. In addition to transforming an individual in this way, an important term for Goffman is information: what are the information about yourself that the individual provides, what information he receives about others, whether he controls information about himself, whether he manipulates them. The moment when individuals enter each other into the field of observation, there is a mutual identification and interaction between them, which is caused by the necessity of the circumstances that are imposed often independent of the will of the actors in the relationship. Communication between people in a mutual presence is a form of interaction or face-to-face behavior, sometimes not a form of communication because in that relationship there is something far deeper and more erratic. First of all, interactive partners provide an enormous number of diverse sources of information about the actor, of which verbal statements make only a small part.¹³ Goffman (Goffman) determines a total institution as a “place of residence and work, where a large number of individuals of a similar position, for a long period of time cut off from a wider society, lead a joint life in a closed area under the control of formal administration”.¹⁴ He actually defines these institutions in a more anthropological way and considers it to be a “routine, common arrangement” through which the social structure enters a system that perpetuates and renews itself. Its institutions belong to the domain of everyday life, and besides standard, “schools” and “factories”, include friendship, university courses or business cocktails.

Goffman talks about the five types of total institution: for people who are unable to take care of themselves and are harmless (homes for old people and orphans); for people who are incompetent but dangerous to the environment (asylum); for persons endangering others (prison); to create “good” condi-

¹² Hughes “total institution” reserves for institutions isolated from the outside world (Spasić, 1998: 84)

¹³ There is a general appearance, a way of dressing, holding (Ivana Spasić, *Interpretativna sociologija*, Beograd: ZUNS, 1998: 84).

¹⁴ Ivana Spasić, *Interpretative sociology - the challenges of understanding the social world*. in: *Interpretative Sociology*, Belgrade: ZUNS, 1998. 5-32

tions for performing a specific task with a clear utilitarian goal (barracks, boarding schools); for securing shelters (monasteries).¹⁵

The extent to which an individual or how Goffman defines a protector is deprived of the self in relation to the type of total institution, but everywhere the individual's visible features of the "civilian suit" are replaced by the institutional uniform. Goffman believes that despite uniforming, individuals in a similar situation do not react in the same way. There are four basic forms of reaction: "situational withdrawal" attention is not given to anything other than objects and events in the immediate environment, and they are viewed from a completely personal perspective; stubbornness, deliberate overthrowing of the institution, refusal to cooperate with staff and rejecting its demands; Colonization: From what the institution offers, the maximum gain on which the existence is built is drawn out; the conversion-individual takes over the official view of himself and tries to act as a "perfect protege".¹⁶

The importance of Goffman's teaching in terms of interpreting and understanding the notion of "total institutions" is great, because he is one of the few who caught up with something that is significantly unexplored, but certainly challenging. Students' dorms, by their very nature, belong to total institutions, and as such they carry great challenges for researchers. In them, a specific life in a community that has all the characteristics of a particular type of community takes place, yet it deserves a different treatment and special form of research, which implies a symbiosis of sociology, pedagogy, psychology and other disciplines, with regard to the type of population that forms the structure of the domicile students group.

The position and importance of students' dorms in the educational system

Since students in high school are enrolled mainly in their interests in students' dorms according to their place of residence, differences in socio-cultural development are also transferred to those institutions and much more in the home than in school, because the children in the home are placed 24 hours, and this is in fact other house. In this sense, the dorm turns into a set of different socio-cultural environments whose children bring with them the arrival of children. The differences in the socio-cultural status of the families from which the children come will reflect the differences between children in the dorm. More recently, it is primarily based on the needs of students and

¹⁵ Erving Goffman, *Azili*. Novi Sad: Mediterran Publishing, 2011.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*

their parents, rather than some general interests of the state or educational authorities. This, of course, should also affect the characteristics and functions of the home and the nature of the educational work and the life in general that is organized there. By this, education is directed towards the needs of the users. The interests of society, families and students are genuinely met and integrated, and educational activities are accepted by all participants, not forced and externally imposed. With this status in the system of upbringing and education, the dorm has the prospect of fully justifying its existence and becoming a desirable social milieu. Dorms have their own future and sense of existence, only if the state decides that the education system conceives so it is primarily to meet the basic social needs and not the needs that meet the short-term political interests. Otherwise, it may be that dormowners lose their function and sense of existence. The social benefits of students' dorms, as well as education, depend on the level of social capital of the society. The issue of upbringing and education is an important link for every society, which should not be interrupted at any price. It is the element of social structure that is one of the primary in terms of functioning and the very survival of society.

The dorms with their organization make a meeting of interests, not only family, home and school, but also enterprises, local communities and states, represented by the Ministry of Education within the jurisdiction of a special department. This issue of ownership, rights, obligations and responsibilities is important because it affects the procedures for determining the education program and the organization of living and working in homes. Dorms' capacity utilization can be multiple. They, especially during school holidays, can participate in the exchange of school youth and the organization of student tourism, which can lower costs on both sides, both for students traveling and for those who live in homes. In the end, the social significance of the home can be reflected in its role in relation to the local environment and the settlement in which it is located.

The dorm environment, in relation to the urban environment in which the dorm is located, represents a positively selected social environment and an environment that can protect the young man from numerous parasitic factors and negative environmental influences. There are less verbal lessons in the dorm and more specific pedagogical situations through which he will be able to choose the best patterns of behavior, influences and lifestyles. In the dorm life, in fact, the effects of development and upbringing of the individual in general can be remarkably checked. It is a convenient situation for systematic monitoring, acquaintance and resolution of the developmental problems of a young man or girl in that period (importance of advisory education). The direct human (empathy) and advisory contact of students and educators can

just be established in the life circumstances offered by the home. As a collective form of life, the dorm forms a community of students and educators, which is the basis for the socialization of young people.

If the dorm is understood, primarily as a living space that covers the very specific needs of the students, and not as an institution for the mere socio-pedagogical treatment of the young generation, then the educational work in it will have a full meaning of life. Educational work at school is predominantly a rational relationship, while in the dorm it is poured into a true emotional relationship, which gives relations full strength and quality.

Negative Social Capital in Educational Institutions

Negative social capital can be present in any segment of the social structure. What is important to mention is the fact that it is much easier to build in places that have social assumptions that suit its origin. In the foreground, there are places that are sensitive to nature and in their basis represent a fertile soil for the development of bad phenomena in a society that includes both negative or asocial capital. One of these places may be the students' dorm which primarily performs the function of educating high school adolescents in conditions of out-of-date socialization. Departure from the family and longer stay outside it, with the specific position of the one who comes from the "big city", individuals provide the basis for potential adoption and negative social values, the acquisition of bad habits and the promotion of socially unacceptable behavior. We advocate the emergence of a positive side of social capital in students' dorms, but we suggest the possibility of building negative social capital, which is a potential danger for the individual and therefore for society as well.

Concerning the definition of the negative social capital, there are many doubts and disagreements. Some authors call it the negative effects of social capital, the dark side of social capital, asocial capital... The first question that arises is whether social capital is always positive and can it be negative? The second question that arises is whether negative or asocial capital is actually a social capital that is only misused. The basic determinant of this problem may be that social capital is actually positive, but if it is used badly, it does not become negative, it gets negative connotations, and in this sense Margaret Levi called this kind of social capital the name of the capital.¹⁷ The use of the term "negative" social capital is certainly interesting in its application, but it

¹⁷ Margaret Levi, *Social and Unsocial Capital: A Review Essay of Robert Putnam's Making Democracy Work*. *Politics and Society*, 1996. 24, pp. 45-55.

is problematic within the wider context, since it is based on a post-hoc court, taking a certain point of view in relation to the notion of what is negative, so we can ask the question whether the underground movement of resistance will be viewed as a positive or negative phenomenon, obviously depends on which side we are on.¹⁸ In our opinion, we can speak of a negative type of social capital when it is concentrated in special groups, such as gangs, ethnic clans, ghetto zones. Then he can nurture and promote the culture of negative social behavior and promote negative social values that are designed to ultimately be accepted as correct. Then there is the possibility of its distribution or, more specifically, the distribution of its popularity among adolescents who are educated outside their biological families.

Methodological framework of the research

We decided to examine the attitude of the students' dorms about trust, friendship, attitude towards educators and the whole environment. As the main indicators of social trust, we have singled out common interests, then respect, friendship and humanity, which for the home represent essential social values. There is also a desire to stay connected with friends from dorm after completing schooling, which in itself indicates that the built social capital will be potentially distributed in some future time.

Research hypotheses

H. Living in the dorm is an agent for the development of social capital, and especially trust, as a significant aspect of social capital, as indicated by the differences in the construction of social capital (trust) between middle-school students who live in the dorm and those who live during their education in their families' house. Compared to their peers who grow up in their families, it is easier for these people to develop desirable social value systems.

H1. The acquisition of social trust among high school students is determined by the material, social and value position of an individual.

H2. Social capital and network connections are built with high school students under the influence of external factors.

H3. Social norms play an important role in generating social capital among high school students.

H4. The construction of social capital among high school students is mainly based on social trust.

¹⁸ John Field, *Social capital*, Routledge, 2008. P. 92

H5. The built social capital is a resource that can be used later.

H6. The conditions of out-of-family socialization significantly influence the construction of social capital among high school students.

H7. The dorm environment causes the emergence of special new forms of social capital.

We proceed from the view that Woolcock is the theoretical framework in which he develops the ideas of communitarianism, but also the network theory, corresponding to and closest to our research. In this analysis, we will not base ourselves exclusively on its theoretical framework, fearing not to ignite a serious gap in the exclusive attachment and consistent advocacy of only one concept, which is disadvantageous for the discourse on social capital, because as such it does not tolerate one-sidedness and the firm holding of only one course, although it would essentially be necessary in the author's analysis and taking the viewpoints, the researcher is based on some theoretical framework, and in our case it is almost dominant Vulkokov (Woolcock)¹⁹. Therefore, we can say that our point of view, from which we start in analyzing the obtained results of an empirical research of analytical character, will be precisely defined as functional-communitaristic, which aims to have a comprehensive analysis of the phenomenon of the dorm community that is structured. The relationships among its members are organized on the basis of certain rules that the community is imposed by the community, but also those created by the individual and in this sense we find the communitarian spirit of the community where radical individualism is necessarily eliminated and as such within the framework of such a conceived community can hardly survive. Social relationships that are established on this basis have clear patterns and are repeated. The home community has a communitarian character and has clear basic needs that must be met and in this sense the radical-individualistic character of the action of any individual at the expense of the home community will be eliminated, and in that sense will appear conformist-individualistic which is more acceptable to the community.

¹⁹ According to Woolcock, social capital is a norm and network that encourages collective action. (Michael Woolcock, „Social Capital and Economic Development“, *Theory and Society*, 1998. 27 (2): 151-208, p. 153), and the domicile community has the expressive character of collective action is conditioned by norms and networks created by individuals within it based on various factors that encourage social networking. Therefore, Vulkock's definition of social capital in our case clearly shows that there are elements in the dorms for building social capital.

THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

Basic research data

The survey was conducted in March and April 2016, on which occasion 162 respondents from different categories of society were interviewed, who completed an anonymous survey. Stratification of the sample was done in 4 different groups. The first group is represented by current students who are living in the dorm. The second group consists of students who are peers with homelands, but during their stay they live in their familie's homes. The third group consists of "ex-dorm", while the fourth group of respondents consists of teachers who directly participate in direct work with the students which are living in the dorms.. The number of respondents is evenly distributed in cities, as shown in the chart below.

The survey was conducted in three institutions for the accommodation and food of high school students in three different cities/municipalities in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Republic of Srpska: Zenica, Doboј and Bijeljina. The sample was: 20 high school students living in dorm in 2015/2016 school year; 20 high school students which do not live in the dorms, 10 „ex-dorm sutdents“ and 4 teachers and professional associates who are employed in the dorm. When determining the sample, gender, age, education, socio-professional status, interests, degree of social integration and other parameters were taken into account. The data collection technique used the questionnaire form with closed-type questions and pre-offered responses that respondents could choose, as well as the Likert scale, where respondents expressed their opinion by expressing the degree of their agreement or disagreement with the claimed assertion. Statistical data processing was done in the statistical package SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). Descriptive statistical analysis was used to interpret the research results. The results of the research are presented in percentage values. The institutions where the research was carried out are: JU "DOM UČENIKA DOBOJ, JU "ĐAČKI DOM" Zenica, and JU "DOM UČENIKA " Bijeljina. These are classical institutions for the accommodation and nursing of high school students who stay in them while attending some high school.

Based on this, for the sake of transparency of the entire research, the presentation of the obtained research results will take place in four phases. The first phase is presenting the results for present dorm students. The second phase is the presentation of the received data for current students who do not live in the dorm; the third phase will be a category of the students - ex dorm


and the fourth is a category of teachers or professional associates who have the function of direct supervisor and follower of student behavior and functioning in the home environment.

Research results

a) Present dorm students

Present students, who participated in the research are students of different ages. Chart 1.1 shows the structure by age, in this case by the class they attend. The random selection of respondents resulted in the final percentage where the highest number of respondents from the third and fourth class, but in the other two, the proportion was not significantly impaired.

Chart 1.1. *Structure of the sample by age*



Structure of respondents by type of settlement from which they come from. It is evident here that most respondents (72%) come from the village, which can be taken as logical, because the basic mission of the dorm students is that they are mostly accommodated by those students who attend school outside their place of residence. Since towns mainly have high schools, then it follows that the home is mostly children from the village, and the exception is with medical schools that only have large centers, and therefore those who come from the city mostly attend either a medical or some other professional school that does not there is in their city or which they could not enroll and hence a percentage of 15% of those surveyed who originate from urban areas, while 13% of those surveyed lead from the suburban settlements.

Q: In whom you have the greatest trust? The majority of dorm students surveyed that they have the greatest confidence in their family. This is ex-

pected from the aspect of their age and socialization, and we can conclude that these are children from patriarchal families with the traditional way of upbringing. Only 6% of the respondents said they had the greatest confidence in their friends, and 7% of the respondents said they had no credentials in anyone. This is a general trust, which must be separate from the particular confidence that we will encounter in subsequent reviews, because the issue in an annex relates to general, that is, general trust.

Q: With whom you most socialize, 38% of them surveyed that they are intensely socializing with their friends, but it is also necessary to pay attention to the percentage of 33% of the respondents who mostly hang out with their colleagues from dorm. This is a great indicator that dorm students already have such friendships that are almost equal to those in the category of friends that are not just about dorm, but also their socializing outside the dorm and friendship from before. So, social capital is obviously being built among homeowners. Social contacts and confidence building themselves arise mainly spontaneously and are built over time, and can be influenced by various factors. Family relationships are primary and biologically caused, so that trust in the family in relation to others with whom an individual has contacts can not put it in the same plane. The family is an essential determinant of the development of social trust among actors in communication and social relations because the acquired habits that an individual carries with them from their biological family can have a decisive influence on the ability to accept or reject the new environment in which the individual is located.


The crucial factor for socializing the majority of the dorm students (72% of the respondents) are their common interests, while the social status and other responses offered are almost neglected. Common interests are nevertheless the most important, and they are the basis for establishing networks of connectivity and reciprocity on the basis of which the first signs of social capital building among the hosts can appear in the near future. What type of social capital will be, depends on a variety of different circumstances.

Q: Do you have trust in friends from the Dorm? 32% of respondents said they had confidence in them. The percentage of 54% of respondents who have declared their partial trust in dorms students friendship is basically optimistic because it is over 14% of those who do not trust in their friends from dorm are dominant. Partial trust can grow under completely certain conditions of development of social relations and general atmospherics in the institution. There is a base for building social capital because a higher percentage of the partial trust that the dorm has in their peers is a positive indicator that there is an atmosphere for building social trust and hence social capital. This data largely corresponds to the data where 77% of the dorm students said they

should be cautious in contact with people, and therefore it is not surprising that based on this information, social trust is not being built at first, but should leave room and time that this would happen.

When we asked about the general trust (Chart 1.3), the majority (60%) of respondents said to have confidence in their roommates. A percentage of 12% of those who said they trusted teachers were worrying, and it is a serious indicator that this confidence has been violated for some reason that should be determined in the future. Confidence in other staff is very few, and the reason for this can exist in the fact that with other staff, they do not have a permanent and obligatory contact, but other reasons may influence such a relationship. Mutual trust among students living in the same room is an important and relevant category for developing trust, which is the fundamental dimension for the emergence and construction of social capital among high school students who live in their homes, and based on these data it is evident that such kind of trust, social capital, there are also those types of relationships that will build social capital in the future.

Chart 1.2. *Who do you have the most trust in the Dorm?*




Q: If they are satisfied with their peers from dorm? As many as 47% answered positively, and 45% in part, which is evidence that satisfaction among students can be characterized as extremely good, as only 8% of respondents were negative in this regard. Satisfaction with their peers can be seen in a number of circumstances in which, in the context of ongoing communication and contact between the actors, there is intimacy or repulsion, thus filtering those who have common interests in relation to those who do not have it, so in The perspectives crystallize the types and categories according to which the types of socializing and contacts between the hosts differ. The percentage of 47% of examined is one of the important indicators on the basis of which

we can notice that the home environment is a fertile soil for the development of social trust.

As the most important factor of success in society, the respondents said that this is knowledge, while the aspiration for a society without crime and corruption and a tendency towards the responsible authority below the category of knowledge. These data from scale no.2. represent a picture of the seriousness of the respondents. As much as they think that in their circles the most important thing is wit, they are so aware of the fact that knowledge is crucial to success in society. Therefore, the stamina and maturity are noticed, as is the readiness to progress.

Chart 1.3. *Factor of success in society*



As the main factor for advancement in society, most respondents marked happiness, and education was elsewhere. Particularly interesting is the fact that respondents consider that money is a mild advantage over relationships and acquaintances. Non-formal education is not marked as important. In this case, we can notice that most respondents think that there is nothing worth having if you are not lucky, which is characteristic of their life, but not far from the thinking of adults.

Q: If you would like to stay in touch with friends from dorm after school, 52% of respondents said they wanted to do so honestly, which proves that strong strength has been achieved among members of the dorm population during their stay in the institution. A small percentage of respondents - 33%, declared that they only wanted to be good friends, which is normal because there are many students in their dorms who during their stay in the dorm

did not get closer contact with all dorms, but limited their socializing and contacts to smaller ones number of persons. The smallest number of those who do not want to stay in touch with their friends at home is that category of introvert pupils who during the stay in the dorm did not have contacts with anyone except with whom they had to contact. One smaller percentage (10% of respondents) said that he wanted only superficial contacts. Therefore, the vast majority are those who want to maintain those contacts and friendships that they have achieved during their stay in the home, which is an extremely good basis for the construction, development and use of social capital.

Chart 1.4. *Do you want to stay in touch with friends from dorm after finishing school?*



Q: Do you think that you will sometimes use your acquaintances from dorm? They think that they will once again use the acquired acquaintances from the dorm in the future (66% of the respondents), while 25% of the respondents are sure they will. The smallest number are those who have opposed this issue negatively. It also proves that such mutual relations are built up in the home that trust is expressed, that is, there is no great concern that there is no trust, and the networks of connection and reverence are also to a great extent present. Based on this, the conclusion is drawn that relations between the home are present, both social trust, and networks of affection and connectivity, which basically represent the dimensions of social capital.

b) Present students – „non-dorms“

The category of respondents that we have taken as a parameter according to which we compare the potential social capital in the dorm are students, their peers who do not stay at dorm during their education, but in their family communities. We will mark this category as a non-dorms for easy loading.

As was the case with dorms, the sample of non-dorms is the same, 20 in each city in which the survey was conducted.

The age of the respondents (taken according to the class that attends rather than the age of life) is to a large extent proportional. Out of the total color of the surveyed, 24% were students of the first and third grade, while 21% were second-graders and 31% were fourth-graders.

Regarding the school education of the parents of the interviewed students in the non-dorms category, the majority of respondents come from families in which parents have completed secondary school education of 72%. This figure for the “dorm” family is 87%. We see that respondents from both categories (both dorms and non-dorms) come mainly from families with secondary education.

According to the type of settlement in which they live: 35% of the respondents said they live in the city, 38% live in the village, and 27% are asked to live in a suburban settlement. The majority of respondents stated that they had the highest level of trust in the family, as many as 84% of those surveyed. A smaller number, 10% have confidence in friends, while only 6% of those surveyed have confidence in unknown people, which is an indicator that high school students do not trust people who are unknown. The data from this question tell us that, regarding the type of family relations, this is a similar category of examinees as in the previous chapter, because in most of the innocents the family is in the first place, which is significant data.

Q: Who do you mostly hang out with? 36% of the respondents said they were with friends, 34% with the company from the school, while 15% of the respondents said that they mostly hang out with their families, that is, with the company from the region. Such data is largely influenced by the fact that respondents from the categories of adolescents, where the basis for their socializing is actually the existence of common interests, as well as in the dorm. Their priorities at that age are heightened by family relationships and their need is to move socially. Compared to non-dorms, this percentage is approximately the same in the households where the most is socializing with friends (38% of those surveyed) and with the company from the home (33% of those surveyed). The reasons for such a relationship are not primary in the fact that the homes grow up in conditions of out-of-date socialization with new cultural and life patterns dictated by contemporary social trends.

As a decisive factor in socializing, most of the non-dorms respondents said they had 52% of the common interests. 21% of respondents said they went to the same school, while the smallest percentage declared that they were social status and sports, 16% and 7%. This supports one of the previous assertions that common interests are an extremely important factor in socializing with others.

It is interesting to note that 69% of those polled only have partial trust in schoolmates, while 21% of those polled have declared themselves trusted in schoolmates. If we compare this information with the explanation of the dorm students on this issue, we will see that 54% of the interviewed dorm students said they have partial trust in the mates from the dorm, while 32% said they had a lot of trust in the friends from the dorm. Here, a certain oscillation of 11% is in favor of the dorm students - the confidence in the comrades is higher in comparison with the non-dorms. This is one of the indicators that gaining confidence as a pre-requisite of social capital is, however, greater in dorm than in non-dorm. The specifics of a "total institution" in which the dorm are also a factor is certainly a significant factor that causes greater mutual trust among the peers staying in them. Even the figure of 69% of the partial trust in non-dorm in relation to the home in which this percentage is lower (54%) supports this claim.

When it comes about the trust in school, the majority of respondents have confidence in class-62%. The smallest percentage of those who have no confidence in whom and only 7% of them. A worrying fact can be noticed when only 15% of those polled trust the professors. The reason for this is unknown to us, but this information is certainly an indicator that something happened on this issue that caused less trust in the professors.

On the scale of trust in the school, it is evident that the respondents answered the questions mostly, they do not have a position, while the greatest confidence is expressed in school mates. The least trusted respondents have professional associates (pedagogues, psychologists, speech therapists, defec-tologists), and categories of other school workers that include non-essential staff.

As a factor of success in society, the largest number finds it important to value knowledge. Society without corruption and responsible government are also a significant factor of success in society. The greatest number of respondents, as a factor of progress in society, marked happiness and education, followed by connections and acquaintances, and money as an important factor. Non-formal education in the opinion of those surveyed is not so important for advancement in society.

Q: Do you want to stay in touch with schoolmates and after school? 48% of respondents answered affirmatively, and 44% said that only if they were good friends. Only 8% said they wanted a superficial contact after school. If we compare this information with responses of the dorm students, we will see that 52% of the local people say they want to stay in touch after finishing school, and 33% made this condition with the fact only if they were good friends. Here we notice that there are more people among those who want to stay in touch after finishing school.


Regarding the question of whether you feel that your acquaintances from the school will benefit from you in the future, 59% of respondents were “sometimes maybe”, while 23% said they were certain. In a comparable relationship with the same question posed to dorm students, we notice that there are more people who think they might use them (66% of respondents), while 25% sure they will. On the basis of these data, we can conclude that social trust is building more among the dorm students, and that the dorm students have a slight advantage over non-Jews in terms of awareness of the fact that their acquaintances and friendships will once be useful in their lives. So, social capital is present both in the one and the other, but the advantage in this sense is still home.

c) Former students –dorm users

In the category of former students, are those who stayed in the dorm during their education and we will mark this category as former students-dorm users. This is a population of former “dorm students” who had been in the dorm for decades, who were interviewed in this research. The sample designated for this population is 10 respondents from each of the three cities, therefore a total of 30 respondents in the category of former students - dorm users.

When it comes to the age of the respondents, there are mostly those who belong to the age limit of 26 to 30 years. The smallest percentage of respondents belongs to the age limit over 40 years, and 30% have been tested for the age of 30 to 40 years. During the research, several age groups were considered to be more representative of the sample. Respondents from all age groups that are included in this chapter of the research belong to the category of ex-dorm students and spent most of their high school education at the students’ dorm.

Chart 1.5. *School education of respondents*




From Chart 3.1. it is evident that in terms of school education, respondents are as much as 56% with completed faculty or master, while 41% are interviewed with completed high school. The smallest percentage of those surveyed belongs to the category of possession of the scientific degree of Doctor of Science, PhD, and they are 3%.

In the working status of the respondents, we note that the largest number of respondents are employed in the form of permanent employment, ie 54%, while 32% of the respondents are currently unemployed (Chart 3.4.). Of the total number of respondents, 14% have a student status. In this case, the status of a student refers to basic, master and doctoral studies, but they are currently unemployed, or doing part-time work without permanent work engagement.

The issue of socializing during home stay is important for our research because it is one of the conditions for building social trust and network of connections, which basically represents the dimensions of social capital. To this question, the largest number of respondents-51% answered that they had most socialized with the company from home. A smaller number of them (32%) were mostly friends with roommates and 14% were interviewed with a school company. The smallest number of those who have been socializing exclusively with a company outside the home, which is 3%, which is an indicator that the home is a place where acquaintances are realized and make friendships that in the future affect the formation of social capital dimensions. There are many reasons for this, and one of them is the so-called. "forced socialization" in Goffman's sense, but not crucial. Basically, the backbone of socialization of high school students in the students' dorms takes place in a way that they accept the environment and the environment accepts them.

Chart 1.6. *What was the decisive factor for you to socialize with?*



Common interests were, to a large extent, a decisive factor in socializing. As many as 42% of respondents opted out, while other data (Chart 3.2) show that it was crucial for socializing to go to the same school or to stay together at the dorm. A smaller number of those who declared that their decisive factor was to come from the same place, and only 8% of them were questioned. If we compare this data with the data from Chart 1.7. where 72% of the interviewed dorm students said that it was crucial for them to socialize with them in common interests, we will see that it is the dimension that is most important to them in the previous years and later. If we compare these data with the data from the previous two categories of respondents, dorm and non-dorm students, we will see that they also have common interests in dorm (72%, non-dorm 52%) respondents. Therefore, a common interest in all three categories of respondents is imposed as a factor of building trust and social capital. The only oscillation is in relation to the non-dorm students, because in addition to their common interests, the fact that they go to the same school, which is a product of different positions and social orientations as a determinant of life in different circumstances and conditions of socialization, is also an important factor.

The highest trust during the time spent in the dorm, the respondents had in the educators-45%, while the roommates and friends from the dorm share the same percentage (26%), which is interesting data. Educators at dorm have a substitute role for a biological parent. They are in principle much more than ordinary pedagogues working with students, because with their work and commitment they are actually something that can not be identified with parents, but to a large extent their function is more than a mere social welfare and nothing more than that.

During their stay in the dorm, the respondents gained the greatest trust in their roommates or mothers from the room and educators. Particularly interesting is the fact that a large number of respondents marked friends from the home as someone they trusted in, and that number is greater than those who have declared themselves fully trusted in their roommates. This is an indicator that social trust as one of the most important dimensions of social capital does not occur only among roommates in a room, but spreads to the whole community. Here, the community's cohesiveness appears as an essential determinant of the formation of networks of reciprocity, and through trusting the realization of the possibility of building social capital.


As the most important factor of success in society, the majority of respondents said that they were knowledge and education. These two categories, in the opinion of the respondents, represent the backbone of success in the society because without them other social categories and the factors do not have real value.

Particularly interesting is the fact that 36% of the respondents said they were helped by friends a lot. Thus, the process of integration into the new environment for the ex-dorm students was relatively fast and without major obstacles, and the reason for this is largely in the nature of the home environment that is specific and new individuals who are willing to accept the new environment rules that such individuals relatively quickly Assimilates. It is also one of the important indicators of dorm students readiness to accept new members of a wider network of relationships and build relationships on which social capital rests.

An exceptionally large number of respondents in terms of their satisfaction with the experience they gained during their stay in the dorm, stated positive (80%), while only 3% of the respondents stated that they were not satisfied with the acquired experience during their stay in the dorm. Even a small number of those who are partially satisfied (7%), which indicates that the home is a positive environment in which the relationships of the secondary school students are appropriate, and in that sense the experiences gained are generally positive.


When it comes to factors of promotion in society, the largest percentage of those surveyed consider it to be education, connections and acquaintances, while a high percentage and those who consider it to be money, but the first two factors are of decisive importance. Respondents are aware of the fact that education is an extremely important factor, but without social connections and acquaintances it is impossible to advance in society. Here we notice that strong elements of social capital appear, connections and acquaintances in the perception of the respondents get more importance.

Chart 1.7. *Did your friendships from the Dorm help you in life?*



In Chart 3.3 we see that the majority of those who have declared that they were largely (43%) gained friendship from the Dorm helped later in life. A smaller percentage is those who have declared that they have gained a good experience, and such respondents are 37%. A percentage of 10% of respondents who have declared that they have acquired acquaintances have not helped anything in their life compared to a percentage of 43% of those who say the opposite, is one of the more important indicators not only of building but also of the distribution of social capital in the dorm community. Chart 3.3 shows that the claim that social capital is being built in the dorm in the way of achieving a high degree of social trust and creating networks of connectivity and reciprocity is almost entirely accurate. Relationships built between dorms are such that social capital is largely built on the basis of strong relationships of reciprocity that obviously do not stop even after the end of that period of life, but they are visible and survive even after the school ends and staying in the dorm.

Scale 1.8. *Factors of progress in the society*



On scale 4.1. the attitudes of the respondents regarding the factors of social progress are presented and here we notice that, according to the respondents, they are among the most important factors for the lack of communication in the society of connections and acquaintances and education that again without connections and acquaintances does not have a great effect. This is about of the attitude that educators have for general social categories and values, and on the basis of their knowledge and experience, crystallized exactly these attitudes that clearly show that social capital is desirable and appreciated in the eyes of educators and that they (knowingly or unconsciously) are considered crucial for advancement in society.

Discussion of research results

From the presented results of empirical research, we have seen that four categories of respondents (dorm students, non-dorm students, high school students - dorm users and educators) responded to questions related to the acquisition of social trust and, consequently, the construction of social capital. Adolescence is a period of human life when people are most intensely building their own system of values, adopting patterns of behavior, cultural value, and building their personality. In this process, the emergence of social trust is of paramount importance, because on the basis of trust young people build their worldviews and general processes of secondary socialization. Since social trust is an important dimension of social capital, as discussed in the theoretical part of this paper, we come to the conclusion that social capital is being built among young people who are staying in students' dorms.

From the above presented empirical data, we see that 12% of the interviewed dorm students expressed their confidence in their educators, while 15% of the non-dorm students trusted their teachers at school, while 26% of the ex-dorm students examined said that during their stay in the dorm, they had confidence in educators. This is an exact data that directly confirms the part of the basic hypothesis that refers to the assumption that in the educational system the processes of monitoring the development of peer groups in conditions of collective accommodation are not sufficiently prepared. In the developmental hypotheses of this empirical research, data appear which negate some of these hypotheses, and some confirm.

The first elaborate hypothesis (the acquisition of social trust in secondary school students is determined by the material, social and value position of an individual) is completely rejected because we have seen from the data that respondents of the category of material wealth, social prestige and reputation

are marginal and as such they do not reject them categorically, but they do not accept them.

Another elaborate hypothesis (Social capital and network connections is built up by high school students under the influence of external factors) to a large extent is confirmed on the basis of the respondents' attitudes where the hosts mostly interact with members of their family and friends from the home community, suggesting that their worldview is largely determined by the feeling of belonging to the community. On the other hand, territorial capital appears, and that is the kind of social capital that is built on the basis of belonging to a particular territory from which individuals come.

In the third elaborate hypothesis (Social norms play an important role in generating social capital among high school students), acceptance or rejection of social norms and rules of behavior appears, which we can say are within the limits of normality and on the basis of those surveyed in this study we have not noticed that social norms are rejected, but accepted and respected as a normative category in the behavior that is being adopted.

The fourth elaborate hypothesis (the construction of social capital in secondary school students is mainly based on social trust) is fully confirmed and social trust is the basic base and the dimension on which social capital construction is based. It can not be said that the other dimensions are not important, but social trust is nevertheless the basis for any kind of development of such social relationships that ultimately have the prospect of building social capital.

Fifth elaborate hypothesis (The built social capital in the Dorm is a resource that can be used later) is fully confirmed. The confirmation of this hypothesis stems from the fact that the dorm students believe that they would use the acquired acquaintances from dorm in the future (66% of the respondents), while 25% of the respondents are sure they will. In this regard, we can conclude that the built social capital of the ex-dorm students is fully efficient and its distribution is real.

The sixth developing hypothesis (the conditions of out-of-pocket socialization significantly influence the construction of social capital among high school students) was confirmed on the basis of the data we received from the interviewed households where we saw that the solidarity and interdependence of the members of the home community is quite strong because there are strengths and strong and weak connections are some prerequisites for building social capital.

The seventh hypothesis (The home environment causes the emergence of special new forms of social capital) was confirmed because we identified three forms of social capital (dorm equity, educational capital and youth cap-

ital) that were imposed on us as new forms of social capital. Although they have touch points, they are separate phenomena and their manifestations are diverse. Dorm capital is the kind of social capital that, in Gofman's sense, has the inhabitants of a "total institution", where in the first place it refers to dorms and interns, and the universality of its manifestations is complex. Dorm capital is more durable in nature than the one who builds non-Jews, and the reasons for this are many. Educational capital would be the kind of social capital that is built on the basis of the process of educating adolescents where individuals adopt such norms of behavior and action that ultimately have the possibility of building social capital on the basis of an educated influential individual. Youth capital could be described as a specific type of social capital that has a category of adolescents and high school students, both dorm and non-dorm students, who would be labeled as youth as a single name. The social capital of a young person is specific and differs in many ways from other forms of social capital and is conditioned by a number of different circumstances where territorial affiliation does not play a decisive role due to the increasing use of mass communications. In this sense, we are talking about the special type of socialization that we can label as virtual socialization, which greatly encourages the development of new forms of social capital.

When individuals move and communicate within different social circles, they actually connect the home community in an indirect way to the wider environment and provide it with new and useful information. We can designate the dorm community as a closed network, but not in terms of rigid closeness to external influences, but that such a conceived community has its own rules and norms that are respected within the network and in such a way creates a network of reciprocity and interdependence in Putnam (Putnam) level, and that external influences are provided through the involvement of actors in other social circles from which they obtain new information useful to the community. The dorm in itself implies the existence of a closed network within it, because the way in which actors in the network of the home community build their relationships and the overall influence of internal and external factors lead to the fact that the home community has a closed or possibly semi-open, as in the previous debate on social capital not known. A new actor in the network of the home community can be incorporated only if it accepts the rules and norms of the community, and avoids radical individualism. Such actors may also be external in the sense that they do not live in the home, but that they are members of the home community through a greater number of acquaintances with homeowners, but this is rare. At Kolman, we find that closed networks can provide a better basis for cooperation, which in our case is true, and the reasons for this are found in the fact that actors in the

network of the home community even necessarily realize very good mutual cooperation that enables them to function better and survive within dorm communities and in wider environments. Ronald Bart argues that stronger social connections in closed networks can be a source of rigidity, and in that case there is a danger of negative social capital in the sense of the unsocial capital theses set by Portes and Levy, but this danger can be overcome by better control and accountability access to education staff at home.

Conclusion

After all previous considerations, we suggest that the specific type of social capital that is being built in students' dorms, which we have established from the previous exhibitions and research, is designated as educational educational capital. He could not have a scientific-educational character because, in itself, scientific capital in the Burdhi sense signifies some other aspects and elements that we did not identify in mutual relations among adolescents in our dorms, while educational capital in these conditions of creating networks of interdependence and reciprocity is important and present, but he needs to add a new, so far not known type of social capital, which is educational capital. When we merge all the elements that we have in the networks of mutual relations within the dorm and the population that identifies in it, we will get a new form that we call educational capital. This kind of social capital, which is being built in the conditions of out-of-school secondary socialization of adolescents in students' dorms, manifests itself in the way that, from the arrival of an individual in the dorm community when diversification of radical individualism is carried out by active actors in the network, until his departure from the community as a corresponding participant in the network of interdependencies, such types of relationships in the network happen that the participant participating actively in them, after leaving the institution, quite certainly possesses such capital which in educational sense undoubtedly has its value, but in educational sense these values are of great proportions in the educational- educational character of capital. An individual is enriched for a whole range of values that he himself does not know he owns. All the acquaintances and the mutual contacts that the dorm students realize are actually much wider because in Granovetter's sense relations and contacts are created that can only be discovered later. Educational character is partly created under the influence of educators in the dorms, as well as professors and associates who influence the educational character of an individual, but in educational terms, using educational capital resources, individuals in their

networks of relationships create new values by which they assign a glorified character and Although these values often do not attach particular importance to the older ones, it is possible that they are the backbone of many life decisions of an individual, but also of some major social events. In structural terms, educational capital has the need to be constantly upgraded, but basically its structuralist character remains the same. It depends to a large extent on the general social climate and the impact of a real social environment, but for its construction the crucial dimension arises from the reciprocal relationship of actors in a network where a pertinent relationship between members is necessary in order to avoid negative consequences or to violate the established order of relations in community. Educational capital in dorms is built on the basis of inherent social relations of individuals, which results in the construction of social capital whose distribution and use is manifested throughout the life of an individual.

Literature

- Burt, Roland. *The Social Structure of Competition*. u: Nohria, N., i Eccles, R. (eds.), *Networks and Organizations, Form and Action*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press. 1992.
- Coleman, John. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press. 1990.
- Field, John. *Social capital*, Routledge. 2008.
- Fukuyama, Francis. *Trust: social virtues and the creation of well-being*. Zagreb. 2000.
- Gambetta, Diego. *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*. Blackwell Ltd. 1988.
- Gofman, Ervin. *Azili*. Novi Sad: Mediterran Publishing. 2011.
- Granovetter, Mark. „The strength of weak ties: a network theory revisited“. *Sociological Theory*, Vol. 1. 1983.
- Hentig, Hartmunt. *What kind of education we want*. Zagreb: Educa. 2007.
- Klapan, Anita. *Organization of learning in the student dormitory as a factor of school success*: doctoral dissertation, Rijeka, Faculty of Education, 1994.
- Margaret Levi. *Social and Unsocial Capital: A Review Essay of Robert Putnam's Making Democracy Work*. *Politics and Society* 24, 1996.
- Putnam, Robert. *How to make democracy effective*. Zagreb: Faculty of Political Science, 2003.
- Putnam, D. Robert. *Bowling alone*. Novi Sad: Mediterran publishing, 2008.
- Savagnone, G., Briguglia, A. *Il coraggio di educare*. Leumann: Elledici. 2009.

Spasić, Ivana. „Interpretative sociology - the challenges of understanding the social world“. in: *Interpretative Sociology*, Belgrade: ZUNS. 1998.

Woolcock, Michael. „Social Capital and Economic Development. Toward a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework.“ *Theory and Society*, 27(2). 1998.