Dynamics of Community Development in Hot-spring Resorts
——How does Bonding and Bridging Social Capital Work?——

Yamagata University   Masayuki Kanai

1. Introduction

We investigate how social capital promotes community development in hot-spring resorts in Japan.

The literature of social capital has theoretically divided it into two classes, "bonding" and "bridging" (Putnam 2000). Bonding social capital (cohesiveness of the network inside a community) seems to be useful for community development, because (1) communication and close relationship among community members will be necessary for cooperation, and (2) community development is considered to be a kind of social dilemma which requires strong norms and sanctions in order to prevent community members from free-riding. On the other hand, bridging social capital (ties to the persons outside of the community) will also contribute to community development, because new information and ideas result from outside will help community members to plan and conduct their own community development.

But it is not obvious whether these two social capitals together and simultaneously work for community development. It is a dynamical process, from no movement through discussing and making plan to completing and carrying out that plan. Each stage might require a different kind of social capital. So we examine the dynamic relationship between two social capitals and community development, by operationally dividing the community development process into 3 steps.

2. Data and Methods

Our research group conducted a questionnaire survey on problems and activities of hot-spring resorts, in January to February 2007. The sample was 56 hot-spring resorts of 4 prefectures (Nagano, Yamagata, Gumma, Niigata) which had at least 10 hotels belonging to the local hotel union. A self-administered questionnaire survey to 56 local hotel unions was conducted. The response rate was 91% (51 resorts).

In this study, we use qualitative comparative analysis (QCA). This is because we wish to clarify the dynamic and interactive effects of two kinds of social capitals to the community development process.

Table 1　Variables

	Name	QCA	Description
Dependent	<No Plan>		No movement for community development
	<In Progress>		Drawing up a plan at present
	<Completed>		Plan has already completed
Independent	<Bonding>	I	Average frequency of a hotel-owner hanging out with other hotel-owners in the community is higher than the median of all communities
	<Bridging>	E	Invited lecturer(s) from outside at least once in the year 2006

The dependent variables are three steps of community development; <No Plan>, <In Progress>, <Completed>. Here we pay attention to whether a community has development plan or not, because according to the literature, having a plan and organizations for development is essential and indispensable to community development (Yasumura 2006). The independent variables are two kinds of social capital; <Bonding> and <Bridging>. For the operational definitions of these variables, see table 1.

3. Results

We conducted two QCAs, whose dependent variable were <No Plan> versus <In Progress> and <In Progress> versus <Completed>, respectively. The independent variables were both of <Bonding> and <Bridging> in both of two analyses.

Table 2　Results of QCAs

Dependent	Minimal Disjunctive Form*	Meaning
<No Plan> vs. <In Progress>	I	Having <Bonding> social capital
<In Progress> vs. <Completed>	Ei	Having <Bridging> social capital, and having no <Bonding> social capital

* Capital letters represent that condition (see table 1) exists, and small letters represent that does not.

The results of these analyses are shown in table 2. (1) The condition under which a community moves from <No plan> to <In Progress> is that the community has <Bonding> social capital. This means that in order for community development to start cohesiveness and frequent communication among the community is indispensable. Note that in this phase <Bridging> social capital has no effect on community development. (2) On the other hand, the condition for the transition from <In Progress> to <Complete> is that a community has <Bridging> social capital but has no <Bonding> social capital.

4. Conclusion

These results show that in each phase of community development, a different type of social capital plays an important role. At the beginning of its process, bonding social capital, namely cohesiveness and solidarity of a community unites its members and helps to start the development process. But after that, in order to discuss concise contents of the development plan and finally complete it, bridging social capital, namely information from outside is necessary.

References

Kanai, M., 2008, "Social Structure Supporting Community Development in Hot-spring Resorts," *The Annual Reports of the Tohoku Sociological Society*, 37: 83-91. [in Japanese]

Putnam, R. D., 2000, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ragin, C. C., 1987, *The Comparative Method: Moving beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Yasumura, K., 2006, *Dynamics of Community Development for Sightseeing: A Sociological Study of Sightseeing and Local Community*, Gakubunsha. [in Japanese]