

## The Role of Bonding Social Capital in Enhancing Family Cohesion: A Field Study in Center of Duhok City

Barin Musa Sulaiman (Corresponded Author) <sup>(1)</sup>

Prof. Muhammad Saeed Hussein Al-Barwari, (PhD) <sup>(2)</sup>

<sup>(1)</sup> Lecturer Assistant, Bachelor in Sociology/Department of Sociology, Duhok University  
[barin.sulaiman@uod.ac](mailto:barin.sulaiman@uod.ac)

<sup>(2)</sup> Department of Sociology, Duhok University [muhammad.saeed@uod.ac](mailto:muhammad.saeed@uod.ac)

Copyright (c) 2026 Barin Musa Sulaiman . Prof. Muhammad Saeed Hussein Al-Barwari (PhD)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31973/vbxsvy37>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

### Publication Dates

(Received 2025-06-17) (Revised 2025-07-07) (Accepted 2025-08-07) (Published 2026-09-15)

### Abstract:

This research aims to identify the role of bonding social capital at the level of family cohesion among families living in the center of Dohuk City. Grounded in the theories of Bourdieu, Coleman and Putnam as well as Bowen's Family Systems Theory, this study examines how families' close relationships, emotional support, mutual confidence and care taking are contribute to maintain strong family ties, in an environment such as a city faced with the modern urban challenges.

A quantitative research design is employed. The data was collected through a stratified random sample of 412 families across nine different neighborhoods in Duhok city, selected from different economic levels. A structured questionnaire was utilized to assess family cohesion (communication, emotional connectedness, and shared responsibility) and bonding social capital (trust, empathy, physical assistance, and shared values).

The statistical analysis of the data was performed with SPSS, involving descriptive statistics, Spearman's correlation, and group comparison tests. The findings have shown a statistically significant and strong positive correlation between bonding social capital and family cohesion ( $\rho = 0.740$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Additionally, it is found that these variables were consistently significant across all sociodemographic categories, with no significant differences by age, gender, marital status, or their level of education. With considerable implications for urban social policy, community planning, and family development initiatives in the Iraqi Kurdistan region, these findings highlight the basic role that bonding bonds play in fostering resilience in families and unity.

**\*The authors has signed the consent form and ethical approval**

**Keywords:** Bonding Social Capital, Family Cohesion, Family Relations, Social capital.

## دور رأس المال الاجتماعي الترابطي في تعزيز التماسك الأسري:

## دراسة ميدانية في مركز مدينة دهوك

بارين موسى سليمان (المؤلف المراسل) أ. د. محمد محمّد سعيد حسين البرواري  
مساعد محاضر/جامعة دهوك-كلية العلوم جامعة دهوك-كلية العلوم الإنسانية- قسم  
الإنسانية- قسم علم الاجتماع علم الاجتماع

## تواريخ المنشور

| الإستلام    | النسخة النهائية | الموافقة   | النشر الإلكتروني |
|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------------|
| (2025/6/17) | (2025/7/7)      | (2025/7/8) | (2026/9/15)      |

## (مُلخَصُ البَحْثِ)

يهدف هذا البحث إلى التعرف على دور رأس المال الاجتماعي الترابطي في مستوى التماسك الأسري بين الأسر المقيمة في مركز مدينة دهوك. وانطلاقاً من نظريات بورديو وكولمان وبوتنام، بالإضافة إلى نظرية النظم الأسرية لبوين، يفحص البحث كيف تساهم العلاقات الوثيقة داخل العائلة، والدعم العاطفي، والثقة المتبادلة، والرعاية، في الحفاظ على الروابط الأسرية القوية في بيئة حضرية تواجه تحديات الحداثة والتغير الاجتماعي السريع.

اعتمد البحث على تصميم كمي، حيث تم جمع البيانات من خلال عينة عشوائية طبقية مكونة من 412 عائلات موزعة على تسعة أحياء مختلفة في مدينة دهوك، تم اختيارها وفقاً لمستويات اقتصادية متفاوتة. وقد استُخدم استبيانٌ منظم لقياس التماسك الأسري (من خلال مؤشرات مثل التواصل، والارتباط العاطفي، والمسؤولية المشتركة)، ورأس المال الاجتماعي الترابطي (من خلال الثقة، والتعاطف، والمساعدة الجسدية، والقيم المشتركة). تم تحليل البيانات باستخدام برنامج SPSS، من خلال الإحصاء الوصفي، واختبار ارتباط سبيرمان، واختبارات المقارنة بين المجموعات. وأظهرت النتائج وجود علاقة ارتباط قوية ودالة إحصائية بين رأس المال الاجتماعي الترابطي والتماسك الأسري ((  $p < .001$ ,  $p = 0.740$ )).

كما أظهرت النتائج أن هذه العلاقة كانت ثابتة ومهمة عبر جميع الفئات الديموغرافية، دون وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بحسب العمر أو الجنس أو الحالة الاجتماعية أو المستوى التعليمي. وتسلط هذه النتائج الضوء على الدور الأساسي الذي تلعبه الروابط الترابطية في تعزيز مرونة الأسر ووحدتها، ما يحمل دلالات مهمة لسياسات التنمية الأسرية، والتخطيط المجتمعي، والسياسات الاجتماعية الحضرية في إقليم كردستان العراق.

\* وقع المؤلفون على نموذج الموافقة والموافقة الأخلاقية الخاصة بالمساهمة البشرية في البحث

### **1.1 Introduction**

In the last few decades, urban societies have changed rapidly in terms of social and economic issues. This has placed more stress on traditional family structures and values. During all of these transformations, the concepts of bonding social capital the strong emotionally supportive connections among close family members have become increasingly important for its function in fostering resilience, trust, and cohesion within the family unit. Bonding ties are an important aspect of social capital as it fosters mutual support, shared values, as well as frequent interaction all of which are essential for maintaining stability and unity, particularly in urban settings where relationships among individuals have been challenged by individualism, technological advances dependence, and way of life dissolution. This is especially important in Duhok City Center, an urban area where traditional family relationship seems to be decreased while technological advancement is taking place. As a main social

institution, the family both produces and benefits from social capital. Social bonding within the family and the larger community is enhanced by successive generations passing on of norms of trust and cooperation through strong intra-family networks. In the urban context of Duhok City Center, this study examines the role that bonding social capital has in enhancing family cohesion. It looks at how family members' shared responsibilities, trust, communication, and emotional intimacy foster unity and act as walls against outside external factors. In accomplishing this, the study covers the gap in the local literature and provides useful information for policymakers and educators who want to use family-centered approaches to strengthen the cohesiveness of our urban communities.

### **2. Research Problem:**

Urban areas suffer lots of challenges to family cohesion, including the breakdown of traditional support networks, economic pressures, and rapid societal change. Such problems become even worse in the context of Duhok City Center

by internal displacement, changing demographics, and cultural changes. This city setting makes it difficult for families to remain close and communicate effectively, which frequently results in a loss of interactions and weaker family cohesion.

Bonding Social capital, which includes close emotional bonds, cooperation, mutual support among family members and trust, is essential for building family resilience and cohesiveness. The specific roles that bonding social capital has in enhancing family cohesion in the urban setting of Duhok City still not recognized. While social capital is commonly categorized into bonding, bridging, and linking aspects, a little is known about the distinct function of bonding ties in shaping family dynamics in Kurdish urban society.

In order to address these gaps, this study examines the connection between family cohesion and bonding social capital in Duhok City. Examining how this aspect of social capital affect family dynamics. Understanding these dynamics is essential for formulating strategies to

enhance family cohesiveness and adaptability in the urban setting of Duhok City. Accordingly, the research problem can be defined and identified through the following questions:

1- To what extent does bonding social capital enhance family cohesion in Duhok City's urban setting?

2- What are the family cohesion and bonding social capital levels in Duhok City?

3- How does the level of bonding social capital as well as the level of family cohesion vary across gender, age, education, and marital status?

### **3. Research Importance:**

The study of how bonding social capital is enhancing family cohesion is important and crucial topic due to the major role that families have in building and maintaining societies. Amid the rapid social and economic changes There is an urgent need to understand the aspects that support stability and the strengthening of family ties in urban contexts such as Duhok City. In order for families to overcome obstacles and promote unity, bonding social capital becomes an important aspect. This research

seeks to provide an in-depth knowledge of the relationship between bonding social capital and family cohesiveness in an urban context like Duhok, shedding light on an understudied subject, particularly Kurdistan Region and generally in Iraq, where studies on the interplay between bonding social capital and family cohesion are insufficient. This study will become a useful resource for both scholars and decision-makers.

#### **Theoretical Importance of the research:**

The study's theoretical significance stems from its unique contribution to the subject of family sociology, which looks at the relationship between bonding social capital and family cohesion, especially in the socially and culturally unique setting of an urban community like Duhok. It enriches scholarly debate on the subject by emphasizing the idea of bonding social capital as an essential resource for strengthening and maintaining familial ties. The study also offers new insights into the function of social ties in building strong families by

developing a theoretical framework for understanding how social values like trust, cooperation, and involvement affect family stability and cohesion. This study fills important knowledge gaps by focusing on the urban setting of Duhok City and as it is a first in this area. As far as the researcher is aware, this is the first study of its sort to be carried out in Duhok, providing a distinct perspective on the connection between family cohesion and bonding social capital in this particular urban setting.

#### **4. Research Goals:**

The study aims to:

- 1-Investigate the role of bonding social capital in family cohesion by examining how networks, reciprocity, and trust improve family cohesion in Duhok City.
- 2- Assess the level of bonding social capital among families in Duhok City.
- 3- Measure the level of family cohesion among respondents.
- 4- To evaluate if bonding social capital and family cohesion differ among sociodemographic factors such as gender, age, education level, and marital status.

## **5. Research Limitations:**

The limitations of this research are defined as follows:

1- Spatial Limitation: The research focused in the center of Duhok City, including 48 neighborhoods. The data were gathered from families living in this urban area.

2- Human Limitation: The population being targeted consisted of 412 families living in the center of Duhok City. The research focused on urban households to examine social capital and family cohesion.

3- Time Limitation: This research is limited by the academic year 2024-2025.

## **6. Basic Concepts of Research:**

### **1. Social Capital**

The concept of “social capital” describes the type of ties that bind people and groups together in a community, it has a big impact on how social issues are shaped and how successfully human societies can work together and live in harmony (حوكا, 2015). It is the collective set of shared values, beliefs, and social ties that allow individuals and groups to collaborate successfully toward common goals (Dario Castiglione, Jan W. van Deth, 2005). It includes all of the

value and benefits gained from social connections, promoting trust, understanding, and reciprocity to promote collaboration in communities and groups (Lindon J. Robison, 2002). Social capital contains both material and immaterial results, including mutual support, trust, information exchange, and shared value (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Jacqueline Scott, Judith Treas & Richards, 2004). This concept is influenced by reciprocal relationships, social norms, and trust that foster cooperation which exist in the communication time between people (قاسمي. et al., 2007). Coleman defines social capital in terms of functions, emphasizing how it may change relationships to promote action (سعادت, 2007). Social capital, on the other hand, is defined by Bourdieu as the sum of the benefits obtained now and in the future by belonging to networks of structured relationships (Field, 2003). Social ties or participation, the degree of trust in these relationships, and the resources or advantages gained from them are the three main components of social capital, according to

Matsaganis and Wilkin (2014). However, Dolfsma and Dannreuther (2003) and Edwards and Foley (1997) argue that because social capital is viewed differently in different fields, there is no globally recognized definition for it. Although there isn't one universally accepted definition, it's generally accepted to be the value that comes from social networks that connect people and promote collaboration, which eventually benefits society as a whole (Lindon J. Robison, Robert J. Myers, 2002). Both Bourdieu and Coleman, as sociologists, as well as Putnam as a political scientist, are recognized for developing the main ideas and current discussions around social capital (Carroll & Stanfield, 2003). Social capital, according to Bourdieu refers to the actual and potential resources derived from participation in formal social networks. Its value depends on the size and mobilization capacity of these networks, and it represents a purposeful investment in relationships driven by the expectation of reciprocity, with the potential to be converted into economic

capital under certain conditions (Bourdieu, 1986). According to Putnam, social capital is made up of aspects of social life such as networks, conventions, and trust that make it easier for people to cooperate in order to accomplish common objectives (R. Putnam, 1993). Whereas Coleman defined social capital in terms of its purpose, claiming that it is a sufficient number of links between people rather than an independent entity. According to him, it improves social structure in some ways and makes it easier for people to act in particular ways within that structure (Coleman, 1988). Accordingly, social capital includes normative regulations that govern, for example, walking on busy roads or taking turns in lines, as well as the function of asking for assistance from others in a community, which strengthens bonds and distribute social benefits (Coleman, 1990). Lin indicates that social capital "should be defined as resources embedded in a social structure that are accessed and/or mobilized in purposive actions" (Burt, 2001) stresses that social capital

includes more than just having relationships; it additionally involves how these relationships give access to beneficial resources. Drawing from previous definitions, the researcher sees social capital as a set of social connections that unite people and organizations, aiding in the resolution of social problems and fostering mutual understanding, cooperation, and trust for a shared goal. As social capital is essential to family cohesiveness because it builds relationships, promotes interpersonal trust, and creates an accepting environment that increases family resilience and stability.

## 2. Bonding Social Capital

Bonding social capital is the term that refers to close relationships between people who have strong personal ties, such as family, close friends, and neighbors. These relationships usually develop between people who share important social traits, such as political views, religion, class, ethnicity, or level of education. In extremely close groups, bonding capital tends to be inward-focused, encouraging solidarity and mutual support among members. It facilitates

the development of smaller groups like neighborhood associations or self-help groups, improves communication, and encourages collaboration toward common objectives (Van Oorschot et al., 2006).

## 3. Social Relations

A social relations can be defined as “a description of social interaction between two or more parties, where each party forms an image of the other, which influences their judgment of one another either positively or negatively, social relations encompass aspects like kinship and family bonds, friendship, workplace friendship, acquaintances and friends(عثمان, 2009). Social relations are the outcome of people interacting and communicating with one another in order to meet their needs. These connections also help shape an individual’s function and performance in society. Thus, social relationships are seen as a crucial source for the maintenance, satisfaction, and continuity of social life (فكرة, 2017). The researcher defines social relations as interactions between people that build trust and unity, such as friendships,

family, and professional relationships, which are measured by how they affect social stability and communication.

#### 4. Trust

Trust is one of the main components of social capital, as it is essential for the stability of social relationships, effective problem-solving, and even societal survival. Blau (Blau, 1964) states that “trust is essential for stable relationships,” while Bok (Bok, 1978) affirms that “when trust is destroyed, societies falter and collapse.” In studies on social capital, trust has been referred as the “glue” or “lubricant” of social ties (Koniordos, 2005). Trust is defined as “the expectation within a community that individuals will behave in an honest, consistent, and cooperative manner based on shared norms” (Fukuyama, 1995).

In contrast to societies with lower levels of trust, which often have weaker democratic structures and slower economic development (Seligman, 1997:36–37), societies with high levels of institutional or extended trust typically have stronger economic growth

(Fukuyama, 1995) and greater civic participation (Putnam, 1993). The researcher sees that trust is a basic component of social capital that facilitates problem-solving, cooperation, and the stability of relationships.

#### 5. Family Cohesion

Family cohesion is the emotional connection and bond that exists between members of a family, with a focus on relationships that are stable, supportive, and caring. Family cohesion is strengthened when these positive relationships are strengthened, however internal unity is weakened when they are broken or move toward outside groups (صالحی, 2017). According to Olson, Russell, and Sprenkle (OLSON et al., 1983), it represents the level of emotional intimacy between members while maintaining their own independence, and it affects relationships and the ability to adjust to changing circumstances (D. H. Olson et al., 1979). Researches indicate that trust, collaboration, and psychological well-being are enhanced by a balanced degree of cohesiveness, where families maintain emotional intimacy

without becoming overly tied (D. Olson, 2011).

Important elements that maintain family cohesion include spousal harmony, dispute resolution, member acceptance, and outside assistance, maintaining strong family ties also requires other factors including moral principles, financial security, and flexibility in response to social norms (منصوري, 2022). Family cohesion can be improved, resulting in more harmony and long-term stability, by individuals acknowledging and accepting family duties, responsibilities, and emotional relationships (D. H. Olson et al., 1979; OLSON et al., 1983). Family cohesion as the researcher sees is the emotional connection and support that family members have for one another, which improves stability and flexibility. It is a vital component of social cohesiveness and is crucial to the stability and success of families.

## **7. Literature Review:**

### **First: Arab studies:**

1- The study “The role of the family in shaping the values of social capital in light of modern

technological changes,” Safwat, Dina Mohamed ( 2021), looks at how families shape social capital values in the face of contemporary technological advancements. By using a sample of 250 students and ten in-depth case studies to concentrate on Cairo’s university youth. In addition to analyzing the effects of contemporary communication techniques on youth social capital, it seeks to examine the ways in which the family affects trust, involvement, collaboration, social cohesiveness, and life satisfaction. Data was gathered quantitatively using case study interviews and questionnaires, and descriptive statistics and structural equation modeling were used for analysis. The results show that families, with high levels of collaboration, engagement, and life happiness, are important in forming social capital. Modern communication technologies, however, have had an important effect on social capital values, resulting in a decrease in family communication and a rise in social isolation. Furthermore, relationships between different aspects of social capital and

demographic characteristics (such age and gender) were discovered. Although social cohesion within the family is discussed in the study as a component of social capital, the causal relationship between social capital and family cohesion is not directly examined. But according to the research, social capital is increased through family connections, trust, and involvement, which may ultimately lead to greater family cohesion.

2- In the study “Indicators of Social Capital in the Family: A Field Study on a Sample of Families in Libyan Society,” Hussein, Hind Abdulqader (2023), examines social capital indicators in Libyan families, emphasizing cohesion, collaboration, trust, participation, and satisfaction. The researcher interviewed ten households (husband and wife) in-depth using a case study methodology. The findings show low engagement with institutions, neighbors, and extended family, but strong intra-family interaction and trust. Although gender differences in satisfaction still exist because of formed cultural

norms, family cohesion emerges as a crucial component of social capital, demonstrated in problem-solving and mutual support. Although cohesion is emphasized in the study as a crucial aspect of social capital, a direct causal link between social capital and family cohesion is not established. The findings’ generalizability is also restricted by its small sample size.

### **Second: International studies**

1- The study entitled “Families and Social Capital: Exploring the Issues,” Edwards, R., Franklin, J., & Holland, J. (2003), explores how social capital and families influence social networks and societal cohesion. Families from many social backgrounds are part of the study community, and the sample is representative of various socioeconomic and ethnic groups. The goal of the study is to examine the ways in which family structures influence social capital, with a focus on the effects of bonding, bridging, and linking social capital. Case studies and interviews serve as the main instruments for gathering data in this qualitative research methodology. The study uses

theme analysis to pinpoint significant patterns in community involvement and family connections. The research indicates that social cohesiveness, trust, and involvement in community activities are all strongly impacted by family-based social capital. Though the study concentrates on more general characteristics of social integration.

2- “Investigating the effect of social capital on the power structure, cohesion and strength of families living in Arak city,” khosravi, S., ahmadi, O. A., roshanaei, A. and jamali, H., (2021). This study investigate how social capital affects family power structures and cohesion. Uses a multi-stage random selection technique to pick 383 households from Arak, Iran. The aim of the study is to examine how social capital and family cohesion relate to one another and how this affects family stability at various stages of life. To evaluate the relationship between social capital, family identity, and sustainability, a quantitative approach was used to gather data via surveys and analyze it using regression

analysis, ANOVA, and the Smirnov test. The results show that through fostering relationship continuity, enhancing family ties, and influencing the division of roles within the home, social capital has a direct impact on family cohesion. The study also emphasizes how social capital is essential for strong and stable families to overcome a variety of obstacles in life. Higher levels of social capital improve family harmony, stability, and social connectivity, according to the study, which specifically tackles the relationship between social capital and family cohesion.

## **8. Theoretical background:**

### **8.1 Theories of Social Capital:**

#### **8.1.1 Social Capital According to Pierre Bourdieu (1930–2002):**

In his Practice Theory, Bourdieu expanded Marxist and conventional economic conceptions of capital to encompass social, cultural, and symbolic capital, ultimately developing the idea of social capital. He believed that in order to maintain group cohesion and unity, members needed to have mutual recognition, shared values, and

constant effort. Social capital, according to Pierre Bourdieu (1986), is the sum of available or potential resources connected to long-lasting networks of formalized connections of recognition and trustworthiness. He saw social capital as an individual's wealth that is based on social structure and connected to class, status, and power (Bourdieu, 1986). In contrast to other theories, Bourdieu highlighted that social capital is distributed unfairly and depends on a person's status in social hierarchies (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). His approach is based on more general sociological theories like fields and habitus, which capture the complex, specific to the circumstance nature of social life (Fine, 2002). Coleman's goal for developing the idea of social capital was to maintain the significance of social structure while incorporating the economic principle of rational actions into the study of social systems (Forsman, 2005). Thus, Coleman connected the fields of sociology with individual social behavior on the one hand and rational economic theory on the other (Jordan, 2015).

### **8.1.2 James Coleman (1926–1995):**

Following Bourdieu, Coleman was a significant theorist who highlighted the importance of social capital in schooling and its influence on subsequent generations. According to him, social capital is a resource rooted in interpersonal relationships that gives people access to chances and assistance that are not possible through economic means alone (Foley & Edwards, 1999). Coleman linked sociology and people's social behaviors to economists' rational theories that people behave individually and in their own best interests. These rational choices are made inside a certain social framework, which explains not just the individual behavior as well as the growth of social structure (Coleman, 1988). People participate in social networks, connections, and interactions as long as their benefits last. In this way, social capital benefits everyone in the group not just those who participate in setting up the organizations or networks and is both a private and public good. For instance, even though some residents

never actively join the watch team, everyone in the community gains when a neighborhood watch organization is established to assist reduce the local crime rate (Coleman, 1988). Based on rational choice theory, his method presents social capital as a productive, particular to the situation resource that is found in the framework of interpersonal relationships rather than in people (Coleman, 1988; 1990). Coleman stressed social capital's function in assisting groups in achieving shared objectives rather than associating it with power or class reproduction, as Bourdieu did. His theories have been widely accepted because they are easy to understand and focus on the practical advantages of social structure, especially in the fields of public health and American social science literature (Smith & Kulynych, 2002).

### **8.1.3 Robert Putnam (1941–present):**

Robert Putnam extended James Coleman's work on social capital by applying the idea to fields such as democracy, political engagement, education, and

child rearing. His groundbreaking work has influenced the way political scientists, foundations, and civic leaders see social capital, particularly his studies on Italian democracy and American civic life (Smith & Kulynych, 2002). President Bill Clinton reacted to Putnam's work and spoke about it in his 1995 State of the Union speech (Portes, 1998). According to Putnam's 1995 book *Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital*, civil society in the US has been declining in recent years. His opinion was supported by data such as declining newspaper readership, falling attendance at elections, and declining participation in neighborhood associations such as volunteer clubs, PTA (Parent Teacher Association) (R. Putnam, 1993;1995). Based on his studies in Italy, he demonstrated that areas with stronger community involvement traditions typically have more successful governments. According to him, social capital consists of the trust, rules, and networks that enable people to cooperate for the good of everyone (R.

Putnam, 1993). Putnam's main contribution was to link social capital to "civicness" group-level social norms, political engagement, and trust rather than just interpersonal ties. Putnam placed more emphasis on general social trust across communities than Coleman did on trust specific settings (Foley & Edwards, 1999). And also, unlike Bourdieu, he links social capital to cities, communities, and society at large, moving the emphasis from the individual to the community level. Putnam highlights the critical role that social capital plays for both Individuals and communities, characterizing it as an essential tool that people use to address social issues (R. D. Putnam, 1995).

According to him, social networks are valuable because, just as tangible resources like a screwdriver or a college degree (which are examples of human and physical capital) increase productivity, social relationships also increase the performance of both individuals and groups (R. D. Putnam, 1995). He uses a metaphor to say that social capital is the "oxygen" that maintains a community.

Additionally, he underlined that the family is the most fundamental form of social capital says there is "massive evidence of the loosening of bonds within the family (both extended and nuclear)" and that this is "well known" and cited failing family relationships as evidence of societal destruction (R. D. Putnam, 1995). Putnam proposed a number of reasons for the decline of social capital in the United States, including the emergence of more women into the workforce, the increased rate of migration, which makes it more difficult to establish ties in a community, and the way technology has made leisure increasingly isolated and personalized (R. D. Putnam, 1995).

Two kinds of social capital are identified by Putnam: bridging social capital, which links people from different social backgrounds, and bonding social capital, which strengthens bonds within homogeneous groups (such as families and close friends). According to him, bridging capital promotes cooperation and social integration more than anything else (Robert D. Putnam, 2000). Putnam's

concept received criticism from scholars for failing to take structural inequality into account. According to feminist and critical race theorists, his theory, which frequently excludes women and people of color from formal social networks, is mostly centered on the experiences of white, middle-class males prior to the 1960s (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). A more intersectional and inclusive conception of social capital is demanded by these criticisms.

The research instrument's structure was carefully guided by the fundamental concepts of bonding social capital, which were based on the theoretical works of Bourdieu, Coleman, and Putnam. Strong familial ties are measured using elements influenced by Bourdieu's focus on social networks. Coleman's ideas on reciprocity and trust influenced ideas about shared responsibilities and mutual support. Empathy, shared values, and emotional intimacy have been included as a result of Putnam's theory of bonding social capital. With the guidance of these theories, the researcher managed to create a

tool that accurately shows the essential elements of bonding social capital and how it contributes to the strengthening of family ties.

## **8.2 Theoretical Approaches to Family Cohesion**

### **8.2.1 Structural–Functionalist Perspective:**

Structural-functionalism in sociology is a fundamental theoretical perspective that describes how social structures promote societal stability and functioning. It emerged in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and views society as a complex system with interrelated parts that all play important roles in maintaining the equilibrium of society (Horton & Hunt, 1984). Institutions like the family, education, and religion are seen as components that contribute to maintaining social harmony by performing necessary functions. The structural–functional approach was developed and refined by prominent scholars like Robert K. Merton, Talcott Parsons, Émile Durkheim, and Herbert Spencer. Durkheim put more emphasis on societal facts and cohesiveness, while Spencer compared society to a living organism. Merton (1968)

extended Parsons' (1951) systematic account of the ways in which different elements of society contribute to its stability by including notions such as dysfunctions and latent functions to explain both intentional and unexpected social impacts (Ritzer, 1996). Moreover, functionalist ideas were extended to the study of kinship and culture by scholars such as Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski, who stressed the ways in which social structures maintain overall stability and cohesion (FLIS, 1992). Structural-functionalism has even older philosophical roots, going back to Aristotle's idea of nature and Montesquieu's 17<sup>th</sup>-century theory of the separation of powers, which placed an emphasis on various societal functions to maintain stability (Woodger, 1948). The rise of Darwin's theory of evolution additionally had a big impact on functionalist thinking. Early sociologists and anthropologists used similar language to study society since Darwin believed that existence depended on the capacity for adaptation of various sections. This functionalist perspective was accepted by social

Darwinism specifically, which maintained that unsuitable institutions would ultimately disappear and claimed that progress in society derived from the functional adaptation of each of its components (Merton, 1968). In his work, Émile Durkheim developed the fundamental sociological ideas of collective consciousness and social facts, which gradually supported the functionalist theory of social integration (Pope, 1975). Later, Almond and Coleman grew functionalist concepts into political science by using them to compare and contrast the political system (Almond & Coleman, 1960). In the context of family cohesion, structural-functionalism offers important insights into how the family functions as a fundamental social unit. It is believed that the family plays crucial roles in fostering the general stability and integration of society. According to Horton and Hunt, the family is a vital social unit that carries out important functions like socialization, emotional support, and economic cooperation. These functions are essential for maintaining unity within the family and in

society as a whole (Horton & Hunt, 1984). According to Talcott Parsons' AGIL model, which represents four functional imperatives, integration is essential to family cohesion as it ensures that family members support and engage mutually with one another (Ritzer, 1996). This perspective was widened by Robert K. Merton, who introduced the ideas of dysfunction and non-functionality. He stressed that not all family dynamics support stability because role strain or conflict could weaken cohesiveness (Merton, 1968). Structural-functional theory also uses an organic analogy: social institutions such as the family are interdependent and essential to the health of society, much as organs support the body (Handel, 1993; Wolinsky, 1988). Structural-functionalism offers an extensive basis for understanding the importance of family unity in maintaining social stability. By focusing on the roles, standards, and functions that families carry out, this theory offers a lens through which to examine the relationship between family

dynamics and the well-being of society (Haralambos & Holborn, 2000; Ritzer, 1996). The core principles of the theory are still crucial for clarifying how family cohesion supports the maintenance and survival of the social structure, despite its weaknesses, which include its traditional bias and difficulty in addressing social change and conflict.

### **8.2.2 Family Systems Theory:**

Family Systems Theory, created by Murray Bowen in the 1950s and developed in the 1970s, is an important foundation in family studies and family therapy. According to the theory, the family can be best described as an emotional and interconnected system in which each member's behavior largely depends on the actions of the others. As no individual within a family can be fully understood in isolation, because one member's actions and feelings ultimately affect the entire system (Hall, 1983). The theory contains several key ideas that explain how families function as systems, such as triangles, self-differentiation, emotional cutoff, and multigenerational transmission processes. These processes

explain how emotional patterns appear, continue, and are passed down across generations, as well as how family members deal with familial bonds, conflict, and stress (Bowen, 1993). Bowen's theory draws on the assumption that families look for emotional equilibrium and establish repetitive interaction patterns both healthy and unhealthy in order to achieve this balance. A well-functioning family structure is marked by flexible boundaries, effective communication, and members who can remain emotionally connected while keeping their individual identities (Nichols, 2012). According to this theoretical perspective, family cohesion reflects emotional bonding and connectedness among family members. Bowenian theory does not define cohesiveness with constant closeness but rather with the ability to maintain an emotional connection without excessive reliance or emotional fusion. This balance is defined as self-differentiation each family member's ability to engage in relationships while maintaining their sense of autonomy (Kerr & Bowen,

1988). Families with a great deal of differentiation tend to be more cohesive in a healthy way; they support one another, manage conflict effectively, and maintain appropriate boundaries in their emotions. Families with a little differentiation, on the other hand, may become enmeshed (extremely tight, with fuzzy boundaries) or emotionally cut off (overly distant and disconnected), both of which are viewed as family system dysfunctions that hinder healthy cohesion (Brown & Errington, 2024). Thus, Family Systems Theory provides an adequate framework for examining how cohesiveness is formed, preserved, and damaged within families. It highlights that cohesiveness is an ongoing process impacted by communication patterns, emotional balance, and generational dependency. Bowen's Family Systems Theory provided the framework for the research's view of family cohesion. In line with Bowen's theory of balanced differentiation, the questionnaire asked about communication, shared responsibility, and emotional

attachment. The idea that enhanced family cohesion can be promoted by stronger bonding social capital through emotional limits and supportive relationships was also supported by the theory.

## **9. Research Procedures:**

### **9.1 Research Methodology**

This research employs an analytical descriptive methodology to provide an in-depth understanding of how bonding social capital enhance family cohesion in center of Duhok City. The descriptive method allows for identifying the relations between variables and their theoretical and empirical interpretation. The independent variable is bonding social capital where dependent variable is family cohesion. The research's theoretical framework is based on Bourdieu, Coleman, and Putnam's theories of social capital. A quantitative social survey method was applied empirically, with a structured questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale to gather numerical data on bonding social capital and family cohesion.

### **9.2 Research Population**

The current research population consists of all

families residing in the center of Duhok City, totaling about 45,428 families, distributed across 48 neighborhoods or areas within the city's administrative boundaries. This number is based on official data provided by the Duhok Directorate of Statistics for the year 2025, obtained through an official letter. This population was selected due to its significance in representing the urban social structure and because the family is considered the fundamental unit for analyzing the role of social capital in enhancing family cohesion. The variety of socioeconomic characteristics among neighborhoods allowed for broad insight into the different family dynamics and social structures in Duhok City, thereby increasing the comprehensiveness and accuracy of the study's findings.

### **9.3 Research Sample**

The research sample consisted of 412 families selected from a total population of 45,428 families residing in the center of Duhok City. The proper sample size was initially calculated using Cochran's Formula, which resulted in a

needed sample size of 381 households. However, the researcher decided to raise the sample size to 412 in order to improve accuracy and ensure a more reliable representation of the community at large. The sample size is determined not only by statistical calculation, but also by a number of important factors, including the characteristics of the research population, the time available for data collection, the researcher's effort, and financial resources. When the population is homogeneous, smaller numbers of respondents may be sufficient; but, in heterogeneous communities, samples with greater numbers are more appropriate to capturing variation (Boora & Gupta, 2021). In this study, the population considered diverse due to differences in the social and economic status of families across the city's neighborhoods. To take into consideration for this diversity, the sampling procedure followed a proportional stratified random sampling strategy to capture the social and economic diversity of the urban community. The questionnaire was distributed across nine neighborhoods in

the center of Duhok City, selected based on income-level classifications provided by the Duhok Directorate of Statistics, specifically, 30% of the sample was allocated to low-income neighborhoods, 50% to middle-income neighborhoods, and 20% to high-income neighborhoods. Within each stratum, households were proportionally selected based on the relative number of families in each neighborhood. This method ensured equitable and representative coverage of Duhok City's socio-economic diversity. This classification relied on observable criteria such as residing type and value of property. Families were selected randomly from these neighborhoods to ensure balanced representation across the city's many social strata. For greater involvement and accessibility, the researcher distributed the questionnaires using two methods: paper-based distribution through direct fieldwork and online distribution using a Google Forms link shared with residents in the chosen neighborhoods. This combined method allowed the researcher to access a greater range of

participants from varied socioeconomic backgrounds, resulting in the collection of more accurate and comprehensive data that was in line with the study's analytical aims.

The sample was distributed proportionally based on income level: 30% for low-income neighborhoods, 50% for middle-income neighborhoods, and 20% for high-income neighborhoods. Within each income group, households were selected based on the relative population size of each neighborhood to ensure balanced representation across Duhok City's diverse social structure.

#### **9.4 Research tools**

A structured questionnaire was designed after reviewing relevant literature on social capital and family cohesion to measure the main variables of the study: social capital and family cohesion. It was created to find out how people living in Duhok City's center assume bonding social capital and how it influences family cohesion. The 35-item questionnaire prepared by the researcher to measure bonding social capital and the family cohesion scale

includes three main sections: The first (8 items), contains general demographic data about the respondents such as respondent's age, gender, education level .... etc.; the second is the bonding social capital (12 items), included subdimensions such as trust, emotional support, mutual help, and shared values. Example item: "I have complete trust in my family members", "My family members help each other without hesitation" ... etc. And the third is the family cohesion scale consist of (15 items) benefiting from a modified version of the "Family Satisfaction Scale" by Olson, 2000, to determine how satisfied people were with their families' connection, communication openness, and cooperation to measure family cohesion such as "Decisions in my family are made collectively", "My family makes sure to spend enjoyable time together regularly, such as eating meals or going on family trips". All questions were closed-ended and structured on a Likert scale (from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) for facilitating response and statistical analysis. To minimize

bias in responses, the language was carefully reviewed for clarity, accuracy, and neutrality. Each scale was tested for validity and reliability to ensure the accuracy and consistency of the data collected from participants in the center of Duhok City.

### **Validity of the Questionnaire**

Validity refers to how effectively a test measures what it aims to assess and whether or not the findings gathered from its results are relevant, meaningful, and useful (Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, 1999)(AERA) et al., 1999). There are several forms of validity: content validity, which is judged by experts on how well items reflect what was intended ; criterion-related validity, which is measured by how results relate to external factors, including concurrent and predictive validity ; and construct validity, which decides whether the test measures the intended concept ;The term "face validity" relates to how valid a test appears to users(Indira Gandhi National Open University, 2021). To ensure both the accuracy and

appropriateness of the research tool used in this study, two types of validity stood out: content validity and face validity. Content validity is important to this study because it decides whether the questionnaire items adequately represent the dimensions of the concepts under inquiry, which are bonding social capital and the key elements of family cohesion (emotional support, trust, communication, and mutual responsibility). In order to confirm the content validity of the questionnaire, twelve experts in the domains of sociology, psychology, social work, and educational sciences reviewed the questionnaire to confirm its validity, they were asked to assess the statement's accuracy, clarity, and relevance of the items in measuring the concepts of bonding social capital and family cohesion. Based on their feedback, several items were modified, such as combining or eliminating repeated statements, to improve clarity and reduce respondent boredom while keeping consistent with the theoretical framework. The validity score for the bonding social capital scale was 95.5%,

while the family cohesion scale scored 94.9%, showing excellent and scientifically acceptable levels of content and face validity. The overall average validity rate was 95.2%, indicating that the questionnaire is adequate for gathering reliable field data. Participants used a Likert scale of one to five points for assessing their level of satisfaction, with 1 indicating “completely dissatisfied” and 5 indicating “completely satisfied.”

### **Reliability of the Questionnaire**

Reliability refers to a test’s consistency and stability in measuring what it intended to measure. A reliable test gives consistent results when repeated under the same situations and has no notable measurement mistakes. It can be assessed by using a variety of methods, such as test-retest, split-half, item-total correlation, inter-rater reliability, and statistical tools such as Cronbach’s alpha and Pearson correlation. While 100% reliability is uncommon, a reliability value of 0.70 or higher is generally accepted, 0.90 or above is preferred for

high-accuracy measurements . (Indira Gandhi National Open University, 2021). To ensure the reliability of the research instrument, two widely approved statistical methods were applied: test-retest reliability and Cronbach’s alpha. The questionnaire’s reliability was tested using the test-retest and Cronbach’s alpha methods. The test-retest method evaluated the reliability of responses over time by giving the questionnaire to the same group twice to determine the correlation between scores. Cronbach’s alpha evaluated the internal reliability of items within both dimension (bonding, and family cohesion), with values more than 0.70 considered acceptable. Both, these methods proved the tool’s reliability in measuring the desired social elements(Indira Gandhi National Open University, 2021). The first method used to testing questionnaire reliability was test-retest reliability, which was set using Spearman’s rho correlation between responses gathered at 2 separate time points (T1 and T2). As shown in the table below, that all examined scale had significant

correlations at the 0.01 level ( $p < .001$ ,  $N = 30$ ), showing consistent responses over time.

The second method to assess questionnaire reliability was to use Cronbach's alpha to measure internal consistency. Both scales showed excellent reliability as shown in the table below, showing strong internal consistency. Additionally, the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) values (average measurements) for both dimensions reached 0.88, indicating high stability over time. These findings indicate that the instrument is statistically reliable for measuring the function of bonding social capital in enhancing family cohesion in Duhok City.

## **10. Results and Discussion:**

### **10.1 The normality tests for the key variables of research:**

Normality tests were applied to choose the proper statistical methods (parametric or non-parametric) for the main variables: bonding social capital, and family cohesion. Two tests were utilized: Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk. These tests enable to determine whether data are normally distributed,

which is critical for selecting whether to use correlation/regression or non-parametric methods.

Table (4) presents the results of normality tests for the research's major variables. According to the Shapiro-Wilk results, both variables, bonding and family cohesion, had significance levels less than 0.05, showing that their distributions away from normality. The Lilliefors correction was applied to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test allowing for the use of estimated parameters from the sample, which increased the test's accuracy.

### **10.2 Results According to Research Objectives:**

#### **Objective 1: Investigate how bonding social capital assists to enhanced family cohesion.**

For analyzing the relationship between bonding social capital and family cohesion Spearman's rank correlation was used because of the non-normal distribution of variables (as demonstrated through normality test).

Table (5) shows that there's strong positive relationships between bonding social capital and family cohesion ( $\rho =$

0.740), showing that strong internal family relationships significantly increase cohesion. The results shown here show bonding social capital, plays an important role in enhancing family cohesion.

**Objective 2: Assess the level of bonding social capital among families in Duhok City.**

**Objective 3: Measure the level of family cohesion among respondents.**

For the second and third research objective, aiming to measure the level of bonding social capital as well as family cohesion, descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) are made for both bonding social capital and family cohesion to assess their overall level in the sample.

This table presents the mean and standard deviation for both variables. As shown in Table (6), bonding social capital had a strong mean ( $M = 4.04$ ,  $SD = 0.64$ ) and also family cohesion had a strong mean ( $M = 4.10$ ,  $SD = 0.70$ ), indicating significant connection within families.

**Objective 4: To evaluate if bonding social capital and family cohesion differ among**

**sociodemographic factors such as gender, age, education level, and marital status.**

### **1. Gender Differences**

#### **Shapiro-Wilk Normality Test:**

The Shapiro-Wilk test was applied to decide whether parametric or non-parametric tests could be employed to both of the key variables (bonding social capital and family cohesion) within each demographic grouping.

The Shapiro-Wilk test has been used to check for normality in each gender group between the study variables. The study found that bonding social capital and family cohesion scores were not normally distributed for both genders ( $p < .05$ ). The Mann-Whitney U test has been used for all gender comparisons, to ensure consistency in analysis across variables.

#### **▪ Mann-Whitney U Test:**

The Mann-Whitney U test was applied to find out whether there were significant differences between males and females in regards to bonding social capital, as well as family cohesion.

The Mann-Whitney U test outcomes show that there were no statistically significant gender differences in bonding social capital, and also in family cohesion. Females had slightly greater mean ranks in most factors, but the differences were not significant at the 0.05 level. As a result, gender does not appear to have a significant effect on levels of social capital or family cohesion among the study respondents.

## **2. Age Group Differences**

The Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that both variables across the five age groups weren't meeting the assumption of normality. Only one variable (such as bonding social capital in certain age groups) showed normal distributions. To compare levels of social capital and family cohesion across age groups, the Kruskal-Wallis (non-parametric) test was adopted.

### **▪ Kruskal-Wallis H test for Age Category:**

Based to a non-normal distribution of both variables across age groups, the Kruskal-Wallis H test (a non-parametric alternative to One-Way ANOVA) was utilized for analyzing variations in bonding

social capital and family cohesion among the five age groups.

The Kruskal-Wallis H test indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between bonding social capital ( $p = 0.092$ ), and family cohesiveness ( $p = 0.106$ ), showing that age has no effect on close connections, or family cohesion

## **3. Education Level Differences**

The Shapiro-Wilk test outcomes showed that, although both variables in the "Below Primary" group matches the normality assumption, significant violations occurred in other education levels. For such violations and the necessity for consistency, the Kruskal-Wallis test was determined as the best non-parametric approach for comparing bonding social capital and family cohesion at different education levels.

### **▪ Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Education Level**

The Kruskal-Wallis H test was applied to assess differences in bonding social capital and family cohesion across educational levels.

The Kruskal-Wallis H test showed no significant differences were found for bonding ( $p = 0.200$ ), or family cohesion ( $p = 0.220$ ), showing that these aspects are rather stable regardless of educational background.

#### **4. Marital Status Differences**

The Shapiro-Wilk test indicates that several variables in different marital status groups do not match the normality assumption.

#### **Kruskal-Wallis H test for Marital Status**

The Kruskal-Wallis H test was applied to assess differences in bonding social capital and family cohesion across marital status.

The Kruskal-Wallis H test results illustrate that there are no statistically significant differences between marital status categories in bonding social capital ( $H = 5.244$ ,  $p = 0.155$ ), or family cohesion. Although there is some difference in mean ranks, the differences are too small to be statistically significant. As a result, marital status seems to have no significant effect on any of the variables assessed in this study.

#### **11. Research Results:**

This research investigated at how bonding social capital may enhance family cohesion among families in the center of Duhok City. The following shows the findings of descriptive, correlational, and comparative statistical analyses:

- Bonding social capital has been found to have a strong and statistically significant relation with family cohesion ( $p = 0.740$ ,  $p < .001$ ), demonstrating that stronger family cohesion is directly correlated with deeper emotional bonds, mutual support, and trust.

- The results of the descriptive analysis, both variables had relatively high levels; the mean scores for family cohesion and bonding social capital were 4.10 and 4.04, accordingly, showing that families in Duhok City often have good internal ties.

- A majority of sociodemographic various groups and the sample as a whole had non-normal distributions, according to normality tests, which encouraged the use of non-parametric tests. Both the Kruskal–Wallis H test and the Mann–Whitney U test shows no

significant variation across age, education, or marital status groups, nor did they show any gender differences in bonding or cohesiveness.

- These findings indicate that, in the urban setting of Duhok, bonding social capital is an unchanging important element that enhances family cohesion, essentially independent of sociodemographic differences.

## **12. Research**

### **Recommendations:**

The following recommendations are presented in relation to the results of the research:

- To enhance family cohesion, encourage family-based programs that foster communication, emotional ties, and mutual support.
- Develop neighborhood initiatives that emphasize the value of family trust and collaboration, particularly in changing urban environments.
- Integrate educational and religious institutions in fostering lifelong conversation and respect, strengthening social capital that strengthens bonds between generations.
- To improve resistance against modern urban challenges like technological

disengagement and family breakdown, including bonding social capital into family policy strategies.

### **13- Research Suggestions:**

Considering the results, the researcher suggests the following fields of study for future study:

- Conducting longitudinal research to find out how urban families' bonding social capital changes over time.
- Utilize a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods to better understand the cultural and emotional components of family cohesion.
- Conduct field research in other cities to compare local shifts in family cohesion and bonding social capital.
- Study how extended family structures and tribal traditions influence Kurdish society's bonding social capital.

## References

- (AERA), A. E. R. A., (APA), A. P. A., & (NCME), N. C. on M. in E. (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*.
- Almond, G. A., & Coleman, J. S. (1960). *The Politics of the Developing Areas* (pp. 237–241). New Jersey, Princeton University Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. In *John Wiley & Sons, Inc.* <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203792643>
- Bok, S. (1978). *Lying: moral choice in public and private life* (Vol. 90, Issue 2). Vintage Books.  
<https://archive.org/details/lyingmoralchoice0000siss>
- Boora, S., & Gupta, S. (2021). *Block 3 : Population and Sampling*.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. In J. G. RICHARDSON (Ed.), *Greenwood*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2069964>
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* Polity Press. Polity Press.
- Bowen, M. (1993). *Family therapy in clinical practice*. Jason Aronson.
- Brown, J., & Errington, L. (2024). Bowen family systems theory and practice: Illustration and critique revisited. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, 45(2), 135–155.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/anzf.1589>
- Burt, R. S. (2001). NAN LIN AND SOCIAL CAPITAL. In *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action* (p. 294). Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815447>
- Carroll, M. C., & Stanfield, J. R. (2003). Social capital, Karl Polanyi, and American social and institutional economics. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 37(2), 397–404.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00213624.2003.11506587>
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 94(1988), 95–120.
- Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England. <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.27-6637>
- Dario Castiglione, Jan W. van Deth, G. W. (Ed.). (2005). *The Handbook of Social Capital* (illustrate). Wiley.  
<https://books.google.iq/books?id=LmcTnwEACAAJ>
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). Critical Race Theory: An Introduction. In *Understanding Words that Wound*. NEW YORK UNIVERSITY PRESS. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429503351-1>

- Dolfsma, W., & Dannreuther, C. (2003). Subjects and boundaries: Contesting social capital-based policies. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 37(2), 405–413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00213624.2003.11506588>
- Edwards, B., & Foley, M. W. (1997). Social capital and the political economy of our discontent. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 5, 669–678. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764297040005012>
- Edwards, R., Franklin, J., & Holland, J. (2003). Families and social capital: Exploring the issues. In *Family & Social Capital ESRC Research Group*. South Bank University.
- Field, J. (2003). *SOCIAL CAPITAL*.
- Fine, B. (2002). It ain't social, it ain't capital and it ain't Africa. *Studia Africana*, 13(13), 18–33.
- FLIS, M. (1992). Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown: Two Versions of Functionalism. *The Polish Sociological Bulletin*, 97(97), 35–43. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44816941>
- Foley, M. W., & Edwards, B. (1999). Is it time to disinvest in social capital? *Journal of Public Policy*, 19(2), 141–173. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X99000215>
- Forsman, M. (2005). Development of Research Networks : The Case of Social Capital. In *Åbo Akademi University Press* (Vol. 11, Issue 1). [http://scioteca.caf.com/bitstream/handle/123456789/1091/RE\\_D2017-Eng-8ene.pdf?sequence=12&isAllowed=y%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2008.06.005%0Ahttps://www.researchgate.net/publication/305320484\\_SISTEM\\_PEMBETUNGAN\\_TE\\_RPUSAT\\_STRATEGI\\_MELESTARI](http://scioteca.caf.com/bitstream/handle/123456789/1091/RE_D2017-Eng-8ene.pdf?sequence=12&isAllowed=y%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2008.06.005%0Ahttps://www.researchgate.net/publication/305320484_SISTEM_PEMBETUNGAN_TE_RPUSAT_STRATEGI_MELESTARI)
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust : the social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. Free Press. <https://search.library.wisc.edu/catalog/999764493702121>
- Hall, C. M. (1983). *The Bowen family theory and its uses*. Jason Aronson, Inc.
- Handel, W. H. (1993). Contemporary Sociological Theory. In (No Title). New Jersey; Prentice Hall Inc.
- Haralambos, M., & Holborn, M. (2000). Sociology: Themes and perspectives. In Weber, M.(1946). *Bureaucracy*. In H. Gerth and CW Mills (Eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. Collins educational.
- Horton, P. B., & Hunt, C. L. (1984). *Sociology* (p. 613). McGraw-Hill College.
- Indira Gandhi National Open University, N. D. (2021). *Psychological Research Guidelines on Practicum*. <http://egyankosh.ac.in/handle/123456789/73593>

- Jacqueline Scott, Judith Treas, A., & Richards, M. (Eds.). (2004). *The Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Families*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Jordan, J. (2015). A Study in How Linking Social Capital Functions in Community Development. *Dissertations*, 44(328).  
<http://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations/44>
- Kerr, M. E., & Bowen, M. (1988). *Family Evaluation: An Approach Based on Bowen Theory* (1st ed.). W. W. Norton & Company.
- Khosravi, S., Ahmadi,omid ali, Roshanaei, A., & Jamali, H. (2021). Investigating the effect of social capital on the power structure, cohesion and strength of families living in Arak city i. *Political Sociology of Iran*, 3(4), 2539–2564.  
<https://doi.org/10.30510/psi.2022.350649.3693>
- Koniordos, S. M. (Ed.). (2005). *Networks, Trust and Social Capital: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations from Europe* (1st ed.). Ashgate Publishing.
- Lindon J. Robison, Robert J. Myers, and M. E. S. (2002). Social Capital and the Terms of Trade for Farmland. *Oxford University Press on Behalf of Agricultural & Applied Economics Association*, 24(1), 44–58.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1349820>
- Lindon J. Robison, A. A. S. & M. E. S. (2002). Is social capital really capital? *Review of Social Economy*, 60(1), 1–21.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00346760110127074>
- Matsaganis, M., & Wilkin, H. (2014). Communicative Social Capital and Collective Efficacy as Determinants of Access to Health-Enhancing Resources in Residential Communities. *Journal of Health Communication*, 20, 1–10.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2014.927037>
- Merton, R. K. (1968). Social theory and social structure, Rev. ed. In *Social theory and social structure, Rev. ed.* Free Press.
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Knowledge and Social Capital, August*, 119–158. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259373>
- Nichols, M. P. (2012). *Family therapy: Concepts and methods* (10th ed.). Pearson Higher Ed.
- Olson, D. (2011). FACES IV and the Circumplex Model: Validation Study. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 37(1), 64–80.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2009.00175.x>
- OLSON, D. H., RUSSELL, C. S., & SPRENKLE, D. H. (1983). Circumplex Model of Marital and Family Systems: An Update. *Family Process*, 22(1), 69–83.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.1983.00069.x>

- Olson, D. H., Sprenkle, D. H., & Russell, C. S. (1979). Circumplex Model of Marital and Family Systems: I. Cohesion and Adaptability Dimensions, Family Types, and Clinical Applications. *Family Process*, 18(1), 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.4076/1757-1626-2-6315>
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The Social System*. Free Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1954.56.3.02a00240>
- Pope, W. (1975). Durkheim as a Functionalist. *Sociological Quarterly*, 16(3), 361–379. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1975.tb00954.x>
- Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.1>
- Putnam, R. (1993). THE PROSPEROUS COMMUNITY Social Capital and Public Life. *The American Prospect*, 4, 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.20542/0131-2227-1995-4-77-86>
- Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal Of Democracy* 6, 6(1), 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.1995.0002>
- Ritzer, G. (1996). Sociological Theory, Eighth Edition. In *Encyclopedia of Social Theory*. McGraw-Hill. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412952552.n87>
- Robert D. Putnam. (2000). *Bowling alone : the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0362-3319\(02\)00190-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0362-3319(02)00190-8)
- Smith, S. S., & Kulynych, J. (2002). It may be social, but why is it capital? The social construction of social capital and the politics of language. *Politics and Society*, 30(1), 149–186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329202030001006>
- Van Oorschot, W., Arts, W., & Gelissen, J. (2006). Social capital in Europe: Measurement and social and regional distribution of a multifaceted phenomenon. *Acta Sociologica*, 49(2), 149–167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001699306064770>
- Wolinsky, F. D. (1988). *The Sociology of Health, Principles, Practitioners and Issues*. HarperCollins. <https://books.google.iq/books?id=uIKEQgAACAAJ>
- Woodger, J. H. (1948). *Biological Principles: A Critical Study* (Issue 14). Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- حسين، ه. ع. (2023). مؤشرات رأس المال الإجماعي لدى الأسرة : دراسة ميدانية على عينة من الأسر في المجتمع الليبي. *مجلة كلية الآداب* , 56, 206–249. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37376/jofoa.vi56.5925>
- حوكا، ب. أ. (2015). الرأسمال الاجتماعي ورابطة العيش المشترك: دراسة في الركائز الأخلاقية والثقافية للاجتماع السياسي في المغرب. *المجلة العربية لعلم الاجتماع* ,

- 29/30, 162–182. <https://search.emarefa.net/detail/BIM-550322>
- سعادت، ر. (2007). تخمین سطح و توزیع سرمایه اجتماعی استان ها. روش داگوم، سرمایه اجتماعی، سرمایه انسانی، متغیرهای پنهان. 23(6), 173–196. <http://refahj.uswr.ac.ir/article-1-1967-fa.html>
- صالحی، ع. (2017). التماسك الأسري: الأسس و الآثار. مجلة العلوم الاجتماعية و الإنسانية. 14, 11–27.
- صفوت، د. م. (2021). دور الأسرة في تشكيل رأس المال الاجتماعي في ظل المتغيرات التكنولوجية الحديثة. مجلة كلية الآداب، جامعة القاهرة. 70(81), 1–70. <https://search.emarefa.net/detail/BIM-1306363>
- عثمان، إ. (2009). مقدمة في علم الاجتماع (الطبعة الع). دار الشروق للنشر والتوزيع. <https://books.google.iq/books?id=GG58uQEACAAJ>
- فكرة، ع. ا. (2017). العلاقات الاجتماعية من منظور سوسيولوجي. مجلة العلوم الاجتماعية والإنسانية. <http://dspace.univ-khenchela.dz:4000/items/c41c4a33-e142-4744-bb13-b6e4eb64c477>
- قاسمی، و، إسماعيلي، ر، & ربیعی، ك. (2007). سطح بندی سرمایه اجتماعی در شهرستان های استان اصفهان. اعتماد اجتماعی، سرمایه اجتماعی، شبکه اجتماعی، مشاركت اجتماعی و مدنی، هنجار اجتماعی. 23, 225–250. <http://refahj.uswr.ac.ir/article-1-1969-fa.html>
- منصوري، ن. (2022). التماسك الأسري و دوره في تحقيق الضبط الاجتماعي. مجلة تطویر. 9(2), 59–76.

Table (1) Sample Distribution by Neighborhood and Income Leve

|   | Neighborhoods | Number of Families | % of Total Population (Out of 45,428) | Income Level       | Sample Size Drawn |
|---|---------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Baroshke      | 1787               | 3.93%                                 | Low                | 55                |
| 2 | Naoure        | 788                | 1.73%                                 | Low                | 24                |
| 3 | Gely          | 1400               | 3.08%                                 | Low                | 44                |
|   | Total         | 3975               | 8.74%                                 | (30%)              | 123               |
| 4 | Etiti         | 848                | 1.86%                                 | Middle             | 57                |
| 5 | Diari         | 1650               | 3.63%                                 | Middle             | 110               |
| 6 | Shakhke2      | 558                | 1.22%                                 | Middle             | 38                |
|   | Total         | 3056               | 6.71%                                 | (50%)              | 205               |
| 7 | Malta jori    | 957                | 2.10%                                 | High               | 24                |
| 8 | Masik1        | 1583               | 3.48%                                 | High               | 40                |
| 9 | Zirka         | 692                | 1.52%                                 | High               | 18                |
|   | Total         | 3232               | 7.1%                                  | (20%)              | 82                |
|   |               |                    |                                       | Grand Total (100%) | 410               |

**Table (2) Test-Retest Reliability (Spearman's Rho) for Questionnaire Dimensions**

|   | Variables Compared                | N  | Correlation Coefficient ( $\rho$ ) | Sig.(2-tailed) | Interpretation     |
|---|-----------------------------------|----|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Bonding Social Capital (T1 vs T2) | 30 | $\rho = 0.733$                     | < .001         | Strong reliability |
| 2 | Family Cohesion (T1 vs T2)        | 30 | $\rho = 0.762$                     | < .001         | Strong reliability |

**Table (3) Internal Consistency (Cronbach's Alpha and ICC) for Questionnaire Dimensions**

|   | Scale                  | No. of Items | Cronbach's Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) | ICC (Average Measures) | Interpretation        |
|---|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Bonding Social Capital | 12           | 0.889                         | 0.889                  | High reliability      |
| 2 | Family Cohesion        | 15           | 0.918                         | 0.918                  | Very high reliability |

**Table (4) Tests of Normality for Bonding Social Capital and Family Cohesion**

|   | Variable                      | Kolmogorov-Smirnov |     |       | Shapiro-Wilk |     |       |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------------|-----|-------|--------------|-----|-------|
|   |                               | Statistic          | N   | Sig.  | Statistic    | N   | Sig.  |
| 1 | Bonding Social Capital (Mean) | 0.132              | 412 | <.001 | 0.909        | 412 | <.001 |
| 2 | Family Cohesion (Mean)        | 0.145              | 412 | <.001 | 0.893        | 412 | <.001 |

Note: Lilliefors Significance Correction was applied for Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

**Table (5) Spearman's Rank Correlation Between Bonding Social Capital and Family Cohesion**

| Variables Compared                        | $\rho$ (Spearman's) | Sig. (2-tailed) | N   |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----|
| Bonding Social Capital vs Family Cohesion | 0.740               | < .001          | 412 |

Note: Spearman's rho correlation was used. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Table (6) Descriptive Statistics for Bonding Social Capital and Family Cohesion (N = 412)**

| Component              | Mean   | Std. Deviation |
|------------------------|--------|----------------|
| Bonding Social Capital | 4.0419 | 0.63907        |
| Family Cohesion        | 4.1031 | 0.69545        |

Note: Scale ranged from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

**Table (7) Shapiro-Wilk Test for Normality by Gender**

| Variable               | Gender | N   | Shapiro-Wilk Statistic | Sig. (p-value) | Normality Met? |
|------------------------|--------|-----|------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Bonding Social Capital | Male   | 149 | 0.921                  | < .001         | No             |
|                        | Female | 263 | 0.903                  | < .001         | No             |
| Family Cohesion        | Male   | 149 | 0.875                  | < .001         | No             |
|                        | Female | 263 | 0.897                  | < .001         | No             |

**Table (8) Mann-Whitney U Test Results by Gender**

| Variable               | Mann-Whitney U | Sig. (p-value) | Significant? |
|------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Bonding Social Capital | 19394.00       | 0.863          | No           |
| Family Cohesion        | 17850.00       | 0.132          | No           |

**Table (9) Shapiro-Wilk Test for Normality by Age**

| Age Group | Variable               | N   | Shapiro-Wilk Statistic | Sig. (p-value) | Normality Met? |
|-----------|------------------------|-----|------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 18–25     | Bonding Social Capital | 51  | 0.946                  | 0.022          | No             |
|           | Family Cohesion        | 51  | 0.939                  | 0.011          | No             |
| 26–35     | Bonding Social Capital | 109 | 0.894                  | < .001         | No             |
|           | Family Cohesion        | 109 | 0.879                  | < .001         | No             |
| 36–45     | Bonding Social Capital | 162 | 0.905                  | < .001         | No             |
|           | Family Cohesion        | 162 | 0.934                  | < .001         | No             |
| 46–55     | Bonding Social Capital | 63  | 0.959                  | 0.034          | No             |
|           | Family Cohesion        | 63  | 0.868                  | < .001         | No             |
| 55+       | Bonding Social Capital | 27  | 0.940                  | 0.120          | Yes            |
|           | Family Cohesion        | 27  | 0.910                  | 0.022          | No             |

**Table (10) Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Bonding Social Capital and Family Cohesion by Age Group**

| Variable                      | Age Group     | N   | Mean Rank | Kruskal-Wallis H | df | Asymp. Sig. |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-----|-----------|------------------|----|-------------|
| <b>Bonding Social Capital</b> | 18–25 years   | 51  | 183.43    | 7.990            | 4  | 0.092       |
|                               | 26–35 years   | 109 | 189.12    |                  |    |             |
|                               | 36–45 years   | 162 | 215.86    |                  |    |             |
|                               | 46–55 years   | 63  | 216.33    |                  |    |             |
|                               | Over 55 years | 27  | 241.13    |                  |    |             |
| <b>Family Cohesion</b>        | 18–25 years   | 51  | 176.44    | 7.630            | 4  | 0.106       |
|                               | 26–35 years   | 109 | 201.11    |                  |    |             |
|                               | 36–45 years   | 162 | 209.72    |                  |    |             |
|                               | 46–55 years   | 63  | 212.66    |                  |    |             |
|                               | Over 55 years | 27  | 251.37    |                  |    |             |

**Table (11) Shapiro-Wilk Test for Normality by Education Level**

| Education Level      | Variable                      | N   | Shapiro-Wilk Statistic | Sig. (p-value)   | Normality Met? |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|-----|------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Below Primary</b> | <b>Bonding Social Capital</b> | 5   | <b>0.910</b>           | <b>0.468</b>     | <b>Yes</b>     |
|                      | <b>Family Cohesion</b>        | 5   | <b>0.879</b>           | <b>0.303</b>     | <b>Yes</b>     |
| <b>Primary</b>       | <b>Bonding Social Capital</b> | 8   | <b>0.753</b>           | <b>0.009</b>     | <b>No</b>      |
|                      | <b>Family Cohesion</b>        | 8   | <b>0.942</b>           | <b>0.630</b>     | <b>Yes</b>     |
| <b>Secondary</b>     | <b>Bonding Social Capital</b> | 30  | <b>0.909</b>           | <b>0.014</b>     | <b>No</b>      |
|                      | <b>Family Cohesion</b>        | 30  | <b>0.839</b>           | <b>&lt; .001</b> | <b>No</b>      |
| <b>University</b>    | <b>Bonding Social Capital</b> | 252 | <b>0.895</b>           | <b>&lt; .001</b> | <b>No</b>      |
|                      | <b>Family Cohesion</b>        | 252 | <b>0.888</b>           | <b>&lt; .001</b> | <b>No</b>      |
| <b>Postgraduate</b>  | <b>Bonding Social Capital</b> | 117 | <b>0.930</b>           | <b>&lt; .001</b> | <b>No</b>      |
|                      | <b>Family Cohesion</b>        | 117 | <b>0.906</b>           | <b>&lt; .001</b> | <b>No</b>      |

**Table (12) Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Bonding Social Capital and Family Cohesion by Education Level**

| Variable               | Education Level | N   | Mean Rank | Kruskal-Wallis H | df | Asymp. Sig. |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----|-----------|------------------|----|-------------|
| Bonding Social Capital | Below primary   | 5   | 305.70    | 5.985            | 4  | 0.200       |
|                        | Primary         | 8   | 241.00    |                  |    |             |
|                        | Secondary       | 30  | 177.30    |                  |    |             |
|                        | University      | 252 | 207.16    |                  |    |             |
|                        | Postgraduate    | 117 | 205.96    |                  |    |             |
| Family Cohesion        | Below primary   | 5   | 232.50    | 5.731            | 4  | 0.220       |
|                        | Primary         | 8   | 297.75    |                  |    |             |
|                        | Secondary       | 30  | 195.88    |                  |    |             |
|                        | University      | 252 | 202.13    |                  |    |             |
|                        | Postgraduate    | 117 | 211.29    |                  |    |             |

**Table (13) Shapiro-Wilk Test for Normality by Marital Status**

| Marital Status     | Variable               | N   | Shapiro-Wilk Statistic | Sig. (p-value) | Normality Met? |
|--------------------|------------------------|-----|------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Single             | Bonding Social Capital | 122 | 0.886                  | < .001         | No             |
|                    | Family Cohesion        | 122 | 0.901                  | < .001         | No             |
| Married            | Bonding Social Capital | 284 | 0.94                   | < .001         | No             |
|                    | Family Cohesion        | 284 | 0.905                  | < .001         | No             |
| Divorced/Separated | Bonding Social Capital | 2   | .                      | .              | -              |
|                    | Family Cohesion        | 2   | .                      | .              | -              |
| Widowed            | Bonding Social Capital | 4   | 0.899                  | 0.427          | Yes            |
|                    | Family Cohesion        | 4   | 0.788                  | 0.082          | Yes            |

**Table (14) Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Bonding Social Capital and Family Cohesion by Marital Status**

| Variable               | Marital Status     | N   | Mean Rank | Kruskal-Wallis H | df | Asymp. Sig. |
|------------------------|--------------------|-----|-----------|------------------|----|-------------|
| Bonding Social Capital | Single             | 122 | 192.41    | 5.244            | 3  | 0.155       |
|                        | Married            | 284 | 213.98    |                  |    |             |
|                        | Divorced/Separated | 2   | 92.00     |                  |    |             |
|                        | Widowed            | 4   | 162.75    |                  |    |             |
| Family Cohesion        | Single             | 122 | 188.71    | 5.188            | 3  | 0.159       |
|                        | Married            | 284 | 214.28    |                  |    |             |
|                        | Divorced/Separated | 2   | 275.50    |                  |    |             |
|                        | Widowed            | 4   | 162.13    |                  |    |             |