IARIW-Bank of Korea Conference "Beyond GDP: Experiences and Challenges in the Measurement of Economic Well-being," Seoul, Korea, April 26-28, 2017

Social Capital and Human Well-being in South Korea

Shiv Kumar (A.S. College, Punjab University, India)

Paper prepared for the IARIW-Bank of Korea Conference

Seoul, Korea, April 26-28, 2017

Session 3B: Well-being in Asia

Time: Wednesday, April 26, 2017 [Afternoon]

IARIW-Bank of Korea Conference

On

BEYOND GDP: PAST EXPERIENCES AND FUTURE CHALLENGES IN THE MEASUREMENT OF ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

(April 26-28, 2017)

Organized by

Bank of Korea, Seoul, Korea

Title: **SOCIAL CAPITAL AND HUMAN WELL-BEING IN SOUTH KOREA**

Author: **Shiv Kumar**
Assistant Professor of Economics, A.S. College, Khanna, Punjab, India – 141401
e-mail: shiv7.kumar7@gmail.com
Mobile No. +91-98558-27029

SOCIAL CAPITAL AND HUMAN WELL-BEING IN SOUTH KOREA

Shiv Kumar
Assistant Professor of Economics, A.S. College, Khanna, Punjab, India – 141 401.
(Affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh)
e-mail: shiv7.kumar7@gmail.com

Abstract

Social capital theorists claim that social capital has positive impacts on various aspects of societal life, such as economic well-being, health, crime rates, educational achievement, and adolescent development (Woolcock, 1998). Thus, on the basis of data collected from 965 individuals by World Values Survey (WVS) wave 6 South Korea 2010, the present paper examines the inter-linkage between social capital and human well-being in South Korea. In the study, social capital is measured by two proxy indicators, the generalized trust among individuals and the membership of individuals in voluntary organizations. Individual scores on these two dimensions are added and the resultant score is rescaled from 0 to 100 to construct the additive Social Capital Index (SCI) where 0 represents the lowest level of social capital. At all South Korea level, mean score for individuals on the social capital index is found to be 35.45 points out of possible 100 points with standard deviation 12.06. To test the effect of social capital on human well-being, OLS regression model is used where human well-being (measured by happiness in life, health condition, satisfaction in life, freedom of choice, satisfaction of the individual with his/her financial situation, and the extent of savings) is taken as the dependent variable, and on the other side, social capital, human capital and income level are taken as the explanatory variables along with two demographic characteristics of the individuals, gender and age. At mean social capital score of 35.45, the coefficient of the variable shows that a one unit increase in social capital (i.e. 2.82 per cent) would increase well-being of individuals by 20.9 per cent. It is also revealed that both of the dimensions of social capital, group membership and generalized trust, have the positive impact on human well-being. In the analysis, multiplicative social capital index is also prepared and that too contributes in raising the human well-being. Thus, with the many positive benefits of social capital, it is concluded that increasing levels of this dynamic form of capital can help individuals, households and communities become more sustainable.

Key words: membership, organization, social capital, trust, well-being

JEL Codes: *A13, D71, I31.*

---

1. INTRODUCTION

Human well-being is a key aggregating concept that incorporates many of the measures of social sustainability. Terms such as quality of life, standard of living, human development, welfare, life satisfaction, utility, and happiness are some terms used interchangeably with well-being. Social capital theorists claim that social capital has positive impacts on various aspects of societal life, such as economic well-being, health, crime rates, educational achievement, and adolescent development (Woolcock, 1998). Thus, the main objective of this paper is to examine the inter-linkage between social capital and human well-being in South Korea. The paper is divided into six sections. Following introduction, second section presents the data sources and methodology. The concept of social capital is defined in section three. Section four measures the social capital in South Korea. Section five examines impact of social capital on human well-being and the paper concludes in section six.

2. DATA SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY

The study is based on data collected from 965 individuals in South Korea by World Values Survey (WVS)[1] wave 6 South Korea 2010. The WVS is a global research project that explores people's values and beliefs, how they change over time and what social and political impact they have. It is carried out by a worldwide network of social scientists who, since 1981, have conducted representative national surveys in almost 100 countries. The work is also frequently used by governments around the world, scholars, students, journalists and international organizations and institutions such as the World Bank and the United Nations (UNDP and UN-Habitat). The present paper is based on the individual responses for 30 questions out of a total set of 258 common questions used in WVS in all countries. The collected data are analyzed by using regression, t-test, F test, one way ANOVA, multiple comparison of means test by applying post Hoc tests in addition to descriptive statistics.

3. THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL CAPITAL

Social capital has been widely discussed across the social sciences in recent years. One of the pioneers in the study of social capital is Hanifan[2] (1920) who argued that "social capital…refer(s) to…those tangible assets (that) count for most in the daily lives of people, namely: goodwill, fellowship, sympathy, and social intercourse among the individuals and

families who make up a social unit." Others include: Jacobs (1961), Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), Loury (1977) [As cited in Woolcock, 1998], and Meehan et al. (1978). Bourdieu (1984; 1986) developed the concept of social capital during the 1970s and 1980s, but it attracted much less attention than other areas of his social theory. In the past 20-25 years, Putnam (1993; 1995) and Coleman (1988; 1990) are credited with bringing the term "social capital" to prominence[3].

In the literature, social capital is often defined as a sociological variable, i.e., referring to the relationships between people. From this perspective social capital is relational, not something owned by any individual, but rather something shared in common. However, there is a perspective that social capital stands for the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in networks or other social structures (Portes, 1998). Thus, it is possible to distinguish 'individual' and 'group' social capital. Individual social capital, sometimes referred to as 'social network capital', can be defined as the set of social attributes possessed by an individual – including charisma, contacts and linguistic skill – that increase the returns to that individual in his or her dealings with others. Community-level 'group' social capital is defined as the set of social resources of a community that increases the welfare of that community (Glaeser et al., 2002). Bezemer et al. (2004) used the term 'relational capital' for individual social capital, and 'social network' or 'communal social capital' for group social capital. Knack (1999; 2002) differentiated social capital as government social capital and civil social capital. He defined government social capital as the institutions, the rule of law, and the civil liberties that influence people's ability to cooperate for mutual benefit; and civil social capital as the common values, norms, informal networks, and associational memberships that affect the ability of individuals to work together to achieve common goals. Grafton and Knowles (2004) distinguished between civic social capital and public institutional social capital, with the latter being defined by measures of corruption and democracy. Grootaert (1999) talked about a macro level of social capital which includes institutions such as government, the rule of law, civil and political liberties etc. These notions of government, public institutional and macro social capital are identical to formal institutions. Collier (1998) noted that many people restrict the term "social capital" to civil social capital. Thus, for the individual level study to find the inter-linkage between social capital and human well-being, it seems wise to restrict the definition of social capital to civil social capital.

4. MEASUREMENT OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN SOUTH KOREA

Measuring social capital is said to be difficult. There is a challenge in identifying a contextual relevant indicator of social capital and establishing an empirical correlation with relevant benefit indicator. This is because these social capital indicators differ both geographically and sectorally and for this reason and due to the strong contextual nature of social capital, it is unlikely that a few "best" indicators that could be generalized for use everywhere can be arrived at (Okunmadewa et al., 2007). Thus, instead of devising global measures of social capital that span entire countries and continents, a locally relevant measure of social capital is advised. In the study, social capital is measured by two proxy indicators, the membership of individuals in voluntary organizations and the generalized trust among individuals.

(a) Membership in Voluntary Organizations: The effectiveness of social capital to reduce opportunistic behavior, to disseminate information, and to facilitate collective decision making depends on many aspects of the groups and organizations like group membership, working with others in the community and an active participation in the organizations. In South Korea, there are many formal and informal organizations, groups and networks like, art/music/educational organizations, Church or religious organizations, consumer organizations, environmental organizations, humanitarian or charitable organizations, labor unions, political parties, professional associations, self-help or mutual aid groups, sports or recreational organizations etc. Each individual was asked in the survey that for each organization, whether you are an active member, an inactive member or not a member of that type of organization.

Overall, the data indicate that, out of 965 sampled individuals, 699 are members of one or more organizations; the maximum number of group memberships for an individual is eleven. The total number of memberships included in the sample added up to 1762, which indicates that on average each individual (out of 699) is a member of about three organizations (Table 1). And out of 1762 memberships, individuals are active in 606 memberships which indicate that individuals actively participate in these three associations. Membership is most common in Church or religious organizations (43.83 per cent), sports or recreational organizations (30.98 per cent), and art, music or educational organizations (27.25

per cent). In Church or religious organizations individuals participate actively in group activities.

Table 1: Membership of Individuals in Voluntary Organizations

Organization	Total Membership[a]	Active Member[b]	Inactive Member[b]
Church or Religious Organization	423 (43.83)	229 (54.14)	194 (45.86)
Sports or Recreational Organization	299 (30.98)	111 (37.12)	188 (62.88)
Art, Music or Educational Organization	263 (27.25)	69 (26.24)	194 (73.76)
Humanitarian or Charitable Organization	111 (11.50)	20 (18.02)	91 (81.98)
Self-Help Group, Mutual Aid Group	101 (10.47)	28 (27.72)	73 (72.28)
Professional Association	95 (9.84)	29 (30.53)	66 (69.47)
Environmental Organization	76 (7.88)	19 (25.00)	57 (75.00)
Labor Union	64 (6.63)	17 (26.56)	47 (73.44)
Consumer Organization	61 (6.32)	15 (24.59)	46 (75.41)
Political Party	61 (6.32)	10 (16.39)	51 (83.61)
Other Organizations	208 (21.55)	59 (28.37)	149 (71.63)
Total	1762 (16.60)[#]	606 (34.39)	1156 (65.61)

a. Figures in parentheses are percent values calculated as

$$= \frac{\text{Number of individuals who are member of an organization}}{\text{Total number of sampled individuals}}$$

b. Figures in parentheses are percentages of total memberships.

This percentage is calculated as $= \frac{\text{Total number of memberships reported by individuals}}{\text{Maximum number of possible memberships}} = \frac{1762}{10615}$

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

The mean score on group membership dimension of social capital for 965 sample individuals is found to be 11.15 with standard deviation 13.17 (Table 2). For married sample individuals in South Korea, the mean score on group membership and active participation in groups is found to be 11.94 points out of maximum 100 points which is significantly high as compared to the single individuals whose mean score on group membership and active participation in groups is found to be 9.87. Individuals with Protestant religion and with Roman Catholic religion have the highest mean score 17.85 and 16.19 respectively on group membership which is significantly high as compared to the individuals with Buddhist religion and individuals with no religion where the corresponding mean score is 10.27 and 5.88 respectively. The mean difference of group membership between male and female respondents is found to be 0.89 which is statistically insignificant. Similarly, the group membership mean difference between different age groups is also found to be insignificant. It is also observed in the analysis of data that as with the increase in level of education the

group membership mean score has also increased from 8.59 points to 11.77 points and with the increase in level of income of the individuals the mean score on group membership increased from 8.93 points to 19.23 points.

Table 2: Mean Score on Group Membership, Trust and Social Capital with Individual Characteristics

Individual Characteristics	Number of Individuals	Group Membership	Trust	Social Capital
Marital Status				
Married[a]	592	11.94 (13.90)	57.82 (14.73)	36.21 (12.29)
Separated[b]	69	10.08 (12.85)	56.04 (15.62)	34.18 (11.52)
Single	304	9.87 (11.61)	56.45 (15.53)	34.26 (11.63)
Religion				
None	404	5.88 (9.24)	54.79 (15.01)	30.99 (10.11)
Buddhist	177	10.27 (11.11)	56.37 (15.22)	34.46 (10.57)
Protestant	222	17.85 (14.03)	60.99 (14.23)	41.40 (12.24)
Roman Catholic	155	16.19 (15.90)	59.89 (14.06)	39.84 (12.54)
Other[c]	7	13.64 (23.47)	46.03 (26.00)	31.35 (21.68)
Gender				
Male	473	11.61 (14.06)	56.42 (15.51)	35.31 (12.67)
Female	492	10.72 (12.25)	58.06 (14.57)	35.58 (11.46)
Age (in Years)				
19-30	253	9.95 (11.81)	56.24 (15.49)	34.20 (11.53)
31-60	559	11.65 (13.30)	57.57 (14.50)	35.91 (11.85)
61-85	153	11.32 (14.68)	57.81 (16.29)	35.82 (13.53)
Education Level				
No Formal Education	9	8.59 (6.98)	53.32 (15.66)	32.41 (7.35)
Primary[d]	51	7.04 (11.37)	58.06 (18.20)	33.33 (12.81)
Secondary[e]	69	10.28 (11.71)	55.88 (12.64)	34.22 (10.94)
Senior Secondary[f]	271	10.95 (13.72)	56.46 (16.06)	34.92 (12.68)
Graduation and above[g]	565	11.77 (13.24)	57.79 (14.51)	36.09 (12.06)
Income Group				
Poorest	83	8.93 (10.27)	54.62 (18.01)	32.76 (11.74)
2nd Quintile	250	10.02 (11.60)	55.78 (15.58)	34.01 (11.58)
3rd Quintile	426	11.02 (13.64)	57.36 (14.59)	35.41 (11.95)
4th Quintile	193	13.33 (13.23)	59.56 (13.60)	37.92 (11.89)
Richest	13	19.23 (28.64)	65.38 (14.19)	44.44 (19.08)
All	*965*	*11.15 (13.17)*	*57.26 (15.05)*	*35.45 (12.06)*

Figures in parentheses are standard deviations.

a. Married includes Married (584), and Living together as Married (8).
b. Separated includes Divorced (17), Separated (5), and Widowed (47).
c. Other includes Confucianism (3), Jew (2), Muslim (1), and Orthodox (1).
d. Primary includes Incomplete Primary School (10), and Complete Primary School (41).
e. Secondary includes Incomplete Secondary School: Technical/Vocational Type (13), and Complete Secondary School: Technical/Vocational Type (56).
f. Senior Secondary includes Incomplete Secondary School: University-Preparatory Type (25), and Complete Secondary School: University-Preparatory Type (246).
g. Includes Some University-Level Education: Without Degree (133), and Some University-Level Education: With Degree (432).

Source: Calculated from World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010 Data.

b) Trust: The psychic and transactional costs of interacting with people we trust is lower than the costs of interacting with someone we distrust. When levels of trust are low among a group, associational activity and collective action are inhibited. Trust and

trustworthiness increase the chances of exchange among people without written contractual obligations. Instead, people rely on expectations of mutual obligation, honesty, reciprocity, mutual respect, and helpfulness. In this environment, if there is a perceived need, cooperative action is more likely to occur than when trust is low among people living in the same village (Narayan, 1997). To measure generalized trust, individuals were asked in World Values Survey about two types of variables. One related with the question that g*enerally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people?* The responses are coded as most people can be trusted as '2' and need to be very careful as '1'. The other variable includes six questions related to individual's trust in people from his/her family, neighbourhood, people he/she knows personally, people he/she meets for the first time, people of another religion and people from other nationality.

Overall the mean score on this indicator of trust is found to be 57.26 points with standard deviation 15.05 out of maximum possible 100 points (Table 2). In South Korea, the index of trust unveiled distinct religious and social patterns. It is revealed in the analysis of data that with the mean score of 60.99 and 59.89 points individuals who belong to Protestant and Roman Catholic religious groups respectively have more trust in people than the individuals with no religion. With the mean score of 58.06 points, female respondents reported significantly more trust in people than the male respondents. Further, it is also found that as the level of education and the level of income rises, the generalized trust also rises but this rise is found to be statistically insignificant.

(c) Social Capital: Individual scores on these two dimensions, group membership and generalized trust, are added and the resultant score is rescaled from 0 to 100 to construct the additive Social Capital Index (SCI) where 0 represents the lowest level of social capital. At all South Korea level, mean score for individuals on the social capital index is found to be 35.45 points out of possible 100 points with standard deviation 12.06 (Table 2). With the mean score of 36.21 points, social capital is found to be significantly high for married individuals than the single individuals where the mean social capital score is 34.26 points. The social capital is related to the religious composition of the sample individuals since individuals with Protestant and Roman Catholic religion have the highest means scores of 41.40 points and 39.84 points respectively which are significantly high as compared to the individuals with Buddhist religion and individuals with no religion. The absolute mean difference of social capital scores between male and female respondents is found to be 0.27

which is statistically insignificant. It is also observed that as the level of education and the level of income rises, the score on social capital index rises.

5. SOCIAL CAPITAL AND HUMAN WELL-BEING

The main objective of this study is to analyze the impact of social capital on human well-being at individual level. In relating social capital to human well-being the customary or conventional model of individual socio-economic behavior under constrained utility maximization relates the level of happiness in life, health condition, satisfaction in life, freedom of choice, satisfaction of the individual with his/her financial situation, and the extent of savings directly to the exogenous asset endowments of the individual and variables describing the social and economic environment in which the individual makes decision. The individual well-being is hypothesized to be influenced by the independent variables included in the equation below:

$$W_i = a + b_1SC_i + b_2HC_i + b_3Y_i + b_4SX_i + b_5AG_i + u_i \quad \text{.....(1)}$$

Where,
W_i = Index of Human Well-Being of Individual i
SC_i = Individual Endowment of Social Capital
HC_i = Individual Endowment of Human Capital
Y_i = Household Income Level
SX_i = Gender of Respondent
AG_i = Age of Respondent
u_i = Error Term

The key feature of the model is the assumption that social capital is truly "capital" i.e. a stock, which generates a measurable return (flow of income) to the individual. Social capital has many "capital" features: it requires resources (especially time) to be produced and it is subject to accumulation and destruction. Much social capital is built during interactions which occur for social, religious, or cultural reasons. The key assumption is that the networks built through these interactions have measurable benefits to the participating individuals, and lead, directly or indirectly, to a higher level of well-being. There is an impact assumption that social capital is embodied in the members of the household. This conforms to the position advocated by Portes (1998), which highlights that, although the source of social capital is the relationship among a group of individuals, the capital itself is an individual asset. This is in contrast to the position of Putnam (1993), who sees social capital as a collective asset. For the

purpose of this study, the position by Portes (1998) is adopted. Hence, social capital is viewed as individual household asset.

5.1 Variable Definitions

a) Human Well-Being: Human well-being index is prepared by adding individual scores on six different aspects namely, happiness in life, health condition, satisfaction in life, freedom of choice, satisfaction of the individual with his/her financial situation, and the extent of savings. The responses on these aspects are added and then rescaled from 0 to 100.

b) Social Capital: The social capital is calculated on the basis of additive (as well as multiplicative) scores on two dimensions of social capital: group membership and active participation in groups; and the level of generalized trust.

c) Human Capital: The human capital variable is measured as the highest education level attained by the individual.

d) Income: Level of income is calculated by asking individuals that counting all wages, salaries, pensions, and other incomes in what group the individual consider his/her household in the ten income groups, where first decile is the lowest income group.

e) Gender of Respondent: A dummy variable is used for the gender of respondent (D=1 if male, D=0 if otherwise).

f) Age of Respondent: Age of respondent is measured in years.

5.2 Results and Discussion

In the first column of Table 3 is the basic model of individual well-being without social capital. This model shows that about 25.2 per cent of the variations in well-being of individuals are explained by the specified human capital, income and demographic factors of the individuals. In specific terms, the highest coefficient 0.483 reveals that higher the level of income of the individual significantly improves the well-being. In the second column of Table 3, additive social capital variable is introduced. The inclusion of this variable led to improvement in the adjusted R^2 from 0.252 to 0.294. It is also found that along with income

of the individuals, social capital significantly influences the welfare status of individuals. At mean social capital score of 35.45, the coefficient of the variable shows that a one unit increase in social capital (i.e. 2.82 per cent) would increase well-being of individuals by 20.9 per cent. It is also revealed that both of the dimensions of social capital, group membership (coefficient 0.058) and generalized trust (coefficient 0.215), have the positive impact on human well-being. In the analysis, multiplicative social capital index is also prepared and that too contributes in raising the human well-being with the coefficient of 0.114. The results in Table 3 also show that age of the individual has a significantly negative impact on human well-being of the individuals.

Table 3: Social Capital and Human Well-Being

	Basic Model (without Social Capital) 1	**with Additive Social Capital 2**	**with Multiplicative Social Capital 3**	**with Dimensions of Social Capital 4**
	Coefficients (t-values)	*Coefficients (t-values)*	*Coefficients (t-values)*	*Coefficients (t-values)*
Intercept	41.177* (11.215)	35.829* (9.849)	41.916* (11.495)	31.417* (8.305)
Social Capital	-	0.209* (7.566)	0.114* (4.084)	-
Group Membership	-	-	-	0.058** (2.082)
Generalized Trust	-	-	-	0.215* (7.788)
Human Capital	0.008 (0.209)	−0.020 (−0.536)	−0.007 (−0.188)	−0.015 (−0.408)
Income	0.483* (16.382)	0.456* (15.804)	0.471* (16.054)	0.454* (15.858)
Sex of Individual	−0.046 (−1.614)	−0.039 (−1.413)	−0.046 (−1.653)	−0.032 (−1.175)
Age of Individual	−0.084** (−2.315)	−0.115* (−3.246)	−0.099* (−2.736)	−0.114* (−3.237)
Number of Observations	965	965	965	965
R^2	0.255	0.297	0.268	0.308
Adjusted R^2	0.252	0.294	0.264	0.304
F-Statistics	82.256*	80.108*	70.216*	71.157*
Durbin-Watson Statistics	1.910	1.931	1.929	1.911

Figures in parentheses are t-values. *significant at 1% and **significant at 5%.
The dependent variable is the well-being of individuals.
Source: Computed from World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010 data.

6. CONCLUSION

In the present paper the impact of social capital on human well-being is studied on the basis of field survey data collected by World Values Survey, Wave 6 in South Korea in 2010. In the study, social capital is measured as the additive score on two dimensions of cooperative and mutual beneficial behavior of individuals – the membership in local groups and active participation in these groups; and the generalized trust among people. It is found in the study results that both social capital and income of the individuals are important to raise well-being of individuals. The impact of both additive as well as multiplicative measures of social capital, and two dimensions of social capital separately, is positive and significant on human well-being. Thus, with the many positive benefits of social capital, it is concluded that increasing levels of this dynamic form of capital can help individuals, households and communities become more sustainable. Finally, the study suggests that development programmes should integrate social capital as an essential element and like human capital the investments in the social capital should be made.

Notes

1. Since its first Wave (1981-84), South Korean data collection is a regular feature of World Values Survey; Wave 2 (1990-94), Wave 3 (1995-98), Wave 4 (1999-2004), Wave 5 (2005-09) and Wave 6 (2010-14). The work on Wave 7 (2016-18) is in progress. The 7th Wave survey aims to contribute towards monitoring the set of Sustainable Development Goals and the targets defined by the UN post-2015 agenda.

2. Hanifan, an educational administrator, was interested in the contribution of 'goodwill, fellowship, mutual sympathy and social intercourse' to collective prosperity and well-being, an argument he then used to bolster his case for community centres in rural areas (Farr, 2004).

3. Foley and Edwards (1999) have described Pierre Bourdieu, James S. Coleman and Robert D. Putnam as representing three 'relatively distinct tributaries' in the literature on social capital.

References

Bezemer, D.J., Dulleck, U. and Frijters, P. (2004) Social Capital, Creative Destruction and Economic Growth. Working/Discussion Paper No. 186a, School of Economics and Finance. Brisbane: Queensland University of Technology.

Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

- (1986) “The Forms of Capital”, in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, J.G. Richardson (ed.). Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J.C. (1977) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture,* Translated by Richard Nice. London: Sage Publications.

Coleman, J.S. (1988) Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(Supplement): S95-S120.

- (1990) *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Collier, P. (1998) Social Capital and Poverty. Social Capital Initiative Working Paper No. 4, Social Development Department, The World Bank. Washington D.C.: World Bank.

Farr, J. (2004) Social Capital: A Conceptual History. *Political Theory*, 32(1): 6-33.

Foley, M.W. and Edwards, B. (1999) Is It Time to Disinvest in Social Capital? *Journal of Public Policy*, 19(2): 141-173.

Glaeser, E.L., Laibson, D.I. and Sacerdote, B. (2002) An Economic Approach to Social Capital. *The Economic Journal*, 112(483): F437-F458.

Grafton, R.Q. and Knowles, S. (2004) Social Capital and National Environmental Performance: A Cross-Sectional Analysis. *Journal of Environment and Development*, 13(4): 336-370.

Grootaert, C. (1999) Social Capital, Household Welfare and Poverty in Indonesia. Local Level Institutions Working Paper No. 6, Social Development Department, The World Bank. Washington D.C.: World Bank.

Hanifan, L.J. (1920) *The Community Centre*. Boston: Silver, Burdett and Company.

Jacobs, J. (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Random House.

Knack, S. (1999) Social Capital, Growth and Poverty: A Survey and Extensions. Social Capital Initiative Working Paper No. 7, Social Development Department, The World Bank. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

- (2002) “Social Capital, Growth and Poverty: A Survey of Cross-Country Evidence”, in *The Role of Social Capital in Development: An Empirical Assessment*, C. Grootaert and T. van Bastelaer (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Loury, G.C. (1977) “A Dynamic Theory of Racial Income Differences”, in *Women, Minorities and Employment Discrimination*, P.A. Wallace and A. LaMund (eds.). Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Meehan, E.J., Reilly, A.C. and Ramey, T. (1978) *In Partnership with People: An Alternative Development Strategy*. Rosslyn: Inter-American Foundation.

Narayan, D. (1997) *Voices of the Poor: Poverty and Social Capital in Tanzania*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.

Okunmadewa, F.Y., Yusuf, S.A. and Omonona, B.T. (2007) Effects of Social Capital on Rural Poverty in Nigeria. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(3): 331-339.

Portes, A. (1998) Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24: 1-24.

Putnam, R.D. (1993) The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life. *The American Prospect*, 4(13): 35-42.

- (1995) Bowling Alone: America’s Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1): 65-78.

Woolcock, M. (1998) Social Capital and Economic Development: Towards a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework. *Theory and Society*, 27(2): 151-208.

Annexure 1: Significance of the Difference in Mean Scores on the Group Membership Dimension of Social Capital

Individual Characteristics	Number of Individuals	Mean	S.D.	Significance of the Difference in Mean Scores					
Marital Status				*Marital Status*	Married	Separated	Single		
Married[a]	592	11.94	13.90	Married	-	1.86 (1.67)	2.07*** (0.93)		
Separated[b]	69	10.08	12.85	Separated		-	0.21 (1.75)		
Single	304	9.87	11.61	Single			-		
				F (2, 962) = 2.742***					
Religion				*Religion*	None	Buddhist	Protestant	Roman Catholic	Other
None	404	5.88	9.24	None	-	4.39* (1.10)	11.97* (1.02)	10.30* (1.15)	7.75 (4.63)
Buddhist	177	10.27	11.11	Buddhist		-	7.58* (1.23)	5.92* (1.34)	3.36 (4.68)
Protestant	222	17.85	14.03	Protestant			-	1.67 (1.27)	4.22 (4.67)
Roman Catholic	155	16.19	15.90	Roman Catholic				-	2.55 (4.70)
Other[c]	7	13.64	23.47	Other					-
				F (4, 960) = 42.785*					
Gender									
Male	473	11.61	14.06	Absolute difference in Mean Scores of Gender = 0.89 (0.85), t = 1.049, d.f. = 963.					
Female	492	10.72	12.25						
Age (in years)				*Age (in years)*	19-30	31-60	61-85		
19-30	253	9.95	11.81	19-30	-	1.70 (1.00)	1.37 (1.35)		
31-60	559	11.65	13.30	31-60		-	0.33 (1.20)		
61-85	153	11.32	14.68	61-85			-		
				F (2, 962) = 1.465					
Education Level				*Education Level*	No Formal Education	Primary	Secondary	Senior Secondary	Graduation and above
No Formal Education	9	8.59	6.98	No Formal Education	-	1.54 (4.75)	1.69 (4.66)	2.37 (4.46)	3.18 (4.42)
Primary[d]	51	7.04	11.37	Primary		-	3.24 (2.43)	3.91 (2.01)	4.73 (1.92)
Secondary[e]	69	10.28	11.71	Secondary			-	0.68 (1.77)	1.49 (1.68)
Senior Secondary[f]	271	10.95	13.72	Senior Secondary				-	0.82 (0.97)
Graduation and above[g]	565	11.77	13.24	Graduation and above					-
				F (4, 960) = 1.736					
Income Group				*Income Group*	Poorest	2nd Quintile	3rd Quintile	4th Quintile	Richest
Poorest	83	8.93	10.27	Poorest	-	1.09 (1.66)	2.10 (1.57)	4.40 (1.72)	10.30 (3.91)
2nd Quintile	250	10.02	11.60	2nd Quintile		-	1.00 (1.04)	3.31 (1.25)	9.21 (3.73)
3rd Quintile	426	11.02	13.64	3rd Quintile			-	2.31 (1.14)	8.21 (3.69)
4th Quintile	193	13.33	13.23	4th Quintile				-	5.90 (3.75)
Richest	13	19.23	28.64	Richest					-
				F (4, 960) = 3.649*					
All	*965*	*11.15*	*13.17*						

Figures in parentheses are standard errors. The mean difference is significant at *0.01 level, and ***0.10 level.
a. Married includes Married (584), and Living together as Married (8).
b. Separated includes Divorced (17), Separated (5), and Widowed (47).
c. Other includes Confucianism (3), Jew (2), Muslim (1), and Orthodox (1).
d. Primary includes Incomplete Primary School (10), and Complete Primary School (41).
e. Secondary includes Incomplete Secondary School: Technical/Vocational Type (13), and Complete Secondary School: Technical/Vocational Type (56).
f. Senior Secondary includes Incomplete Secondary School: University-Preparatory Type (25), and Complete Secondary School: University-Preparatory Type (246).
g. Includes Some University-Level Education: Without Degree (133), and Some University-Level Education: With Degree (432).
Source: Calculated from World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010 Data.

Annexure 2: Significance of the Difference in Mean Scores on the Generalized Trust Dimension of Social Capital

Individual Characteristics	Number of Individuals	Mean	S.D.	Significance of the Difference in Mean Scores					
Marital Status				*Marital Status*	Married	Separated	Single		
Married[a]	592	57.82	14.73	Married	-	1.78 (1.91)	1.37 (1.06)		
Separated[b]	69	56.04	15.62	Separated		-	0.41 (2.01)		
Single	304	56.45	15.53	Single			-		
				F (2, 962) = 1.072					
Religion				*Religion*	None	Buddhist	Protestant	Roman Catholic	Other
None	404	54.79	15.01	None	-	1.59 (1.34)	6.20* (1.24)	5.11* (1.40)	8.75 (5.65)
Buddhist	177	56.37	15.22	Buddhist		-	4.61** (1.49)	3.52 (1.63)	10.34 (5.71)
Protestant	222	60.99	14.23	Protestant			-	1.09 (1.55)	14.95 (5.69)
Roman Catholic	155	59.89	14.06	Roman Catholic				-	13.86 (5.73)
Other[c]	7	46.03	26.00	Other					-
				F (4, 960) = 8.713*					
Gender									
Male	473	56.42	15.51	Absolute difference in Mean Scores of Gender = 1.64*** (0.97), t = 1.691, d.f. = 963.					
Female	492	58.06	14.57						
Age (in years)				*Age (in years)*	19-30	31-60	61-85		
19-30	253	56.24	15.49	19-30	-	1.34 (1.14)	1.57 (1.54)		
31-60	559	57.57	14.50	31-60		-	0.23 (1.37)		
61-85	153	57.81	16.29	61-85			-		
				F (2, 962) = 0.807					
Education Level				*Education Level*	No Formal Education	Primary	Secondary	Senior Secondary	Graduation and above
No Formal Education	9	53.32	15.66	No Formal Education	-	3.74 (5.45)	1.56 (5.34)	2.14 (5.10)	3.47 (5.06)
Primary[d]	51	58.06	18.20	Primary		-	2.18 (2.78)	1.60 (2.30)	0.27 (2.20)
Secondary[e]	69	55.88	12.64	Secondary			-	0.58 (2.03)	1.91 (1.92)
Senior Secondary[f]	271	56.46	16.06	Senior Secondary				-	1.33 (1.11)
Graduation and above[g]	565	57.59	14.51	Graduation and above					-
				F (4, 960) = 0.632					
Income Group				*Income Group*	Poorest	2nd Quintile	3rd Quintile	4th Quintile	Richest
Poorest	83	54.62	18.01	Poorest	-	1.16 (1.90)	2.74 (1.80)	4.94 (1.97)	10.77 (4.47)
2nd Quintile	250	55.78	15.58	2nd Quintile		-	1.58 (1.19)	3.78 (1.44)	9.61 (4.26)
3rd Quintile	426	57.36	14.59	3rd Quintile			-	2.20 (1.30)	8.03 (4.22)
4th Quintile	193	59.56	13.60	4th Quintile				-	5.83 (4.29)
Richest	13	65.38	14.19	Richest					-
				F (4, 960) = 3.352*					
All	*965*	*57.26*	*15.05*						

Figures in parentheses are standard errors. The mean difference is significant at *0.01 level, **0.05 level and ***0.10 level.
a. Married includes Married (584), and Living together as Married (8).
b. Separated includes Divorced (17), Separated (5), and Widowed (47).
c. Other includes Confucianism (3), Jew (2), Muslim (1), and Orthodox (1).
d. Primary includes Incomplete Primary School (10), and Complete Primary School (41).
e. Secondary includes Incomplete Secondary School: Technical/Vocational Type (13), and Complete Secondary School: Technical/Vocational Type (56).
f. Senior Secondary includes Incomplete Secondary School: University-Preparatory Type (25), and Complete Secondary School: University-Preparatory Type (246).
g. Includes Some University-Level Education: Without Degree (133), and Some University-Level Education: With Degree (432).
Source: Calculated from World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010 Data.

Annexure 3: Significance of the Difference in Mean Scores on Social Capital

Individual Characteristics	Number of Individuals	Mean	S.D.	Significance of the Difference in Mean Scores					
Marital Status				*Marital Status*	Married	Separated	Single		
Married[a]	592	36.21	12.29	Married	-	2.03 (1.53)	1.95*** (0.85)		
Separated[b]	69	34.18	11.52	Separated		-	0.08 (1.60)		
Single	304	34.26	11.63	Single			-		
				F (2, 962) = 3.045**					
Religion				*Religion*	None	Buddhist	Protestant	Roman Catholic	Other
None	404	30.99	10.11	None	-	3.47** (1.01)	10.42* (0.94)	8.85* (1.06)	0.36 (4.28)
Buddhist	177	34.46	10.57	Buddhist		-	6.94* (1.13)	5.38* (1.24)	3.11 (4.33)
Protestant	222	41.40	12.24	Protestant			-	1.57 (1.18)	10.05 (4.31)
Roman Catholic	155	39.84	12.54	Roman Catholic				-	8.49 (4.34)
Other[c]	7	31.35	21.68	Other					-
				F (4, 960) = 38.046*					
Gender									
Male	473	35.31	12.67	Absolute difference in Mean Scores of Gender = 0.27 (0.78), t = 0.352, d.f. = 963.					
Female	492	35.58	11.46						
Age (in years)				*Age (in years)*	19-30	31-60	61-85		
19-30	253	34.20	11.53	19-30	-	1.71 (0.91)	1.62 (1.23)		
31-60	559	35.91	11.85	31-60		-	0.09 (1.10)		
61-85	153	35.82	13.53	61-85			-		
				F (2, 962) = 1.835					
Education Level				*Education Level*	No Formal Education	Primary	Secondary	Senior Secondary	Graduation and above
No Formal Education	9	32.41	7.35	No Formal Education	-	0.93 (4.36)	1.81 (4.27)	2.51 (4.08)	3.68 (4.05)
Primary[d]	51	33.33	12.81	Primary		-	0.89 (2.23)	1.59 (1.84)	2.75 (1.76)
Secondary[e]	69	34.22	10.94	Secondary			-	0.70 (1.63)	1.87 (1.54)
Senior Secondary[f]	271	34.92	12.68	Senior Secondary				-	1.16 (0.89)
Graduation and above[g]	565	36.09	12.06	Graduation and above					-
				F (4, 960) = 1.240					
Income Group				*Income Group*	Poorest	2nd Quintile	3rd Quintile	4th Quintile	Richest
Poorest	83	32.76	11.74	Poorest	-	1.25 (1.51)	2.65 (1.43)	5.16** (1.57)	11.68** (3.56)
2nd Quintile	250	34.01	11.58	2nd Quintile		-	1.40 (0.95)	3.91** (1.14)	10.43*** (3.40)
3rd Quintile	426	35.41	11.95	3rd Quintile			-	2.51 (1.04)	9.03 (3.36)
4th Quintile	193	37.92	11.89	4th Quintile				-	6.52 (3.42)
Richest	13	44.44	19.08	Richest					-
				F (4, 960) = 5.875*					
All	*965*	*35.45*	*12.06*						

Figures in parentheses are standard errors. The mean difference is significant at *0.01 level, **0.05 level, and ***0.10 level.
a. Married includes Married (584), and Living together as Married (8).
b. Separated includes Divorced (17), Separated (5), and Widowed (47).
c. Other includes Confucianism (3), Jew (2), Muslim (1), and Orthodox (1).
d. Primary includes Incomplete Primary School (10), and Complete Primary School (41).
e. Secondary includes Incomplete Secondary School: Technical/Vocational Type (13), and Complete Secondary School: Technical/Vocational Type (56).
f. Senior Secondary includes Incomplete Secondary School: University-Preparatory Type (25), and Complete Secondary School: University-Preparatory Type (246).
g. Includes Some University-Level Education: Without Degree (133), and Some University-Level Education: With Degree (432).
Source: Calculated from World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010 Data.

A. Social Capital Indicators

Group Membership

Q. No. V25 to V35: Now I am going to read off a list of voluntary organizations. For each organization, could you tell me whether you are an active member, an inactive member or not a member of that type of organization?

V25. Church or religious organization

Table A1: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V25 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Not a member	0	0	53.0	61.0	45.1	60.9	52.8	48.5
Inactive member	1	1	18.7	16.6	20.8	19.1	19.4	17.7
Active member	2	2	22.5	15.9	28.8	16.5	22.4	26.1
No answer	−1	−1	5.8	6.5	5.2	3.5	5.4	7.7
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V26: Sports or recreational organization

Table A2: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V26 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Not a member	0	0	65.4	59.8	70.9	69.9	57.9	72.4
Inactive member	1	1	16.6	18.5	14.8	16.0	23.3	8.3
Active member	2	2	10.0	14.0	6.0	9.3	11.6	8.3
No answer	−1	−1	8.0	7.7	8.2	4.8	7.1	10.9
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V27: Art, music or educational organization

Table A3: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V27 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Not a member	0	0	68.3	69.3	67.2	64.6	65.3	74.3
Inactive member	1	1	16.7	16.6	16.7	20.4	19.3	11.1
Active member	2	2	5.7	4.6	6.7	10.2	5.2	3.5
No answer	−1	−1	9.4	9.4	9.4	4.8	10.1	11.2
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V28: Labour union

Table A4: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V28 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Not a member	0	0	82.7	81.4	84.1	91.4	79.2	82.1
Inactive member	1	1	5.1	6.2	4.0	3.0	7.3	3.6
Active member	2	2	1.6	2.1	1.2	0.5	2.1	1.7
No answer	−1	−1	10.5	10.3	10.7	5.1	11.4	12.6
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V29: Political party

Table A5: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V29 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Not a member	0	0	84.2	83.0	85.4	91.5	81.0	84.0
Inactive member	1	1	4.8	5.6	3.9	2.9	7.3	2.6
Active member	2	2	0.7	1.0	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.7
No answer	−1	−1	10.3	10.3	10.3	5.1	10.9	12.7
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V30: Environmental organization

Table A6: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V30 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Not a member	0	0	81.2	79.8	82.6	89.7	79.5	78.5
Inactive member	1	1	5.8	6.0	5.6	4.0	6.3	6.2
Active member	2	2	2.6	3.9	1.4	1.2	3.1	2.8
No answer	−1	−1	10.4	10.3	10.5	5.1	11.1	12.5
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V31: Professional association

Table A7: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V31 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Not a member	0	0	80.6	77.9	83.3	88.5	78.4	78.8
Inactive member	1	1	5.6	7.0	4.2	4.2	7.4	4.0
Active member	2	2	3.6	4.9	2.4	2.5	3.2	4.9
No answer	−1	−1	10.2	10.2	10.1	4.8	10.9	12.3
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V32: Humanitarian or charitable organization

Table A8: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V32 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Not a member	0	0	80.1	78.7	81.4	88.4	76.4	79.9
Inactive member	1	1	8.0	8.7	7.3	5.5	10.1	6.7
Active member	2	2	1.8	2.3	1.3	0.7	2.4	1.6
No answer	−1	−1	10.2	10.2	10.1	5.3	11.1	11.8
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V33: Consumer organization

Table A9: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V33 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Not a member	0	0	83.2	82.2	84.2	91.3	80.4	82.2
Inactive member	1	1	4.6	5.1	4.1	3.2	6.6	2.8
Active member	2	2	1.8	2.4	1.1	0.5	2.0	2.2
No answer	−1	−1	10.4	10.3	10.5	5.1	11.1	12.7
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V34: Self-help group, mutual aid group

Table A10: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V34 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Not a member	0	0	79.0	77.3	80.6	89.7	75.7	76.8
Inactive member	1	1	6.8	7.5	6.1	4.7	9.2	4.9
Active member	2	2	3.9	4.4	3.4	0.7	4.2	5.3
No answer	−1	−1	10.3	10.8	9.9	4.8	10.8	13.0
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V35: Other organization

Table A11: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V35 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Not a member	0	0	68.6	65.9	71.3	76.7	62.8	71.4
Inactive member	1	1	13.7	14.9	12.4	12.4	15.8	11.6
Active member	2	2	6.4	7.5	5.4	4.5	8.2	5.3
No answer	−1	−1	11.3	11.7	10.9	6.3	13.3	11.7
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

Trust

Q. No. V24: Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people?

Table A12: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V24 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Most people can be trusted	1	2	26.5	28.8	24.1	32.2	27.0	22.3
Need to be very careful	2	1	73.0	70.9	75.1	66.7	72.9	77.0
No answer	−1	−1	0.5	0.2	0.8	1.1	0.1	0.7
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

Q. No. V102 to V107: I'd like to ask you how much you trust people from various groups. Could you tell me for each whether you trust people from this group completely, somewhat, not very much or not at all?

V102. Your family

Table A13: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V102 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Trust completely	1	4	82.5	81.8	83.2	84.3	80.1	84.6
Trust somewhat	2	3	15.2	15.0	15.5	14.1	16.5	14.2
Do not trust very much	3	2	1.6	2.4	0.8	1.3	2.0	1.1
Do not trust at all	4	1	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.9	0.1
No answer	−1	−1	0.2	0.2	0.2	-	0.4	-
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V103. Your neighbourhood

Table A14: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V103 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Trust completely	1	4	11.3	9.0	13.5	2.1	8.6	20.2
Trust somewhat	2	3	60.9	63.4	58.5	54.2	66.0	58.4
Do not trust very much	3	2	22.9	22.6	23.1	32.0	22.3	18.2
Do not trust at all	4	1	4.7	4.6	4.8	11.3	2.9	3.1
No answer	−1	−1	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.1
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V104. People you know personally

Table A15: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V104 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Trust completely	1	4	15.6	14.6	16.5	12.2	14.5	19.0
Trust somewhat	2	3	65.1	68.0	62.2	67.8	68.4	59.1
Do not trust very much	3	2	15.4	13.7	17.1	14.8	13.4	18.3
Do not trust at all	4	1	2.8	3.4	2.3	5.2	1.3	3.4
No answer	−1	−1	1.1	0.3	2.0	-	2.5	0.1
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V105. People you meet for the first time

Table A16: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V105 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Trust completely	1	4	0.9	0.7	1.1	0.2	1.2	0.9
Trust somewhat	2	3	18.1	17.4	18.9	13.9	20.1	18.1
Do not trust very much	3	2	51.6	51.5	51.8	47.5	51.8	53.9
Do not trust at all	4	1	28.8	30.0	27.7	37.9	26.7	26.2
No answer	−1	−1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.9
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V106. People of another religion

Table A17: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V106 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Trust completely	1	4	2.9	2.7	3.0	-	3.3	4.0
Trust somewhat	2	3	36.9	34.9	38.8	33.3	39.2	36.0
Do not trust very much	3	2	45.5	46.1	44.8	47.2	45.4	44.4
Do not trust at all	4	1	14.2	15.7	12.8	19.2	11.7	14.6
No answer	−1	−1	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.2	0.4	1.0
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

V107. People of another nationality

Table A18: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V107 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Trust completely	1	4	2.0	1.7	2.4	0.7	2.1	2.9
Trust somewhat	2	3	29.5	28.9	30.1	30.6	32.5	25.0
Do not trust very much	3	2	47.3	47.1	47.6	48.0	48.1	45.9
Do not trust at all	4	1	20.7	21.8	19.6	20.5	17.0	25.5
No answer	−1	−1	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.7
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

B. Human Well-Being Indicators

Happiness in life

Q. No. V10: Taking all things together, would you say you are:

Table B1: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V10 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Very happy	1	4	15.2	14.0	16.5	15.7	18.1	11.2
Rather happy	2	3	74.8	73.4	76.1	75.0	72.3	77.7
Not very happy	3	2	9.2	12.1	6.4	9.0	8.4	10.3
Not at all happy	4	1	0.7	0.6	0.8	0.2	1.0	0.7
No answer	−1	−1	0.1	-	0.2	-	0.2	-
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

Health condition

Q. No. V11: All in all, how would you describe your state of health these days? Would you say it is:

Table B2: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V11 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Very good	1	4	14.9	17.0	12.9	23.6	15.0	9.6
Good	2	3	65.2	67.1	63.4	59.5	67.8	65.2
Fair	3	2	17.6	14.2	20.9	14.5	15.3	22.4
Poor	4	1	0.9	0.7	1.0	1.1	1.0	0.5
No answer	−1	−1	1.4	1.0	1.8	1.3	0.8	2.2
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

Satisfaction in life

Q. No. V23: All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?

Table B3: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V23 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Completely dissatisfied	1	1	1.1	1.9	0.4	1.2	0.3	2.1
2	2	2	0.3	0.5	0.2	-	0.6	0.2
3	3	3	4.4	5.1	3.6	3.7	4.7	4.3
4	4	4	5.5	6.1	4.9	8.0	4.0	6.0
5	5	5	19.6	19.0	20.1	12.3	17.6	26.5
6	6	6	14.5	15.8	13.4	18.4	15.5	11.0
7	7	7	21.8	20.8	22.8	21.2	24.9	18.3
8	8	8	19.0	19.1	18.9	17.4	20.4	18.2
9	9	9	7.8	6.6	9.0	9.2	8.5	6.0
Completely satisfied	10	10	4.3	4.1	4.5	5.9	3.4	4.5
No answer	−1	−1	1.6	1.0	2.2	2.7	0.1	3.0
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416
Mean			6.51	6.38	6.63	6.64	6.61	6.29
Standard Deviation			1.82	1.89	1.75	1.86	1.72	1.91
Base mean			1181	587	593	239	537	404

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

Freedom of choice

Q. No. V55: Some people feel they have completely free choice and control over their lives, while other people feel that what they do has no real effect on what happens to them. Please indicate how much freedom of choice and control you feel you have over the way your life turns out?

Table B4: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V55 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
No choice at all	1	1	0.8	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.6	1.4
2	2	2	2.2	1.8	2.5	1.9	1.3	3.4
3	3	3	4.4	3.9	4.8	3.9	2.2	7.4
4	4	4	7.3	6.6	7.9	4.7	8.2	7.6
5	5	5	16.6	17.8	15.3	14.5	18.7	15.1
6	6	6	13.4	14.1	12.7	16.5	11.3	14.3
7	7	7	20.1	21.1	19.2	17.1	24.5	16.2
8	8	8	19.0	18.6	19.3	20.4	18.9	18.2
9	9	9	8.0	6.5	9.5	8.5	7.9	7.9
A great deal of choice	10	10	8.0	8.5	7.5	11.5	6.2	8.2
No answer	−1	−1	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.4
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416
Mean			6.57	6.57	6.57	6.84	6.61	6.36
Standard Deviation			2.01	1.98	2.05	2.01	1.85	2.20
Base mean			1196	592	604	245	537	415

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

Satisfaction of the individual with his/her financial situation

Q. No. V59: How satisfied are you with the financial situation of your household?

Table B5: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V59 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Completely dissatisfied	1	1	2.6	1.9	3.3	2.1	1.5	4.3
2	2	2	2.4	2.1	2.6	3.8	1.6	2.6
3	3	3	8.3	8.7	8.0	6.9	7.0	10.9
4	4	4	9.8	9.8	9.8	8.3	9.7	10.8
5	5	5	23.3	24.6	22.0	19.8	21.5	27.7
6	6	6	17.3	16.4	18.2	13.4	22.4	13.0
7	7	7	18.0	17.6	18.3	19.9	18.1	16.7
8	8	8	10.2	11.0	9.4	13.3	11.6	6.5
9	9	9	3.7	3.1	4.2	4.2	3.6	3.4
Completely satisfied	10	10	2.5	2.6	2.5	4.8	1.7	2.3
No answer	−1	−1	2.0	2.3	1.7	3.5	1.5	1.8
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416
Mean			5.69	5.71	5.66	5.95	5.83	5.34
Standard Deviation			1.93	1.88	1.97	2.08	1.76	1.98
Base mean			1176	579	597	237	530	409

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

Extent of savings

Q. No. V237: During the past year, did your family save money, just get by, spent some savings and borrowed money

Table B6: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V237 (Percentage)

Response	WVS code	Recode for this paper	Total	Sex		Age		
				Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Save money	1	4	21.6	22.2	21.0	23.4	27.1	13.5
Just get by	2	3	52.1	53.2	50.9	47.1	51.5	55.7
Spent some savings	3	2	13.4	11.8	15.0	16.8	10.2	15.6
Spent savings and borrowed money	4	1	12.2	11.8	12.5	11.8	10.8	14.3
No answer	−1	−1	0.7	0.9	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.9
N			1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

C. Individual Demographic Characteristics

Marital Status

Q. No. V57: Are you currently:

Table C1: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V57 (Percentage)

Response	Total	Sex		Age		
		Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Married	62.7	64.2	61.2	12.8	74.1	77.6
Living together as married	1.0	1.4	0.6	1.7	0.7	0.9
Divorced	2.3	1.8	2.8	0.2	2.6	3.2
Separated	0.5	0.3	0.6	-	0.6	0.5
Widowed	5.7	1.4	10.0	-	0.9	15.4
Single	27.0	29.3	24.7	83.1	20.7	1.9
No answer	0.8	1.5	0.1	2.2	0.4	0.6
N	1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

Religion

Q. No. V144: Do you belong to a religion or religious denomination? If yes, which one?

Table C2: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V144 (Percentage)

Response	Total	Sex		Age		
		Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
None	41.3	49.4	33.3	55.3	42.8	30.9
Buddhist	20.6	18.8	22.3	8.8	15.5	34.1
Confucianism	0.5	0.8	0.3	0.7	0.4	0.5
Jew	0.1	-	0.1	-	0.1	0.1
Muslim	0.1	0.2	-	0.5	-	-
Orthodox	0.1	-	0.1	0.3	-	-
Protestant	21.0	16.3	25.6	18.3	23.1	19.9
Roman Catholic	15.7	13.7	17.6	16.2	17.0	13.6
No answer	0.7	0.8	0.7	-	1.0	0.8
N	1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

Income

Q. No. V239: On this card is an income scale on which 1 indicates the lowest income group and 10 the highest income group in your country. We would like to know in what group your household is. Please, specify the appropriate number, counting all wages, salaries, pensions and other incomes that come in.

Table C3: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V239 (Percentage)

Response	Total	Sex		Age		
		Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Lower step	6.8	5.1	8.5	3.5	5.3	10.7
Second step	7.1	5.1	9.0	5.5	5.9	9.6
Third step	11.3	9.6	13.0	8.9	7.8	17.3
Fourth step	15.7	17.2	14.3	18.4	16.6	13.1
Fifth step	25.9	27.6	24.3	24.8	27.6	24.4
Sixth step	17.0	16.0	18.0	20.3	19.8	11.4
Seventh step	10.5	12.8	8.3	11.8	11.3	8.8
Eighth step	4.3	4.7	3.9	5.0	5.0	3.1
Ninth step	0.4	0.6	0.2	0.7	0.1	0.6
Tenth step	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.5
No answer	0.4	0.6	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.4
N	1200	593	607	246	538	416
Mean	468	4.89	4.47	4.99	4.89	4.23
Standard Deviation	1.85	1.79	1.88	1.74	1.75	1.95
Base mean	1196	590	606	245	537	414

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

Gender

Q. No. V240: Respondent's gender by observation

Table C4: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V240 (Percentage)

Response	Total	Sex		Age		
		Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Male	49.4	100.0	-	51.6	50.9	46.2
Female	50.6	-	100.0	48.4	49.1	53.8
N	1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

Age

Q. No. V242: Age of respondent

Table C5: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V242 (Percentage)

Response	Total	Sex		Age		
		Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
Up to 29	20.5	21.4	19.6	100.0	-	-
30-49	44.8	46.2	43.5	-	100.0	-
50 and more	34.7	32.4	36.9	-	-	100.0
N	1200	593	607	246	538	416
Mean	43.79	42.97	44.58	23.63	39.47	61.29
Standard Deviation	15.47	14.70	16.15	3.16	5.74	8.39
Base mean	1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.

Education

Q. No. V248: What is the highest educational level that you have attained?

Table C6: Gender and Age Wise Responses to the Question V248 (Percentage)

Response	Total	Sex		Age		
		Male	Female	Up to 29	30-49	50 & more
No formal education	1.9	-	3.7	-	-	5.4
Incomplete primary school	2.8	2.2	3.3	-	1.3	6.3
Complete primary school	12.5	8.4	16.5	-	2.2	33.1
Incomplete secondary school: technical/ vocational type	4.1	3.7	4.4	0.4	3.2	7.4
Complete secondary school: technical/ vocational type	6.5	6.1	6.9	0.4	5.8	11.1
Incomplete secondary school: university-preparatory type	2.4	2.3	2.5	-	3.1	3.0
Complete secondary school: university-preparatory type	32.3	32.7	31.9	26.8	43.4	21.3
Some university-level education, without degree	11.3	12.1	10.4	26.0	11.5	2.2
University-level education, with degree	26.3	32.4	20.4	46.3	29.6	10.3
N	1200	593	607	246	538	416

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6, South Korea 2010.