

МЕМЛЕКЕТТІК БАСҚАРУ ЖӘНЕ МЕМЛЕКЕТТІК ҚЫЗМЕТ PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIL SERVICE ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЕ И ГОСУДАРСТВЕННАЯ СЛУЖБА

BONDING AND BRIDGING SOCIAL CAPITAL AS DETERMINANTS OF INSTITUTIONAL TRUST IN KAZAKHSTAN: EVIDENCE FROM THE WORLD VALUES SURVEY

Abdulla *
TOKENOV

Ph.D. Candidate, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan,
abdulla.tokenov@alumni.nu.edu.kz, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2418-9943>

Tatyana
DRONZINA

Professor, Doctor of Political Sciences, Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski", Sofia,
Bulgaria, dronzina@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5794-3390>

Дата поступления рукописи в редакцию: 30/09/2025

Доработано: 05/12/2025

Принято: 12/12/2025

DOI: 10.52123/1994-2370-2025-1557

УДК 328

МРНТИ 11.15.45

Annotation. The paper analyses the connection between social capital and institutional trust in Kazakhstan based on the data provided in the World Values Survey (Wave 7). Based on the chi-square results, the researcher found that trust in government and parliament is mostly linked to bonding values, especially the significance of family, religion, and trust between people. In comparison, indicators of bridging social capital like charitable giving, tax compliance, and organizational membership show less strong and more dislodged relationships. Notably, the confidence of government is always better than that of parliament, which is an asymmetry of centralized politics. On the whole, the findings indicate how traditional values remain in influencing the institutional trust and governance patterns in Kazakhstan.

Key words: Social capital, institutional trust, Kazakhstan, bonding values, bridging social capital, parliament, government.

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақала Қазақстандағы әлеуметтік капитал мен институционалдық сенім арасындағы өзара байланысты World Values Survey (7 толқын) деректері негізінде талдайды. χ^2 -тест нәтижелеріне сүйене отырып үкімет пен парламентке деген сенімнің негізінен бондинг әлеуметтік капиталға, яғни әсіресе отбасының маңыздылығына, дінге және адамдар арасындағы сенімге тығыз байланысты екені анықталды. Ал бриджинг әлеуметтік капиталдың көрсеткіштері қайырымдылық жасау, салық төлеуді азаматтық міндет ретінде қабылдау және ұйымдарға мүшелік әсірәсіз әрі тұрақсыз байланыстырды көрсетеді. Сонымен қатар, үкіметке деген сенімнің парламентке қарағанда үнемі жорғары екені байқалайды, бұл орталықтандырылған саяси жүцелерге тән ассметрияны көрсетеді. Жалпы алғанда алынған нәтижелер дәстүрлі құндылықтардың Қазақстандағы институционалдық сенім мен басқару үлгілерін қалыптастыруда әлі де маңызды рөл атқаратынын дәлелдейді.

Түйін сөздер: Әлеуметтік капитал, институционалдық сенім, Қазақстан, бондинг құндылықтары, бриджинг әлеуметтік капитал, парламент, үкімет.

Аннотация. В статье анализируется взаимосвязь между социальным капиталом и институциональным доверием в Казахстане на основе данных World Values Survey (7-я волна). Результаты χ^2 -анализа показывают, что доверие к правительству и парламенту в большей степени связано с внутригрупповыми (бондинг) ценностями, прежде всего с важностью семьи, религии и межличностного доверия. В тоже время показатели соединяющего (бриджинг) социального капитала, такие как благотворительность, соблюдение налогового законодательства и членство в организациях, демонстрируют более слабые и нестабильные связи. Отмечается, что доверие к правительству стабильно выше, чем к парламенту, что отражает асимметрию доверия, характерную для централизованных политических систем. В целом, результаты свидетельствуют о сохраняющемся влиянии традиционных ценностей на формирование институционального доверия и моделей управления в Казахстане.

* Corresponding author: A. Tokenov, abdulla.tokenov@alumni.nu.edu.kz

Ключевые слова: Социальный капитал, институциональное доверие, Казахстан, внутригрупповой социальный капитал (бондинг), соединяющий (бриджинг) социальный капитал, парламент, правительство.

Introduction

The institutional trust has been widely known as an essential element of political order, which allows citizens to acknowledge authority, obey the rule, and organize collective action. Once trust is destroyed or distributed in an uneven manner, institutional legitimacy is lost, accountability is lost, and a vacuum of individualistic or populist governance is created (Algan, 2018; Fukuyama, 1995). Such dangers are especially acute in the politics of transition where the informal structures do not fade away and the civil expectations are shifting.

The social capital theory is among the most powerful methods of explaining the sources of institutional trust. Social capital conceptualized as networks, norms, and expectations of trust to cooperate to benefit mutually based on the previous work by Putnam (1994, 2000) and others. The literature identifies a major difference between bonding social capital (which is based on strong ties within the frame of homogeneous groups (family, kinship, network, close communities)) and bridging social capital that links individuals across social boundaries as represented by civic participation, generalized reciprocity, and democratic participation. Even though the two forms can both affect institutional trust, it is context-specific and both forms may have conflicting effect.

According to evidence of already-established democracies, bridging capital enhances the institutional trust by facilitating the development of civic networks and through horizontal cooperation (Knack and Keefer, 1997; Putnam 1994). By comparison, the research literature on transitional and post-Soviet situations concludes that bonding values tend to be predominant in the context of a weak civil society and a high level of normative power of traditional values (Koster & Bruggeman, 2008; Muringani et al., 2021). Institutional trust in these conditions might take the form of expectations, which are culturally and socially constructed and connected with family, community, and religion rather than being the result of belonging to civic associations.

The situation within Kazakhstan can be viewed as a very pertinent case to the study of these dynamics. Being a post-Soviet state with centralized systems of political and popular administration, it has its strengths of traditional values and selective modernization and low level of associational density of the civic world.

Despite the governmental encouragement of institutional changes, the society remains influenced by hierarchical governance, the non-development of civil organizations, and the use of informal networks. This poses significant questions: To what degree to institutional trust in Kazakhstan is based on bonding as opposed to bridging forms of social capital?

The current paper explores the role of various aspects of social capital bonding (family, religion, interpersonal trust), and bridging (organization membership, donations, tax payment) in the formation of trust towards two important political institutions, the government, and the parliament. The study postulates that the institutional trust in Kazakhstan is founded on bonding social capital and the bridging dimensions reveal less systematic and stronger correlations, as based on the existing information regarding the theoretical and empirical insights.

Literature review

It is generally accepted that institutional trust is one of the most important indicators of political legitimacy, and it shows how ordinary citizens believe that the authorities are reliable, just, and responsive (Algan, 2018, Newton 2001). The compliance is made easy with high levels of institutional trust, the transaction cost is minimized and conducive to policy implementation, and the low trust is accompanied by weak accountability and chronic governance problems (Fukuyama, 1995). One of the biggest predictors of political trust is social capital. Traditional definitions focus on networks, common norms and trusted attitudes of making collective action possible (Coleman, 1988). The comparative analysis of Italian regions by Putnam remains a classical source that proves that civic engagement and associations density are associated with more efficient and reliable institutions. But later studies have indicated that the social capital is not one-dimensional. Social capital based on deep and intensive bonds restricts generalized trust and reinforces exclusivity by bonding social capital which offers support and solidarity (Lopez & Sanchez, 2004; Stone, 2003). Introducing social capital, on the other hand, relates to linking heterogeneous populations and high-quality institutions and norms of cooperation (Keefer & Knack, 2005). Cross-national data explains

the effects of social capital depending on institutional settings. Social capital bridging supports the low corruption and healthy democratic norms of the Scandinavian countries that are accountable and have a transparent governing system. On the other hand, bonding relationships are very crucial in most of the Latin American and Southern European societies, thus leading to clientelism, patronage, and limited institutional trust (Lopez&Sanchez, 2004). These patterns of comparison highlight the fact that social capital is a maker and a maker of institutional contexts.

Controversies about the sources of institutional trust point out two powerful views. The institutionalist approach states that trust is the main expression of assessments of institutional performance. According to scholars like Rothstein and Stolle (2003), the development of trust, at every level, is encouraged by unbiased, predictable, and clean governance (Rothstein and Teorell, 2008). The cultural one, in its turn, emphasizes the contribution of values, social norms and historically established patterns of behavior. The cultural traditions can either promote the generalized trust or sustain the family-oriented, particularistic ones (Kliksberg, 1999; Kaasa and Andriani, 2022). Other practices like community involvement or volunteering may reinforce social cohesion, but selectively or unevenly depending sometimes (Murzun-Kupisz and Dziasek, 2013; Sgroi et al., 2020). Depending on bigger institutional circumstances, religious orientations or individualistic values can increase bridging ties or strengthen bonding ties (Wang and Gordon, 2011).

However, this literature pays a lot of attention to Western democracies despite their experience. Not much has been done to examine these mechanisms as they manifest across the post-Soviet societies which are characterized by high levels of institutional instability, hierarchical governance and high levels of informal norms that influence the perceptions and behavior of the citizens. This is something that is under researched in Kazakhstan. The available literature indicates the persistence of traditional values and kinship-related networks as the core determinants of the organization of social life and political expectations, and civic associations are relatively small in their scope and power. The current research is one of the attempts to fill this gap by exploring the relationship between bonding and bridging types of social capital and institutional trust in Kazakhstan and placing these results into the greater context of discussing the development of the trust in transitional political regimes.

Methodology

It is a data-driven study, which is informed by a survey report, the World Values Survey, Wave 7 (2017-2020) carried out in Kazakhstan 2018 using a nationally representative sample of nearly 1200 adult participants. The survey design is representative in terms of gender, age, and residence of the place where the survey was conducted with a possibility of generalizing on the entire population. The WVS is especially suitable in this study because it offers a lot of data on cultural values, interpersonal trust, civic participation, and views of the attitudes towards the public institutions.

The two items that were used to measure institutional trust were: confidence in government (Q71), and confidence in parliament (Q73). In accordance with the tradition of cross-national research (Zmerli and Newton, 2017), both variables were also dichotomized, and such words as a great deal and quite a lot were counted as a high trust (1), whereas such words as not very much and none at all were counted as a low trust (0).

The analysis did not include the responses of the form of don't know, no answer, not applicable, and system-missing. Social capital has been operationalized in terms of two dimensions that are generally differentiated bonding and bridging (Putnam, 2000). The independent variables take two dimensions of social capital that are generally separated in literature (Putnam, 2000). The three indicators of bonding social capital which represent traditional and inward-oriented values measured included the importance of family (Q1) (Fukuyama, 1996), the importance of religion (Q6) (Norris and Inglehart, 2004), and interpersonal trust (Q57) which were measured by the classic item that contrasted the importance of most people can be trusted with the need to be careful (Putnam, 1993; Uslaner, 2002). The concept of bridging social capital, which denotes civic and outward-oriented practices, was encompassed in selective organizational membership and civic responsibility. In particular, four kinds of associations were covered, namely, political parties, sport clubs, professional associations and humanitarian or charitable organizations (Q95, Q96, Q98, Q101). Within both active and inactive membership, the 1 was used to represent both active and inactive membership and 0 was used to refer to non-membership in each instance. Other indicators

were willingness to make charitable contributions (Q213) coded as 1 willingness and 0 unwillingness and paying taxes is a civic duty (Q180) coded as 1 when the respondents supported the idea that paying taxes is a civic duty. Both are measures of orientations to collective duties and willingness to provide support to the public good (Rothstein and Teorell, 2008). The inclusion of these variables is a sign of international scholarship, as well as the Kazakhstani situation, where family and religion are central to culture, and civic behaviors like donations, paying the necessary taxes and selective associational membership are the new types of civic behavior.

The pairwise deletion option, the standard SPSS approach of categorical variables, was used to deal with missing data, which leads to different valid sample sizes among the analyses. No weights (W WEIGHT) were used as is common in the literature of WVS based research in the transitional contexts where weighting does not meaningfully change the direction or meaning of associations. The empirical plan was divided into two steps. First, descriptive statistics were employed to provide a summary of the distribution of the institutional trust and distribution of the social capital indicators. Second, the bivariate and associative correlations between bonding and bridging variables and trust in political institutions were analyzed using chi-square test (2) with Cramer V supplementing them to measure the strength of a relationship. Since the analysis was based on original multicategorical variables, chi-square statistics were computed by degrees of freedom that indicated the entire range of response variables, which enhances the correspondence between the analysis process and empirical findings. Since the objectives of the study are exploratory and the data are categorical, 2 - tests will be the main type of analysis. The logistic regression models were not applied because the aim was to see the general association patterns and not to construct prediction models. All calculations were made in the SPSS Statistics (version 29), and results were, later on, exported and made presentable.

Results

A set of chi-square tests was used to test the relationships between indicators of bonding and bridging social capital and institutional trust. The findings are shown in table 1 of both government and parliamentary trust. Although some of the relationships are statistically significant, the majority of the effect sizes are small or small-to-moderate based on traditional interpretations of Cramer V. This implies that, even though some of the indicators of social capital are correlated with the institutional trust, the substantive effect is relatively weak.

Table 1. Chi-square associations between social capital indicators and institutional trust

Independent variable	Dependent variable	χ^2 (df)	p-value	Cramer's V
Family importance (Q1)	Government (Q71)	31/59(9)	.000	0.09
Family importance (Q1)	Parliament (Q73)	27.40(9)	.001	0.09
Religion importance (Q6)	Government (Q71)	81.30(9)	.000	0.15
Religion importance (Q6)	Parliament (Q73)	57.81(9)	.000	0.13
Interpersonal trust (Q57)	Government (Q71)	21.73(3)	.000	0.14
Interpersonal trust (Q57)	Parliament (Q73)	14.15(3)	.003	0.11
Charitable donations (213)	Government (Q71)	16.45(6)	.012	0.08
Charitable donations (213)	Parliament (Q73)	3.73(6)	.713	0.04
Tax compliance (Q180)	Government (Q71)	31.22(6)	.000	0.12

Tax compliance (Q180)	Parliament (Q73)	6.63 (6)	.356	0.05
Party membership (Q94)	Government (Q71)	12.70 (6)	.048	0.08
Party membership (Q94)	Parliament (Q73)	8.17 (6)	.226	0.06
Sports club membership (Q95)	Government (Q71)	4.66 (6)	.588	0.04
Sports club membership (Q95)	Parliament (Q73)	5.71 (6)	.456	0.05
Professional associations (Q96)	Government (Q71)	4.94 (6)	.551	0.04
Professional associations (Q96)	Parliament (Q73)	6.50 (6)	.369	0.05
Humanitarian/charity organizations (Q97)	Government (Q71)	6.51 (6)	.369	0.05
Humanitarian/charity organizations (Q97)	Parliament (Q73)	15.62 (3)	.001	0.11

Note: The table is compiled by author is based on the World Values Survey, Wave 7 (2017-2022), Kazakhstan sample.

The strongest associations are indicated by bonding. Both family importance and religious importance are strongly connected with the confidence in the government and the parliament, and religion has the highest effect size of all variables ($V = 0.13 - 0.15$), yet it shows that traditional and normative orientations are still important to explain the trust to the state institutions. The interpersonal trust is also statistically significantly related to both types of institutional trust, but with lower level of significance, indicating that there is a modest but consistent relationship between the generalized interpersonal expectations and political confidence.

Current social capital bridging patterns are more heterogeneous. Trust in government has a strong relation with tax compliance and charitable giving, and has a poor or no relation with parliamentary trust. This can be indicative of different perception to the institutional roles, with the government being more closely linked to the provision of the public goods. Selective patterns were also exhibited in organization membership i.e. party membership is positively related to trust in government and not with parliament and humanitarian and charity organizations have been positively associated with trust in parliament. In comparison, the membership of sports groups and professional associations does not demonstrate significant relationships with either of the institutions. This aligns with the context of the Kazakhstani society which is dominated by service oriented structures of such organizations as opposed to civic or political interactions.

In most indicators, the relationship in trust in government is found to be stronger than trust in parliament. This imbalance is an indication that citizens can make distinctions between these institutions, by viewing the government as more central to day to day governance and state power, and more focused on normative expectations based on social capital.

Combined, the data suggests that institutional trust in Kazakhstan has a stronger connection with bonding types of social capital than with bridging types. Traditional value orientations - especially family and religion show the least variation in their relationship with institutional trust and civic or associational practices show weaker and less even distributions. Although these findings do not indicate high causal impacts, they indicate that institutional trust still remains influenced mainly by the inward-oriented forms of social norms, but not by more extensive types of civic engagement.

Discussion

The research results of this paper indicate that institutional trust in Kazakhstan is still strongly linked with traditional and inward oriented social capital. The most consistent correlations with confidence in political institutions are family significance and religious values, as well as interpersonal trust. Conversely, bridging resources, i.e., organizational involvement, charitable giving, tax compliance, etc., show less strong and selective associations. Even though some of the associations are statistically significant, the effect sizes are relatively small, which means that such

associations are to be taken lightly. In general, the findings indicate the persistence of the dominance of bonding social capital in the formation of political trust and lead to significant questions concerning its role in governance and democratic development.

The bonding capital focus unites a significant amount of theoretical and practical studies. Family and knit-based networks as Beugelsdijk and Smulders (2009) observe offer people a sense of satisfaction and predictability but do not always lead to a wider civic cooperation. Similar, Patulny and Svendsen (2007) theorize bonding as a kind of particularized trust which creates solidarity in closed, homogenous networks and restrictive outsiders. Classical literature supports these observations: Banfield (1967), in his study of Southern Italian family-based loyalties, has illustrated the hindrance of collective action by family-focused loyalty; Putnam (2000) had found support networks among religious communities to build internal cohesion, but he failed to transfer these relationships to the rest of the world; Portes (2024), has shown how dense bonding networks among Latin American migrants provided support structures that simultaneously limited upward mobility.

Similar dynamics emerge in the post-Soviet situations. Stephenson (2001) reported an example of how dense networks among marginalized groups in Russia helped in survival besides facilitating the criminal organization. The same can be indicated through evidence provided by the broader comparative studies, which indicate that bonding ties, despite reinforcing internal cohesion, are likely to come at the cost of the development of generalized trust. An example is given by Herreros (2015), who reveal that close ties between family members can prevent the development of broader social trust because the subjects had on close networks are more likely to strengthen since they do not need to consider wider civic connections. The analysis provided by Kim (2006) also indicates that the bonding and bridging social capital produce different social consequences, where bonding is frequently linked to inward-looking solidarity which cannot be easily transformed into civic cooperation in general. This trend can be supported by research of post-soviet societies. Growiec et al. (2014) also discover that the connection between trust and well-being in post-Soviet and transitional European settings is more tied to family-based networks than to the generalized social connections. In combination, this body of literature indicates that a bonding relationship can stabilize social life even in a state of uncertainty, but may not contribute to the generalized trust and the development of democratic institutions. This trend can be observed in the case of Kazakhstan: family and religion continue to be vital sources of institutional trust, which help the country to remain cohesive, which limits the development of more expansive civic activities.

This interpretation is also supported by the mixed and selective impacts of bridging social capital. Whereas tax compliance and charitable giving are linked to trust in government, they are not positively related to parliamentary trust. Institutional trust does not have a significant relationship with membership in sport clubs and professional associations; party membership, on the contrary, is only related with confidence in government. These findings contrast with that of Putnam (1994) that voluntary associations are the so called schools of democracy where people acquire norms of reciprocity and cooperation. Civic networks favored inclusive government in Northern Italy and a lack of such in the South was linked with weak and clientelist institutions. It seems that organizations in Kazakhstan bridging are not able to produce similar effects. Most of the associations, especially the sports clubs, are more of service providers and not civic platforms, and thus it restricts their ability to develop generalized trust. Tax compliance or other types of charity can also be seen as independent civic behavior and more as expressions of obedience in a hierarchical political society. This agrees with the results of Knack and Keefer (1997) that not all associational activity is positive and that groups can work towards short-term objectives that will not lead to trust in the public. Similar to Koster and Bruggeman (2008), Koster and Bruggeman (2008) state that the effect of social capital is conditional upon the quality of the institutions, whereby in the high institutional quality, bonding and bridging reinforce cooperation, and in the weak institutional quality bonding empowers inward orientation and bridging battles to expand.

The Kazakhstani results should, thus, be interpreted within the context of cultural and institutional levels. The institutional trust is still bonded and bridging ties are limited in scope and effect. Despite the role of bonding in social cohesion, over-reliance on inward-oriented networks will run the risks of strengthening patrimonialism and hierarchical government. Weak bridging social capital, in turn, limits the possibility of horizontal collaboration as well as civic responsibility, thus limiting the sustainability of political institutions in the long-run. This dynamic is also demonstrated by the asymmetry between trust in government and trust in parliament. In the vast majority of indicators, correlations with trust in government are greater and more stable than the ones with trust in

parliament. It is a common trend in centralized political systems, where the executive institutions gain legitimacy, but the representative bodies are not a priority. Toth (2019) defines such situations as the ones where the citizen view the executive as the provider of order and efficiency, whereas parliaments are unable to build credibility. This imbalance in Kazakhstan is an indication that political legitimacy is not shared across the institutions but lies with the executive. This asymmetry has significant implications to governance. Institutional accountability may be compromised by the lack of strength in parliamentary trust but this allows the stability of government and policy enforcement. It has been demonstrated by comparative evidence that such imbalances may facilitate populist or majoritarian narratives that do not undergo a legislative process. In the case of Kazakhstan, it will be necessary to strengthen the institutions of representatives, and increase the breadth of bridging networks in order to establish a more stable institutional trust base.

In summary, the results indicate that the institutional trust in Kazakhstan is firmly based on bonding social capital, and family, religion, and interpersonal trust are the main source of legitimacy. The lack of capital is strong and disjointed, which can be explained by the insufficient establishment of independent processes of civic interaction. This imbalance is useful to account how traditional anchors have survived and exposing weaknesses in representative institutions. Available literature has shown that enhancement of civic association and their independence and horizontal coordination will be critical to the establishment of a more diverse and robust governance structure. Until these shifts are achieved, institutional trust will presumably be pegged on the values of bonding, which are stabilizing but tend to limit the wider democratic possibilities of the political structure.

Conclusion

This paper has explored the question of the association between social capital and institutional trust in Kazakhstan based on the data provided by the World Values Survey, Wave 7. The findings suggest that bonding types of social capital are mostly used as a foundation to institutional trust in Kazakhstan. Family, religion and interpersonal trust always report strong correlations with government and parliament confidence, and the importance of inward-looking networks in determining political legitimacy could not be underrated.

In comparison, bridging types of social capital, like organizational membership, charitable giving, and tax compliance, portray more disjointed and erratic impacts. On the one hand, certain indicators, such as donations or tax compliance, are associated with the trust in the government, but their impact on the trust to parliament is not significant. In addition, professional and sports memberships do not present any associations, which indicates that horizontal civic ties are not in place yet.

An interesting observation is the significant institutional asymmetry of trust. The trust in government is more systematically sound than the trust in parliament. This trend is indicative of the larger trends in centralized political systems that is, the legitimacy becomes concentrated within the executive and the representative institutions become increasingly less influential. In the absence of more powerful bridging networks and the presence of more empowering civic activity, this imbalance can limit the development of inclusive and strong governing arrangements. To policymakers, this implication is obvious - reinforcing bridging social capital with assistance to civic associations, safeguarding of their independence and promoting horizontal collaboration is vital in developing a more stable and balanced base in case institutional trust is built.

Further studies need to be conducted on ways of social capital development as Kazakhstan undergoes more political and social transformation. The comparative lenses, in particular, in the context of other post-Soviet and transitional societies can provide additional understanding of the relationship between bonding and bridging and institutional development.

References

- Algan, Y. (2018). Trust and social capital. For good measure: Advancing research on well-being metrics beyond GDP, 283-320.
- Banfield, E. C. (1967). The moral basis of a backward society.
- Beugelsdijk, S., & Smulders, S. (2009). Bonding and bridging social capital and economic growth.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. American journal of sociology, 94, S95-S120.
- Fukuyama, F. (2000). Social capital and civil society.

- Fukuyama, F. (1996). Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity. Simon and Schuster.
- Growiec K., Growiec J. Trusting only whom you know, knowing only whom you trust: The joint impact of social capital and trust on happiness in CEE countries //Journal of Happiness Studies. – 2014. – Т. 15. – №. 5. – С. 1015-1040.
- Herreros Vázquez, F. (2015). Ties that bind: Family relationships and social trust.
- Kaasa, A., & Andriani, L. (2022). Determinants of institutional trust: the role of cultural context. Journal of Institutional Economics, 18(1), 45-65.
- Keefer, P., & Knack, S. (2005). Social capital, social norms and the new institutional economics. In Handbook of new institutional economics (pp. 701-725). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Kim, D., Subramanian, S. V., & Kawachi, I. (2006). Bonding versus bridging social capital and their associations with self rated health: a multilevel analysis of 40 US communities. Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health, 60(2), 116-122.
- Kliksberg, B. (1999). Capital social y cultura. Revista de la CEPAL, 69, 85.
- Knack, S., & Keefer, P. (1997). Does social capital have an economic payoff? A cross-country investigation. The Quarterly journal of economics, 112(4), 1251-1288.
- Koster, F., & Bruggeman, J. (2008). The institutional embeddedness of social capital: a multi-level investigation across 24 European countries. Policy & Politics, 36(3), 397-412.
- Levi, M., & Stoker, L. (2000). Political trust and trustworthiness. Annual review of political science, 3(1), 475-507.
- Mansbridge, J. (1997). Social and cultural causes of dissatisfaction with US government. Why people don't trust government, 134, 134.
- Muringani, J., Fitjar, R. D., & Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2021). Social capital and economic growth in the regions of Europe. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 53(6), 1412-1434.
- Murzyn-Kupisz, M., & Działek, J. (2013). Cultural heritage in building and enhancing social capital. Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development, 3(1), 35-54.
- Newton, K. (2001). Trust, social capital, civil society, and democracy. International political science review, 22(2), 201-214.
- Patulny, R. V., & Lind Haase Svendsen, G. (2007). Exploring the social capital grid: bonding, bridging, qualitative, quantitative. International journal of sociology and social policy, 27(1/2), 32-51.
- Pena López, J. A., & Sánchez Santos, J. M. (2014). Does corruption have social roots? The role of culture and social capital. Journal of Business Ethics, 122(4), 697-708.
- Portes, A. (2024). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. New critical writings in political sociology, 53-76.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community. Simon and schuster.
- Putnam, R. D., Nanetti, R. Y., & Leonardi, R. (1994). Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy.
- Rothstein, B., & Stolle, D. (2003). Social capital, impartiality and the welfare state: An institutional approach. In Generating social capital: Civil society and institutions in comparative perspective (pp. 191-209). New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Rothstein, B. O., & Teorell, J. A. (2008). What is quality of government? A theory of impartial government institutions. Governance, 21(2), 165-190.
- Sgroi, D., Redoano, M., Liberini, F., Lockwood, B., Bracco, E., & Porcelli, F. (2020). Cultural identity and social capital in Italy.
- Stephenson, S. (2001). Street children in Moscow: Using and creating social capital. The Sociological Review, 49(4), 530-547.
- Stone, W. (2003). Bonding, bridging and linking with social capital. Stronger families learning exchange bulletin, 4(1), 13-16.
- Tóth, G. A. (2019). Breaking the equilibrium: From distrust of representative government to an authoritarian executive. Wash. Int'l LJ, 28, 317.
- Vallier, K. (2019). Social and Political Trust.
- Wang, L., & Gordon, P. (2011). Trust and institutions: A multilevel analysis. The Journal of Socio-Economics, 40(5), 583-593.
- Zmerli, S., & Newton, K. (2017). Objects of political and social trust: Scales and hierarchies. In Handbook on political trust (pp. 104-124). Edward Elgar Publishing.

БРИДЖИНГ ЖӘНЕ БОНДИНГ ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК КАПИТАЛ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛДЫҚ СЕНІМ ДЕТЕРМИНАНТТАРЫ РЕТІНДЕ: WORLD VALUES SURVEY ДЕРЕКТЕРІ НЕГІЗІНДЕ

Абдулла ТӨКЕНОВ*, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің PhD докторанты, Қазақстан, abdulla.tokenov@alumni.nu.edu.kz, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2418-9943>

Татьяна ДРОНЗИНА, профессор, саясаттану ғылымдарының докторы, «Климент Охридски» атындағы София университеті, София, Болгария dronzina@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5794-3390>

**ВНУТРИГРУППОВОЙ (БОНДИНГ) И СОЕДИНЯЮЩИЙ (БРИДЖИНГ) СОЦИАЛЬНЫЙ КАПИТАЛ КАК
ДЕТЕРМИНАНТЫ ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛЬНОГО ДОВЕРИЯ В КАЗАХСТАНЕ: НА ОСНОВЕ ДАННЫХ
WORLD VALUES SURVEY**

Abdulla TOKENOV*, Ph.D. Candidate, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan,
abdulla.tokenov@alumni.nu.edu.kz, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2418-9943>

Tatyana DRONZINA, Professor, Doctor of Political Sciences,
Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski", Sofia, Bulgaria, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5794-3390>