

# The Strength of Social Capital of Three Local Communities at Gunung Pueh National Park, Lundu, Sarawak

Muhammad Luqman Hasan, Thoo Poh Yee, Yee Lai Ling, Shazali Johari, Diana Emang

**Abstract:** *Social capital is an important concept in identifying the connection and relationship of the community, which has three dimensions: bonding, bridging and linking social capital. Since nowadays the issues related to trust, criminal and relationship has been a serious problem in our community, hence the measurement to determine the strength of social capital dimension has been conducted. The initial process has been explored to identify the suitable social capital indicators. The result is then used to construct into an instrument comprising six indicators based on survey items and past studies namely participation in local community, proactive in social context, neighborhood connection, diversity and tolerance, feeling trust and safety and family and friends connection. This is a quantitative study involving 390 respondents with the self-administered questionnaire distributed in three communities at Gunung Pueh National Park which are Kampung Biawak, Kampung Sebako and Kampung Pueh. The result revealed that bonding social capital is strongly hold the communities followed by linking and bridging social capital. At the other hand, the result showed Kampung Pueh has the strongest overall social capital followed by Kampung Sebako and Kampung Biawak.*

**Keywords:** *Social capital, bonding, bridging, linking, community*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Social capital basically a concept that close related with the resources available in an individual or a community. Putnam (1993) defined social capital as social networking, trustworthy and norms which can enhance community and individual efficiency. Social networking is participation and relation of an individual in community, clubs or organization. Trustworthy is the feeling of trust of an individual toward their community or other members such as family, friends, neighbors and colleagues, while norms is cultural and daily practices of a community (Seligman, 1997). Social capital definition also revolved connection among individuals which social network, the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness arise from them and can be measure by the amount of trust and reciprocity in a community or between individuals (Putnam, 2001).

**Manuscript published on 30 January 2019.**

\*Correspondence Author(s)

**Muhammad Luqman Hasan**, Faculty of Forestry and Institute of Tropical Forestry and Forest Products, University Putra Malaysia.

**Thoo Poh Yee**, Faculty of Forestry and Institute of Tropical Forestry and Forest Products, University Putra Malaysia.

**Yee Lai Ling**, Faculty of Forestry and Institute of Tropical Forestry and Forest Products, University Putra Malaysia.

**Shazali Johari**, Faculty of Forestry and Institute of Tropical Forestry and Forest Products, University Putra Malaysia.

**Diana Emang**, Faculty of Forestry and Institute of Tropical Forestry and Forest Products, University Putra Malaysia.

© The Authors. Published by Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP). This is an [open access](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) article under the CC-BY-NC-ND license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

There are three dimension of social capital that theoretically proved to be exist namely bonding social capital, bridging social capital and linking social capital. Bonding social capital is the relationship within the network which has similar characteristics such as ethnic, race, family, age and others (Farlender, 2007). Bridging social capital is the relation of two heterogeneous group or individual which has dissimilar social characteristic (Schuller, Baron and Field, 2000) and linking social capital is the relationship between an individual or a community with other organization which relatively has higher status in term of power, wealth or position (Szreter and Woolcock, 2004). Social capital has been widely discussed in past research and known to yield positive result of social development (Hakim et. el, 2010). Social capital is said vital and could create huge potential in identifying existing resources in the social network, thus would enhance and improving quality of life. Therefore it would ensuring the social development process could be sustain. The important of social capital is visible when international entities such as World Bank, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), federal government of Malaysia has make social capital as one of the main policies due to its potential. While the issues of crimes, trust toward federal government and family institution and others economic and social issues became worsen in recent years, thus several methods of measurement and instruments has been developed by various organization and parties such as World Bank which has produce the measurement called Social Capital Assessment Tool (SOCAT) (Grootert and van Bastelaer, 2001), Australian Social Capital Framework and Indicators (Australian Bureau of Statistic, 2004), General Household Survey (Office of National Statistic, United Kingdom, 2006). In the other hand, less parties are developed instrument to measure the dimension of social capital. Previous study by Onyx and Bullen (2000) explained social capital is the raw material of civil society and it is created from myriad of everyday interaction between people. He believed that social capital is not located within individual person or social structure, but in the space between people. In Onyx and Bullen (2000) research in measuring social capital in five communities in New South Wales, Australia revealed that social capital is an empirical study that possible to measure social capital in local communities. According to the finding, there are eight distinct element that appear to define social capital, four of the elements are regarding the participation and connections in various arenas which are (1) participation in local, (2) neighborhood connection,



(3) family and friends connections and (4) work connections and four of the elements are the building blocks of social capital which are

(5) proactive in social context, (6) feeling of trust and safety, (7) tolerance and diversity and (8) value of life. The research finding showed that social capital are different between the five communities. On top of that, Krishna (2002) adapting social capital measurement from Onyx and Bullen (2000) studies and the measurement method are reconcile with the study context. He argued that, indicator that will be used in adapting the new instrument is based on the study need and he disagree of used standardized instrument as it is not appropriate for varying context of study.

Other study by Cote and Healy (2001) believed that social capital need to be measured comprehensively which should covered network, values and norms. They argued that it need to be balanced between attitudes and subjective elements in any given aspects. They argued that measurement should be reconcile with social culture for behavior or attitude that related with social capital and the instrument might be differ by country.

They are likely less studies and measurement instrument of social capital dimension. In previous study, however the measurement instrument should comply with the definition and conceptual of the dimension social capital. The studies which look forward into issues and vitality of social capital dimension in Malaysia is still lack. Thus, the measurement instrument and factor that increase level of social capital dimension are less discussed (Ismail, Mahfodz and Sulaiman, 2016).

This article is aim to measure the dimension of social capital bonding, bridging and linking using adaption of social capital instrument. This study are used 390 respondents data that collected from three communities around Gunung Pueh National Park. This article is divided by 4 sections. Next section would be discuss methodology of this study follow by result and conclusion.

**II. METHODS AND MATERIALS**

**A. Sample of Study**

Three hundred and ninety respondents from three communities around Gunung Pueh National Park (GPNP) has been involved in this survey. The research area consist of three communities in GPNP, Kuching, Sarawak. The communities are Kampung Biawak, Kampung Pueh and

Kampung Sebako. The communities are chosen those of multicultural, religion and ethnic. These communities have high potential to become fast growing communities since Gunung Pueh has been gazette as National Park. This study was self-administered questionnaire through purposive sampling. Purposing sampling was used for data collection since only respondent originate from this area are allowed to provide the information to answered the questionnaire beside the age must exceed 18 year old and above. However, small percentage of respondents decline to participate the survey. Therefore, random sampling technique was not suitable to use.

**Instruments and Data Analysis**

A questionnaire form was used to obtain data from the study sample. The structure of the questionnaire was based on the discussion with local communities in Gunung Pueh National Park (GPNP) which live in the areas. The indicators employed in the questionnaire were formulate and adapted from previous study of Onyx and Bullen (2000) in NSW, Australia and study by Marzuki et. al, (2014) of social capital in peninsular Malaysia. Based on the study done by Onyx and Bullen (2000), there are eight (8) elements that build social capital namely participation in local community, proactive in social context, feeling of trust and safety, family and friends connection, neighborhood connection, tolerance and diversity, life values, and work connection. While Marzuki et. al(2014) study of community social capital in peninsular Malaysia show six (6) components of social capital has been identified namely participation in local community, life values, proactive in social context, tolerance and diversity, feeling of trust and safety and family and friends connection. Another two dimension was excluded because of redundant with family and friends connection and not suitable or related with the study context. Thus, this study adopt six (6) components from the previous study and divided according to the dimension of social capital which are bonding, bridging and linking. The components are participation in local communities, proactive in local context, neighborhood connection, family and friend connection, feeling trust and safety and tolerance and diversity. The items has been formed based on these six components. Since the study was conducted in which most of respondent communicate and understand Malay language, the questionnaire was translated into Malay (note: English version is written here for the benefits of wider audience).

**Table 1. Indicators that include in social capital dimension**

<b>Indicators/ dimension of social capital</b>	<b>Bonding</b>	<b>Bridging</b>	<b>Linking</b>
1. Family and friends connection	X		
2. Participation in local community	X	X	X
3. Proactive in social context	X	X	X
4. Feeling trust and safety	X	X	X
5. Neighborhood connection	X	X	
6. Tolerance and diversity	X	X	X

'X' inclusion of the components



The final instruments of this study contain 53 items of social capital and divided according to dimension of social capital and components. Bonding social capital (20 items), bridging social capital (17 items) and linking social capital (16 items). The scale used in this study is based on the 5-point Likert scale which starting from 1-strongly disagree up to 5-strongly agree, the midpoint of the scale which is 3-neutral. When respondents responding to a Likert item, respondent will specify their level of agreement or disagreement on a symmetric agree – disagree scale for a series of statements, thus the range will captures the intensity of their feelings for a given items (Burn, Alvin and Ronald, 2008). The min above 3.00 is consider to be high level (positive mean value) while below that is consider low level (negative mean value) of social capital.

### III. RESULTS

#### A. Bonding social capital

For bonding social capital there are six indicators are used to determine the level of this social capital dimension – family and friend connection, participation in local community, proactive in social context, feeling trust and safety, neighborhood connection and tolerance and diversity. Most of the indicators in bonding social capital dimension show relatively high score above the average.

Based on table 2, the result for participation in local community show that Kampung Pueh has the highest mean (n = 130, 4.37) followed by Kampung Sebako (n = 130, 4.11) and Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 3.73). The three communities show positive mean value which is 4.07. This reveal that the communitites in GPNP have sense of togetherness and willing to participate in any community events with their family and friends. Participation in outdoor events or activities usually have high involvement those who has a family (Thoo Poh Yee and Shazali Johari, 2016). Other than that, indicator proactive in social context showed that Kampung Pueh has the highest min (n = 130, 4.31) follow by Kampung Sebako (n = 130, 4.24) and the lowest is Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 3.87). All three communities showing positive mean value with overall mean value was 4.14. This indicate that the communities have sense of willingness to be a starter of doing something good that

contribute to their circle of people and they are put the welfare of other in communities or their immediate people ahead of themselves.

Neighborhood connection show Kampung Pueh has the highest mean (n = 130, 4.58), while Kampung Sebako is the second highest with mean (n = 130, 4.22) followed by Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 4.05). All the mean shows positive value with overall 4.29. This result indicate that the connectedness of the community is strong and they can be rely with each other and form a strong community. Other than that, tolerance and diversity indicator showed positive mean value for the three communities. Kampung Sebako has the highest positive mean value among all (n = 130, 4.10) followed by Kampung Pueh (n = 130, 3.96) and Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 3.91) with slight margin. The overall mean for this indicator is 3.99 which is positive mean value. This result showed that the communities are tolerance with each other and would live with different ethnic, races, religion and could mix with them without bother their customs and routines.

Feeling trust and safety showed positive mean value and Kampung Sebako has the highest positive mean value (n = 130, 4.00) followed by Kampung Pueh (n = 130, 3.82) and the lowest is Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 3.75). Overall show positive mean value 3.86. This showed that the communities believed their communities are safe and can be trust with each other while having trust would normally be followed by a feeling safety and security. Other than that, family and friend connection showed positive result with Kampung Pueh showed the highest mean compare to other (n = 130, 4.30) followed by Kampung Sebako (n = 130, 3.96) and Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 3.77). Overall result yield positive mean value of 4.01 showing that the relation with close friends and family are strong and they can rely with each other. On top of that, strong family and friend connection could boost the feeling of togetherness and create a positive vibes throughout the community.

Overall, Kampung Pueh has the highest level of bonding social capital with positive mean value of (N = 390, 4.23) followed by Kampung Sebako (N = 390, 4.12) and Kampung Biawak (N = 390, 3.89).

**Table 2: Mean of bonding social capital of three communities at Gunung Pueh National Park**

Item	Statement	Kampung Biawak	Kampung Pueh	Kampung Sebako	Min
<b>Participation in local community</b>					
1	Participate any community events with family	3.80	4.51	4.12	4.14
2	Participate any community events with friends	3.71	4.52	4.18	4.14
3	Participate any volunteerism activities with family and friends	3.67	4.08	4.02	3.92
		<b>3.73</b>	<b>4.37</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>4.07</b>
<b>Proactive in social context</b>					
4	Willing to help friends and family	4.18	4.47	4.54	4.40
5	Meet friends every week	3.74	4.28	4.00	4.01
6	Say hello to your friends and family every week	3.68	4.45	4.18	4.10
7	Help family clean the house vounteerly	3.99	3.72	4.28	4.00
8	Greet friends with same bacKampunground if meet	3.77	4.64	4.18	4.20
		<b>3.87</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>4.24</b>	<b>4.14</b>
<b>Neighborhood connection</b>					

9	Help neighbor when they ask	4.12	4.65	4.37	4.38
10	Greet neighbor every week	3.96	4.53	4.05	4.18
11	Know your neighbor around you	4.08	4.57	4.24	4.30
		<b>4.05</b>	<b>4.58</b>	<b>4.22</b>	<b>4.29</b>
<b>Tolerance and diversity</b>					
12	Forgive your friends accidentally break your belonging	3.64	2.81	3.94	3.46
13	Mix with family member who has different ethnic bacKampungground	3.98	4.50	4.13	4.20
14	Not bother with other ethnic, religions, race feastival	4.12	4.55	4.24	4.30
		<b>3.91</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>3.99</b>
<b>Feeling trust and safe</b>					
15	Community feel safe	3.88	4.52	4.28	4.23
16	Share problems with family and friends	3.84	4.54	4.10	4.16
17	Believe friends will keep secrets	3.53	2.40	3.62	3.18
		<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.86</b>
<b>Family and friend connection</b>					
18	Have a lot of best friends that can share secret	3.68	4.16	3.91	3.92
29	Family will help you	3.88	4.51	4.20	4.20
20	Prone to spend time with friends dan keluarga	3.74	4.22	3.77	3.91
	Have a lot of best friends that can share secret	<b>3.77</b>	<b>4.30</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>4.01</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>4.06</b>

### B. Bridging social capital

Bridging social capital comprise of five indicators to measure the level of this social capital dimension - participation in local community, proactive in social context, feeling trust and safety, neighborhood connection and tolerance and diversity. Most of the indicators are showing positive min values which above than 3.00.

Based on table 3, participation in local community showed that Kampung Sebako has the highest mean value compare to other community (n = 130, 3.73) followed by Kampung Pueh with slight margin (n = 130, 3.72) and Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 3.63). Overall mean showed that communities in Gunung Pueh National Park has above average mean value 3.69. This show that communities are involving and willing to participate other communities' events or programs. Other than that, proactive in social context show that Kampung Pueh has the highest mean value (n = 130, 3.77) followed by Kampung Sebako (n = 130, 3.70) and Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 3.64). Overall show the indicator has above average mean of 3.70. This indicate they are proactive and willing to be a starter of doing good deeds in other communities beside in their community.

Neighborhood connection in the other hand show Kampung Pueh and Kampung Sebako has similar mean value which is (n = 130, 3.70) and Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 3.63). The result for this indicator show positive mean value which is 3.67. This show that responden are actively involved in other communities neighborhood, whether they involved in planning or discussing issues or events in other

communities neighborhood. Other than that, tolerance and diversity revealed that Kampung Pueh has the highest mean value (n = 130, 4.10) follow by Kampung Sebako (n = 130, 3.87) and Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 3.81). Overall mean show that this indicator score more than average which has mean of 3.92. This indicate that the communities are tolerance and could live in mix of culture, religion and ethnic and they are tolerance toward people who are outside from their communities.

Next, feeling save and trust show mixed result, only Kampung Biawak show positive mean value of (n = 130, 3.30) and the other two show the result below the average which is negative mean value, Kampung Sebako (n = 130, 2.79) and Kampung Pueh (n = 130, 2.65). Overall mean value show the indicator has negative mean value which is 2.91 below the average. This result show that perception toward other communities in term of trust and safety are less, they assumed that other communities or people outside of their community cannot be trust fully and less safer compare to its own community and people. This could be the negative rumors that spreading throughout the areas. Word of mouth spreading could bring negative perception and could change the view of local communities toward others (Lai Ling et al, 2018). In conclusion, overall Kampung Biawak has the highest bridging social capital with overall mean value (n = 130, 3.59) follow by Kampung Pueh (n = 130, 3.56) and Kampung Sebako (n = 130, 3.53). Overall mean value for bridging social capital in Gunung Pueh National Park is above the average and has positive mean value of (n = 390, 3.56).

**Table 3: Mean of bridging social capital of three community at Gunung Pueh National Park**

Item	Statement	Kampung Biawak	Kampung Pueh	Kampung Sebako	Mean
<b>Participation in local community</b>					
1	Participate any event organize by your community	3.66	4.57	4.01	4.08
2	Active member in other community club	3.48	3.01	3.50	3.33

3	Ready to be volunteer in other community	3.75	3.59	3.68	3.67
		<b>3.63</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>3.69</b>
	<b>Proactive in social context</b>				
4	Cleaning other community area voluntarily	3.52	2.36	3.55	3.14
5	Visit other community to watch their system of management	3.73	4.38	3.58	3.90
6	Voluntarily help any entities such as school, welfare etc.	3.66	4.56	3.96	4.06
		<b>3.64</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>3.70</b>
	<b>Neighborhood connection</b>				
7	Can ask for help from your neighbor anytime	3.36	2.19	3.40	2.98
8	Greet neighbor when bumped with them	3.88	4.58	4.01	4.16
9	Involved yourself in community discussion or meeting	3.64	4.32	3.69	3.88
		<b>3.63</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>3.67</b>
	<b>Diversity and tolerance</b>				
10	Cautions accepting foreign people to your community	4.00	4.41	3.86	4.09
11	Living with different ethnic making your community better	3.95	4.55	4.07	4.19
12	Forgive stranger for accidentally destroyed your belonging	3.50	2.88	3.50	3.29
13	Help other community if they ask	3.80	4.54	4.04	4.12
		<b>3.81</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>3.92</b>
	<b>Feeling trust and safe</b>				
14	Feel your community is safe and can be trust	3.63	4.42	3.65	3.90
15	Give stranger to borrow your phone	3.49	2.94	2.95	3.13
16	Let your sibling or child playing around in your community	2.88	1.55	1.98	2.14
17	Feel safe when you are alone in other community	3.18	1.68	2.58	2.48
		<b>3.30</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>2.91</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>3.56</b>

### C. Linking social capital

This dimension of social capital comprise of four indicators to measure the level of linking social capital = participation in local community, proactive in social context, tolerance and diversity and feeling safe and trust. All the indicators in linking social capital are positive min value which is above 3.00 Based on table 4, participation in local community show Kampung Pueh has the highest mean value compare to others (n = 130, 4.28) follow by Kampung Sebako (n = 130, 3.85) and Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 3.61). Overall this indicator showed positive mean value of 3.92 mining that respondents are actively involved in any programs and events that been organized by state government or other authority bodies. Other than that, proactive in social context indicator show Kampung Sebako has the highest mean (n = 130, 4.11) follow by Kampung Pueh (n = 130, 3.84) and Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 3.81) with slight margin. This result revealed that communities in Gunung Pueh National Park have initiatives to gain informations and resources from any bodies which dominate the sources.

Tolerance and diversity in the other hand show that Kampung Pueh come with the highest mean value (n = 130, 4.40) follow by Kampung Sebako (n = 130, 4.19) and Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 3.94). Overall, this indicator yield positive mean value of 4.18 showing that communities in Gunung Pueh National Park are tolerance toward their leader who has different socio-demographic bacKampungground and respect to government officer and authorities. Lastly, feeling trust and safety show Kampung Pueh has the highest mean value which is (n = 130, 4.40) follow by Kampung Sebako (n = 130, 4.16) and Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 3.86). In total, this indicator show positive mean result of 4.16. It revealed that communities are putting trust toward their leader and belief their leader doing good job for making the community safe. In conclusion, overall, the indicators showed positive mean value and above the average. By that, the highest mean score for linking social capital is Kampung Pueh (n = 130, 4.24) follow by Kampung Sebako (n = 130, 4.07) and Kampung Biawak (n = 130, 3.80). Overall mean for linking social capital is (n = 390, 4.04) which is above the average.

Table 4: Min of linking social capital of three communities at Gunung Pueh National Park

Item	Statement	Kampung Biawak	Kampung Pueh	Kampung Sebako	Mean
<b>Participation in local community</b>					
1	Involve in general election process	3.72	4.42	3.78	3.97
2	Participate in any programs organize by NGO or government	3.60	4.52	3.92	4.01
3	Join politician that come to your community	3.40	3.92	3.65	3.66
4	Involved activities and programs to develop your community	3.73	4.26	4.06	4.02
		<b>3.61</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>3.92</b>
<b>Proactive in social context</b>					
5	Cooperate with authorities	3.94	4.57	4.43	4.31
6	Invite researcher, NGO or authorities to your community	3.82	3.13	3.73	3.56
7	Always communicate with government agencies	3.65	3.07	3.98	3.57
8	Report to authorities if community is polluted	3.84	4.58	4.28	4.23
		<b>3.81</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>3.92</b>
<b>Diversity and tolerance</b>					
9	Not bothered to politician with different bacKampungground	3.93	4.61	4.02	4.19
10	Willing to cooperate if other ethnic become your leader	3.92	4.28	4.30	4.17
11	Proud knowing doctor, police, authorities different ethnic	3.98	4.32	4.25	4.18
		<b>3.94</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>4.19</b>	<b>4.18</b>
<b>Feeling trusty and safe</b>					
12	Not bother if government want to develop tourism in community	4.00	4.48	4.12	4.2
13	Believing authorities doing their job	3.79	4.53	4.18	4.17
14	Believing politician doing his/her job	3.76	4.42	4.06	4.08
15	Your leader take good care of your community	3.88	4.38	4.45	4.24
16	Believed with the authorities that keep the tourism areas in my community	3.88	4.42	3.97	4.09
		<b>3.86</b>	<b>4.45</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>4.16</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>3.80</b>	<b>4.24</b>	<b>4.07</b>	<b>4.04</b>

**D. Level of social capital in Gunung Pueh National Park**

The level of social capital can be determine by looking into the social capital dimension – bonding, bridging and linking social capital, thus, by measure each of this dimension the level of social capital can be determine.

Based table 5, bonding social capital showed the highest mean compare to other social capital dimension with mean value (n = 390, 4.06) followed by linking social capital (n =

390, 4.04) and bridging social capital (n = 390, 3.56). Based on this result, it showed that all dimension of social capital has positive mean value which mean the value are above average. Overall, the mean value of social capital in GPNP is (n = 390, 3.89) which showing communities around GPNP has positive perception toward social capital since overall mean value are above the average.

Table 5: Mean of social capital dimension and overall

Community/SC dimension	Bonding	Bridging	Linking	Overall
Kampung Biawak	3.84	3.59	3.80	3.79
Kampung Pueh	4.23	3.56	4.24	4.01
Kampung Sebako	4.12	3.53	4.07	3.91
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>3.89</b>

#### IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Many studies have been conducted on social capital. The scopes of social capital are wide including community aspects. This paper has showed how social capital dimension are measured and the level of social capital is determine in community level. The finding of this study depicted different communities has different level of social capital dimension. The level of social capital is clearly influence by the localization of the community itself and the frequent interaction with the society. Social capital is said to be differ according to local characteristics and cultures (Krishna, 2002). Thus, with strong result from the social capital dimension: bonding, bridging and linking, it can be said that the community have high level of social capital.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by Universiti Putra Malaysia under the research grants of GP-IPM/2018/9592900.

#### REFERENCES

1. Australian Bureau of Statistic, 2004. Australian social capital framework and indicators. Canberra: Government of Australia.
2. Burns, Alvin & Ronald, 2008. Basic Marketing Research. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
3. Cote, S. & Healy, T., 2001. The well-being nations. The role of human and social capital, Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Developmen, OECD.
4. Grootaert, C. & van Bastelaer, T., 2001. Understanding and measuring social capital: A synthesis of findings and recommendations form the social capital initiative. Washington, D.C: The World Bank.
5. Hakim, A. et al., 2010. The relationship between social capital and quality of life among rural household in Terengganu, Malaysia. OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development, 1(5), pp. 99-106.
6. Ismail, R., Mahfodz, N. & Sulaiman, N., 2016. Tahap dan penentu indeks modal sosial di Malaysia. Kajian Malaysia, 34(2), pp. 101-121.
7. Krishna, A., 2002. Enhancing political participation in democracies: What is the role of social capital?. Comparative Political Studies, 35(4), pp. 437-460.
8. Lai Ling, Y. et al., 2018. Factors Influencing Visitors' Evaluation of Service Quality In Giant Panda Conservation Centre (GPCC), Zoo Negara. International Journal of Business and Society, Volume 19, pp. 140-158.
9. Marzuki, A. et al., 2014. Community social capital in Malaysia: A pilot study. Asian Social Science, 10(12), p. 202.
10. Office of National Statistic, 2006. General Household Survey, 2005 report, s.l.: United Kingdom.
11. Onyx, J. & Bulen, P., 2000. Measuring social capital in five communities. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 36(1), pp. 23-42.
12. Putnam, R., 2001. Social capital: measuremen and consequences. Canadian Journal of Policy Research, pp. 41-51.
13. Putnam, R. D., 1993. What makes democracy work, Civic traditions in modern Italy. s.l.:Princeton University Press.
14. Schuller, T., Baron, S. & Field, J., 2000. Social capital: A review and critique, in Baron, S., Field, J & Schuller, T (eds) Social capital: Critical perspectives. pp. 1-38.
15. Seligman, A., 1997. The problem of trust. s.l.:Princeton University Press.
16. Szeleter, S. & Woolcock, M., 2004. Health by Association? Social Capital, Social Theory, and the Political Economy of Public Health. International Journal of Epidemiology, Volume 33, pp. 650-667.
17. Thoo Poh Yee & Shazali Johari, 2016. Visitor Satisfaction towards Facilities of the Giant Panda Conservations Centre, Zoo Negara Malaysia: An Exploratory Analysis. ASia- Pacific Journal of Innovation in Hospitality and Tourism, 5(3), pp. 71 -88.

#### AUTHORS PROFILE

**Muhammad Luqman Hasan** is working as Faculty of Forestry and Institute of Tropical Forestry and Forest Products, Universiti Putra Malaysia

**Thoo Poh Yee** is working as Faculty of Forestry and Institute of Tropical Forestry and Forest Products, Universiti Putra Malaysia

**Yee Lai Ling** is working as Faculty of Forestry and Institute of Tropical Forestry and Forest Products, Universiti Putra Malaysia.

**Shazali Johari** is working as Faculty of Forestry and Institute of Tropical Forestry and Forest Products, Universiti Putra Malaysia.

**Diana Emang** is working as Faculty of Forestry and Institute of Tropical Forestry and Forest Products, Universiti Putra Malaysia.