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Abstract

Community capacity building (CCB) is one of the important structures in modern empowerment area. Among social structures involved in CCB, social capital, according to the definition, is people's non-materialistic accumulation in their social relations network that acts as a common good to expand the capabilities of individual in societal activities. These two structures can be put together to form a solution within marriage. This article studies the aspects of community capacity building (CCB) and social capital, the way they influence the process of mate selection and marriage, and how to improve the status of marriage through the social capital. The present systematic review including the review of articles related to the community capacity building (CCB), social capital and marriage (with keywords, community capacity building, social capital, social trust, social networks, social exchange, marriage, fear of marriage, the effective factors in marriage, social facilitation of marriage, social capital in marriage) in scientific bases of Google Scholar, Pubmed, Science direct, Elsevier, Ebsco, Proquest, SID, IranDoc, PsychInfo, RoseNet, ISI Web of Science from 2000 to 20 January of 2014, was conducted in English and Persian sources. Entry criteria were comprised of the relevance to the keywords of the research, quantitative aspects of the research, and a score of at least 2 in Jadad Scale. Based on research obtained from 658 sources, 141 sources were accepted and the main sources used in this article were 46. In this paper, after reviewing the basic concepts and definitions of community capacity building (CCB) and social capital, the role of social capital in marriage, the components of social capital (social sharing, social networking, social trust), ways of increasing social capital, and social capital facilitated through marriage have been examined.
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Introduction

Community Capacity Building (CCB), also referred to as capacity development, is a process by which individuals, organizations, institutions and communities build their capabilities for executive functions, solve problems, and set and achieve their goals. CCB is based on facilitation of people's understanding of the potentials, limitations, and needs of the communities and their environment. According to the UNDP, CCB is a long-term and continuous process in which all the mechanisms and institutions of society (ministries, local governments, non-governmental organizations (NGO), professional associations, academic institutions, and others) are involved. Definition states that three major criteria in community capacity building should be the object of desire (The UN Committee of Experts in Public Administration, 2006):
• The creation of an enabling environment with appropriate policy and legal framework,
• Institutional development including community participation (especially for women),
• Human resource development and strengthening management systems.

CCB has three levels: individual, institutional, social. Capacity building at the individual level includes creating a situation in which public servants are able to apply for the continuous learning and adapting to changes. This means enabling the public to have access to efficient and modern training. Community Capacity Building (CCB) includes all aspects of human capabilities, scientific, organizational, institutional, technological, and resources of a country. One of the main goals of community capacity building is to facilitate the evaluation and selection of the most fundamental issues related to social policy and their implementation in the field of social development (United Nations Committee of Experts in Public Administration, 2006; United Nations Development Programme, 1997).

Perhaps the most important activity in any human society is finding couples and marriage, because marriage is considered as the cornerstone of social construction and transmission of culture from one generation to another. In other words, marriage and family formation is a stage of manifestation processes enabling future generations to foster community capacity building (CCB) within the community. For this reason, it appears that one of the main goals in empowerment is facilitating the process of dating and marriage in order to improve the quality and speed of community capacity building.

While capacity building is a novel and difficult concept from the aspects of definition, construct, and measurement (Davies, and Danaher, 2014; Mastan, 2011) and it can be manifested in the concept of social capital. In social sciences, social capital refers to the common economic and social interests which stems in interaction and cooperation of individuals and groups in networks of interpersonal communication and interaction. While in different domains of humanities and social sciences, authors focus on varied aspects of social capital. All of these definitions have the same basic idea in common that "social networks are inherent values of human interaction". Just as physical capital (e.g., money), or cultural and human capital (college), increase the production and capacity of individuals in varied aspects of life, social relations can increase the efficiency of individuals and groups (Taheri, Rouzbahani, Changavi, & Rouzbahani, 2013; Halpern, 2009; Putnam, 2000).

Social capital in varied areas of humanities has different definitions, interpretations and applications. In general, in political science, two domains of economics and social relations have been emphasized. In scope of the research, emphasize has been put on components of top levels management, development of entrepreneurship agencies, improvement of the performance of functionally conflictive groups, value derived from strategic partnerships, and facilitating the chain of distribution relationships (Stam, Arzlanian, & Elfring, 2014, Ferragina, 2010).

The aim of the present paper is systematically reviewing the literature on community capacity building (CCB) through social capital and how they affect the process of marriage. In this context, the definition of social capital, marriage, and marriage overlapping spheres of social capital, social capital dimensions, factors and methods to increase social capital, are reviewed and at the end, the effective ways of increasing social capital that facilitate the process of marriage are discussed.

**Method**

The present study is a systematic review that was conducted to involve review of articles related to community capacity building, social capital and marriage (by keywords community capacity building, social capital, social trust, social networks, social exchange, marriage, fear of...
marriage, the effective factors in marriage, social facilitation of marriage, social capital in marriage) in scientific bases of Google Scholar, Pubmed, science direct, Elsevier, Ebsco, Proquest, SID, IranDoc, PsychInfo, RoseNet, ISI Web of Science in time interval of 2000 to 20 January of 2014 which has been published in English and Persian. Entry criteria included the relevance of the keyword research, quantity of research, and a score of at least 2 in Jadad scale. Based on the studies obtained from 658 sources, 141 sources were accepted and 46 sources were determined as the main sources used in this article which in the original article, the content, relevance and relationships were used.

**Results**

**Social Capital**

According to the basic definition by Putnam (1994), social capital facilitates cooperation and mutual supportive relations within communities and societies and therefore, it is a valuable tool confronting with many social and psychological problems in modern society (e.g., crimes). Unlike those who focus on the individual interests of social networking and self-centered actors, social capital refers to individual access to a wide set of skills, knowledge, capabilities, and the power of social networking. Accordingly, people are able to benefit from the social capital of their future job, instead of corporate interests, (Hazelton and Kennan, 2000). Bourdieu (1986) announces the social capital as the sum of the actual and potential in conjunction with a network of more or less durable than traditional relations of mutual understanding and appreciation. This is an instrumental definition of social capital which concentrates on the usefulness of social relations with the aim of creating resources (Boase, Horrigan, Wellman, & Rainie, 2006; Varshney, & Ashutosh, 2001). Coleman defines social capital as a diverse range of entities with two common elements: having the aspect of social structure and facilitating the action of the actors within the social structure. Therefore, social capital is whatever that improves individual and collective action and communication networks, reciprocity, trust and social norms (Borman, & Dowling, 2010; Coleman, 1988).

**Social capital and marriage**

The need to establish relationships, which also known as affiliation need, is one of the human emotional needs and marriage which is the most intimate relationship in response to all the needs of both physical and psychological aspects (Basko, 2013). Marriage is the foundation of a family. Family is the most important element of any given community and one of the most natural affairs that could solve material, emotional, developmental and spiritual needs of people. This social unit is the origin of humanely justice and the center for most intimate relationships and interactions between the people. The importance is as the health and development of any society (Rafiei bandari, & Nourani Pour, 2005). Marriage, by definition, is the linkage between two adults which is socially approved and recognized. When two people are married, they become relative to each other. However, in fact, the marriage links a wider group of their kins to together; parents, sisters, brothers and other relatives of the blood, by marriage, also come to a greater family and create a greater social network (Giddens, & Sutton, 2013). Marriage and family making are earliest social actions in history and family is the most widespread organization and social institution worldwide. This suggests that family values are very important to the survival of the human. In addition, family is considered as the fundamental generator and the pathway of other social institutions, so that (ab) normality of a given society depends on the general situations of its families and none of the social impairments is independent from family influences (Hamidi, Afroz, Kiamanesh, & Tabatabai, 2011).
Family is more than just a collection of individuals who are involved in a physical and psychological space. Today, family is seen in various forms which are considered as socio-cultural systems. Within such a system, individuals tied by the emotionally powerful, durable and mutual bounds (Nazari, & Navabi Nezhad, 2006). Marital relations can be a great source of suffering or happiness. Love begins with hope; hope that one day ones feelings are understood or accepted and a lovely relationship is created. Spouses’ relationships give the possibility that partners have discussions, solve problems, and learn from each other's needs (Pancsofar, Vernon-Feagans, & Odom, 2013; Young and Long, 2012).

According to Putnam (2000), social capital refers to the value of social and supportive networks of individual and the tendency which arise from these networks and interactive services to perform actions and interactive services to other network members. In addition, Fukuyama (2002) in his definition of social capital, acknowledges this concept as common norms and values that promote and encourage social cooperation in the context of social relationships. According to him, social capital is a prerequisite for successful development and survival of communities. Nonetheless, at the same time, the powerful role of law and political institutions to lay the foundation of social capital is required (Kilpatrick, Johns, & Mulford, 2010; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Brashears, 2006). On this basis, it appears that marriage, because of making kinships that are even more powerful than blood kinships, is considered as the origin of foundation and development of spouses’ social networks. Moreover, people in the time of spouse-finding and marriage are in search of a partner which can improve their social influence and social capital. On the other hand, social capital will act as a secure base for marriage (providing monetary and social support) and finding a fit spouse. In other words, it seems that the greater social support results in a better marriage, and in turn, a good marriage can be a source of development and improvement of social capital after making the kinship.

Components of social capital

Social capital, according to the definition, is the intellectual accumulation of people in their networks of social relation which acts as a common good to improve personal capabilities in her/his community and society. The social capital construct, from theoretical aspect, comprises three main concepts namely social exchange, social networks, and social trust.

The first component of social capital is social exchange which interprets motives and activates stimuli in making and development of social capital. Social exchange is a psycho-social concept that deals with social alteration and stability as part of the process of negotiated exchanges between two sides of a given relationship. According to the concept, human relations are based on (un) conscious analyses of pros and cons and comparison of different alternatives. On the basis of the social exchange model, whenever people realize that doing some action would result in reward, they are encouraged to repeat that action (Success proposition). In addition, the more a given stimulus resulted to reward in the past, the more probable to respond to it in the future by the individual (Stimulus proposition). Moreover, the extent to which the individual has taken a given reward, the value of this reward decreases in the present time (Deprivation-satiation proposition; Cook, & Rice, 2012). Self-interest, as a compound of economic and psychological needs which is an advancing power of mutual relations (McDonell, Strom-Gottfriend, Burton, & Yaffe, 2011; Völker, & Flap, 1997) and interdependence of actors which includes mutual control and formation of consequences and outcomes of the relationship upon a set of joint and complementary contractions are considered as core concepts of social exchange (West, & Turner, 2007).

The second component of social capital is individuals’ social networks that social capital is formed on their platform. Social network is a social structure that consists of a set of social actors (individuals/organizations/institutions) and a set of twofold and mutual nodes between these actors.
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Social network is a theoretical construct for explaining the structure and relations between people in their interactions within the society. Then, the basis of the action and the value of the connections would be the characteristics of the interactions of the network unit, not the individual characteristics. The level of analysis is the important issue in social networks. In micro level, intrapersonal and interpersonal relations of the network members (social actors) are analyzed; in meso-level, mutual relations of network members with network as a whole are considered, and in macro level the internetwork relations and mutual relations of network with social institutions are inspected as well. The strength of any given social network is directly related to the amount of support, services, and social exchange between its network members and therefore, is a constitutional factor in the level of access of its members to its resources and social capital (Gardner, & Eccles, 2011; Burt, 2004).

The third important component of social capital is social trust. Social trust refers generally to a condition in which the trustor is willing and eager to rely and count on actions of trustee and the situation would be generalized into the future. In addition, trustor (arbitrary or compulsory) stops controlling and monitoring the actions of trustee. An important issue to consider is that as a consequence of waiving control, the trustor is unsure of the outcomes of trustee’s actions and can only have some expectations. This hesitation includes failure risk or risk of harm to trustor whenever trustee does not act as expected (Kosfeld, Heinrichs, Zak, Fischbacher, & Fehr, 2005; Shneiderman, 2000). In other words, social trust determines the degree to which someone confides in the behaviors and actions of her/his counterpart in a given relationship. Any society and community needs trust to survive and develop, because increasingly with social division of labor, the society comes to an edge of trusting to what learnt from daily experience and depending on new contingencies. Without trust, all dependent contingencies shall be considered ceaselessly which in turn will end in paralysis of action. Trust is a suitable way to provide dependence of trustor with trustee and is an attractive alternative of control. Trust is worthy especially when the trustee is more powerful than the trustor and the trustor is under social obligation to support the trustee (Platow, Foddy, Yamagishi, Lim, & Chow, 2012; LaCohee, Cofta, Phippen, & Furnell, 2008; Cofta, 2007).

**How to promote social capital**

Based on theoretical orientations and approaches of studying social capital, various internal motives and external factors are proposed and suggested to improve and develop social capital. From the aspect of internal motives, the core characteristic is selfishness. Selfishness means to devote a scarce resource from the agent completely independent from her/his relationships with others (selfishness of preference hypothesis). It has been assumed that devoting a scarce resource from agent may be based on her/his available social capital or compassionate relations with others which can result in the production of socio-emotional good which in turn would satisfy socio-emotional needs to social validation and belongingness. The second promoting internal motive is endeavoring to social validation through acts based on the values of ideal self. In this way, the individual approaches to her/his values of ideal self by increasing the available services to other her/his social network members. The third internal motive is trying to be approved by other social network members. The forth motive is try to reach a high level of group belongingness. The realization of having no impact of others sense of compassion and sympathy results in a great sympathy to other group members, in the process of making the sense of group belongingness, and therefore, providing group with more resources. The fifth motive is natural and inherent empathy of people to their group-mates which ends in the eagerness of group members to share their social capital with others within their groups and act toward their interests (Pane, Shnek, Conrad, 2013; Robison, Shupp, Jin, Siles, & Ferrarini, 2012).

There is a wide range of proposed external factors to improve and develop social capital. It could be assumed that any activity in which social relations are being enriched and empowered, and
no short-term gain is expected from, would be a path to accumulate social capital in any given group, community, and society. One brilliant example is pro-social behavior which in definition is attributed to a set of voluntarily and arbitrary action in favor of others that has no gain for the agent and usually entail risk and/or cost for the actionist (Twenge, Baumeister, Dewall, Ciarocco, & Bartels, 2007). These actions are not considered as irrational of self-destructive and in long-term, because of group belongingness, have a wide range of benefits for the actionist and her/his other group members. All cultures, explicitly and/or implicitly, encourage their members to perform pro-social behaviors (Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005). Examples of pro-social behaviors comprise martyrdom, self-sacrifice, heroics, cooperation, amicable actions, sharing personal properties with others, empathy, sympathy, compassion, acceptance of other groups’ members, charity, organ donation, blood donation, etc. (Wilson, 2008; Eisenberg, Fabes, & Spinard, 2007; Hirschberger, 2006).

The best way to increase the happening of pro-social behaviors and as a result social capital is to promote and teach such actions and behaviors in mass population through primary and secondary socialization processes. Simultaneously, mass media can play a great active role in modeling and promoting prosocial behaviors in the form of social and cultural norms and values because of the ubiquity and large amount of addressees (Aggestam, 2012). It appears that mass policy making for planning the production of encouraging TV programs for pro-social behaviors and modelling them in such programs has its own benefits for promoting social capital in the long run (Shahsavarani, 2015).

Facilitation of marriage through the promotion of social capital

Social capital is considered as sum of all potential and de facto resources that are gathered in an individual or a group of people (organizations, agencies, associations, regions, or countries) to serve as a network of more or less common and constant of knowledge and mutual understanding relations which are available to group members. Social capital is a result of investment in human relations that need resources and time (Westlund & Adam, 2010). Marriage is a formal social, and ritual matrimony, and/or a legal contract between a man and woman which are then addressed as spouses and establishes rights and obligations among spouses and their children, and spouses and their new kins and relatives. The definition of marriage, despite cultural variations, comprises intimate and sexual interpersonal relations among spouses (Haviland, Prins, McBride, & Walrath, 2011).

These triple components of social capital appear to have influential roles in marriage facilitation. In social exchange, the most important point is the understanding of individual of having implicit potential relations and capitals which could be used for personal purposes in the time of need. Then, the individual has a secure mental margin whenever she/he confronts with social and personal life issues. Once social capital increases, because of the increased possibility of connection with other group members and making use of their capabilities, the amount of indecisiveness and solititude about failure in marriage (i.e., possible losses, future financial problems) would be reduced and individual would experience less fear of finding unfit spouse and/or adjustment problems after marriage with spouse and her social networks. Moreover, by the time of problems of lack of material and cultural (humane) capital, individual can rely on her/his social capital, and ask other network members for help. These network members, in turn, would invest such potential capability for their own issues of concern in future because according to unwritten rules of social exchange, the receiver of the aid in future would back up other network members within her/his capabilities in return. In addition, charity organizations that work on facilitation of marriage (matchmaking, spouse finding, mating, financial or commodity aids, preparation of dowry, etc.) act
as an attractive factor to increase the willingness to marriage which is based on the empowerment of social exchange.

From the aspect of social networks component, when social capital increases, individual with the help of received support from her/his networks, especially immediate networks include her/his family and her/his spouse’s family would gain more access to material, relational and informative sources and this would increase the willingness to marriage. Furthermore, social networks act as information providers in the way that if there would be fit individual in complementary sex, other network members and/or the network (in the case of presence of mating/matchmaking institutions) would take steps toward making such marriages happen. Other dimension in this context, would be providing network members with adequate information, knowledge, and skills of finding the fit mate, marriage, and marital codes of conduct. In addition, development of social networks in line with the development of social capital, individuals have chance to meet more people of complementary sex and the possibility of finding a suitable mate grows up. Meanwhile, by development of people’s social networks, the selection range would grow and then, individual is not limited to a few alternatives. This will result in a greater sense of free choice in mating and making society members more eager to marry. Ideally, formal authorities of any given society are the best caretakers of founding and developing specialized social networks for marriage services. However, charity and non-governmental sectors can play a great role in such services and it might be better not to officially include authorities in such services after founding them in order to promote pro-social behaviors among society members. It might be sound to basically compile the laws, acts, and regulations of establishment of such institutions and promoting it via media by authorities.

In the field of social trust, social capital is high whenever interpersonal trust is high because social capital would develop on the basis of unwritten transactional relations. This, in marriage, results in a greater trust to spouse, marry, family formation, and receiving more support in the way of marital life from self/spouse supportive networks. When people experience high levels of social trust, they become more willing to marry because they would be sure that in the case of upcoming problems they are not alone and the resources of social capital would help them if they cannot confront and cope adequately with such situations. Moreover, social trust is a kind of guarantor of damage decline in the case of wrong choice and/or deception in the process of mating; social deception and cheating in marriage (any kind of unrealistic show-off of self, family, and social networks of own) would reduce from both sides. In addition, social trust could act as a reducing factor of failure risk of nurturing children properly, because individual can rely on the support of social networks in educational and nurturing affairs. Totally, it could be argued that social trust is people’s reliance on their social networks and relations which are considered as resources of any kind of support in the case of any problem or obstacle. Any individual who lives in a society with high levels of social capital has less perturbation and worry about confronting new issues and obstacle, especially in the precise act of marriage and this could lead to more motivation towards marriage all around the society.

If personal motives, especially selfishness is taken to account, it would appear that because society acknowledges marriage as an important step toward proving individual competence, individuals show greater willingness to marry in order to show their belongingness to their social and cultural group as well as validation to get access to a higher level of social capital. From the aspect of prosocial behaviors, whenever people do not act in favor of a short-term reward towards other society and group members, others would be encouraged by live modelling to take steps toward serious actions like marriage.
Conclusion

As aforementioned, marriage is a fundamental affair to consolidate social structure and strengthen cultural bases of all societies and nations. Today, one of the main concerns of international institutions like UNDP is to investigate mechanisms with which the improvement of quality of life and social relations of people become synchronous to the development of social, economic, and political empowerment and as such, the level of people’s welfare increases as the result. The use of the comprehensive construct of community capacity building was due to the inclusion of different layers of society (Individual, organizational, social). In general, in order to facilitate marriage, the social capital model could be implemented; the more social capital in the society, the more social solidarity, altruism, and intimacy among society members. Therefore, people gain confidence that they can benefit from supports of social networks and other society members and hence, they tend more to marry. In addition, by taking advantage of higher levels of social capital, more people at the edge or below of the point of deciding to marry will become eager to undergo the risk of marriage because of trusting on support of their social networks. This can result in simultaneously improvement of personal, and cultural capital, as well as social capital and facilitation of marriage, while help its continuation. Such reinforcement of interweaving of social networks would ultimately help ongoing sustainable development through the community capacity building (CCB).
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