THE MEDIATING ROLE OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN TURNING HUMAN CAPITAL INTO COLLECTIVE OUTCOMES

A'zamova Zarnigor Farkhodzhanovna
Independent researcher of Fergana State University

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24117923 · Received: 1 November 2026 · Accepted: 4 November 2026 · Published: 7 November 2026

Abstract: The transition from individual knowledge to collective outcomes is examined through information exchange, reciprocal expectations and coordination. Social capital is distinguished from mere closeness, while ties are considered as possible resources of both cooperation and exclusion. Criteria concern open contacts, recognition of contributions and criticism.

Keywords: social capital, human capital, cooperation, trust, information, networks, collective outcomes

I. Introduction

The fact that many skilled people are gathered in a group does not yet mean that it will be able to successfully perform a common task. Communication between knowledge, the division of tasks, and the conditions for understanding each other's message are necessary. Therefore, the depiction of a collective result as a collection of individual competencies makes some important relationships invisible. The article specifically puts the difference between the sum and the coordinated activity as a problem.

Coleman analyzes social capital through the resources of attitude that enable action [1]. Granovetter, on the other hand, highlights the role of relationship structure in information and intergroup communication [2]. From their approaches, it is impossible to draw a simple conclusion of "much familiarity, many outcomes" or "a close group is always good." The size of the network, the content of the connection, and who can benefit from it are all different questions.

Research question: Through what conditions does social capital mediate the transition of human capital to collective outcome, and in what case can it become an obstacle? The theoretical contribution of the article is expressed in distinguishing the existence of a relationship from its openness, acknowledgment of contribution, and resistance to criticism. Social capital is here seen not as a morally always positive trait, but as a relationship whose influence depends on the terms of use.

II. Materials and Methods

In the study, a conceptual reconstruction was performed based on verified bibliographic records and annotations of classical papers on social capital, relationships, and multicenter collaboration. Empirical details not indicated in the annotations were not attributed to the sources. E. Ostrom's paper, which focused on exploring broader forms of cooperation from market and state confrontations, was used to explain organizational heterogeneity [3].

The knowledge carrier, the mode of communication, the shared decision, and the recognition of contribution were distinguished as units of analysis. Mental situations about a group that was closed to open collaboration and internal commitment were strong, but to external thought. Network dimensions were not calculated, and communities were not surveyed. The term "mediation" was used in a philosophical sense that explained how activities were linked, not a statistical mediation coefficient.

III. Results

There are three different tasks of combining knowledge. It is a separate task for team members to have the same information, combine different knowledge, and be responsible for an agreed outcome. In the first case, dissemination, translation and coordination, and in the third, the boundary of responsibility will be important. Placing them all in one phrase such as "communication is good" will not help define the disruption in the process. It is necessary to distinguish who did not know the information, who did not understand it, and who did not have the authority to act.

In a thought project, the technician identifies the fault, while the organizer receives the user's complaint. If they do not share the information, the problem may not be solved, even if both are skilled in their respective directions. Even when communication is made, if there is no common language, the information remains only sent. This means that there are two sides to the connection in the transition of human capital to a collective result: the delivery of the message and its transformation into a corresponding action. This difference limits the interpretation of the collective result with a purely individual flaw.

The coexistence of trust and verification. Understanding trust as the complete absence of verification can make mistake invisible in the team. According to the author's working definition, trust in activity encompasses the ability to ask for reason when an expectation is violated, while relying on the expected action of a partner. Scrutiny, on the other hand, is not always a sign of distrust; pre-agreed quality control can protect both parties from vague accusation. The issue is not whether there is control, but whether it is applied to whom and on what basis.

Even if mutual trust is assumed to be high in a closed group, the scope of available knowledge can narrow when the opinion of an outside expert is not heard. This counter-example of thought suggests that trust itself is not a criterion for an adequate evaluation. Intimacy within a group can be a condition that puts one person into activity and leaves another out. For this reason, the question in the study of trust is not limited to "how much?"; questions such as "relative to whom?" and "by what evidence does it change?" are also needed.

Communication boundary and intermediary dependence. The issue of intergroup communication in Granovetter's analysis is important for discussing information transfer between networks [2]. The article does not translate this idea into the argument that any long-distance communication is always more beneficial than close communication. The type of task

© 2026 Bulletin of International Journals · Germany · ISSN 2750-3402 (online) · CC BY 4.0

Table 1. Relationships in the Transition of Capacity to Collective Outcome

Mediated relationship	Enabling Side	Probability Limitation	Texthiruv Savonian
Information exchange	Knowledge reaches the person concerned	Getting Stuck in a Group	To whom didn't the important message go?
O'zaro ishonch	The move is made easier to negotiate	Cancel Verification	Can trust be reassessed?
Intergroup communication	New knowledge and finding a partner	Excessive dependence on intermediary	Will communication continue without one?
Hissaga e'tirof	The reason for knowledge sharing seems to be	Corinmas Hardworking Witch	How was the auxiliary contribution recorded?
Possibility of objection	Early Bug Discussion	Personalize disagreement	Is the critic unrestrained?

is decisive: in some cases, repeated cooperation may be necessary, in others it may be necessary to gain new knowledge. The basis for a complete assessment of the two needs with the same network indicator is insufficient.

When communication between teams takes place through one individual, he or she can be an important interpreter of knowledge. At the same time, there is a possibility that his departure or selective delivery of information will affect the entire collaboration. The criterion of authorship is therefore not the exclusion of the mediator, but the fact that the link is understandable and sustainable. When agreements and concepts are open to other participants as well, the benefit of individual skill to the community can be partially maintained even in its own absence. This should probably be checked in a specific organization.

Recognition of contribution and sharing of knowledge. The final product that is visible in the collective result and the ancillary labor that prepared it may not be conspicuous to the same extent. The participant who answers the question, trains a new member, or anticipates a mistake does not appear to have produced a particular result. However, his contribution may have created the condition for the work of others. Therefore, the contribution is analyzed as pertaining not only to the authorship of the product, but also to the task in the implementation of the collaboration.

UNV's 2022 report looks at forms of voluntary collaboration and collaborative service creation [4]. Drawing on this context, the author's conclusion is that recognition may not be limited to the distribution of individual awards: it is also important that it is clearly indicated whose knowledge, time, and assistance have been used. But recognition cannot be identified with the same award-giving. It is part of a collective responsibility to discuss contributions in a way that is evidenced and open to objection, rather than hiding the controversy about contribution differences.

Network closure and knowledge verification. Closeness between partners can contribute to quick agreement, but speed and the correctness of the conclusion are not the same criterion. Team members may narrow down some explanations because they are familiar with each other's way of working; however, it is also unlikely that all members will accept the same hypothesis without verification. The paper presents these possibilities not as an observed outcome, but as a logical threshold for automatically evaluating close communication as useful.

When the conditional project team accepts a new participant, let it pose a question that has not been asked before. The novelty of the question does not prove its correctness, but the fact that it does not conform to the old procedure is also not enough to reject it. Therefore, in assessing the quality of the network, in addition to the intensity of communication, it is examined whether the new argument is considered and whether there are conditions for the uncomfortable error to be stated. Mutual respect is not associated with the elimination of criticism, but with the discussion of the criticism without escalating into personal discrimination.

In order to distinguish social capital from a means of restricting access to others, the basis of the network boundary must be defined. Certain collaborations may be limited by a requirement of confidentiality, qualifications, or duty. In other cases, there is a possibility that the boundary serves only to maintain familiarity. An outside observer cannot know what situation has occurred based solely on the existence of the group. Evidence of the criteria, the order of access, and the reasons for the decisions made is necessary. The existence of dependence, therefore, does not equate to its moral acceptability.

Through whom knowledge is disseminated in the transition to a collective outcome also raises the question of responsibility. When one intermediary brings all the communication together, it can both facilitate collaboration and make other participants addictive. It is suggested that which of these happens not by the scale of the impact, but by the fact that members can verify the information without an intermediary and continue the new communication. Not replacing the value of the network with the authority of a single individual preserves collective potential as a separate object of analysis.

IV. Discussion

An objection to the broad use of the concept of social capital is the danger of explaining any success with good connections. If the conclusion that "there is social capital" is drawn because the result is good, the explanation forms a circle. Therefore, the signs of attitude should be defined independently of the outcome: the lines of communication, the agreements, the order of response and objection are foreseen. Only then is their relationship to the outcome checked. The table in the article serves to formulate such independent questions.

A second objection is that an emphasis on communication can devalue professional knowledge itself. The article does not propose to substitute acquaintances for potential. Becker's question of education and training within human capital remains relevant to individual competence itself [5]. Communi-

cation may bind a certain ability, but it does not automatically create knowledge that does not exist. For teamwork, personal competence and its association with others are complementary, but not interchangeable.

In causal testing, the high confidence of a successful team can be interpreted in two different ways: the belief eased the outcome, or the good result increased the confidence. The Gertler et al. co-authors' guide to impact assessment explains the importance of the counterfactual question [6]. This paper does not apply these methods, only shows the threshold for the transition from correlation to causation. Observation and alternative explanations over time will be necessary in the next work.

When measuring trust, the question "do you trust partners?" can lump many different attitudes together into one answer. A person may believe in his partner's honesty and find it necessary to verify his or her technical judgment. Or he may admit his qualifications and suspect that he will adhere to the agreed deadline. These circumstances are not logically contradictory. For this reason, it is limited to draw a practical conclusion from the general indicator without determining the object of the trust, knowledge, promise, intention, or order.

Collective contributions are not the same type of labor, either. Participants who find a solution, test it, connect collaborators, and identify a mistake perform a different task. Linking them all to a single apparent final product author can obscure mediation labor. Not every relevance, however, is an equal contribution. The proposed analysis considers task tracks, decision changes, and outcome affiliation separately; they do not count as a ready-made universal share or score.

V. Conclusion

Social capital is not the force that automatically converts human capital into a collective outcome. It can mediate through information exchange, reciprocity, coordination, and acknowledgment of contribution. The same relationship can also narrow the use of existing potential in the context of giving preference to the closed group or limiting criticism.

The theoretical outcome limits the use of the number of connections and the level of trust as a criterion of individual effectiveness. Openness, the possibility of objection, and the recording of invisible contribution should be analyzed separately. The proposed questions aim to investigate in which limb the collective result occurred or was disconnected; their true causal dimension remains a matter of empirical research.

References

[1] Coleman J. S. Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital // American Journal of Sociology. 1988. Vol. 94, Supplement. P. S95–S120. DOI: 10.1086/228943.

[2] Granovetter M. S. The Strength of Weak Ties // American Journal of Sociology. 1973. Vol. 78, No. 6. P. 1360–1380. DOI: 10.1086/225469.

[3] Ostrom E. Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems // American Economic Review. 2010. Vol. 100, No. 3. P. 641–672. DOI: 10.1257/aer.100.3.641.

[4] United Nations Volunteers. 2022 State of the World's Volunteerism Report: Building Equal and Inclusive Societies. Bonn: UNV, 2022.

[5] Becker G. S. Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

[6] Gertler P. J., Martinez S., Premand P., Rawlings L. B., Vermeersch C. M. J. Impact Evaluation in Practice. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank, 2016.