

---

# How Does Trust Work – In the Context of Social Capital and Community Resilience?

---

**Presentation to the Urban Studies Program Luncheon Seminar Series, Faculty of Environment, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia. September 19, 2005.**

by

**Ralph Matthews, Ph.D.  
Professor of Sociology  
The University of British Columbia**



---

# Acknowledgements:

- **Griffith University, Brisbane.**

- For the award of a **Sir Allan Sewell Visiting Fellowship** provided the funding for me to visit Australia.

**The Residents of 23 civic communities and adjacent First Nation communities in coast British Columbia.**

- They have given of their time, knowledge, and insights to assist us in carrying out this research.

- **The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC).**

- Whose strategic research program provided the funding grant for the **Resilient Communities Project**, and an additional **Community-University Research Alliance (CURA)** grant for the **Coastal Communities Project**.



# Outline of Presentation Today

1. **Introduction to Coastal British Columbia**
2. **Description of the Two On-going Projects**
  1. **Resilient Communities Project (RCP)**
  2. **Coastal Communities Project (CCP)**
3. **Focus of Today's Presentation**
  1. **Stage two data from the RCP**
4. **Three Key Dimensions: Social Capital, Trust, Resiliency**
  1. **Indicators and Dimensions**
  2. **Social Capital Measures**
5. **Findings, Relationships, Implications**



---

# Coastal British Columbia - Description of Research Area

- Is a mountainous and rugged area consisting of Vancouver Island and a ribbon of coast some 850 miles long, sandwiched between the ocean and 8,000 ft mountains stretching from the boarder with Washington State and Alaska.
- There are 131 communities in this region with a population of from 50 to 12,000 persons.
  - Most communities are small – less than 500 persons.
  - Only 11 communities are incorporated towns and villages.
  - 76 communities are First Nation (i.e. Native Indian) Reservations.
  - Remainder are small unincorporated villages – with mixed aboriginal and non-aboriginal population.
  - Approximately half of the population is aboriginal.



# Coastal British Columbia: A Region in Economic Decline

- Fishing is in massive decline due to dwindling stock and changes in policy related to government 'buy back' of licences.
- Logging is in major decline due to globalization processes.
- Area of massive unemployment.
  - **Over 80 percent unemployed on most aboriginal reserves and about 25-40 percent unemployed in civic communities.**
- Area is experiencing extreme population out-migration
  - Larger towns down from 15 to 25 percent between 1996 and 2001).
- A world of hurt – both economically and socially.



---

# Two Longitudinal Projects – Both Still Ongoing

## ***The Resilient Communities Project (RCP)***

Ralph Matthews, Principal Investigator

[www.resilientcommunitiesproject.com](http://www.resilientcommunitiesproject.com)

## ***The Coastal Communities Project (CCP)***

Ralph Matthews, Principal Investigator

[www.coastalcommunitiesproject.com](http://www.coastalcommunitiesproject.com)

**Together, these constitute one of the largest sustained social investigations undertaken of a region in Canada.**



---

# The Resilient Communities Project –

---

A Six Year Research Study (1999-2005)  
in three Data Collection Phases



# The Resilient Communities Project - Orientation

- Is examining the *relationship* between social capital and economic development.
- Assumes that economic relationships are “*embedded*” in social ones. (cf. Granovetter)
- Examines whether social processes can bring about economic change, particular at the community level.
  - i.e turns usual causal argument around.
  - Can the social ‘cause’ changes in the ‘economic’?
- Aims to determine whether social capital can serve as a buffer against economic downturn and a basis for potential economic development.
  - Is community ‘resilience’ related to social capital?



# The Resilient Communities Project

## – Research Questions

- Do social relations operating within and between communities provide a buffer to the economic crisis, and aid them in adapting effective economic change?
  - Can Social Capital play a role in community and regional social and economic development?
  - Is the ‘resilience’ of a community related to its ability to access ‘resources’ through social network relations, and how does this occur?



---

# The Resilient Communities Project (RCP)

- **Five year Study –Multi-stage project involving:**
  1. **Background Data.**
    - **Statistical data analysis of pre-existing data.**
  2. **Mailed Questionnaire.**
    - **Sent to 4,386 households in 23 communities.**
    - **N.B.: Five mailings – 60.0 % response rate.**
  3. **Interviews (Semi-Structured).**
    - **93 local residents from six communities.**
    - **78 ‘leaders’ from six communities.**
    - **All households on two First Nation (aboriginal) reserves.**



---

# The Coastal Communities Project

---

A Collaborative 'Knowledge' Project –  
Working with six civic communities and  
their adjacent First Nation Communities



---

# The Coastal Communities Project (CCP)

- Five year study – approximately one year completed.
- Community-University Research Partnership WITH six coastal communities AND their adjacent First Nation communities.
- Focus on ‘Knowledge’ (rather than research per se).
- . Research BECOMES Knowledge.
  - Knowledge Translation.
  - Transmission and Exchange.
  - Knowledge Generation.
  - Knowledge Implementation.



---

# The Coastal Communities Project

- Provides 'capacity' and knowledge development:
  - Community Governance and the Impact of External Policy on Local Opportunities.
  - Community Social and Economic Development.
  - Environmental Sustainability of Local Resources.
  - Educational Planning and Career Development.
  - Human Health – Related to Healing and Wellness.



---

# Comparison of the Two Projects

The **Resilient Communities Project** is about research on social capital in communities, and about resiliency.

- ❑ Focus on relationship between social capital, trust, and resilience.
- ❑ Emphasis on empirical measurement.
- ❑ **It is a research project.**

The **Coastal Community Project** involves engaging communities.

- ❑ Works with communities on community chosen problems.
- ❑ Goal - to empower communities with capacity to generate own knowledge (We come as teachers not consultants).
- ❑ **It is a 'knowledge' project.**



---

# Focus of Today's Presentation

- Data from the second phase of the Resilient Communities Project
  - i.e. mailed questionnaire sent to 4386 households in 23 communities
  - Communities chosen using systematic random sample (North and South coast; resource intensive vs less resource intensive).
  - Households chosen randomly from telephone listings
  - Used the 'Dillman Method' (five mailings)
  - Response Rate of 60.0 percent



---

# Measurement Issues to be Considered in This Presentation

Focus here is on measurement in the mailed questionnaire  
Stage 2:

1. **How Social Capital is Measured:**
  - Examination of the Position Generator as a measurement tool.
  - Presentation of statistical findings re Social Capital.
2. **How Trust is Measured .**
  - Focus on types of trust and their measurement.
  - Examination of findings re relationship between trust and social capital.
3. **How Resilience is Measured as an Outcome Variable.**
  - Examination of impact of other social variables in resilience.



---

# I. Measuring Social Capital

---



# Primary Instrument – Adaptation of the Position Generator

- Position Generator measures access to social positions with potential ‘embedded’ resources (Lin 2001).
  - Sees social capital as (potential) ‘access to resources’ (economic, social, cultural, physical, knowledge).
  - **Social Capital analysis is not synonymous with social networks, which are the structures of relationship that people have.**
  - **Social Capital analysis is not just social support, though that takes place through networks,**
  - **Social Capital is the study of how networks work as potential and actual delivery tools of resources (of all types).**



---

# Social Capital: The Position Generator as a Measurement Tool

- ❑ Position Generator measures access to social positions with potential 'embedded' resources (Lin 2001).
- ❑ We revised the Position Generator to include a range of positions significant to B.C. coast.
- ❑ These selected positions are roughly divided into two prestige categories. (i.e. a social class or linking social capital element)
- ❑ We adapted the position generator to measure 'weak ties' vs. 'close ties' (i.e. acquaintances vs. friends).
- ❑ We asked respondents to indicate whether ties reside inside or outside the community (i.e. structural holes; bridging and bonding).



---

# Strengths and Weaknesses of our formulation of the Position Generator

- Strengths.
  - Measures ties to potential 'resources'.
  - Can be adapted to the 'position structure' of local region.
  - Measures both strength of ties (weak, strong) and location of ties (bridging, bonding).
  - Easily completed by even semi-literate population and using a mailed research instrument.
  
- Weaknesses.
  - Assumes that access to people in positions is a reflection of access to (and potential use of) socially embedded resources.
  - Best used in complement with more intensive interviews aimed at showing how access to 'positions' are actually used.



---

# Additional Data Related to Social Capital Formation Collected in RCP

- Your Social Activities - Indicators.
  - Questions re Formal Group Involvement.
  - Questions re Informal Social Activities.
  
- Your Community – Indicators / Measures.
  - Identification of the Community as Unique.
  - Identification with the Community as Critical to Personal Identify.
  - Commitment to the Community.
  - Satisfaction with the Community as a place to live.
  - Trust in other community members and community leaders.



---

# Variables Relating 'Position Generator' with Activities, and Background

- We can examine four types of 'ties' to potentially resource rich positions:
  - Weak ties inside the community
  - Weak ties outside the community
  - Strong ties inside the community
  - Strong ties outside the community
  
- We can relate these ties to other social activities
  - Formal and/or Informal social activities
    - Identified as occurring either inside or outside the community (or both)
  
- We can relate these ties to other variables
  - Gender
  - Age
  - Marital Status
  - Employment Status
  - Educational Level



**Table 1: Relationships between Social Ties and Social Activities. (Significant Relationships in Yellow - Kendall's Tau-b) (N= 1,763)**

		Weak Ties (Acquaintances)		Strong Ties (Close Friends)		<i>Total</i>
		<i>Inside</i>	<i>Outside</i>	<i>Inside</i>	<i>Outside</i>	
<b>Activities</b>	Inside	0.179	-0.008	0.135	0.001	0.139
	sig. (2-tailed)	(<0.001)	(0.671)	(<0.001)	(.950)	(<0.001)
	Outside	-0.072	0.147	-0.037	0.111	0.004
	sig. (2-tailed)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.080)	(<0.001)	(0.825)
	Both	0.098	0.171	0.110	0.175	0.167
	sig. (2-tailed)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
	<b>Total</b>	0.200	0.139	0.187	0.136	0.234
	sig. (2-tailed)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)

---

# Implications of Findings From Position Generator

- Establishes a significant relationship between an individual's access to resource rich positions and their activities both inside and outside the community.
  - Shows that both strong and weak ties outside the community are generally unrelated to activities inside the community.
  - Those who can access resource positions inside the community or both inside and outside have major network advantages). (I.e. supports Burt's argument).
  - **Key for this forum:**
    - Shows the utility of the Position Generator as a tool for measuring social capital as a network accessed resource – particularly when used in the context of other social activity measures.
-

---

# Measuring Gender Differences Using the Position Generator

- ❑ The Position Generator can also be used to provides insight into gender relations and network ties.
  - ❑ **Table 2** shows that only weak ties within the community demonstrate statistically significant gender differences.
  - ❑ Women, however, are engaged in significantly more activities inside the community – and this may help explain the result just noted above.
-

**Table 2: Strength of Ties to Resource Rich Positions, Activities and Demographic Variables by Gender**

	Mean or Percentage			sig.
	Total	Males	Females	
<b>Weak ties - Inside</b>	13.98	12.83	15.13	0.022
<b>Weak ties - Outside</b>	4.87	4.86	4.87	0.993
<b>Strong ties - Inside</b>	2.51	2.41	2.60	0.420
<b>Strong ties - Outside</b>	1.37	1.19	1.55	0.120
<b><i>TIES - TOTAL</i></b>	22.73	21.29	24.15	0.086
<b>Activities - Inside</b>	1.92	1.69	2.14	<0.001
<b>Activities - Outside</b>	0.27	0.27	0.28	0.686
<b>Activities - Both</b>	0.82	0.87	0.77	0.088
<b><i>ACTIVITIES - TOTAL</i></b>	3.00	2.82	3.18	<0.001
<b>Age</b>	53.50	54.89	51.98	<0.001
<b>Married or with partner</b>	70.6%	75.9%	65.3%	<0.001
<b>Employed full-time</b>	44.4%	51.0%	38.0%	<0.001
<b>Attended at least some college</b>	54.9%	50.3%	59.8%	<0.001

---

# Implications of Findings From Position Generator

- Shows that both strong and weak ties outside the community are generally unrelated to activities inside the community.
- Provides insight into the weak tie vs. strong tie argument (Granovetter) and the 'structural hole' argument (Burt). (e.g. Those who can access resource positions inside the community or both inside and outside have major network advantages).
- **CONCLUSION: Analysis shows the utility of the Position Generator as a tool for measuring social capital as a network accessed resource – particularly when used in the**
- **context of other social activity measures.**



---

## II. Measuring Trust in the Context of Social Capital Analysis

---

Is it, or is it not ...

Part of Social Capital,

a Proxy for Social Capital,

Not directly related to Social Capital?



---

# Social Capital and Trust – Presumed Relationship

- Some contend that trust is an integral part of social capital:
  - The level of trustworthiness in the social environment” is a “critical element” in **social capital** formation.
    - Coleman (1994: 306)
  - Trust **as social capital** which facilitates cooperation, is an attribute of the social structure and can benefit the wider community” (emphasis added)
    - Misztal (1996: 96)



# Trust and Social Capital - Proxy

- **Others See Trust as Proxy for Social Capital**
  - **Social Trust is not part of the definition of social capital but it is certainly a close consequence, and could be through of as a proxy.”**
    - **Putnam (2001: 45)**



---

# Trust and Social Capital – No Necessary Relationship

- **Still others warn against seeing a link between Social Capital and Trust:**
  - **...Collective assets such as trust promote relations and networks and enhance the utility of embedded resources, or vice versa, but it should not be assumed that they are all alternative forms of social capital or are defined by one another. (Lin, 2001: 26)**
  - **Empirical studies suggest some grounds to be cautious about using trust as a proxy..... It is clearly theoretically possible to have very high levels of trust which only engaging in a bare minimum of social interaction”.**  
(Government of Canada, Policy Research Institute, 2003:7)



# Measuring Trust in the RCP:

- Respondents were asked to indicate support or disagreement with 12 statements concerning trust.
- Statements ranged from 'global' measures (e.g. Most people can be trusted), to 'community specific' measures (e.g. Business leaders in this community can be trusted).
- Factor Analysis of our 'Trust' variables identified two distinct factors comprising seven of the 12 statements.
- We have labeled these [Generalized Trust](#) and [Institutional Trust](#).



---

# Trust Factors - Component Loadings

**TABLE 1 . Factor Analysis Component Loadings**

	Loading
<b><u>Component 1: Generalized Trust</u></b>	
Most people in this community can be trusted.	0.818
Most people can be trusted.	0.797
Most people in this community are [not] likely to take advantage of you if they get the chance. <sup>1</sup>	0.694
Young people in this community can be trusted	0.652
<b><u>Component 2: Institutional Trust</u></b>	
The politicians who represent this community can be trusted to do a good job.	0.853
I trust the leaders of this community to respond to the community needs.	0.853
Business leaders in this community can be trusted.	0.699

---

# Trust Scale Items and Scale Reliability

	Questionnaire Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	% Agree or Strongly Agree
Generalized Trust	Most people can be trusted.	3.65	0.810	72.4%
	Most people in this community can be trusted.	3.79	0.682	76.9%
	Young people in this community can be trusted.	3.46	0.763	55.3%
	Most people in this community are [not] likely to try to take advantage of you if they get the chance [Reverse coded].	3.85	0.850	77.0%
	Cronbach's alpha = 0.7464			
Institutional Trust	I trust the leaders of this community to respond to the community needs.	3.35	0.873	50.9%
	Business leader in this community can be trusted.	3.3551	0.797	48.6%
	The politicians who represent this community can be trusted to do a good job.	3.10	0.884	35.5%
	Cronbach's alpha = 0.7634			

*N = 2537 for all*

---

# Ties and Trust

## Position Generator Answers correlated with Trust Factors

- The Position Generator produces data on four types of ties:
  - Weak ties to Resource Rich Positions inside the local community
    - (i.e. Acquaintance ties inside the community)
  - Weak ties to Resource Rich Positions outside the local community
    - (i.e. acquaintance ties outside the community)
  - Strong ties to Resource Rich Positions inside the community.
    - (i.e. Friendship ties inside the community)
  - Strong ties to Resource Rich Positions outside the community
    - (i.e. Friendship ties outside the community)
- NOTE; These are not just any social ties. These are ties to people in positions to control significant network resources as identified through the Position Generator.



# Distribution of Resource Rich Ties, by Generalized and Institutionalized Trust

			Generalized Trust				Institutional Trust			
			Less than average	More than average	<i>P-value</i> <sup>1</sup>	Odds Ratio	Less than average	More than average	<i>P-value</i> <sup>1</sup>	Odds Ratio
Network Ties to Positions Rich in Embedded Resources	Weak - Inside	No	44.3%	55.7%	<b>0.006</b>	<b>1.311</b>	50.4%	49.6%	0.354	1.095
		Yes	37.7%	62.3%			48.1%	51.9%		
	Weak - Outside	No	41.2%	58.8%	<b>0.007</b>	<b>1.250</b>	49.4%	50.6%	0.335	1.081
		Yes	35.9%	64.1%			47.4%	52.6%		
	Strong - Inside	No	41.5%	58.5%	<b>0.004</b>	<b>1.273</b>	50.1%	49.9%	0.077	1.153
		Yes	35.8%	64.2%			46.5%	53.5%		
	Strong - Outside	No	40.3%	59.7%	<b>0.031</b>	<b>1.224</b>	48.4%	51.6%	0.719	0.968
		Yes	35.6%	64.4%			49.2%	50.8%		



# Factor Analysis

- Principal components analysis utilizing a varimax rotation showed:
  - Generalized trust accounted for 33.4% of the variance
  - Institutional trust accounted for 29.1% of the variance
  - A total of 62.5% of the variability explained



# Generalized Trust vs. Institutionalized Trust

- Preceding Table demonstrates that Trust is not a unitary variable.
- Our findings strongly support Putnam's claim that:
  - Trust in other people is logically quite different from trust in institutions and political authorities.... Empirically, social and political trust may or may not be correlated, but theoretically, they must be kept distinct." (2002: 137)



# Correlational Analysis

- **Trust and Civic Participation**
  - Participation in Informal Social Activities
    - E.g. clubs, church groups, political groups
  - Participation in Formal Organizational
    - E.g. Played cards, had a meal with friends.



# Correlations Between Trust Scales and Network Tie and Structure Measures

	Measure	Generalized Trust	Institutional Trust
Network Ties to Positions Rich in Embedded Resources	Weak ties - Inside the community	0.054	0.005
	<i>2-tailed sig.</i>	0.000	0.754
	Weak ties - Outside the community	0.041	0.000
	<i>2-tailed sig.</i>	0.009	0.985
	Strong ties - Inside the community	0.058	0.022
	<i>2-tailed sig.</i>	0.000	0.160
Civic Participation	Strong ties - Outside the community	0.037	0.000
	<i>2-tailed sig.</i>	0.024	0.979
	Formal activities	0.071	0.019
	<i>2-tailed sig.</i>	0.000	0.247
Civic Participation	Informal activities	0.054	-0.003
	<i>2-tailed sig.</i>	0.001	0.867

# Distribution of Civic Participation by Trust Scales

			Generalized Trust				Institutional Trust			
			Less than average	More than average	<i>P-value</i> <sup>1</sup>	Odds Ratio	Less than average	More than average	<i>P-value</i> <sup>1</sup>	Odds Ratio
Civic participation	Formal activities/ organizations ( <i>n</i> =2536)	No	46.2%	53.8%	<b>0.000</b>	<b>1.448</b>	51.7%	48.3%	0.107	1.712
		Yes	37.2%	62.8%			47.8%	52.2%		
	Informal activities ( <i>n</i> =2536)	No	48.3%	51.7%	<b>0.019</b>	<b>1.489</b>	50.3%	49.7%	0.662	1.078
		Yes	38.5%	61.5%			48.5%	51.5%		

<sup>1</sup> Note that though proportions are shown, p-values relate to Pearson Chi-square tests of association using cell counts.



# Implications of Correlational Analysis

- A person who has above average **weak ties inside the community** is 31% more likely to have higher than average generalized trust.
- A person who has above average **weak ties outside their community** is about 25% more likely to have higher than average generalized trust.
- A person who has above average **strong ties inside their community** is about 27% more likely to have higher than average generalized trust.
- A person who has above average **strong ties outside their community** is about 22% more likely to have higher than average generalized trust.



# Cross-Tabular Comparisons

- To better understand how generalized and institutional trust relate to network measures of access to resources, civic participation and certain socio-demographic measures, **cross-tabular comparisons** were undertaken.
- Means were calculated for the two trust measures and then **dichotomous variables were calculated representing “below average trust” and “above average trust”** for each measure.



# Distribution of Ties to Positions Rich in Embedded Resources by Trust Scales

			Generalized Trust				Institutional Trust			
			Less than average	More than average	<i>P-value</i> <sup>1</sup>	Odds Ratio	Less than average	More than average	<i>P-value</i> <sup>1</sup>	Odds Ratio
Network Ties to Positions Rich in Embedded Resources	Weak - Inside	No	44.3%	55.7%	<b>0.006</b>	<b>1.311</b>	50.4%	49.6%	0.354	1.095
		Yes	37.7%	62.3%			48.1%	51.9%		
	Weak - Outside	No	41.2%	58.8%	<b>0.007</b>	<b>1.250</b>	49.4%	50.6%	0.335	1.081
		Yes	35.9%	64.1%			47.4%	52.6%		
	Strong - Inside	No	41.5%	58.5%	<b>0.004</b>	<b>1.273</b>	50.1%	49.9%	0.077	1.153
		Yes	35.8%	64.2%			46.5%	53.5%		
	Strong - Outside	No	40.3%	59.7%	<b>0.031</b>	<b>1.224</b>	48.4%	51.6%	0.719	0.968
		Yes	35.6%	64.4%			49.2%	50.8%		

<sup>1</sup> Note that though proportions are shown, p-values relate to Pearson Chi-square tests of association using cell counts.

---

# Interpretation of Relationship between Trust and Network Ties

- Data in the Preceding Slide indicate:
  - A person who has **weak ties inside their community** is 31% more likely to have higher than average generalized trust than those who do not have such ties.
  - A person who has **weak ties outside their community** is about 25% more likely to have higher than average generalize trust than those who do not have such ties.



---

# Interpretation of Relationship between Trust and Network Ties (cont'd)

- A person who has **strong ties inside their community** is about 27% more likely to have higher than average generalized trust.
- A person who has **strong ties outside their community** is about 22% more likely to have higher than average generalized trust.



---

# Correlation of Types of Trust with Other Forms of Social Participation

- Putnam has argued that **Volunteer Activity and Voting Behaviour** are key dimensions of social capital.
- We undertook to identify the relationship between **Generalize Trust and Institutional Trust** and these **Other Forms of Civic Participation**:
  - **voting behaviour**
  - **time lived in community**
  - **volunteer activity**



# Distribution of Other Participation by Trust Scales

		Generalized Trust				Institutional Trust				
		Less than average	More than average	<i>P-value</i> <sup>1</sup>	Odds Ratio	Less than average	More than average	<i>P-value</i> <sup>1</sup>	Odds Ratio	
Other Participation	Voted in last elections	Did not vote	48.4%	51.6%	<b>0.000</b>	<b>1.549</b>	54.8%	45.2%	<b>0.018</b>	<b>1.332</b>
		Did vote	37.7%	62.3%			47.7%	52.3%		
	Time lived in community (n=2511)	Less than a year	32.4%	67.6%	<b>0.002</b>	<b>NA</b>	43.2%	56.8%	0.301	NA
		1-5 years	37.4%	62.6%			52.8%	47.2%		
		6-10 years	39.4%	60.6%			49.3%	50.7%		
		11-20 years	34.9%	65.1%			48.5%	51.5%		
		21-30 years	37.7%	62.3%			49.2%	50.8%		
	Longer than 30 years	46.2%	53.8%	45.6%	54.4%					
	Currently volunteer (n=2322)	No	40.1%	59.9%	<b>0.015</b>	<b>1.237</b>	51.3%	48.7%	<b>0.001</b>	<b>1.329</b>
		Yes	35.1%	64.9%			44.2%	55.8%		

<sup>1</sup> Note that though proportions are shown, p-values relate to Pearson Chi-square tests of association using cell counts.

---

# Is Trust Affected by Socio-demographic Factors:

- **To better understand how generalized and institutional trust relate to socio-demographic factors, cross-tabular comparisons were undertaken, with:**
  - ❑ **Gender,**
  - ❑ **Age**
  - ❑ **Marital status**
  - ❑ **Full-time employment status**
  - ❑ **Educational attainment**
  - ❑ **Individual income**



# Distribution of Socio-demographics by Trust Scales

		Generalized Trust				Institutional Trust				
		Less than average	More than average	<i>P-value</i> <sup>1</sup>	Odds Ratio	Less than average	More than average	<i>P-value</i> <sup>1</sup>	Odds Ratio	
Sociodemographics	<b>Gender</b> ( <i>n</i> =2468)	Male	40.3%	59.7%	0.293	1.091	49.5%	50.5%	0.472	1.060
		Female	38.2%	61.8%			48.0%	52.0%		
	<b>Age</b> ( <i>n</i> =2484)	20-44	48.3%	51.7%	0.000	NA	57.9%	42.1%	0.000	NA
		45-64	36.9%	63.1%			49.3%	50.7%		
		64-74	31.1%	68.9%			40.1%	59.9%		
		75 or older	36.1%	63.9%			27.5%	62.5%		
	<b>Marital status</b> ( <i>n</i> =2536)	Single	43.4%	56.6%	0.003	1.299	50.5%	49.5%	0.244	1.106
		Married or with partner	37.1%	62.9%			48.0%	52.0%		
	<b>Full-time employment status</b> ( <i>n</i> =2507)	Not employed full-time	37.8%	62.2%	0.182	0.895	45.3%	54.7%	0.000	0.734
		Employed full-time	40.4%	59.6%			53.1%	46.9%		
	<b>Educational attainment</b> ( <i>n</i> =2421)	No college	43.6%	56.4%	0.000	1.512	48.8%	51.2%	0.726	1.029
		At least some college	33.8%	66.2%			48.1%	51.9%		
	<b>Individual income</b> ( <i>n</i> =2415)	Less than \$10,000	52.0%	48.0%	0.000	NA	48.9%	51.1%	0.306	NA
\$10,000-\$29,999		39.3%	60.7%	48.1%			51.9%			
\$30,000-\$49,999		34.0%	66.0%	48.6%			51.4%			
\$50,000-\$69,999		38.1%	61.9%	52.9%			47.1%			
\$70,000-\$89,999		34.5%	65.5%	47.9%			52.1%			
\$90,000 or over		35.9%	64.1%	38.5%			61.5%			

<sup>1</sup> Note that though proportions are shown, p-values relate to Pearson Chi-square tests of association using cell counts.

# Social Capital and Trust - Conclusions

- We have identified, as Putnam postulated, that general trust and interpersonal trust are two very different phenomena that are neither related to one another nor related in the same way to other phenomenon.
- We have found **generalized trust** to be highly correlated to **all forms** of social network involvement and to **both formal and informal** civic participation.
- In contrast, **institutional trust** is related to **no form** of network involvement and **neither formal nor informal** of civic engagement.



# Social Capital and Trust: Further Conclusions

- It would appear that the correlation is strong enough that Generalized Trust can serve as a **proxy** for all forms of social capital and network relationship in most situations.
- However, given the differences of association identified between Generalized Trust and Institutional Trust, it would be an error to think of all forms of trust / distrust as being a significant aspect of social capital.
- **In particular, the lack of correlation between Civic Involvement and Institutionalized Trust raises questions about perspectives which see civic engagement as the basis of social capital formation (i.e. the underlying theme of Putnam's work).**



---

# III. Measuring Community Resilience in the Context of Social Capital

---



---

# Defining and Measuring Community Resilient

- Definition:
    - Community resilience is the capacity to respond to on-going economic and social changes in positive and constructive ways.
  - Therefore resilience has both an economic element and a social element:
    - Resilience is related to the ability of the community to provide economic well-being.
    - Resilience is related to the ability of a community to provide underlying social processes and organization necessary to carry its citizens through a normal lifetime and a normal year.
  - Resilience also involvement a component of individual well-being and a component of collective well being.
-

---

# Social Capital and Community Resilience

- Social capital is a way of theorizing the social benefits that living in a community provides.
  - These benefits include those associated with:
    - Social networks of interaction
    - Trust in one another
    - Network ties
    - Civic engagement
    - Political access
    - Collective efficacy
    - Institutional performance



---

# Operationalizing Community

## Resilience: Whether Residents Stay or

**Go:** We hypothesized that the ultimate test of a community's resilience is whether it is strong enough, both economically and socially, to influence the decision to stay or leave the community.

- A community's 'social resilience', in the final analysis, rests on whether its inhabitants chose to remain in the face of economic hardships internally, and potential economic benefits elsewhere.
    - i.e. whether the members believe that the social has power over the economic.
  
  - We operationally define a community's resilience as agreement or disagreement with the statement:
    - *"I would move away from this community if a good job came up somewhere else."*
-

---

# Community Resilience

## Operationalized:

- Aim is to determine what influences the likelihood that individuals will stay or go from a community.
- Leads to four analytic models that may be associated with willingness to leave (i.e. the dependent variable).



# Analytic Framework: Variable Type By Level Of Analysis

	ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS	SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS
INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL	<i>Individual-Level Economic Characteristics</i>	<i>Individual-Level Social Characteristics</i>
COMMUNITY-LEVEL	<i>Community-Level Economic Characteristics</i>	<i>Community-Level Social Characteristics</i>

---

# Levels of Analysis: Individual Level Characteristics

- I. Individual Level Economic Characteristics
    - Employment Status
    - Income Level
  
  - II. Individual Level Social Characteristics
    - Trust
      - Institutional and General
    - Level of Community Involvement
      - (Civic Engagement Scale – Involved in Local Politics; Volunteering Behaviour)
    - Ties to Other People in the Community vs Outside the Community
-

---

# Levels of Analysis: Social Level Characteristics

- III. Community Level Economic Characteristics
    - Perceived Degree of Isolation (scale).
    - Perceived Economic Opportunity.
      - Provided by local business leaders.
      - Availability of employment within the community.
  
  - IV. Community Level Social Characteristics.
    - Perception of Community Cohesion
    - Sense of Community Inclusiveness
    - Sense of Political Access and Representation
-

# Socio-Demographic Control Variables

- We anticipated ‘Willingness to Move’ also influenced by a range of socio-demographic variables including:
  - Age
  - Gender
  - Marital Status
  - Children in Household
  - Length of Residence in Community
  - Level of Education



---

## Results I : Willingness to Leave & Individual Level Economic Characteristics:

- Demographic / Individual Level Economic Characteristics:
    - Age, gender and marital status are negatively associated with willingness to leave. (i.e. Higher age more likely to want to leave; women more likely to want to leave)
    - But these are not the 'Individual Level Economic Variables. When 'Individual Level Economic Variables' were added to the regression, none were significant. (i.e. income; employment status; as well as time in community; education; and children in household, were not significant predictors of willingness to move.)
    - *Conclusion: Individual level economic characteristics appear largely unrelated to the willingness to consider whether to stay or leave the community.*
-

## Socio-Demographics and Individual-Level Economic Characteristics

	Coefficient
Constant	4.376
Age	-.028****
Gender	-.228****
Married/with partner	-.152*
Children in household	.073
Length of time in community	-.014
Attended some college	.006
Personal income	-2.4E-06
Full time employment	-.096
N = 1814; F Statistic (sig.) = 13.305****; Adjusted R-Squared = .058	
Sig.: *.05, **.01, ***.005, ****.0001	

---

# Results II: Willingness to Leave & Individual Level Social Characteristics:

- Both general trust in community members and trust in institutions are negatively associated with willingness to leave.
  - i.e. more trusting people are less willing to leave.
  
- Civic engagement is negatively associated with willingness to leave.
  - i.e. People who volunteer and those interested in local politics are less willing to leave
  - Whether one voted in last election not related to willingness to move.
  
- Ties:
  - Ties to acquaintances either inside or outside the community. not related to willingness to move.
  - Ties to relatives inside the community, not related to willingness to move.
  
  - Those with close ties to relatives outside the community more willing to leave (i.e. no significance on other ties)
    - i.e. Pull seems to be more important than push factors at the individual level.

***CONCLUSION: Individual level social capital (directed toward the community) contributes to community resilience.***

---

# Individual-Level Social Characteristics

	Coefficient
Constant	5.625
Institutional trust	-.177***
Trust in community members	-.282****
Volunteering	-.209***
Interest in local politics	-.097*
Voted in last local elections	.104
Ties to acquaintances: in	.003
Ties to acquaintances: out	.001
Ties to relatives: in	-.011
Ties to relatives: out	.080***
N = 1814; F Statistic (sig.) = 11.296****; Adjusted R-Squared .096	
Sig.: *.05, **.01, ***.005, ****.0001	

---

## Results III: Willingness to Leave & Community Level Economic Characteristics:

- **ALL community level economic characteristics were related to willingness to move:**
  - **Persons who perceive business leaders are creating economic opportunities / employment opportunities are less likely to leave.**
  - **Those who perceive community as having good employment opportunities are less likely to leave.**
  - **Individuals who rate community as more isolated are more willing to move.**

*CONCLUSION: Perception of community economic development opportunities critical to resilience. However, remember that employment status was not associated with resilience – suggestion that community level economic well-being and not individual economic well-being is critical issue.*



# Community-Level Economic Characteristics

	Coefficient
Constant	4.784
Business leaders creating economic opportunities	-.179****
Good/Poor employment opportunities	-.138****
Isolated/Not Isolated	.092****

N = 1814; F Statistic (sig.) = 22.236\*\*\*\*; Adjusted R-Squared = .103

Sig.: \*.05, \*\*.01, \*\*\*.005, \*\*\*\*.0001

---

## Results IV: Willingness to Leave & Community Level Social Characteristics

- Individuals who perceive their community as not socially cohesive and not inclusive are more willing to leave.
  - Individuals who see their community as not in control of its own future more willing to leave.
  - People who see local political leaders as representing the interests of a few, more likely to leave.
  - Institutional functioning is not associated with willingness to leave. (i.e. perceived quality of schools, health care, and level of crime not related to willingness to move.
  - *CONCLUSION: Findings support the core argument of social capital perspective (as identified in the Resilient Communities Project), that the social characteristics of a community influence whether their populace stays or leaves in the face of economic shock.*
-

## Community-Level Social Characteristics

	Coefficient
Constant	3.681
People have weak sense of community	.186****
Hard to make close friends	.133****
Future depends on outside	.126****
Don't have a say in what political leaders do	.044
Political leaders represent the powerful few	.091**
Safe/Dangerous	-.231****
Good/Poor schools	-.015
High/Low crime	-.061
Good/Poor health care	-.019
N =1814; F Statistic = 26.082****; Adjusted R-Squared = .184	
Sig.: *.05, **.01, ***.005, ****.0001	

---

## Final Notes:

- The findings reported here come from a collection of papers written in conjunction with graduate students Sandra Enns, Todd Malinick and Justin Page who hold Graduate Research Assistantships on the Resilient Communities Project.
- Further information is available on the websites:
  - [www.resilientcommunitiesproject.com](http://www.resilientcommunitiesproject.com)
  - [www.coastalcommunitiesproject.com](http://www.coastalcommunitiesproject.com)

