

**Social Capital, Diversity, and  
the Welfare State .....**



The Equality, Security, and Community (ESC) project, conducted during a six-year period, was conceived as a multidisciplinary collaborative research project. Its objectives were concisely described in its subtitle: "Explaining and Improving the Distribution of Well-Being in Canada." *Explaining the distribution of well-being* requires a concerted multidisciplinary effort that considers the interplay among market behaviour, political and community participation, and policy formation. *Improving the distribution* requires effective and durable policies, which, in turn, must be based on sound theoretical and empirical foundations. Using a wide range of research methodologies, the ESC project sheds light on these complex issues, while it advances our ability to steer public policies toward improved outcomes.

Numerous journal articles and book chapters have resulted from the ESC project. Another major product is a unique national longitudinal survey of Canadians that covers the economic, political, cultural, and attitudinal bases of inequality. This database was analyzed by project co-investigators and has been posted for research by others (on the website of York University's Institute for Social Research).

*Social Capital, Diversity, and the Welfare State* is one of three edited volumes stemming from the ESC project. The other two volumes are:

*Racing to the Bottom? Provincial Interdependence in the Canadian Federation*  
Edited Kathryn Harrison

*Dimensions of Inequality in Canada*  
Edited by David A. Green and Jonathan R. Kesselman

All three volumes are published by UBC Press.

# **Social Capital, Diversity, and the Welfare State**

..... Edited by Fiona M. Kay  
and Richard Johnston



**UBC Press** · Vancouver · Toronto

© UBC Press 2007

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher, or, in Canada, in the case of photocopying or other reprographic copying, a licence from Access Copyright (Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency), [www.accesscopyright.ca](http://www.accesscopyright.ca).

15 14 13 12 11 10 09 08 07 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in Canada on ancient-forest-free paper (100 percent post-consumer recycled) that is processed chlorine- and acid-free, with vegetable-based inks.

### **Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication**

Social capital, diversity, and the welfare state / edited by Fiona M. Kay and Richard Johnston.

(Equality, security, community 1715-8117)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-7748-1309-9

1. Social capital (Sociology) – Canada. 2. Pluralism (Social sciences) – Canada. 3. Trust – Social aspects – Canada. 4. Canada – Social policy. I. Johnston, Richard, 1948- II. Kay, Fiona. III. Series.

HM708.S67 2006

302

C2006-905376-6

## **Canada**

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada through the Book Publishing Industry Development Program (BPIDP), and of the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

The authors acknowledge, with thanks, the financial support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada through a Major Collaborative Research Initiatives grant (#412-97-0003).

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Aid to Scholarly Publications Programme, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and with the help of the K.D. Srivastava Fund.

UBC Press

The University of British Columbia

2029 West Mall

Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2

604-822-5959 / Fax: 604-822-6083

[www.ubcpress.ca](http://www.ubcpress.ca)



# Contents

Figures and Tables	vii
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
FIONA M. KAY AND RICHARD JOHNSTON	
<b>Part 1: Theoretical Overview</b>	
<b>2 Ubiquity and Disciplinary Contrasts of Social Capital</b>	<b>17</b>
FIONA M. KAY AND RICHARD JOHNSTON	
<b>3 The Dynamics of Social Capital: Who Wants to Stay In If Nobody Is Out?</b>	<b>41</b>
FIONA M. KAY AND PAUL BERNARD	
<b>4 Equality, Trust, and Multiculturalism</b>	<b>67</b>
AVIGAIL EISENBERG	
<b>Part 2: Studies of Social Capital and Determinants of Social Capital</b>	
<b>5 Measuring and Modelling Interpersonal Trust</b>	<b>95</b>
STUART N. SOROKA, JOHN F. HELLIWELL, AND RICHARD JOHNSTON	
<b>6 Gender, Early Experiences with “Social Capital,” and Adult Community Participation</b>	<b>133</b>
JAMES CURTIS AND THOMAS PERKS	



- 7 Ethnicity and Social Capital in Canada** 169  
AMANDA AIZLEWOOD AND RAVI PENDAKUR
- 8 Social Capital and Political Struggles of Immigrants:  
Sri Lankan Tamils and Black Caribbean Peoples in  
Toronto** 199  
SARA ABRAHAM
- Part 3: Consequences of Social Capital:  
Policy and Government Programs**
- 9 Social Capital and Intergenerational Coresidence:  
How Ethnic Communities and Families Shape  
Transitions to Adulthood** 219  
BARBARA A. MITCHELL
- 10 Social Capital and Health in Canada: (Compositional)  
Effects of Trust, Participation in Networks, and Civic  
Activity on Self-Rated Health** 251  
GERRY VEENSTRA
- 11 Ethnicity, Trust, and the Welfare State / 279**  
STUART N. SOROKA, RICHARD JOHNSTON,  
AND KEITH BANTING

Works Cited / 305

Contributors / 335

Index / 341

# .....

## Figures and Tables

### FIGURES

1.1	The theoretical and empirical bases of social capital analyses in this book	5
3.1	Typology of social capital: processes of distribution and reproduction	47
5.1	The effects of ethnicity on trust	117
9.1	Living arrangement by ethnic group	231
9.2	Reason for (first) home-leaving by ethnic group	232

### TABLES

5.1	Trust questions in the ESC survey	98
5.2	Relationships between generalized trust and wallet questions	101
5.3	Responses to general trust questions	102
5.4	Responses to wallet questions	110
5.5	Summary of wallets measure	112
5A.1	Descriptives	123
5B.1	Factor analysis of associational memberships	125
5B.2	Sources of associational memberships (ethnic, religious, and other)	126
5B.3	Sources of associational memberships (service clubs and recreation, political, youth, cultural, and help groups)	128
6.1	Participation in community voluntary activities as a youth, by gender, as reported by adult Canadians: national sample, 1997	143
6.2	Participation in community voluntary activities as a youth, by gender, for age cohorts among adult respondents	143

6.3	Levels of current participation in community activities, by gender, among adult respondents	145
6.4	Current participation in selected community activities, by gender, for age cohorts among adult Canadians	147
6.5	Zero-order correlations of participation in community voluntary activities as a youth (Index II) and current participation in community activities, by gender	149
6.6	Relative effects (betas from MCA/ANOVA) for participation in community activities as a youth (Index II) and seven other social background factors as predictors of current participation in community activities, for females and males	151
6.7	Levels of current participation in community activities (deviations from the grand mean), by gender, with statistical controls (MCA) for youth activities and seven social background factors	155
6A.1	Zero-order correlations of participation in community voluntary activities as a youth (Index II) and current participation in community activities, by gender and age cohorts	166
7.1	Characteristics of social capital measures	181
7.2	Comparisons of means for social capital measures according to employment equity categories and immigrant status	182
7.3	Basic model	183
7.4	Broad model	186
7.5	Full model	189
7A.1	Descriptives	196
9.1	Final survival analyses model for staying at home	235
9.2	Final survival analysis model for returning home	239
9A.1	Frequency distribution for home-leaving and home-returning analysis	247
10.1	Social capital and health: individual-level findings	256
10.2	Social capital and health: ecological findings	260
10.3	Social capital and health: multi-level findings	264
10.4	Multivariate logistic regression: basic demographic predictors of fair or poor self-rated health status	267

10.5	Multivariate logistic regression: sociodemographic predictors of fair or poor self-rated health status	267
10.6	Multivariate logistic regression: sociodemographic predictors of fair or poor self-rated health status, parsimonious version	268
10.7	Multivariate logistic regression: sociodemographic and social capital predictors of fair or poor self-rated health status	271
11.1	Modelling trust	287
11.2	Modelling support for social programs: EI/Welfare	291
11.3	Modelling support for social programs: health care	292
11.4	Modelling support for social programs: pensions	293
11A.1	Descriptives	299



**Social Capital, Diversity, and  
the Welfare State .....**



# 1

## Introduction

.....  
*Fiona M. Kay and Richard Johnston*

Social capital is arguably the most critical concept to emerge in the social sciences in the last twenty years (Portes 1998, 2). Not only does it transcend disciplinary boundaries, it enlivens public discourse. Social capital speaks of the importance of social networks, of communication, and of an exchange of resources that strengthens community. Practically speaking, all aspects of people's lives are embedded in social networks, networks in which people invest time and energy and which influence their lives in manifold ways (Flap 1999, 6). Aspects of the concept are found in the phrase, "no man is an island" (Flap 1995), and of the commonplace, "who you know is as important as what you know" (Granovetter 1985). The emphasis on social involvement, investment, and resources embedded in social structure provides a link to community well-being that extends beyond individual utilitarianism and self-interest. At the same time, social capital speaks of the social-psychological orientations that emerge from networks, in particular, of bonds of trust.

Social capital has been invoked to explain an array of social consequences. At the individual level, for example, social capital facilitates employment (Granovetter 1986), social mobility (Forsé 1999; Friedman and Krackhardt 1997; Gabbay and Zuckerman 1998; Lin, Ensel, and Vaughn 1981; Wegener 1991), and entrepreneurial ventures (Burt 1998). Other individual-level behaviours explained by social capital include migration and assimilation (Liang 1994), educational attainment among immigrants and ethnic minorities (Teachman, Paasch, and Carver 1997; Watkins 1984; White and Kaufman 1997), language facility (Parcel and Geschwender 1995), mathematical abilities and truancy (Marjoribanks 1991; McNeal 1999; Morgan and Sørensen 1999), family structure (Mitchell 1994; Mitchell and Gee 1996), and criminality (Arnold and Kay 1995; Hagan 1993; Macmillan 1995; McCarthy and Hagan 2001; Nagin and Paternoster 1994). Social capital also has been

aggregated to provide community-level impacts through studies of financial elites and cohesive subgroups (Frank and Yasumoto 1998), communities of place (Flora 1998; Hofferth and Iceland 1998), associational memberships (Eastis 1998; Putnam 1995a; Stolle and Rochon 1998), collective action (Macy 1991; Smith 1998), and economic development (Fukuyama 1989; Helliwell 1996; Helliwell and Putnam 1995; Woolcock 1998). Policy analysts and students of government decision making consider social capital to offer potential policy leverage, for example, perhaps harnessing social capital for the good of individuals and society (Fox 1997; Lin, Cook, and Burt 2001).

The concept has gained widespread currency across a number of academic disciplines, notably sociology, political science, and economics, and has motivated ambitious interdisciplinary research ventures. The different disciplinary treatments of social capital exhibit strong convergence: all see parallels between social capital and other forms of capital, most notably, human capital; all emphasize its fungibility; all distinguish between “bridging” and “bonding” social capital, although not always in so many words; all are alert to the distributional inequalities that social capital creates; and all assert the centrality of trust.

With only a handful of exceptions, positive evaluations vastly outweigh negative ones. The standard claim takes the form: interaction breeds trust, and trust makes other good things happen. On this reading, the task for policy makers or institutional designers is to get robust interaction going. But the general interaction-trust link is compatible with a wide range of *undesirable* outcomes. Social capital can produce durable social inequality. If social capital is an indicator of inclusion, so must it also mark exclusion. If a group is engaged in antisocial action, trust among its members may make the antisocial outcome even more dire. Honour among thieves does not make theft honourable or society better off. Some observers detect antisocial tendencies in the very agenda of social capital research. They worry that the real objective is to smooth the path of privatization or to compromise the boundary between church and state.

### Bridging Disciplinary Divergences

This conceptual and evaluative confusion reflects divergences that go unrecognized because of disciplinary parochialism and the particular theoretical perspectives of individual authors (Wall, Ferrazzi, and Schryer 1998, 300). Some work concentrates on individuals and households, while other work focuses on collectivities; different units of analysis produce quite different

perspectives and, commonly, quite different moral tones. Some work focuses on the structure of social relations, while other work emphasizes the content of interaction, especially the psychological implications of different structural forms. Roughly speaking, sociologists tend to speak of networks, to focus on their utility to individuals and families, and to emphasize the inequality and exclusion that results. Economists tend to focus on trust, especially of the interpersonal type, to focus on aggregates, such as whole economies, and to emphasize positive externalities. Political scientists talk about both networks and trust, the tendency of the former to produce the latter, the generalizability of trust orientations from the personal to the political (and vice versa), and the beneficial consequences of networks and trust for policy, indeed for democracy.

As a result, the literature is shot through with definitional dilemmas and explanations riddled by tautology. At this point in its intellectual evolution, the concept is suspiciously protean. It requires careful bounding, both to distinguish it from neighbouring concepts and to unpack its internal confusion. Unpacking is the necessary preliminary to identifying – rather than merely supposing – causal links within the domain.

To this end, it is critical to bring scholars from different backgrounds together. This was the central aim of the “Equality, Security, and Community” (ESC) Major Collaborative Research Initiative, of which this book is a product. The initiative drew twenty-three economists, political scientists, and sociologists from across Canada into a common research network, promoted a common discourse, and – we hope – built bonds of interdisciplinary trust. True to certain tenets in the social capital literature, the most powerful piece of bridging required personal bonding.

Much of this took place in the design phase of the central ESC product, a massive, two-wave sample survey. Representatives from each discipline took joint responsibility for the key elements: instrumentation, sample design, and analysis. To the best of our knowledge, no other survey gives as rich an inventory of variables of common interest to these three disciplines. The first wave of the survey was conducted in 2000 and 2001, and this is the version of the data represented here. The largest component of the study is a national probability sample, stratified by province and comprising 4,101 respondents. Supplementing the national sample is a “metropolitan over-sample,” from Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver and drawn disproportionately from census tracts with a high percentage of “visible minority” residents, as defined by the Census of Canada. This component comprises 1,051 respondents. A

third component is the British Columbia Resource Community Sample, with 1,427 respondents from seven different towns in the Georgia Basin. These samples were merged for several analyses reported in this book.

Each sample uses the same survey instrument, which includes items on: (1) household composition, based mainly on the Canadian census; (2) income, based mainly on the *Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics* (Statistics Canada); (3) employment, based mainly on the *Labour Force Survey* (Statistics Canada); (4) well-being and perceptions of risk; (5) party identification and electoral behaviour; (6) policy opinion and perceptions, mainly on the welfare state; (7) links to family, neighbourhood, and secondary associations; (8) media and computer use; (9) ethnic attitudes and perceptions; and (10) trust in institutions and in other persons. The data set also includes geocodes that facilitate linkage to respondents' neighbourhood contexts. These codes enable the cross-level analysis, for example, on the effects of neighbourhood diversity on interpersonal trust. The ESC survey underpins over half the empirical chapters in this book.

The book originated in a conference hosted at Green College, University of British Columbia, in November 2001. Certain chapters were also aired at conferences at Nuffield College, Oxford, at Queen's University, and at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association. The original texts have undergone two complete rounds of editorial comment and revision, each of which also included exchange of mutually relevant papers.

### The Book: A Conceptual Roadmap

This book considers the alternative *meanings* of social capital, its causal *foundations*, and its *consequences* in the realm of policy. Some chapters are devoted to theory and others to the presentation and analysis of data. Most of the latter deploy the ESC survey – sometimes linked to census data – while others use entirely separate data sets. Figure 1.1 locates each chapter jointly in terms of its theoretical focus, its empirical basis, and the aspect of social capital of central concern. Many chapters touch on more than one aspect.

#### THE CENTRALITY OF TRUST

Trust appears as a common theme in the social capital literature. Trust is often treated as the “message” embedded in networks of communication. Through investments in social relations, individuals earn and give their trust to others, facilitating new exchanges of resources and information. In the

FIGURE 1.1

---

**The theoretical and empirical bases of social capital analyses in this book**

Aspect of social capital	Theoretical	Empirical sources of data	
		ESC survey	Other
<b>TYPE/NATURE</b>			
Trust	Eisenberg (CHAPTER 4)	Soroka, Helliwell, and Johnston (CHAPTER 5); Aizlewood and Pendakur (CHAPTER 7); Veenstra (CHAPTER 10); Soroka, Johnston, and Banting (CHAPTER 11)	
Networks	Kay and Bernard (CHAPTER 3)	Soroka, Helliwell, and Johnston (CHAPTER 5); Aizlewood and Pendakur (CHAPTER 7)	Abraham (CHAPTER 8); Mitchell (CHAPTER 9)
<b>FOUNDATIONS</b>			
Social inequality	Kay and Johnston (CHAPTER 2)	Soroka, Helliwell, and Johnston (CHAPTER 5); Aizlewood and Pendakur (CHAPTER 7)	Mitchell (CHAPTER 9)
Bridging/ Bonding	Kay and Bernard (CHAPTER 3)	Soroka, Helliwell, and Johnston (CHAPTER 5); Soroka, Johnston, and Banting (CHAPTER 11)	Abraham (CHAPTER 8); Mitchell (CHAPTER 9)
Fungibility		Soroka, Helliwell, and Johnston (CHAPTER 5); Soroka, Johnston, and Banting (CHAPTER 11)	Curtis and Perks (CHAPTER 6)
<b>CONSEQUENCES</b>			
Life chances	Kay and Johnston (CHAPTER 2)		Mitchell (CHAPTER 9)
Health		Veenstra (CHAPTER 10)	
Opinions on policy		Soroka, Johnston, and Banting (CHAPTER 11)	

---

literature, trust is at times treated as collective (trust of a community or trust felt toward government) (Paxton 1999; Putnam 1993a), and at other times as interpersonal (individual investments within organizations) (Burt 2005; Coleman 1988; Portes 1998; Sandefur and Laumann 1998). For some scholars, trust acts as a lubricant for the growth of social capital (Light and Bonacich 1988), yet, for others, trust is itself an element of social capital, a resource in its own right (Flap 1999; Paxton 1999; Putnam 2000). For others still, trust is neither a conduit nor a form of social capital, but the product of social capital once activated (Granovetter 1985; Woolcock 1998). In this book, several chapters concern themselves with trust at least in passing, but it is a conceptual preoccupation for Chapters 2, 3, and 4.

Avigail Eisenberg (Chapter 4) focuses on the psychological element of trust in the social capital complex. She questions the adequacy of conceptions of trust that originate in interpersonal relations for understanding more impersonal dimensions of social life, including politics. Not only is interpersonal trust empirically misleading for the social and political variants, but it may also even be inappropriate, ethically speaking. More convincing, in her view, is work that starts with notions of trust (or its lack) expressed toward political and government actors. This work is a better guide to understanding trust among strangers than is work among intimates. In the social and political realm, the key is the relative equality of the players. This equality is assumed in analytic modelling of trust relations but is too often forgotten in empirical work. Of particular relevance to Canada is the role of multicultural policies in fostering social and political trust, specifically, as they address inequality. Far from promoting ghettoization – a critique that finds some inspiration in one part of the social capital literature – multicultural policies promote social integration and trust.

Stuart Soroka, John Helliwell, and Richard Johnston (Chapter 5) use the ESC survey to examine interpersonal trust, particularly as trust connects to immigration (with comparisons to Rice and Feldman's 1997 US study of civic attitudes among immigrants) and cultural diversity. They begin with the question of whether the standard measurement of interpersonal trust, which is so critical to comparison over time and across countries, really captures how much trust individuals *actually* repose in others, as opposed to how much they think they *should* repose. The pith of their investigation is a comparison of the traditional question with a new one predicated on the perceived probability of cooperative behaviour in a classic situation of pure trust: a lost wallet. Although trust measured by this set of questions clearly

overlaps that indicated by response to the classic question, divergences are also sharp.

The chapter by Stuart Soroka, Richard Johnston, and Keith Banting (Chapter 11), which looks at the ultimate implications of diversity and trust on welfare policy attitudes, begins by distinguishing political trust from interpersonal trust. Unsurprisingly, interpersonal trust and political trust are related. The primary causal direction in the relationship remains contested (Brehm and Rahn 1997), but a strong case can be made that political trust is not so much a consequence of interpersonal trust as a precondition for it. No less striking, however, is the looseness of the link between the domains.

#### NETWORKS: INSIDERS AND OUTSIDERS

Common to discussions of social capital is the proposition that social capital may present a double-edged sword: it may bridge, facilitating inclusion and integration of newcomers, even as it bonds, excluding undesirable outsiders (Putnam 2000; Tilly 1998). Fiona Kay and Paul Bernard (Chapter 3) explicitly link the aggregate and distributive sides and the inclusionary and exclusionary sides, and urge us to see the negative implications as true concomitants of the positive ones. Social capital must be seen as part of a system that produces and reproduces insiders and outsiders, winners and losers. The authors present a typology of social capital that is characterized by two dimensions: distribution and reproduction, two processes that explain how social capital enables the formation of coalitions and community enhancement, while simultaneously breeding disenfranchisement and ghettoization of the disadvantaged. On one level, this is a reassertion of the sociological origins of the concept and a brief against its sanitization. At another level, it pulls the divergent treatments in sociology, political science, and economics together, with an emphasis on the centrality of social inequality.

#### FOUNDATIONS: ETHNIC DIVERSITY AND SOCIAL INEQUALITY

Canada is particularly well-suited to the exploration of the dynamics of ethnic diversity and social capital, both for its high level of and high variance in multicultural incidence. The contrast between the major cities and the rest of the country is very sharp. Canada has a long tradition as a society of immigrants, with one of the highest proportions among OECD countries of citizens born outside the country. No less critical is that Canada also harbours critically situated "national minorities" (Kymlicka 1995), notably francophones

and First Nations. At the same time, many millions of Canadians have little or no practical experience of diversity – or they think they don't.

What, for instance, is the dispersion, or variance, of social capital across communities? Beyond mean levels of social capital, there is the potential for unequal distribution, and even the shrinking or expansion of social capital within certain communities (Paxton 1999; Putnam 2000; Wuthnow 1997). How is social capital distributed across various cultural communities, geographic regions, and the two official languages of Canada? Amanda Aizlewood and Ravi Pendakur (Chapter 7) use the ESC survey to construct a detailed picture of the ethnic foundations of social capital in Canada. Strikingly, those foundations are very modest. Although individual groups stand out for particular forms of affiliation or orientation, much more striking is the *lack* of ethnic differentiation. Rather, what stands out is the distinctiveness of metropolitan places, places where (to quote the authors) “myriad world-views, languages and cultures meet.” Where most people are strangers, strangers may be more threatening. Affiliation and, with it, trust follow self-selected lines, based on pre-existing networks. The good news is that the ethnic diversification of Canada's cities does not by itself undermine the country's stock of social capital.

Barbara Mitchell (Chapter 9) deploys the *Culture and Coresidence Study*, a four-ethnic-group matched-sample survey drawn from Greater Vancouver, to examine a specific and potentially powerful network: the family. She finds that cultural groups create and reproduce their own social capital, which generates distinctive “social timetables.” In particular, she finds sharp differences among ethnic groups in coresidence, the continued presence of adult offspring in the household. Coresidence lasts longer for Asian families than for those with British or Southern European backgrounds. For the latter, a norm of independence drives exit decisions, but exit on these terms may be premature and disadvantageous. The incidence of “boomerang” coresidence, the return of adults to the origin household, is higher among early leavers. The chapter is a powerful reminder of the social structuring of intergenerational ties. As the social safety net weakens, differences among groups in intergenerational social capital transfer will become only more important to the structuring of social inequality.

#### FOUNDATIONS: BRIDGING AND BONDING

Sara Abraham (Chapter 8) takes an ethnographic turn with a detailed comparison of political organization in two “visible minority” communities

concentrated in the Greater Toronto area: Sri Lankan Tamils and Caribbean Blacks. The two groups share a common legacy of racial marginalization in Canada but diverge in their home-country legacies. Both groups exhibit a striking depth of organization, although many Caribbean organizations founded in the 1960s and 1970s have since folded. One line of feminist explanation for this organizational richness emphasizes pre-political organization around childrearing issues, but Abraham deftly shows the limitations of this claim. In both groups, the key to political organization is *politics* itself, specifically, nationalist politics. For Caribbean groups, the nationalist ideology is Pan-African, reflecting the dominant modes of black organization in the period of US Civil Rights struggles and of decolonization. Sri Lankans organized around home-country ethnic conflict, and Sri Lankan organization in Canada benefits from an international network for political mobilization. In each group, the depth of organization also reflects the very experience of marginalization, an ironic twist on a recurring social capital theme.

Soroka, Helliwell, and Johnston (Chapter 5), in their exploration of alternative indicators of interpersonal trust in the ESC study, examine both diverse groups and diversity as such (as indicated by census data on respondents' neighbourhoods) as factors in trust. They find significant levels of distrust, particularly toward police officers, among visible minorities. This is especially the case where visible-minority numbers are few. Conversely, "majority" individuals exhibit increased distrust as communities become more ethnically diverse. All this is generally consistent with the literature on the "contact hypothesis" (Forbes 1997). They also find that forms of affiliation that bring like into contact with like do little to promote interpersonal trust among strangers. All this raises deep anxieties for the future of the welfare state (Miller 1995). That said, Soroka, Johnston, and Banting (Chapter 11) find that *political* trust is not adversely affected by racial minority status or by community diversity. Much more important for political trust are the older divides in Canadian life, those among national minorities.

#### FOUNDATIONS: FUNGIBILITY

Parallels are often drawn between social capital and other forms of capital, particularly to human capital (Burt 2001; Coleman 1988, 1990b; Flap 1999; Putnam 1995a; Wall et al. 1998). More intriguing is the idea that different forms of capital are fungible, that is, that they can be brokered for each other (Bourdieu 1986; Portes 2000b), enabling new opportunities and increased

profits of social capital (Burt 1992). Fungibility claims concern both networks and trust.

James Curtis and Thomas Perks (Chapter 6) consider the extent to which adolescent experiences of group involvement cash out in adult equivalents, with data from the *National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating*. Continuity from adolescence to adulthood is considerable, a finding with obvious policy implications. In both pre-adult and adult years, women are more participative than men, especially when characteristics indicating restraints on women's ability to participate are controlled. Only in sports do males dominate. Adolescent-adult continuity is also higher for females than for males. The chapter casts doubt on the applicability of Putnam's *Bowling Alone* thesis (2000) to Canada: younger adults claim more involvement for their adolescent years than older ones do.

In the realm of trust, Soroka, Helliwell, and Johnston (Chapter 5) show the strengths and limits of translation among forms of interpersonal trust, or at least among the indicators of each form. They assert that, if necessary, the classic indicator of interpersonal trust stands adequately for all subdomains of the property. Nonetheless, considerable slippage appears, and it is not just measurement error. "Generalized" trust appears to reflect socialization, including conformity pressures. Formal education, for instance, is a critical predictor. A particularly striking source is the cultural pattern in the country of origin outside Canada. For new Canadians and their children, memories of the home country are reflected in group differences within Canada. (No less strikingly, and in contrast to the situation in the United States, origin-country differences do not persist past the second generation.) But the radius of trust in the "wallet" measure is not much affected by conformity-driven cultural forces. Rather, this more strategic form of trust seems to reflect individualized experiences, especially of neighbourhoods' ethnic and economic diversity. Similarly, Soroka, Johnston, and Banting (Chapter 11) show the limits of fungibility across the interpersonal/political divide. If there is a tendency among political scientists to assume that one type of trust readily generalizes to the other, Soroka and his co-authors suggest that this assumption may be premature and naïve.

## CONSEQUENCES

In their review chapter, Fiona Kay and Richard Johnston (Chapter 2) flag an issue that requires close further study. They emphasize a parallel between social capital and other forms of capital in the relationship between the

society-wide aggregate and the within-society distribution. Does an accumulation of social capital that may, on balance, create external benefits for society at large (including a Rawlsian benefit for those at the bottom) also, and almost inevitably, increase the overall level of inequality? This concern seems especially compelling for social capital conceived as networks.

That social capital is a critical mediating factor between sociodemographic characteristics, networks (family, friends, community service clubs), civic participation, and health outcomes for individuals seems highly plausible. Gerry Veenstra (Chapter 10) explores individual-level relationships among trust, social engagement, civic participation, and self-rated health status with data from the ESC survey. Veenstra's work builds on a growing but contested literature on links among these variables and takes advantage of the depth of coverage of all the relevant controls and indicators in the ESC survey instrument. It turns out that social capital in both its dimensions – trusting orientations and certain network connections at least – is conducive to health. As Veenstra puts it, “people who are open to interactions with others, [who] believe in the inherent good will of others” reap a reward in personal health. Actual links to the larger world – informal networking with neighbours, membership in recreational groups, and watching television news – also promote health. In this domain, at least, more social capital always seems to be better.

Finally, Soroka, Johnston, and Banting (Chapter 11) carry the theme of ethnic diversity and dispersion of social capital through to public policy, in particular, to support for the welfare state. Soroka and his colleagues use the ESC survey to address a cross-national theme at a subnational level. Students of the welfare state ask whether the increasing ethnic and racial diversity of the rich, industrial societies is undermining the moral and political foundation of their welfare states. The fear is that diversity undermines the presumption of trust that arguably underpins a willingness to pool risk and redistribute income. Canada is a compelling case both as it has become more diverse and as it has resisted pressure for welfare cutbacks more than most societies. Analysis in the chapter exploits variation in diversity experiences within Canada. It does seem to be the case that interpersonal trust, as captured by the “wallet” measure described in Chapter 5 (Soroka, Helliwell, and Johnston) and Chapter 7 (Aizlewood and Pendakur), declines as the ethnic diversity of a neighbourhood increases. But *political* trust is not similarly affected, and this dimension of trust is also critical to welfare-state support: if one does not trust the political class to administer public programs, one is unlikely to

support the programs themselves. Both forms of trust affect support for the welfare state, but the links along the causal chain are such that there is virtually no relationship between ethnic context and support for social insurance and redistribution. This leaves a question on the table: Is there something distinctive about the Canadian pattern of immigration and settlement?

### The Book in Outline

Chapters are ordered, roughly, by two principles. The first puts the general before the particular. So chapters that focus on theory come first, and the theoretical chapters with the broadest reach precede the ones with a narrower compass. Empirical chapters follow. Almost all empirical chapters touch on many facets of social capital, but each chapter appears in the section that roughly corresponds to its place in a causal scheme stretching from the most basic foundations to the most remote consequences. The final three chapters say much about foundations, and even say much about conceptualization, but all focus on consequences.

Kay and Johnston (Chapter 2) begin with an overview of the entire field, networks and trust, conceptualization, foundations, and consequences. Their point is to portray both the reach of the concept and its limitations and to argue for the very exploration in depth that this book provides. Kay and Bernard (Chapter 3) don their sociological caps to address an interdisciplinary audience. Although social capital as a concept originates in sociology, political science and economics have hijacked the idea, as it were. In doing so, political scientists and economists have tended to downplay the role of social capital in inequality and exclusion, so Kay and Bernard enter a plea for righting the balance. Eisenberg (Chapter 4) presents an essay in political theory, and takes her fellow political scientists to task for their overemphasis on face-to-face interaction. This distracts them from the real challenge for complicated, diverse societies, of fostering trust among strangers.

Soroka, Helliwell, and Johnston (Chapter 5) devote care and attention to the sources of interpersonal trust but do so in a way that brings out slippage among alternative conceptualizations within the domain of the interpersonal. Along the way, they tell a complicated story about Canadian diversity and about the integrative power of well-conceived multicultural policy. This chapter is the first to introduce analysis of the ESC survey. Curtis and Perks (Chapter 6) show the continuity of adolescent-to-adult affiliation patterns, and indicate an abiding source of gender differences. Aizlewood and Pendakur (Chapter 7) use the ESC survey to explore the ethnic foundations of affiliation

and trust at an unprecedented level of comparative detail. Abraham (Chapter 8) goes into even more detail, thanks to her ethnographic focus, as she compares Tamils with persons of Caribbean origin in Toronto.

Mitchell (Chapter 9) looks at ethnic differences in intergenerational coresidence as a source of variation in life prospects. Early departure from the home may foster an illusory independence, one that is unsustainable in the face of urban employment and housing pressure. Veenstra (Chapter 10) looks at health outcomes of both network affiliation and trust. Finally, Soroka, Johnston, and Banting (Chapter 11) look all the way down the road to redistributive politics, as they consider whether diversity is compatible with a generous welfare state.



Part 1

**Theoretical Overview** .....

