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ABSTRACT

Social capital is defined as norms of trust and reciprocity held by a group of individuals or organisations. Family, neighbourhood and friendship realms are often informal platforms upon which young people develop their social capital. In addition, membership of organised groups has been central in discussions of social capital since Robert Putnam (2000) asserted that levels of social capital in the United States of America had declined by pointing out that Americans had stopped attending meetings in volunteer associations and social clubs. Using the perspective of bonding and bridging social capital as starting bases for cultivating social capital, this thesis focuses on the mobilisation of social capital in different social settings. Also, this study examines whether young people are likely to be active members of organised groups if they have generated higher levels of social capital with their family members, friends and neighbours. Another focus of this thesis is to investigate whether group membership makes a difference to young Australians’ levels of civic engagement and generalised trust. Young Australians and permanent residents aged 16 to 25 (N = 283) participated in this study through an online survey. The findings support previous literature, which found members of organised groups to be more trusting and reciprocative in general than those who do not participate in any organised groups. Indeed, passive membership is as important as active membership of organised groups for promoting civic engagement and generalised social capital. Family social capital may serve as a starting base for young people to generate social capital with their friends. However, the data analysed in this thesis show that those who generate very high social capital with their family members are not likely to have higher social capital in all other social settings. Indeed, my findings suggest that social capital among friends and neighbours are important in extending social capital among people in general. Thus, policy makers should turn their focus to promoting social capital among neighbours by creating safe, cohesive, active and stable neighbourhoods, because these four characteristics are identified as important in increasing levels of social capital among neighbours. Finally, it is also important for policy makers to promote organised groups for young people to participate in.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION
Social capital refers to norms of trust and reciprocity held by a group of individuals. Social capital is not a new idea. People began paying attention to it with James Coleman’s (1988a, 1988b) work on family and community involvement in creating better educational outcomes of children and with Putnam et al.’s (1993a) work on Italian communities. It started to gain serious attention among scholars after Putnam (2000) proposed that social capital in the United States of America (USA) had declined. One of the aspects of the decline that he pointed to was that Americans had stopped attending meetings of associations. They maintained their memberships passively by only signing cheques to renew memberships. In explaining the decline in social capital, Putnam (2000) pointed to factors such as more TV watching, demanding jobs and longer than average journeys to work.

Since Putnam’s work in the 1990s other scholars have studied social capital from the perspective of different disciplines. The literature on social capital shows higher levels of social capital to be broadly associated with good public health, political stability, lower crime rates, economic development and social well-being (Rosenfeld et al., 2001; Hyyppa & Maki, 2003; Helliwell & Putnam, 2004; Iyer et al., 2005; Kim & Kawachi, 2006; Salmi, 2006). These studies are the contribution of scholars across different academic disciplines.

Trust is the first issue that I address in order to build social capital within a given social network. The reason is that trust is embedded in social networks that enables social systems to function productively and efficiently (Fukuyama, 1999; Putnam, 1995a). Besides, cooperation is an active result of trust. Therefore, trust is particularly important in situations where individual and collective interests conflict (Ridley, 1996:53, 56). The literature on trust also suggested that people who are predisposed to interpersonal trust in family and friends are more likely to trust broader social institutions such as government, business, the media and so on (Putnam, 1993a; Crystal & DeBell, 2002).

A high social capital circle creates a trustworthy and supportive environment. Hence, people who lived in such environment can help to build and maintain a high social
 capital society (Putnam, 2000:21). It is a virtuous circle. In contrast, if young people spent their early social lives in a hostile and unsupportive environment, they may become generally distrustful (Hardin, 2002:92). Thus, it leads to a low social capital society.

The transition period from youth to adulthood is a key time when young people’s social circles are expanding. In sociology, there are some studies focusing on young people and social capital (Verba et al., 1995; Rahn & Transue, 1998; Morrow, 1999, 2000; Seaman & Sweeting, 2004; Jarrett et al., 2005, Onyx et al., 2005). These studies examine young people and their experiences of building social capital in specific social settings. There is a lack of youth and social capital studies that focus on a variety of social settings.

Besides, there are enormous published researches on youth development and welfare. The majority of those is directed at programs that prevent high-risk behaviours such as drug and alcohol use, risky sexual behaviours, fighting, crime and suicide and to improve personal skills (Dutton, 2001; Rozie-Battle, 2002; Edginton & Randal, 2005; Henderson et al., 2005; Beare & Belliveau, 2007; Weiss et al., 2007; Youngblade et al., 2007; Shek & Wai, 2008; Wells & Arthur-Banning, 2008).

The aim of this study is to investigate the social capital in different social settings among young people. Australian young people of age 16 to 25 years old are targeted in this study. It discusses how young Australians relate to their family, friends, neighbourhood, and to the wider society. Consequently, it explores how young people can generate social capital in different social groups. In contrast to other studies in scrutinising the youth programs to study the youth services and welfare, this study focuses on the connection between the social capital at the micro (informal social capital) and macro (generalised social capital and confidence in societal organisations) levels. It is hypothesised that young people who trust others at the micro level are more likely to trust others at the macro level and vice versa. The second aim of this study is to determine the degree of which the membership of organised groups is able to promote social capital by helping young people to learn and practise norms of reciprocity (i.e. to become trustworthy in themselves and to develop trusting relationships with others).
This thesis is about how young people in Australia experience norms of reciprocity and trust. In particular, this study examines how their experiences of trust and reciprocity in their immediate families are related to their behaviour and expectations with respect to people outside that circle. Outside home and school, Australian young people may have more chances to interact with the wider society, such as the local community and the government, than young Malaysians do in general. This might due to the different youth policies in Malaysia and Australia in promoting the roles of young people, such as the practice of youth representation in city councils. In addition, insights into how young Australians spend their time, whether in solitary activities or group activities, serve as a good launching pad to understand the patterns of their social connections.

Why do I want to study young people? Because young people aged 16 to 25 often experience changes in their lives that mould their future adult lives. I see youth as a stage which is full of possibilities and challenges during which young people start to take responsibility for themselves, their families and their country. I was born in Malaysia and studied for my first degrees in that country. I personally have expanded my social networks since I left home for university when I was 17 years old. I also adjusted to a different family life when my parents moved back to their hometown. To provide context for the research I will describe my own experience of reciprocity and trust as a child and young adult in Malaysia, and later in Australia. The chapter concludes with an outline of the structure of the thesis. Please note that all of the key concepts used in this thesis, such as social capital and trust, are defined in the glossary in Appendix A.

MY PERSONAL BACKGROUND

Family and friends

I was born in Sabah, Malaysia in 1979. I grew up in a family based strongly on Confucian values, which emphasised filial piety and cooperation among siblings. All my life my father taught me the Confucian way to maintain harmonious relationships among family members: parents and children, elder siblings and younger siblings. Close family relationships mattered to my family more than usual because we lived far from our extended family. In his youth, my father left his hometown in Seremban, Peninsula Malaysia, to build his career in Sabah, East Malaysia. I have two siblings and we were born in Sabah and completed our high school education there. During my 17 years as a
child and young girl in Sabah, we only visited our relatives in Seremban once and our grandparents only visited us once, when we were very young. Due to limited resources during that time, my siblings and I hardly knew any members of our extended family. It was almost impossible to build any close relationship with them. In other words, my family social capital for the first 17 years of my life was limited to my nuclear family. Although my parents had built meaningful friendships with my father’s colleagues and their spouses, these friendships were only maintained between the adults; they did not extend to friendships between their children and us. So, my siblings and I neither built close relationships with the adult friends of my parents, nor did we befriend their children. However, the situation in my neighbourhood of childhood was different and I managed to live in a trusting environment as I described below.

This situation changed when I was 18 years old, when my family transferred to Seremban. We moved to my parents’ hometown and lived close to my maternal grandmother. After that, I got to know my grandmother, my aunts and their children. I started to experience extended family life as we became closer. Since then there have been more people in my life whom I can trust and rely on. I expanded my family social capital.

I built close friendships with a few people in schools in Sabah and Seremban and later on in university. In the beginning, I practised the Confucian formulae, that is, the trust and respect that I had learnt at home were applied in building friendship. Later on, I realised that trust and respect are not enough to maintain friendships. Indeed, building friendships involves give and take in terms of social support and practical help. This experience has taught me that I should be more caring of my family members and help them in whatever way I can. So, my experience with building social capital in the family influenced the way I built social capital with my close friends, and vice versa. In many ways, my close friends played and still play the same role as my family.

**Neighbourhoods**

In Sabah, my family and I lived in a small neighbourhood made up of about 50 families. Most of the families knew each other and formed close relationships. My siblings and I had a wonderful childhood spending time with our neighbours. There were eight of us (from five families) who went to school together and spent playtime after school
together. While these relationships were unlike the ones that my parents had with my
father’s work colleagues, my parents were very close to the parents of our school
playmates too. I remember that, when my maternal grandfather passed away, our
neighbours took care of my siblings and me during the day while our mother was away
for two weeks. Also, during Chinese New Year celebrations or for children’s birthdays,
there were a lot of visits in the neighbourhood. Thus while I had little or no contact with
my extended family doing these early years, and did not befriend the children of my
father’s colleagues, I did enjoy close relationships with neighbours’ children (and their
parents).

In contrast, my city neighbourhood experience in Seremban was very different to the
big town neighbourhood I used to live in in Sabah. In Seremban, I lived in a small unit
with another 100 families in the same building. There was another building with the
same structure opposite us. My parents and I lived in this flat for about five years, but I
hardly interacted with any of the families in this area at all. We did not visit each other
during festivals or for birthday celebrations.

**The wider society**

In general, I felt safer and more secure living in Sabah than Seremban. Mostly I think it
was because of the differences in the neighbourhoods. It was easier to think and feel that
Sabah people in general were more trustworthy than Seremban people, due to the fact
that I knew more neighbours, people who were not blood relatives, in Sabah than in
Seremban. I spent most of my time at home, school and in the local neighbourhood in
Sabah. These environments were always safe and supportive for me due to frequent
interaction and the common goal of cooperation that my family and I shared with our
neighbours. In contrast, the lack of interaction in the Seremban neighbourhood made me
more vigilant and wary about my safety.

On the other hand, my confidence in major societal organisations did not differ much
between these two places. I think my general level of confidence in major societal
organisations in Malaysia was similar regardless of which state I lived in.
Participation in organised groups: Malaysia

I did not actively participate in any organised groups until I started university. The experience of joining organised groups changed my perception of, and interaction with, the wider society. I lived away from my home and close friends in Seremban and moved to Johor, another state of Malaysia located in the south of the peninsula. I made a lot of acquaintances at university and started to actively participate in university associations and clubs. These bodies organised events and activities both within the university and outside it. I served on committees in a counselling organisation, and in aerobic and swimming clubs. We organised summer camps for local children, counselling talks for members of the local community, and aerobic and swimming competitions for university students. Through these interactions with the other students and local community members, I began to place trust in and reciprocate with generalised others. This means that I started to feel safe and secure at university and in the local community even though I did not build close relationships with many of my university acquaintances or local community members.

Participation in organised groups: Melbourne

I came to Melbourne to study in 2005. I started a two-month observation in 3Phase Productions (a music group in which young people organise music events in the neighbourhood) and the Youth Reference Group (a film group in which young people study basic filming skills and organise short film competitions and screenings) at Boroondara Youth Services. Most of the members of the two groups were between 14 and 18 years old. They came to the group meeting once a week after school. The meetings usually took about two hours per session. I observed that members of both groups worked closely with neighbourhood people, as well as with the local council, local business, and the film and music industry.

My life journey from Sabah to Seremban, to Johor and most recently to Melbourne inspired me to conduct research on how young people benefit from and contribute to social capital in the community. My younger life in Sabah taught me that trust in and reciprocity with the nuclear family is very important. My lack of extended family was compensated for by good neighbours. Close relationships within the nuclear family and my neighbourhood had a positive effect on my trust in and reciprocity with generalised others in Sabah. On the other hand, my living experience in Seremban taught me that it
is really good to have extended family members whom one can rely on and build trust in and reciprocate with. However, due to the fact that I did not build any close relationships with Seremban neighbours, it was very hard for me to place trust in and reciprocate with generalised others in Seremban. It makes me wonder whether, if I had participated in organised groups in Seremban, would I have contributed more to social capital in the community? Would I have been more able to trust in and reciprocate with the Seremban people? My experiences of being an active member of organised groups during university life have taught me that the organised group, for me at least, was a bridge between me, as a young person, and the community. It meant that I too could contribute to the society in general via interaction with community members, and I could do this through organised group activities.

Therefore, I decided to conduct research into the social aspect of young Australians in Melbourne, because city councils and other voluntary groups here provide youth services for young people in the community (in every suburban area). These services allow young people to get together and participate in activities, or even learn to organise activities. This is in contrast to Malaysia, where only voluntary associations and clubs (not necessarily targeted at young people) run community activities. Thus, it seems that there are more opportunities for young Australians to actively participate in organised groups as compared to young people in Malaysia.

OBJECTIVES
From my life experience, I developed an interest in investigating the settings in which young people generate social capital. For me, my family has taught me that I could always trust and rely on them whenever I need them to share my happiness or to help me when I am in trouble and that I would offer my help and support to them too. These norms of trust and reciprocity in my family act as my basis for interacting with other people beyond the family circle. In addition, I am motivated to participate in organised groups because I am accustomed to interacting with people in group settings. Thus, in this thesis I investigate whether family is a starting base for cultivating social capital and enabling young people to build social capital in other social groups such as among friends, acquaintances, neighbours and people in general, and whether the family helps generate institutional trust.
Next, my participation in organised groups during university changed the dynamic between me as a young person and the local community. Being part of the organised groups gave me a sense of belonging, that I fitted into society in general. This experience gave me the confidence to keep on building social capital with people in general, including strangers. Thus, I developed another main objective in this research, which was to find out whether institutional trust is related to participation in organised groups, and whether participation in organised groups was related to young people’s development of social capital among friends and among people in general, and whether it promotes civic participation. First I investigated whether young people were motivated to actively participate in organised groups because they have learnt to trust in and reciprocate with their close family members. Then I investigated whether active members of organised groups were different from passive members of organised groups and from non-members in terms of their levels of generalised social capital and confidence in major societal organisations. I also investigated whether a young person’s type of membership was related to civic participation.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE THESIS
While a small number of studies have examined young Australians’ social capital and civic engagement, most of the research to date has concentrated only on one particular social group, i.e., the family, friends or neighbourhood. Only a single study by Stone et al. (2003) investigated social capital of Australian employees across formal and informal networks. To be specific, their study focussed on social capital in family and kinship networks, and among friends, and neighbours and its contribution to individual labour market outcomes, compared with the role of civic ties and institutional networks. However, there seems to be little or no research that has involved young Australians who participate in organised groups and how building social capital with their family members, friends and acquaintances (including neighbours) and having confidence in major societal organisations might be related to civic engagement. I proposed that the process of building family social capital may be the initial socialisation base for young people to actively engage in civil society. In addition, young people may also build high levels of generalised social capital and engage actively in civic activities through membership of organised groups. Thus, it is vital to understand how family social capital might be similar to, or be different from, other experiences of building social capital in different social settings, in terms of forming generalised social capital and
being active civic participants. The research presented in this dissertation is significant in terms of both the area of social capital and with respect to young Australians. Furthermore, the study contributes to filling some of the gaps in our understanding of the relationships between family social capital, social capital among friends and acquaintances (including neighbours), institutional trust, and generalised social capital. It provides an in-depth understanding of young people’s social capital by utilising a quantitative approach to analyse the relations of different social networks of young Australians.

To date, a number of studies have focused on the dark side of social capital as well as the positive consequences of social capital (Burt, 1999; Morrow, 1999; Graeff, 2007; Crossely, 2008; Browning, 2009; Iglic, 2010; van Deth & Zmerli, 2010). However, there are few, if any, studies on how each of the different social networks related to give an overall picture of young people’s social capital. By examining the types of social capital in different social settings and by using the same independent and dependent variables, this research reports on the factors that are most critical in influencing the generation of social capital. Moreover, by comparing the structure of each type of social network (i.e., open or closed), the research design has the capability to investigate whether young people people’s iterated experiences in closed networks are more efficient in building social capital than the random interactions between them and others in open networks.

Another significant strength of this research pertains to studies of group membership in civil society. Putnam (2000) claims that the decline of civic engagement is reflected in a lack of active participation in social clubs and associations. However, most of the civic engagement studies to date have collected data on general membership of organised groups. The impact of passive membership of organised groups, that is participation where group members pay a membership fee but do not attend meetings, is rarely discussed in social capital research. Given this lack, this research deliberately set out to study differences in types of membership in order to examine how they relate to levels of social capital. Consequently, the results of this research report on the differences

\[1\text{ Please note that I am not assuming any cause and effect by using these terms. But in the bivariate tables presented in the body of this thesis one variable (the independent variable) is selected as the likely antecedent of the other.}\]
between passive and active membership as well as on the differences between non-membership and membership.

Overall, the research presented in this thesis is, arguably, an important academic study of young Australians aged 16 to 25 on aspects of social capital in four different social settings (the family, friendship groups, neighbourhoods, and institutions) and with respect to their type of membership in organised groups and civic engagement.

STRUCTURE OF THIS THESIS
In this chapter, I have introduced the topic of this thesis. Chapters 2 and 3 discuss previous research findings around trust and social capital. In Chapter 4, I discuss the concept of young people, their membership of organised groups and the role of group participation in building social capital. It also discusses the research questions. Chapter 5 explains how this study was carried out: it sets out the research design, research procedure and the data analysis method. In Chapters 6 through 9, I present my findings and discussion of young people’s experience of social capital in different realms and their membership of organised groups.

In Chapter 6 I show and discuss the relationships between family social capital and social capital in other social settings and types of organised group membership. I also study whether being close to both nuclear and extended family members is associated with high family social capital. In Chapter 7, I study the relationship between levels of social capital among friends and types of group membership, and levels of generalised social capital and confidence in major societal organisations. Chapter 8 focuses on the relationship between the level of social capital among neighbours and types of group membership. In addition, neighbourhood factors such as periods of residence, social cohesion, safety, neighbourhood participation and their association with social capital among neighbours are also discussed here.

Chapter 9 focuses on whether participation in organised groups is associated with young people to engage in civil society. This chapter also discusses different types of group membership and young people’s different levels of generalised social capital and confidence in major types of societal organisations. The types of societal organisations
include: the government, the media, business organisations, and health care, educational, charitable institutions, churches or religious institutions and the unions.

Finally, Chapter 10 summarises the findings, arguing that membership of organised groups at both passive and active levels is associated with civic engagement and higher levels of generalised social capital. Also, young people appear to be more motivated to be active members of organised groups if they have high social capital with their neighbours and friends; in return, their participation in organised groups may reinforce their generalised social capital.

ABBREVIATIONS
In view of the repeated mentioned of the term ‘social capital’ in every social settings, throughout this chapter, I have created these abbreviations: FSC (family social capital), FRSC (social capital among friends), NSC (social capital among neighbours) and GSC (generalised social capital). For the types of membership of organised groups, three abbreviations were used: non-members of organised groups (NOGM), passive organised group members (POGM) and active organised group members (AOGM).
CHAPTER 2 TRUST, TRUSTWORTHINESS AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

INTRODUCTION

This chapter reviews theoretical issues regarding trust including the concept of trust, the concept of trustworthiness, and how trust functions in society. I first discuss the concept of social connectedness, then the main component of social capital, which is trust. The importance of trust in cooperation is discussed next by using the ‘Prisoner’s dilemma’ game as an example. Finally, I discuss the concept of social capital and define social capital and other key concepts in this research.

TRUST

I define trust as the mutual expectation among a number of people that they are willing to act in the best interests of each other. As members of informal groups (such as in the family or among close friends) and of small communities, we develop the understanding that we exchange favours with others asynchronously to avoid sanctions (Hardin, 2002:184). This mutual expectation is then generalised among members of informal groups and becomes the norm of trust and reciprocity in that particular setting. This norm of trust and reciprocity may then become broader social capital. In the following paragraphs, I will talk about the idea of trust, how interpersonal trust is developed and how it can lead to trust within informal groups.

Sztompka (1999:25-26) defines trust as ‘a bet about the future contingent actions of others’. He theorises that there are two components to trust: belief and commitment through action. He explains that the belief component involves specific expectations that another person will perform certain actions, and that commitment through action means that one is willing to take the risk of unpredictable and uncontrollable consequences. A simple example illustrates Sztompka’s concept: Jane trusts (believes) that the teachers in School A are excellent and will impart the necessary education, therefore Jane is willing to place her daughter in School A (a commitment). Here, Jane has expectations that teachers in School A will perform accordingly. But by placing her child in School A, she is taking a risk – with the many variables in educating a child, the school may or may not be good for the child’s education. So the unpredictable and uncontrollable consequence in Jane’s case might be her child’s failure in academic achievement. For Sztompka, trust, then, always involves an element of risk.
Hardin (2002:88) offers a different perspective on trust. He explains that interpersonal trust occurs in ongoing relationships with people who know each other relatively well, and not in a one-shot encounter with strangers. To Hardin, trust is not a simple bet, but is only engendered if the person to be trusted is interested in maintaining a relationship with the person who is doing the trusting by fulfilling the expectation placed on them (Hardin, 2002). In his definition, trust involves a three-part relation: A trusts B to do X (Hardin, 2002:9).

Hardin’s (2002:3-7) ‘encapsulated-interest account of trust’ suggests that trust is an expectation of the trusted person together with the belief that the trusted person is interested in fulfilling the expectation. Hence, in order to trust a person, one has to have an understanding that the person has an interest in fulfilling the trust: I trust you because I understand that you have an interest in fulfilling my trust. Thus, the person who trusts has a reasonable expectation that the other is likely to behave in a trustworthy fashion; their trust is not blind trust.

Uslaner (2002:22) agrees with Hardin and names this type of trust strategic trust. Strategic trust refers to ‘trust in people we know’ (Uslaner, 2000: 571); and it is ‘a prediction about another person’s behaviour’ (Uslaner, 2002:22). He suggests that this type of trust is heavily based on one’s experiences or stereotypes in deciding whom to trust. In other words, strategic trust, also called knowledge-based trust, is a calculated risk. One will not simply trust others without some concrete basic knowledge that the trusted party is trustworthy. The truster’s decision to trust the trusted party must also strategically benefit the truster. Thus, strategic trust only refers to interpersonal trust within one’s social relationships with friends and family. Uslaner (2000) defines another type of trust, which is not based upon personal experience, as moralistic trust. Moralistic trust refers to the moral foundation of trust in ‘people whom we don’t know and who are likely to be different from ourselves’ (Uslaner, 2000: 572). Moralistic trust reflects a commonality of values. It is the belief that it is human nature is to have faith in others because they share the same fundamental moral values. Thus, naturally everyone is inherently trustworthy and it is unethical to distrust others.

To Hardin (2002:11), acting on trust does involve risk but trust itself is not an action. Thus, the main difference between Stzompka’s (1999:25) definition of trust as a bet
(action) and Hardin’s encapsulated trust is the component of trust. Hardin (2002:7) explains that trust is a cognitive notion involving the three-part relation, _A_ trusts B to do X’. However, this notion does not involve the commitment from _A’, the truster, towards the trusted party, _B’. Hardin’s concept of trust is similar to Uslaner’s definition of strategic trust where trusters take calculated risks. For Stzompka (1999:27-29), trusters commit themselves when they act on trust by placing a bet to trust the trusted party. However, Hardin’s (2002:3-7) concept of encapsulated trust emphasises the notion that the trusted party (_B’) must have taken into account the interests of the truster (_A’) before A could trust B. Stzompka’s definition of trust does not include this notion that the trusted party is motivated to act in the truster’s interests to maintain the trust relationship. Uslaner’s concept of strategic trust is similar to both Hardin’s and Stzompka’s definitions where trusters calculate risks then decide to trust based upon personal experiences.

However, Uslaner’s other concept of trust, moralistic trust, is a different understanding of trust from that held by conventional theorists of trust like Stzompka and Hardin. Uslaner (2002) proposes that moralistic trust is the solution to collective action problems: it will lead to cooperation among people in general. I do not agree with Uslaner’s conceptualisation of moralistic trust. When trust is treated as an ethical value of human being, it is very hard to identify a common understanding of morality in every person for every social setting. To me, Uslaner’s concept of moralistic trust is closer to religious ideals than to studies of how people react to trust issues in reality. The question of whether human beings have a common understanding of moral values is a philosophical one. Indeed, moralistic trust may rest on a positive view of human nature where optimists believe that they should have good faith in people (Uslaner, 2002). Thus, studies on moralistic trust are about whether people do in fact behave ethically or morally. Indeed, Uslaner appears to see cooperation among people based on moralistic trust as an ethical imperative. I think that treating trust as an ethic does not take into account the logical reasoning of human beings who act rationally. Suggesting that trust is a fundamental value that everyone ought to have does not further understandings of trust in operation.

On the other hand, Hardin’s definition of trust allows researchers to analyse trust as a cognitive notion involving the three-part relation, _A_ trusts B to do X’. Based on
Hardin’s definition of trust, we can look again at the school illustration about Jane: Jane will not simply place trust in the teachers without actually seeing that the teachers have an interest in acting in a trustworthy fashion. Therefore, in order for Jane to trust the teachers, Jane may join the parent-teacher association to better understand how teachers implement the school curriculum. Jane might have some information about those teachers’ reputations before hand, which serves as a transitional step in building a trust relationship (Hardin, 2002:93). Uslaner (2002) agrees with Hardin that, for strategic trust, one could make the decision to trust based on the trusted party’s references (or qualifications in education, in Jane’s case). Jane would not place a very high expectation on the teachers even if the teachers’ reputations were sufficiently strong for Jane to start a trust relationship with them (Hardin, 2002:139-140). Only when Jane has convinced herself that the teachers are trustworthy and that they are willing to take Jane’s expectation into account, will she then place her trust in the teachers and send her daughter to that school.

If we take the next step and make a more detailed investigation into Jane’s case, it is obvious that Jane made the decision based on her interpersonal trust in the teachers but not in the school (as an institution). Hardin (1998:19) points out that there is a difference between interpersonal trust and trust in an institution such as government. In Hardin’s (1998:13) encapsulated-interest account of trust, both truster and trustee are usually committed to a long term trustworthy interpersonal relationship. However, in the case of trust in an institution like a school, it is quite impossible to know everyone in the institution. Furthermore, in an organisational setting, it is hard to know the intentions and motivations of the members of the organisation and their interest in fulfilling the trustee’s trust (Hardin, 1998:16). Even so, it is rather unusual for individuals in an organisation to act mainly based on the trust placed in them personally; the more usual motivations are the positive and negative incentives from the organisation (Hardin, 1998:17). Thus, outsiders usually rely on personal experience with an institution to judge how trustworthy the institution is. If a person had a long history of dealings with certain organisations, he or she could tell whether those organisations were trustworthy, and this would very much depend on the outcome of those dealings (Hardin, 1998:16). Beneficial dealings will lead to high levels of trust and unsatisfactory dealings will lead to low levels of trust. For those individuals who do not have any personal experience with an organisation, the reputation of the
organisation is used as important evidence in judging the institution’s trustworthiness (Hardin, 1998:16).

Lewis and Weigert (1985:968) argue that ‘trust must be conceived as a property of collective units (ongoing dyads, groups, and collectivities), not of isolated individuals’. A trust culture is then formed between members of these collective units. Stzompka (1999:119) suggests that a trust culture is not merely a historically and collectively shared experience. According to him the formation of a culture of trust involves four processes:

First, the driving force of social processes is human agency, that is, individual and collective actions, decisions, and choices taken by specifically endowed actors, within the framework of opportunities provided by existing structures. Second, the ongoing events making up the social praxis are always complex products of some traits of actors combined with some traits of structures, or to put it otherwise they result from the exploration of existing structural opportunities by willing and competent actors. Third, the structural context itself and the opportunities it provides are shaped and reshaped by ongoing praxis; they are the accumulated, lasting outcomes, often unintended, of the multiplicity of earlier actions. Fourth, the structural effects of past praxis, crystallised as structural tradition, become the initial conditions for future praxis, and are explored as structural resources, and this cycle proceeds interminably making all processes contingent and open-ended (Stzompka, 1999:120).

This model of the formation of cultural trust suggests that different communities have different perspectives on trust (Fukuyama, 1995:25). Fukuyama (1995) compares cultural differences relating to trust in China, Italy, France, Korea, Japan and Germany and the implications of these differences for economic development in those countries. He defines culture as ‘inherited ethical habit’ (Fukuyama, 1995:34). He then explains that an ethical habit is made up of both ideas (or values) and actual social relationships. For example, in Chinese culture, it is very important to show respect to the elderly. Thus, it is important to live with one’s parents and take care of them until they pass away. This idea of trust between parents and children (particularly between father and the eldest son) originated from Confucianism and is inherited from generation to generation.

As an extension of the formation of trust within a social relationship, Fukuyama discusses how trust is cultivated in the whole family. Fukuyama (1995:75-76) shows that Chinese families distrust other (non-kin) members of the society. He does this by
discussing the structure of Chinese family business where non-kin are seldom invited to play key roles. This implies that the trust which is built in one’s nuclear family or extended family is so strong that non-kin members of the society cannot be trusted. He also observed that low levels of trust outside the family discourage the development of voluntary associations (Fukuyama, 1995:56). In contrast, voluntary social groups are formed in countries like the United States, Japan and Germany partly in response to the high levels of trust in non-kin (Fukuyama, 1995:57). Another area which Fukuyama investigates is how having a culture of trust in a nation benefits economic development. He defines trust as ‘the expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest, and cooperative behaviour, based on commonly shared norms, on the part of other members of that community’ (1995:26). Again, he analyses the essence of Chinese Confucianism which emphasises the role of family bonds in Chinese societies in enhancing trust among family members. This in-group trust culture is illustrated in the phenomenon of Chinese family business operations which find it hard to develop into large corporations due to low levels of trust between non-kin.

The two major perspectives of trust which I have discussed so far are those of interpersonal trust and group trust. To summarise, Stzompka (1999:25) claims that in order to trust somebody, one has to consciously take a risk. Hardin further details the trusting relation which he says is not simply a risky bet, but a cognitively calculated notion with a three-part relation: ‘A trusts B to do X’ (Hardin, 2002:9). In other words, A would trust B to do X, but might not trust B to do Y. Or, A would trust C to do Y, but might not trust C to do X.

I agree with Hardin’s (2002:9) concept of trust which involves a three-part relation: ‘A trusts B to do X’. In most social settings, our trust in others depends on specific situations. For example, in an interpersonal and trusting relationship, one might trust a neighbour to collect the mail (say while one is away), but one might not trust that neighbour to take care of one’s dogs. Trust that occurs at an interpersonal level will vary from case to case. Thus, trust is not only a risky bet as described by Stzompka.

In contrast to interpersonal trust, members of informal groups, and even members of whole societies, may trust one another based on inherited norms of trust which focus on the ethical aspects of trusting behaviours (Fukuyama, 1995:34, 36). This broader trust
allows all the members of a community to trust each other on an equal basis. For example, Fukuyama elaborates the norms of trust which exist in a community based on the regular virtues of moral behaviour as preached in Chinese Confucian values. Thus, in this context it is almost a crime if you do not trust your family, but there is no matching obligation to trust local strangers and other non-relatives.

Furthermore, the culture of trust serves as the main point of reference for how trust flows in a group, who can be trusted, and what is the optimum level of trust in an informal group. For example, every evening parents with children in neighbourhood A gather at the playground to chat about life while watching their children play. John has two children aged five and seven years old and has just moved into neighbourhood A. At first John is very worried about his children’s safety at the playground due to the new environment. He is not sure about how well his children will adapt to the new physical environment and he does not know if they will develop new friendships with other children. A few weeks after joining the group, John learns that there is some degree of group trust. These parents trust each other in the sense of how they share the facilities at the playground. John also learns that there is mutual trust among the parents. If any parent has to be away from the playground, it is acceptable to leave their children because the other parents will keep an eye on them. John realises that this group trust is applied to him as well, although he is new to the group, and that the mutual trust and understanding is spread evenly among all the regular parents in the group.

Hardin’s (2002:3) concept of encapsulated trust proposes that, in order for the truster to trust a trustee, the truster has to be confident that the trustee has taken the truster’s interest into account. If this is the case, the truster is very much convinced that the risk of the trustee betraying the trust is low and his interests will be taken into the trustee’s consideration. In other words, the ultimate decision to fulfil or betray the trustee’s trust is fully in the trustee’s hands. The truster then will passively wait and see if he wins or loses his bet. This is interpersonal trust; however, group trust is a little different. In group trust, group members are required to actively cooperate and show trusting and trustworthy behaviours in order to earn trust from other members. At the same time, group members are maximising utility for self-interested purposes by displaying social and moral trusting behaviours.
There is one similarity between interpersonal trust and group trust. Given the situation that the truster does not have any experience of dealings with the trustee (or trustees in a group), the truster has to take a low risk and base trust on personal credentials and group reputation (Stzompka, 1999:71; Hardin, 2002:139). For example, Jane will not enrol her daughter in School A if most of the students in the school have a record of low academic achievement.

In this thesis, I define trust as the expectation that the trusted party (B) will act in the best interest of the truster (A) within the norm of reciprocity and that the truster and the trusted will exchange favours (X) asynchronously. This concept is explained by a three-part relation: ‘A trusts B to do X’ (Hardin, 2002:7-10). Thus, ‘trust and reciprocity’ is one concept which consists of the two components of ‘trust’ and ‘reciprocity’. This definition is derived from Hardin’s (2002:3) encapsulated trust, which emphasises that ‘the trusted party has incentive to be trustworthy, incentive that is grounded in the value of maintaining the relationship into the future’. This definition is more suitable for the purpose of this thesis than Stzompka’s, because every social group has different expectations of levels of trust among its members in different situations. Thus, it is not a simple risky bet that can be equally weighted in each social setting. For example, in a neighbourhood, neighbours may be expected to collect each other’s mail while people are away but they are not expected to lend each other large amounts of money.

In addition, generalised trust as defined relates to generalised trust in and reciprocity with other people (including strangers) in the wider society. Members of the wider society trust and reciprocate in semi-asynchronous ways. More detailed discussion will be presented later in next chapter in the section ‘Generalised social capital’.

TRUSTWORTHINESS, DISTRUST AND COOPERATION

‘Trust is unproblematic in a world in which everyone is trustworthy …‘ (Cook et al., 2005:20). The risk attached to acting on trust would be much lower if everyone were highly trustworthy. By ‘trustworthiness’, Hardin (2002:28) means the commitment shown by the trusted person to fulfilling the truster’s trust. Like the concept of trust, the trustworthiness of a person is often judged in specific relational contexts (Cook et al., 2005:26). In other words, the truster’s judgement about the trustworthiness of the trusted party will vary with different expected actions and in different situations. Thus,
whom do we choose to trust to fulfil what we expect? We usually trust our family and friends because past experiences give us some basis for believing in their trustworthiness. However, it is rather hard to know how trustworthy people who are new to us (strangers) are. Thus, in most situations involving high risk with dealing with strangers or people they hardly know, a person usually seeks legal protection, such as a contract (Fukuyama, 1995:27; Putnam, 2000:136; Cook et al., 2005:80). Unfortunately, most of the daily decisions we make would be far too costly if they had to be enforced by law. For example, we have to take certain risks to live with new tenants in a shared apartment. Even if there is a rental contract between the new tenant and the landlord, the old tenants might still be wary about the trustworthiness of the new tenant. Given circumstances where one has to cooperate with a stranger, the game theory thought experiment 'Prisoner’s dilemma' helps to conceptualise this situation.

'Prisoner’s dilemma' was made popular by Rapoport and Chammah (1965). The game got its name from the following hypothetical situation (I have made some modification): imagine two suspects (say A and B) are arrested under suspicion of having committed a crime together. The police are convinced that the two suspects have committed a major crime, but they lack evidence. In order to get that evidence, the police take each of them aside privately and offer each a deal. If either suspect confesses, the police can then use that evidence against the other suspect. In this situation, the confessor escapes a jail sentence, but the convicted suspect faces the maximum jail sentence (say 20 years). But what if both confess? In that case the police have evidence against both of them and have no need to offer any deals. In this case they will both get moderate jail terms (say 16 years each). And if neither confesses, they will get both a lighter punishment (say 8 years). The two suspects can choose between two moves: either remain loyal to their confederate and refuse to confess (a move which is termed 'cooperate') or betray him and hope to be set free (a move which is termed 'defect'). The best outcome for any one player is that he defects while the other remains loyal and cooperates, while the best outcome for the two of them together as a mini community is that they remain loyal to each other and neither defects. This is illustrated in Table 2.1 below.
Table 2.1 Prisoner's dilemma: four possible outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant</th>
<th>Scenario Description</th>
<th>Payoffs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Neither confesses (this is called 'the reward')</td>
<td>A gets 8 years jail and earns 3 points; B gets 8 years jail and earns 3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>A confesses and goes free, and earns 5 points (A takes the 'temptation'); B does not confess and serves 20 years and earns no points (B gets 'the sucker's payoff')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>A does not confess and serves 20 years and earns no points (A gets 'the sucker's payoff'); B confesses and goes free, and earns 5 points (B takes the 'temptation')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Both confess (this is called 'the punishment'); A gets 16 years jail and earns 1 point; B gets 16 years jail and earns 1 point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Ridley (1996:54)

Note: The points are allocated according to the conventions of the game.

Based on Table 2.1, a simple probability of a 'win-lose' situation arises for each suspect based on the decision whether to cooperate or not. The dilemma resides in the fact that each suspect has a choice between only two options, but cannot make a good decision without knowing what the other one will do.

In quadrant IV, both suspects experience a 'lose-lose' situation with each getting a 16-year term if they confess and getting only one point each. In contrast in quadrants II and III, there is a 'win-lose' situation as one suspect gains at the expense of the other who is faced with the maximum term. Here defectors serve no time and win five points while cooperators get the 'sucker's payoff', serve twenty years and win no points.

In quadrant I, each suspect faces an eight-year term (three points) and one can describe this as a 'win-win' situation for both suspects. This is the best communal outcome for A and B considered as a group rather than as two selfish individuals. In quadrant I, the joint score is six points compared to a 'joint' score of five points in quadrants II and III and one of only two points in quadrant IV.

Ridley (1996) deduces that the ideal action would be for both suspects to cooperate by trusting each other to share the rewards and avoid punishments. Either one of the suspects could be a defector and choose to take advantage of the trust of the other; but they risk paying the price of maximum punishment if both of the suspects choose the same path. In other words, the points that A earns when he or she chooses to cooperate
(not to confess) are just a bit higher than the points if he or she defects, provided that the other prisoner cooperates too. The game thus serves as an exemplar of a situation where individual and collective interests conflict (Ridley, 1996:53, 56). It also exemplifies the dilemma of collective action (see the discussion of Putnam’s work on page 25). In real life, it takes many successful cooperations to build a good reputation and trust, but just one betrayal can destroy the trust which has been built over time (Hardin, 2002:90). Indeed, it is much harder to rebuild trust which has been destroyed than to create trust initially. Thus, one has to consider the potential gain and loss from a longer run of repeated interaction and weigh that gain against the loss from a single risk of cooperation’ (Hardin, 2002:91).

The simple prisoner’s dilemma is a one-shot game\textsuperscript{1}. The problem with a one-shot game is that if both decision-makers were purely rational, they would never cooperate. Indeed, rational decision-making means that you make the decision which is best for you whatever the other actor chooses. Under this circumstance, one would always defect since it is the best strategy for individual gain. Prisoner’s dilemma is interesting to social scientists concerned with the generation of social capital because it exemplifies in microcosm the dilemma of collective action. Thus, under what circumstances will a person follow their individual interests and refrain from cooperating? What motivates people to cooperate instead of defecting? These issues, in essence, address the functions of social capital.

In real-life situations, we handle daily encounters repeatedly with small groups of people. With long term relationship in groups, there is lower probability of either party defecting, in comparison to one-off prisoner’s-dilemma opportunities. The embedded trust and reciprocity in group social relations encourage members of groups to cooperate and make asynchronous exchanges. This cooperation among self-interested individuals could then nurture trustworthy behaviour (Betts, 1998:260). Furthermore, the norms of reciprocity in the community reward those who cooperate and sanction those who defect. Those who earn a trustworthy reputation through cooperation stay in the group and enjoy the shared efforts together, while known defectors may face exclusion.

\textsuperscript{1} For further readings on the advancement of the games of iterated prisoner’s dilemma please refer to Ridley’s (1996) book, \textit{The origins of virtue: human instincts and the evolution of cooperation}. New York: Viking.
SOCIAL CAPITAL

So far I have discussed how trust is built and how individuals can cooperate for the benefit of themselves and others. In this section I discuss the concept of social capital, which allows norms of trust and reciprocal cooperation to work together for the common good.

If capital is an asset, who owns it? The classical Marxist concept of economic capital includes different classes with their own priorities, which results in an imbalance between the working class and the owners of the means of production (Lin, 2001). That is why there is tension and struggle between classes. In neoclassical capital theory, with concepts such as human capital and cultural capital, individuals are often seen as actively finding ways to improve their lives and gain more capital which is valued in the market place (Lin, 2001). For example, people will invest in their education (human capital) so that they can get better jobs and higher pay. Education increases their economic value as individuals, giving them the skills and tools to make more money. Likewise, those who invest in cultural capital will learn or reinforce the rituals in their culture to utilise the capital which is owned by certain group of people (e.g. foreigners learning the Mandarin language and using chopsticks to eat in order to build business relations with Chinese people). With respect to social capital, how building social relations can benefit the individuals or the group will be discussed next.

Although almost a decade has passed since the concept of social capital was brought to the attention of the broader sociological community by Putnam’s best selling book, *Bowling Alone* (2000), scholars still hold different perspectives on it. However, they all agree that social capital is ‘something valuable’ within social relations. On what is this ‘something valuable’ based? There are two main streams in the literature. One presents social capital as resources that bring returns which are valued in the market place (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1988a; Lin, 2001). Here social capital is often conceptualised as an attribute of individuals who develop and maintain their economic capital or human capital within their social networks. The second stream focuses on norms of trust and reciprocity which can facilitate cooperation (Putnam 1993b; Cox, 1995; Fukuyama, 1995; Betts, 1997). Here social capital is usually conceptualised as an attribute of communities or societies.
Bourdieu (1986:248-249) defines social capital as:

the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition—or in other words, to membership in a group—which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectivity-owned capital, a 'credential' which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word. These relationships may exist only in the practical state, in material and/symbolic exchanges which help to maintain them. They may also be socially instituted and guaranteed by the application of a common name (the name of a family, a class, or a tribe or of a school, a party, etc.) and by a whole set of instituting acts designed simultaneously to form and inform those who undergo them; in this case, they are more or less really enacted and so maintained and reinforced, in exchanges.

Bourdieu sees the act of building social connections as an investment strategy for actors who want to enlarge their economic capital. Bourdieu's interest is very much in the convertibility of social capital into economic capital. He says that:

capital can present itself in three fundamental guises: as economic capital, which is immediately convertible into money and may be institutionalised in the form of property rights; as cultural capital, which is convertible, on certain conditions, into economic capital and may be in institutionalised in the form of educational qualifications; and as social capital, made up of social obligations ('connections'), which is convertible, in certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalised in the form of a title of nobility (Bourdieu (1986:243).

In other words, Bourdieu is asserting that the aim of the conversion between different capitals is to produce more economic capital. He recognises that the transmission of different types of capital has a cost, bringing a risk of loss and involving uncertainty in the transactions between holders of different types. Bourdieu explains that the recognition of this uncertainty tends:

… to produce a social capital in the form of a capital of obligations that are usable in the more or less long term (exchanges of gifts, services, visits) necessarily entails the risk of ingratitude, the refusal of that recognition of nonguaranteed debts which such exchanges aim to produce (1986:254).

To conclude, Bourdieu's concept of social capital emphasises how people consciously or unconsciously establish social relations within groups or institutions in order to exchange resources. He is interested in the conversion of social capital into economic
capital and he recognises the potential risks and problems that people face in the process of these conversions. This might suggest that individuals who hold any of these forms of capital can produce the other forms of capital and so expand their resources. It is perhaps for this reason that Coleman (1988a:S101) extends Bourdieu’s concept to define social capital as ‘the value of these aspects of social structure to actors as resources that they can use to achieve their interests’. He builds on Bourdieu’s point that resources are embedded in social relations and explains that an individual can actively tap into these resources for his or her own use so as to achieve individual goals.

Coleman (1988a) discusses how individuals can gain resources from social relations in three forms of social capital: obligations and expectations, information channels, and social norms. Firstly, social capital is formed when one has to fulfil obligations and at the same time is expecting others to fulfil one’s own needs. The term ‘credit slip’ was used to describe a system which was created during the helping process. When one person (A) helps another (B), it is as if B receives a credit slip from A for his generosity. There is a tacit understanding that, at some time in the future, the recipient (B) will reciprocate. Without mutual trust, this system would not function as we can see in Bourdieu’s discussion of the problem of transmitting capitals among actors.

Secondly, Coleman asserts that the flow of information from one party to another is one form of social capital based on trust. For example, a neighbour might trust another neighbour to recommend a good pharmacist or a good eating place. Coleman also suggests a third form of social capital that originates from social norms with sanctions. He cites the following example: ‘Effective norms that inhibit crime make it possible to walk freely outside at night in a city and enable old persons to leave their houses without fear for their safety’ (Coleman, 1988a:S104). He then explains that this form of social capital will work if an individual relinquishes their self-interest and puts the interest of the group as their first priority (Coleman, 1998a). Furthermore, effective norms with rewards and sanctions help individuals to work for the common good. For example, the norms of a neighbourhood would reward people who keep their front yard clean and tidy and constrain people from littering.

For Coleman (1988a:S105-108), the closure of one’s social networks is ideal for the formation of social capital. This exclusive form of membership is closed to non-
members and allows trust to accumulate between known members. Furthermore, closure allows social norms to be implemented in the closed circle. Members have expectations of and obligations to each other because collective sanctions can be performed within this closed social structure (Coleman, 1988a:S107-108). In fact, members of the network have to show their trustworthiness to the group and maintain their reputations for trustworthy behaviour to avoid sanctions. Thus, Coleman concludes that ‘closure creates trustworthiness in a social structure’ (1988a:S108). For example, in a community with many overlapping networks, the community members will feel the responsibility to enforce social norms with each other more strongly compared to members of a different community with fewer overlapping networks. For instance, consider the closure of one triangular social network: Jim and Sean were good friends. Sean and Nicole were neighbours. Sean introduced Jim to Nicole and they became good friends. Thus, a triangular social network had formed. Jim, Sean and Nicole were nature-lovers and environmental activists. Sean and Jim actively influenced Nicole to join in a recycling campaign. Sean and Nicole shared their awareness of global warming with other neighbours. Furthermore, Jim, Nicole and Sean also reminded one another to buy environmentally friendly products when they went shopping together. Thus, trust, and therefore social capital, within the group may have grown as the three became more united and relied on each other to achieve common goals in different contexts.

Coleman’s (1988a, 1988b) research interests revolve around education and social policy at two levels of analysis: family and community. Firstly, Coleman (1988a) argues that family social capital is important in ensuring children's academic achievement. More details of his concept of family social capital will be discussed in next chapter. At the community level, Coleman (1988b:382) asserts that social capital is a resource which helps students in completing their high school education and helps schools in achieving their education goals via the establishment of close parent-child relationships in the family and also in the surrounding community. In this context, trust and trustworthiness are important aspects of social capital (1988b:392). Coleman (1988b) studies the allocation of rights to individuals and to various kinds of corporate bodies and the implications of this for the creation and destruction of social capital at the community level.
For Lin (2001:41) social capital is a personal resource, consisting of social networks that an individual may call upon. Lin (2001:29,43) defines social capital as "resources embedded in a social structure that are accessed and/or mobilised in purposive actions", and he defines social resources, or social capital, "as those resources accessible through social connections". Lin's research focuses on how individuals can tap into resources within their networks and create more capital. Two methods are used to measure social capital: name generators and position generators (Lin, 2001). In short, these measurements require respondents to write down whom they know (social contacts), social positions of these contacts, and what sort of help they can get from their contacts. Lin (2001:56) argues that valued resources are intrinsically attached to positions closer to the top of a structure and that people occupying them have greater access to positions at other rankings. He (2001:76) identifies three factors which determine the quality of a person's social capital: structural position (pyramidal hierarchy); network location (bridging and strength of ties); and purpose of action (instrumental or expressive). He argues that more resources are embedded in higher positions; the stronger the tie, the higher the tendency that the social capital accessed will positively affect the success of expressive action; the weaker the tie (thus the greater access to different networks), the more likely the individual can gain access to better social capital to further an instrumental action (Lin, 2001:76). He explains that individuals are motivated to maintain or gain their resources in purposive social actions (Lin, 2001:75).

Robert Putnam defines social capital as "the features of social organisation, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit" (Putnam, 1993a:36). Putnam (1995a:48) and Cook et al. (2005:159) both cite Alexis de Tocqueville's visit to America in the early nineteenth century and how he was amazed by the way in which Americans exercised their democratic rights via being actively involved in voluntary associations. Both Putnam and Cook see this as an example of how social capital is formed by individuals with trusting relations and networks. From there, Putnam (2000:48-64) investigated the rise and fall of civic engagement and participation in voluntary associations and how they affect social capital in America. Putnam proposed that:

whereas physical capital refers to physical objects and human capital refers to properties of individuals, social capital refers to connections among individuals —social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them (2000:19).
Putnam (2000:93-147) then measured social capital by the level of community organisational life, engagement in public affairs, community volunteerism, informal sociability and social trust. Putnam (2000:277-284) found consistent evidence that the decline of civic engagement from 1965 to 2000 was caused by generational change in America, the long-term effects of television, structural changes in the family due to changing patterns of work and commuting and suburbanisation sprawl.

Putnam (1995a:67) claims that networks of civic engagement enhance norms of generalised reciprocity and encourage members of society to build trust. He explains that dilemmas of collective action can be solved by facilitating more communication among members of society and by reducing the incentive for opportunism, self-interested action or defection.

Similarly, Fukuyama’s work also focuses on social capital at the group level. He (1995:26) says that social capital is:

> a capability that arises from the prevalence of trust in a society or in certain parts of it. It can be embodied in the smallest and most basic social group, the family, as well as the largest of all groups, the nation, and in all the other groups in between [these two groups].

Fukuyama (1995:26-27) asserts that a high-trust society is capable of achieving more effective organisations because members of an organisation trust one another by holding a common set of ethical norms. He emphasises that social capital is formed on the basis of mutual trust among group members rather than by individual virtues. The moral norms of a community (constituting virtues like ‘loyalty, honesty and dependability’) are more likely to create social capital than are individual acts of virtue, as ethical habits are more likely to be maintained and sustained by moral norms than by individuals (Fukuyama, 1995:27). Furthermore, he (1995:27) uses the term ‘spontaneous sociability’ to describe that subset of social capital which refers to ‘the capacity to form new associations and to cooperate within the terms of reference they establish’. Both Putnam and Fukuyama emphasise trust as the most important component in forming social capital. However, Fukuyama gives more weight to the role of culture in cultivating ethical habits than to the role of civic engagement in forming norms of trust as suggested by Putnam. I disagree with Fukuyama’s argument and I see ethical habits
in cultivating norms of trust in the family as as important as civic engagement in cultivating norms of trust with people beyond the family.

For the purposes of this thesis I define social capital in terms of the quality of relationships between members of a group rather than as resources owned by individuals. A group could refer to formal association (e.g. football club) or informal group (e.g. friends) or to institutions (e.g. business organisations). Every individual in a group plays an important part by forming the group’s level of trust. Individuals not only play a part by putting their trust in others, they also have to show their trustworthiness to balance the dynamic of trust in a group. Thus, social capital is not just a directory of contacts that an individual could use to maximise his or her resources, it is shared by members of a group. This suggests that social capital cannot be measured by the social resources that any particular individual could tap into to advance their private goals. But individuals can access the social capital prevalent within the settings they are in to achieve a goal. While social capital is a property of collectivities, it is still a resource that individuals can use. Indeed, social capital grows with use. The more that we find that our associates are trustworthy, the more we trust them.

Defining social capital from an individual viewpoint does not show the dynamics of the accumulation of social capital in a collective unit. Furthermore, the trust that an individual has invested in a group cannot be possessed only by that individual. In fact, when one gains a reputation for trustworthiness from others, mutual trust is formed between individuals. Thus, the benefit of trusting and being trustworthy is only meaningful on a group basis because an individual could not sustain his trustworthiness without taking the risk of trusting others. Furthermore, a trustworthy person has to trust others in the group in order to maintain his or her reputation for trustworthiness. After all, ‘social capital cannot be generated by individuals acting on their own in isolation’ (Onyx & Bullen, 2000). In fact, it involves the exchange of trust and favours between individuals in different social settings. Nonetheless, individuals can benefits from high-trust networks and achieve their personal goals as well as the common goals of the group.

Norms of trust embedded in social ties and networks allow the production of social capital. However, some researchers do not agree that social capital is comprised of trust.
Instead, they assert that trust is the outcome of social capital (Lin, 2001; Woolcock, 2001). They argue that the conceptualisation of social capital should focus on the primary social networks instead of its potential product (i.e. trust). Woolcock (2001:2) defines social capital as ‘the norms and networks that facilitate collective action’. I disagree with this concept because, without trust, networks are merely social contacts which cannot facilitate collective action. The norms that Woolcock refers to should be the norms of trust and reciprocity, where members of social networks have mutual agreements and understandings that they would help each other out for the benefit of all. Thus, trust is the essential ingredient of social capital. With trust, members of the community can easily solve the prisoner’s dilemma’ (Ridley, 1996) and work on collective action via building and maintaining social networks which are embedded with norms of trust and reciprocity.

Moreover, the function of social capital simplifies the complexity of human interaction and reduces the risks in every emotional or physical transaction. For example, when social capital is high, individuals are less fearful of dishonesty and fraud when trading in business. The presence of social capital allows members to cooperate for common goals. Thus, listing who you know and what they can do for you is just indicating the outcomes of having social capital but it is not the experience of social capital itself. So I disagree with Lin’s measurement of social capital. He uses his own framework of ‘position generator’ and ‘name generator’ to evaluate the resources embedded in one’s personal networks. Instead, I focus on the measurement of trust and reciprocity which indicates the experience of social capital. However, the mobility of social capital across different networks took place at both network-based model of social capital and also trust-based model of social capital. While network-based analysts focus on how capital can be transferred to social networks, I am interested in studying whether the more practice of building social capital in one social setting is associated with the higher levels of social capital in another social setting.

TYPES OF SOCIAL CAPITAL
There are three types of social capital discussed in the current literature: bonding social capital; bridging social capital; and linking social capital. Putnam (2000:22-23) defines bonding social capital as that which is reinforced in homogenous groups which share the same identity in an inner social network, such as relationships between family and
friends. Woolcock (2000:17-19) shares the same view and defines bonding social capital as the strong social ties (i.e. social connections) that exist among groups of people who share similar values, interests and backgrounds. This constitutes the social glue that supports interdependencies. Thus, strong ties usually are formed within a structure of bonding social capital. Iterated interactions between members of strong-tie social networks reinforce a group’s identity and homogeneity (Putnam, 2000:22-23). In these iterated relationships, members interact through overlapping relations and form _thick_ relationships (Hardin, 2002). The exclusivity of membership in such a social network was explained in Coleman’s (1988b) argument about the closure of a network structure. In a closed type of social network, norms can be easily enforced in the group and social capital is formed within its social relations.

In contrast to bonding social capital, Putnam describes bridging social capital as characterized by open networks which connect people _across diverse social cleavages_ (Putnam, 2000:22). Woolcock (2000) relates bridging social capital to networks between different social groups — between different generations, cultural, ethnic and religious groups. These ties are generally weaker, with less intense attachments, than ties within bonding social capital. They are cross-cutting connections between heterogeneous peoples that can foster trust and mutual understanding. They consist of weak ties, originating from Granovetter’s (1973) research on _the strength of weak ties_, which emphasises the advantages of weak ties in job-searching and getting information. These weak ties have advantages because they link people to very different groups which will have different sources of information compared to the intimate group with which an individual is most closely associated. In fact, those with dense social ties are disadvantaged on the job market because, as job seekers, they may receive limited information on newly available jobs. In other words, acquaintances are more of a help than close friends because they are interconnected to different social circles.

Thirdly, Woolcock (2000) defines linking social capital as the ties that connect people and communities to sources of power and to resources that lie beyond the neighbourhood in the wider society, notably in formal institutions. These relationships facilitate social leverage, providing access, information and opportunities to people with less power and with a lower social status.
In this thesis, I study bonding social capital and bridging social capital. Trust and reciprocity in the family and among close friends are considered bonding social capital. On the other hand, connections with neighbours, acquaintances, and people in general are social links where bridging social capital can be formed. I see both types of social capital as important to young people. Bonding social capital provides stable and more secure interactions than bridging social capital. However, bridging social capital allows broader social connections to emerge with people from different social backgrounds. Thus, both types of social capital are studied in detail. More discussion of social capital in different social settings will be presented in next chapter.

THE DARK SIDE OF SOCIAL CAPITAL: BRIDGING VERSUS BONDING SOCIAL CAPITAL

A number of researchers have debated the dark side of social capital since the publication of Alejandro Portes and Patricia Landolt’s article on ‘The downside of social capital’ in 1996. As a result, terms like ‘bad social capital’, ‘unsocial capital’, ‘negative social capital’ and the ‘dark side of social capital’ have appeared in the literature on social capital to describe the negative effects of trust and reciprocity in social networks. To understand the conception of the ‘dark side of social capital’, Van Deth and Zmerli (2010) propose that there are two ways to measure the negative consequences of social capital: looking at whether social capital reduces desirable outcomes (e.g. social equality or tolerance); or whether social capital increases undesirable outcomes (e.g. social exclusion or corruption). Van Deth and Zmerli (2010) claim that when a community is full of strong ties and dense networks, the risks of social exclusion and corruption are much higher (van Deth & Zmerli, 2010). Indeed, as opposed to Putnam’s (2000) findings, Aldridge et al. (2002:31-33) report that social capital: fosters ‘behaviour that worsens rather than improves economic performance’; acts as a barrier to social inclusion and social mobility; divides ‘rather than unites communities or societies’; facilitates ‘rather than reduces crime’, contributes to ‘education underachievement and health-damaging behaviour’. According to Roßteutscher (2010), social capital is a stabiliser for the nondemocratic leadership rather than a promoter of democratic society. There are three functions of social capital: generating popular support for nondemocratic government; suppressing regime-threatening forms of protest activity; and nourishing undemocratic ideals concerning governance (Roßteutscher, 2010).
Networks among neighbours are usually positively related to exchange and collective efficacy. However, the same social ties that tend to strengthen collective norms may also lead to collusive tolerance of norm contravention (Browning, 2009:1574).

Browning (2009) asserts that social capital among neighbours does not always provide informal social control in preventing crime. He observes that offenders often reside in the neighbourhoods they offend in. Thus, Browning (2009) argues that social cohesion in neighbourhoods promotes the extensive integration of offenders and conventional residents. For example, charges against young offenders might be dropped because victims happened to know the young offender parents. On the other hand, corruption may also occur because of the unhealthy collective norms among groups with strong ties, like strong family ties (Graeff, 2007).

The fundamental premise of the dark side of social capital is a key to understanding the difference between bridging and bonding types of social capital. Woolcock and Narayan (2000) assert that the function of bonding social capital is to ‘get by’ (e.g. getting emotional support from the closed network) and extensive bridging social capital allows members of networks to ‘get ahead’ (e.g. get more trading opportunities from other networks). The literature on the negative effects of social capital is mainly focused on the undesirable phenomena of social exclusion, social inequality, undemocratic society, corruption produced by bonding social capital in the absence of bridging social capital. Lin (2000) identifies two principles in explaining the relationship between inequality and social capital: the existence of a certain group clusters at relatively disadvantaged socioeconomic positions; and the general tendency for individuals to associate with those in similar groups or with similar socioeconomic characteristics (homophily). Lin (2000:787) explains that:

The first principle reflects a structural process: social groups differentially occupy socioeconomic standings in a society. Depending on the processes of historical and institutional constructions, each society structurally has provided unequal opportunities to members of different groups defined over race, gender, religion, caste, or other ascribed or constructed characteristics. The second principle, homophily, suggests a general tendency in networking: the tendency for individuals to interact and share sentiment with others with similar characteristics. Thus, members of a social group tend to form networks involving other members from the same group.
This explanation shed some lights on what constitute the mechanisms of social inequality. There are four negative effects of social capital: exclusion of outsiders, limitation of network expansion, restrictions of the freedoms of insiders (through conformity) and downward levelling of norms (Portes & Landolt, 1996; Portes, 1998). Firstly, social exclusion exists because strong social ties prevent newcomers from competing in the same market. For example, African American contractors have been excluded from the white- and immigrant-dominated construction industry in the United States (Portes & Landolt, 1996: 19). They were not welcomed in the well established dense social networks even though they had good skills and qualifications.

Secondly, the closure of strong-tie networks firmly retains their members in their social circles and restricts the expansion of the social networks. Under this circumstance, the shared normative structure allows less diligent members to free ride and they can enjoy their access to resources embedded in the networks. In fact, closed networks also hinder entrepreneurship opportunities because new information is being blocked. Van Deth and Zmerli (2010) also assert that especially small-scale organisations with closed networks hinder social cohesion. This is because social cohesion, a production of collective goods, is based on collective decisions and negotiation of solutions. However, these qualities of networks (i.e. small and closed) which consist of bonding social capital that is too strong are barriers for collaboration between different social groups.

Thirdly, social conformity in a community restricts the freedoms of its members. In a small and stagnant network, members of the network have to bear the side effect of constantly being ‘watched’ by neighbours. Thus, individuals may have to sacrifice their privacy and autonomy in such networks. Finally, social capital creates downward-leveling pressures for members of networks who would like to enter the mainstream, discouraging upward mobility.

In the family context, Edward Banfield introduces the concept of ‘amoral familism’ in his book The Moral Basis of a Backward Society (1967). He (1967:83) defines amoral familism as the tendency to ‘maximise the material, short-run advantage of the nuclear family; assume that all others will do likewise’. In other words, amoral familists give priority only to the interests of their nuclear family only and will not show concern in the broader community. They will not engage with civil society, neighbours and church
members. Fukuyama (1995) expands Banfield’s idea and discusses Chinese Confucianism, which emphasises familism, and how this Chinese culture affects participation in associations in civil society. Furthermore, strong and independent collective identities based on family ties might create negative effects (van Deth & Zmerli, 2010). These types of inward-looking and isolated networks usually are independently sustain in the community and create intolerance and ‘uncivicneess’ towards other social groups.

In addition to social exclusion, inequality and intolerance are the two other indicators of the dark side of social capital as suggested by Putnam (2000). Adhikari and Goldey’s (2010) study of communities in Nepal found that inequality exists between the privileged and the village people. They (2010) found that the structure in caste- and class-based hierarchical social organisations allows those at the top of the hierarchy to break rules. Unfortunately it is impractical to impose sanctions on powerful people. This inequality enables the privileged group to capture more resources at the expense of the underprivileged.

Iglic found a negative relationship between associational involvement and attitudes of social and political tolerance in Eastern and Central European countries (Iglic, 2010). She asserts that a strong civil society does not necessarily produce social cohesion among people of different social, ethnic, religious and political groups. Her (2010) research reveals that members of homogenous associations who form dense and closed networks among co-members tend to have low generalised trust. This implies that strengthening civic engagement in networks with low generalised trust might create low social tolerance in diverse groups in the communities.

To conclude here, bonding social capital can have negative effects on the wider society by increasing social inclusion and social inequality. This prompts to study whether bonding social capital is associated with non-participation in organised groups. On the contrary, bridging social capital seems to more useful in creating beneficial connections across different social networks. Thus I will explore in this research whether young people will be more likely to participate in civil society if they enjoy building bridging social capital with their neighbours.
DEFINITION OF KEY CONCEPTS

Social capital
In this thesis, social capital is defined as norms of trust and reciprocity held by a group of individuals. This group of people trust one another and behave in a trustworthy manner themselves. This means they keep promises to reciprocate in asynchronous exchanges and trust others to do likewise. The idea of norms provides a guideline as to how individuals should act in a trustworthy fashion and to what extent individuals should place trust in other members of their informal group. Leonard and Onyx (2004:100) say that social norms are:

> generally unwritten but commonly understood rules or formulae for both determining what patterns of behaviour are expected in a given social context and for defining what forms of behaviour are valued or socially approved.

Because it is embedded in social norms, social capital facilitates cooperative behaviour both in face-to-face encounters and at the level of broader social institutions. This definition of social capital is derived from Putnam's (1993b:41) definition of social capital as "the features of social organisation, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit". I also take Coleman's concept of a 'credit slip' into account which emphasises the reciprocal exchanges among group members that take place asynchronously. The individual might help others at a personal cost, but in the general expectation that this kindness will be returned at some undefined time in the future in case of need (Leonard & Onyx, 2004:4).

Furthermore, I emphasise that trust and reciprocity is social capital where members of formal or informal groups behave in a trustworthy fashion and form high levels of trust within the norms of a group. Thus social capital is not considered as a property owned by a person. Rather, it is the trusting norms held by a group of people. This group may be as small as a dyad or as large as a nation.

Group
A group is:

> a number of individuals, defined by formal or informal criteria of membership, who share a feeling of unity or are bound together in relatively stable patterns of interaction. The latter criterion is necessary in order to distinguish social groups from other aggregates dealt with by sociologists which are grouped only in the statistical sense that they
share some socially relevant characteristic (including, for example, social categories such as suburban residents or junior managers). However, the term is one of the most widely used in sociology, and will often be found applied to combinations of people who may or may not share a feeling of unity (as in social class groups) and may or may not be involved in regular social interaction (as in the case of members of certain ethnic groups). (Scott & Marshall, 2005:1)

A simple definition of social groups is, “collectivities of individuals who interact and form social relationships” (Abercrombie, Hill & Turner, 2000:158).

Fukuyama (1995:26) explains that the formation of social groups is based on a voluntary contract between individuals who have made the rational calculation that cooperation is in their long-term self-interest. However, the formation of a group can be just based on legal mechanisms, which do not involve trust to achieve cooperation in a group (Fukuyama, 1995:26).

I define a group as a number of individuals who share membership in a formal organised group (sports, service group, church group), an informal social group (neighbourhood, family, friends, acquaintances) or a section of the wider society. Group members have to consciously recognise their belonging to the group formally or informally. Thus, they are not a collection of people who share the same characteristics and fall into a category unconsciously; for example, club members might have to pay annual membership fees formally and they are certainly aware of their membership of the group. For some people, showing up to every family gathering like Christmas dinner or birthday parties is an informal way of recognising their belonging to their family. This definition of group agrees with Scott and Marshall’s (2005:[1]) emphasis that groups should be distinguished from aggregates. Furthermore, as Abercrombie, Hill and Turner (2000:158) say, group members interact collectively in a social group. This shows that group members share some interests and cooperate voluntarily as explained by Fukuyama (1995:26).

**Trust and reciprocity**

In this thesis, I define trust as the expectation that the trusted party will act in the best interest of the truster, within the norms of reciprocity, and that the truster and the trusted party will exchange favours asynchronously. This definition emphasises that group
members place trust in one another based on their interaction in the group. However, trust and reciprocity can be generalised to people in general (including strangers in the wider society).

**Closeness**

There are different degrees of closeness between individuals and the rest of the group’s members. One could get more emotional resources or practical resources from someone whom one is close to. Someone one is close to is someone whom one is comfortable being with, whom one can share private matters with, and whom one can ask for help when needed.

**Young people**

In this research, youth is defined as those aged 16 to 25. This category of young people mainly consists of those whose social groups are expanding and who most probably are going through some transition period (e.g. legally just finished schooling, pursuing higher education, looking for a job).

**CONCLUSION**

I have so far established the concept of social capital using a detailed discussion of trust, and trustworthiness. There are two different ideas about trust defined by Hardin and Stzompka. The essential part of Hardin’s definition of trust is the idea of encapsulated trust which emphasises the cognitive notion that the truster knows that the trusted party has taken the truster’s interests into account and therefore the truster trusts the trusted person. In contrast, Stzompka’s definition of trust rests on the risk that the truster is taking concerning uncertain actions of others in the future. After considering these two different definitions of trust, I adopted Hardin’s definition and from it derived my own definition: trust is the expectation that the trusted party will act in the best interests of the truster within the norms of reciprocity and that the truster and the trusted will exchange favours asynchronously.

Next, I have discussed the definition of social capital from two perspectives. One perspective sees social capital as the resources embedded in social relations. It argues that individuals can tap into the resources from the social connections of personal networks and gain market-valued benefit from these connections for themselves. The
second perspective sees social capital as a shared property of community. Here ‘norms of trust and reciprocity’ are the resource itself which is embedded in social relations. The definition of social capital in this research uses the second perspective of social capital as norms of trust and reciprocity and as a shared property of a group, which may be either large or small, formal or informal. It consists of trust and reciprocity in social groups such as family, friends, neighbourhood, people in general and confidence in major societal organisations.

Social capital refers to the norms of trust and reciprocity held by a group of individuals. Social capital is formed through the exchange of trust and reciprocity between individuals. It is not a property owned by an individual but it is a resource for both individuals and groups to cooperate and achieve their goals. Social capital can be formed in different social settings, such as in the family, among friends, in the neighbourhoods, and among people in general. Social capital also can be shown through confidence in major societal organisations. Social capital can grow with use. The more that we find that our associates are trustworthy, the more we trust them. More discussions of family social capital and social capital in other social settings will be presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3 FAMILY SOCIAL CAPITAL AND SOCIAL CAPITAL IN OTHER SOCIAL SETTINGS

INTRODUCTION
In this chapter I review the literature on family social capital, social capital in other realms (such as among friends, in the neighbourhood and among people in general), and confidence in major societal organisations. The thesis tests the proposition that family social capital is a firm base for cultivating social capital in other realms and that it is related to confidence in major societal organisations.

FAMILY SOCIAL CAPITAL
In this section, I present the work of Coleman (1988a, 1988b), Fukuyama (1995), Braatz and Putnam (1996) and other work on family social capital. There is a colloquial expression: ‘If you can’t trust your family, who can you trust?’ In a family, social relationships usually start with nuclear family members, parents and siblings, and then spread out to extended family members such as grandparents. Winter (2000:7) describes family social capital as the ‘bonding social capital within the informal, intense and durable, face-to-face connections of the household ...’ Family members are the people whom we spend a relatively longer time with compared to people from other relationships and with whom our social bonds are likely to be stronger than with any other relationships. This is characteristic of a ‘thick’ relationship which Hardin (2002:21) explains as ‘overlapping iterated interactions over broad ranges of matters’. This implies that family relationships are strong-tie social networks as a result of their reinforcement in family identity and homogeneity.

A family network is usually exclusive to family members. In this closed type of network structure, norms of trust and reciprocity are easy to enforce because of the implementation of collective sanctions (Coleman, 1988a:S106). Family members often have to trust one another and show their trustworthiness in order to promote cooperation. In the family context, Coleman (1988a:S106) refers to intergenerational closure as the closure of a social structure which consists of parents and children and other relations outside the nuclear family. Intergenerational closure can be formed between individuals and their cousins, parents and aunts or uncles. The burden of the implementation of rewards and sanctions are shared by more people in this type of
closed network. For example, Janice and her cousin Joshua went to a party and both of their nuclear families practise night curfew. Their parents were more willing to give permission to Janice and Joshua to attend the party together than if they were going with other friends, because they knew Janice and Joshua would remind each other about the night curfew to avoid punishment if they got home after the curfew. In addition, if both families emphasise honesty, it is easier to reinforce this value when the families are visiting one another, or when Janice is visiting Joshua’s house or vice versa.

Coleman’s work also focuses on the positive side of family social capital in improving children’s educational outcomes. Coleman (1988b:384) says that ‘social capital of the family is the relation between children and parents (and, when families include other members, relationships with them as well)’. He (1988a, 1988b) shows that, in the USA, the rate of dropping out of school in Catholic schools is much lower than in public or other private schools. He argues that the existence of social capital in the religious community which surrounds a religiously-based school supports young people to finish their high school education.

To be specific, Coleman (1988a, 1988b) examines the effects of parent-child interaction on children’s academic performance. He studies the strength of the relations between parents and children in order to measure family social capital. He investigates the effects of three factors on high school drop out rates: the ratio of parents to children in the household; the mother’s expectation of success of her children; and the disclosure of personal matters to parents. He (1988a:S112) says that the drop-out rate is higher in a single-parent family with five children than in a two-parent family with two children. He believes that a high ratio of parents to children is essential to ensure the quality and quantity of interaction between them. This is related to his argument that single-parent families are the most prominent example of structural deficiency in family social capital (Coleman, 1988a:S111). In other words, children from single-parent households gain less family social capital than children from two-parent households due to the lack of opportunities to interact with both parents. Braatz and Putnam (1996) agree with Coleman and they demonstrate that traditional nuclear families are successful agents of socialisation by giving evidence showing that children from two-parent homes have better educational outcomes. To conclude here, two-parent nuclear families are expected to have more bonding social capital than are one-parent nuclear families.
Mothers’ expectation of their children’s success in further study in college is negatively related to the rate of dropping out of high school (Coleman, 1988a). However, the norm of cooperation within the family, which is measured by the frequency of children sharing their personal matters, has no effect on the rate of dropping out of school. Winter (2000) critiques this measurement of the norms of cooperation; he says that the quantitative indicator of parent-child interaction is not a particularly valid measure of the quality of their interaction (i.e. a particular parent-child interaction might be important). I agree with Winter’s comment and believe that it is more important to study the quality of interactions among family members than to look at a list of parent-child activities as a measurement of cooperation.

However, looking from an economic perspective, Fukuyama has a different view of the contribution of family social capital to society. He (1995:28-29) describes the negative impacts that familistic societies have on generalised trust. In his study of Chinese families, he observes that the Chinese are very loyal to their family due to the implementation of Confucianism, which put family bonds as a priority over all other social ties; not even Buddhist priests are able to draw children out of their families. He says that societies such as the Russian, the French and some parts of the Italian are also familistic. These societies share a lack of trust among people who are not related to one another. As a consequence, voluntary groups which consist of strangers and random people are not common in these societies. In contrast, high-trust societies like Germany, Japan, and the United States are equipped with plentiful social capital due to their strong propensity for spontaneous sociability (Fukuyama, 1995:29). Fukuyama (1995:28) refers to spontaneous sociability as the ‘capacity to form new associations and to cooperate within the terms of reference they establish.’ As a result, these societies are more advanced in their industrial economy because high levels of trust allow people to work together according to their common set of ethical norms.

Alternatively, the social capital generating process might start from the mother-child relationship, where the child has acquired trust through his or her experience of the relationship with the mother (Erickson, 1995). However, when the child grows up, he or she needs extended resources to live and become more independent. Perhaps teachers, relatives and friends will guide him or her in the process, but he or she may have to take the initiative to build more relationships with others and expand his or her social
networks. Then he or she would contribute his or her trust in the expanded networks and also learn the norms of reciprocity in getting and returning favours.

To conclude, family social capital constitutes a base for cultivating norms of trust and reciprocity and hence building social capital in other social settings. Winter (2000:9) argues that ‘social capital is the internalisation and transmission of particular norms’. So the internalisation and transmission of norms of trust and reciprocity should start within the family through socialisation. The closed structure of networks in the family allows more socialisation to transmit norms of trust and reciprocity. However, single-parent families are less advantaged than two-parent families in creating family social capital (Coleman, 1988; Braatz & Putnam, 1996). Although Fukuyama (1999:17) agrees with Putnam (1995) that family social capital is the key source of social capital in the community, his earlier work (Fukuyama 1995) shows the downside of family social capital. Bonding social capital in the family might create the bad social capital, where young people might trust only members within the family. This concept of amoral familism (see Chapter 2) might hinder them from participating in civil society. Thus, the impact of family social capital on generalised trust is still an open question. In the following sections, I discuss social capital in different social settings and with respect to major societal organisations.

SOCIAL CAPITAL AMONG FRIENDS AND ACQUAINTANCES
Friendship is another realm which could create bonding social capital. The word ‘friend’ refers to a broad category of relationship, because a friend could be anyone as long as they are not related by blood. For example, one could develop a friendship with a classmate or with neighbours or even with strangers whom one has met in the street.

Friends serve at least six functions: companionship, stimulation, physical support, ego support, social comparison, and intimacy/affection (Parker and Gottman, 1989). In the process of making friends and keeping friends by carrying out the above functions, one must learn whom one can trust, in what circumstances, and how to be a trustworthy person who merits friendship. Then norms of trust and reciprocity, social capital, will develop between friends and enhance the strength of their friendship.
Claes (1992:40) gives working definitions to three types of friends: intimate friends (‘the small number of friends you meet regularly, share a lot of things with, and feel close to’); friends (‘those you know well, talk to often, and enjoy meeting’); and acquaintances (‘you know their names and exchange little more than a simple hello when you see them’). Different degrees of closeness among friends could help young people learn the norms underlying social capital. Intimate friends provide support and help for each other. The level of trust between intimate friends is higher than between other types of friends. In an intimate friendship situation, friends trust and are committed to each other in an ongoing and presumably long term relationship. This description fits into Putnam’s (2000:22-23) definition of bonding social capital which emphasises the norms of trust in and reciprocity among close friends. Putnam explains that bonding social capital is developed and reinforced in homogenous groups which share the same identity in ‘repeated, intensive, multistranded networks’ such as family and friendship relationships. In addition, a closed type of friendship network structure shows that every member in the friendship group knows one another. So bonding social capital among close friends may be related to closed networks. However, this type of bonding social capital might lead to negative consequences whereby a close group of friends might exclude new comers due to the closure of their friendship networks. In turn, young people with strong bonding social capital among close friends might not be actively participate in organised groups.

Mouw et al. (2006) explain the principle of social homophily, where similar people often group together and build friendships. These researchers agree that this is because individuals choose friends who exhibit similar qualities to them. Thus Mouw et al. (2006) suggest that social capital can be estimated based on this theory about how people become friends. In other words, it is possible that young people who are building social capital through membership of organised groups are also building social capital with their friends if they choose to extend their friendship with members of their organised groups. Or, alternatively, they may join the group with some of their friends.

On the other hand, there are informal relationships that are significant in young people’s lives which do not fit into either the category of friends or the category of family, because they do not involve affection and the people concerned are not close to each other. These people are acquaintances who represent weak ties (loose ties)
(Granovetter, 1973) and whom young people build bridging social capital with. For example, young people may form relationships with neighbours, classmates, university mates, other members of organised groups, colleagues or neighbours, but the relationships do not develop into friendships. Still those people play an important role in the young person’s life and give them a certain degree of assistance or social support in specific contexts; for example, a colleague may give them positive comments on a presentation. So building social capital with acquaintances by trusting and showing trustworthiness matters even when the relationship is not an intimate one.

To conclude, social capital among friends can indicate bonding social capital. The key to maintaining social capital among friends is the ability for them to trust each other and to display their trustworthiness in the group. Our friends are often our mirrors. Friends from similar backgrounds reinforce their identity through their friendship.

SOCIAL CAPITAL AMONG NEIGHBOURS
I have defined social capital as norms of trust and reciprocity held by a group of individuals. Thus social capital is not the property of any one person but rather is a characteristic of a group of people. Despite the fact that social capital can only be the property of a group, it functions as a resource for the individuals who are members of the group. One such group consists of neighbours in a neighbourhood. Social capital in neighbourhood settings refers to the norms of trust and reciprocity among neighbours. People who belong to a neighbourhood characterised by high social capital may have better social outcomes, such as better education levels, lower urban poverty, and lower unemployment, than those who belong to a neighbourhood characterised by low social capital (Putnam, 2000).

Social cohesion refers to the degree of group togetherness, sense of belonging and cooperation in a group (Chong, 2008). It can be a result of the trust and reciprocity embodied in social capital, but its key characteristic is a sense of belonging. This means that it is a distinct concept in its own right. Social cohesion in the context of the neighbourhood refers to dense social connections between neighbours which provide a sense of identity. Forrest and Kearns (2001:2130) argue that ‘residentially based networks [are] … arguably the basic building blocks of social cohesion—through them we learn tolerance, co-operation and acquire a sense of social order and belonging’.
Through relationships with their neighbours, young people are able to build trust and understanding. Ongoing interactions with neighbours provide chances for young people to develop broader social networks. Neighbours learn to know one another through dealing with the matters of daily life. Small business centres, schools, the community library, sports and recreation centres, parks, and community centres are examples of the meeting points where ‘neighbouring’ takes place and neighbours develop their neighbourhood network. Moreover, neighbours might build more than one connection with others at the same time in different social settings. For example, Robert is the bookshop owner in the neighbourhood business centre and Rose is his customer. At the same time, Rose is also Robert’s son’s music teacher.

Here is an example of strong neighbourhood social cohesion: Families A, B and C lived in the neighbourhood of Windsor. All of the families knew one another through different situations and they shared different ties. The children of Families A and B shared the same school bus to go to the same school. Sometimes in the evening, the father of Family A walked Family B’s dog. The mother of Family B and a university student in Family C took the same yoga class. Family B sometimes invited Family C to have dinner. Family A met Family C at a neighbourhood house meeting and they once organised a barbeque lunch at the neighbourhood house. After the tsunami disaster in South East Asia in 2004, all three families took the initiative to raise funds. They felt very proud to be a part of their Windsor neighbourhood because there was a neighbourhood spirit reflecting their shared values.

Forrest and Kearns (2001:2137) present evidence of two different views of neighbourhood social cohesion as either ‘a bottom-up process founded upon local social capital’ or as ‘the downside of social capital’. The former view of social cohesion, exemplified by Putnam’s work argues that ‘engaged communities produce cohesive societies of active citizens’ (Forrest and Kearns, 2001:2137). Neighbours come together to contribute to the democracy of society. They cooperate with one another to overcome neighbourhood issues. In other words, self-help and mutual aid increase the ability of a neighbourhood to overcome poverty, combat increased crime rates and tackle health issues (Putnam, 1995a). The second view of social cohesion as the downside of social capital draws on Fukuyama’s evidence showing the ‘apparent paradox between
increased associational activity and declining level of trust and civic engagement’ (Forrest and Kearns, 2001:2137). Neighbours form groups and cliques based on their common interests. Contrasting interests in different groups and cliques can destroy the norms of trust and reciprocity between groups. Further, social exclusion might occur when the group’s interests solely and exclusively benefit only group members. I agree with Putnam that social capital enables neighbours to work together among themselves, but at the same time strong trust among neighbours can cause distrust towards those from other neighbourhoods. I argue that bridging social capital can link people within the same neighbourhood as well as with people from different neighbourhoods.

Another element which might influence neighbourhood social capital is feelings of safety. Having a sense of security in one’s neighbourhood encourages people to interact freely and openly with neighbours beyond their fences. Onyx and Bullen (2000) treat feelings of trust and safety as one factor of social capital in their measurement of social capital in five communities in Australia. Building on this measurement, Leonard and Onyx (2004) argue that the reverse of fear is trust. In order to build social capital in the community, it is important to identify the feelings of fear of crime and the perception of safety in the community. They argue that feelings of fear might lead to less interaction with the people in the local community and to lack of participation in community activities.

It is hard to form social capital without face-to-face social interaction among neighbours. Ziersch et al. (2005) argue that perceptions of safety increase with the level of neighbourhood trust. They also find that there are gender differences in perceived safety, whereby women report lower levels of perceived safety than men. It seems that neighbourhood social capital and perception of neighbourhood safety are related closely to each other. Morrow’s (2000) research also found that young girls showed more concern than boys about neighbourhood safety. Similarly, Kanan and Pruitt (2002:543) reveal that gender is related to the perceived personal risk of being alone in the neighbourhood at night. Neighbourhood connectedness and period of time lived there were associated with neighbours’ feelings of safety in the neighbourhood (Ziersch et al., 2005). However, Kanan and Putit (2002:545) investigate length of residence and found
that it is not a significant factor relating to perceived neighbourhood safety. Fear and insecure feelings about crimes destroy trust amongst neighbours (Ross & Yang, 2000).

Onyx and Bullen (2000) compare levels of social capital across different communities in urban and rural areas and it seems that rural areas generate higher social capital than urban areas. A greater number of ties between families and friends, neighbourhood, community and workplace is more likely to form among people in rural areas than among people in urban areas. However, Onyx et al. (2005) investigate social capital among young people in a town in a rural area and they find young people are increasingly marginalised. In that town, young people build strong networks with their own peers, rather than with the adult community. To those young people, participation in community activities is associated with negative outcomes because they do not feel safe. Thus, social capital is hard to generate in such an unsupportive environment for young people.

To conclude, social cohesion and feelings of safety are essential in cultivating social capital in neighbourhood settings. Social cohesion provides a comfortable environment in which to encourage interaction among neighbours. This interaction then creates the chances for the formation of social capital. However, this type of close-knit neighbourhood might create social exclusion, which is the downside of social capital. The perception of neighbourhood safety is associated with social capital in neighbourhood settings. Norms of trust and reciprocity provide a sense of security that neighbours care for each other’s safety. Thus, creating social capital in neighbourhoods might not only rely on social interaction but also on the effort of the community in ensuring the safety of the community members (i.e. neighbourhood watch activities, anti-crime campaigns, and road safety week).

GENERALISED SOCIAL CAPITAL AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Cox (2002) found that Australian generalised trust experienced a significant fall from 1983 to 1995 according to the World Values Survey. In 1983, 46 per cent of Australians said that most people can be trusted. This percentage dropped to 39 per cent in 1995 when the same question was asked in the same survey. According to the report of the 2003 Australian Survey of Social Attitudes (AuSSA), only 41 per cent of Australians say that most people can be trusted (Bean, 2005). The latest 2006 General Social Survey
shows that 54 per cent of Australians think that most people can be trusted (General Social Survey, 2007). This evidence shows that Australians’ social trust has not shown a consistent fall in these 23 years. Instead, it has fluctuated throughout the years and is most recently at a point where a majority of Australians say that ‘most people can be trusted’.

The term generalised social capital relates to generalised trust in and reciprocity with other people (including strangers) in the wider society. Members of the wider society trust and reciprocate in semi-asynchronous ways. In other words, the reciprocity process does not take place at the same time with the same person. This is because beyond face-to-face daily interaction with those whom one knows, one has to rely on one’s acquaintances and/or total strangers. Sometimes strangers exchange small favours like offering a hand to carry heavy burdens, giving directions, returning one’s lost belongings and so on. This trust and reciprocity may take place unexpectedly and one may not get to know the stranger well enough to return the favours in future. Thus, one would keep in mind a sense of obligation for these strangers’ kindnesses and feel obliged to reciprocate, not to these same strangers exactly, but to other people.

For instance, in the neighbourhood and community we learn to form generalised trust and reciprocity with the people around us. We trust that the strangers who walk past us will not turn back and rob us and they trust us to behave in a similar fashion. This trust embedded among people in general does not mean blind trust. It means trusting people, including strangers, whom we may reasonably suppose to be trustworthy. Putnam (2000:136) refers to this kind of trust as being embedded in ‘the generalised other’, like new acquaintances, with whom one might share some background of social networks and have some expectations of reciprocity. He claims that generalised trust makes it possible for trust to be extended from the personal network to people in general. Furthermore, generalised trust is strongly related to other forms of civic engagement and social capital (Putnam, 2000:136). For Uslaner (2002:27), the foundation of generalised trust is moralistic trust. Based on morals and collective experiences, trusters choose who should be included in their moral community and generalised trust refers to the perception that most people can be trusted (Uslaner, 2002). In other words, generalised trusters trust in a wide range of strangers because they have good faith that most people they meet share the same moral values. The base of generalised trust in
Putnam’s definition is different from Uslaner’s. Putnam does not emphasise moral values in generalised trust. Indeed, he (2000) asserts that social experience in the greater society is the fundamental base of generalised trust. Uslaner (2002) agrees with Braatz and Putnam (1996) and emphasises that collective social experiences in the community are important in producing generalised trust. Collective social experience refers to how people interact with one another in a community (Uslaner, 2002). Putnam and Uslaner also share a similar concept of generalised trust; they think trust can be generalised to most people, including a wide range of strangers. Also, both researchers used the same item to measure generalised trust: ‘Generally speaking, do you believe that most people can be trusted or you can’t be too careful in dealing with people’ (Uslaner, 2002).

However, Uslaner (2002) disagrees with Putnam’s (2000) ‘virtuous circle’ of trust, civic engagement and informal social networks. Uslaner (2002) argues that most types of civic activity do not produce trust in people who are different from one another. Indeed, he argues that, of these, only joining in volunteer activities increases generalised trust. He (2002) asserts that the motivation to engage in volunteering activities relies on the optimistic view of generalised trusters who are willing to reach out and meet other trusting volunteers, who also have same the moralistic responsibilities to help others. I think that the fundamental difference in how Putnam and Uslaner analyse generalised trust and other variables (i.e. civic engagement, trust in informal social networks and trust in government) is the concept of moralistic trust embedded in Uslaner’s concept of generalised trust. Uslaner (2002) argues that moralistic trust is the good faith of trusters in other people. Thus, it is more of an ethical issue if one is not trusting others rather than a socialisation process that needs practice. For Putnam (2000), generalised trust is produced by brief social encounters in the community like greeting people on the street, doing recreational activities with strangers in the park, comfortably enjoying meals with the presence of other patrons in a restaurant. Thus, with these social practices, one can be motivated to participate in civic activities, and so to make more friends which then reinforces one’s trust in others.

Here I would like to present some of my observations at Youth Services, a department of the city council of Boroondara, Melbourne, in support of my expectation that generalised social capital is built as a result of active participation in organised groups. Steve (pseudonym) is 17 years old and studies at Kew High School. He joined the
3Phase music group, a youth group organised groups by the council, and met other people who were not from his family or his school. By joining this group, Steve opened himself up to another world where he had the chance to organise music gigs and interact actively with the adult group leader and other group members who were from different age groups, schools and backgrounds. This expanded Steve’s social network, or at least a part of it. He also made contacts with bands, local authorities and the media officer at the local council. These became a further part of his expanded network. This broader formal network is made up of contacts outside the 3Phase group who may or may not have had links with the 3Phase group members. For example, Steve got to know the group leader’s brother, who is a lawyer specialising in public liability and Steve later made contact with this lawyer and so came to understand the issue of public liability as it relates to band performance insurance. As this involvement continues, he will learn to honour the commitments he has made to others and to value his reputation for competent trustworthiness. He will also learn how to recognise trustworthiness in others.

Generalised social capital is considered an asset of a society, as it indicates that its members are ready to put trust in others and exchange favours regardless of race or socio-economic differences. Over the last two decades, Australians’ generalised trust has fluctuated but it has slowly increased to a point where slightly over half of Australians think that most people can be trusted. Although this figure is not high enough for us to consider Australia a high-trust country as compared to Denmark (67 per cent) and Sweden (66 per cent) in 2000, it is still a good foundation for studying the significance of generalised trust in promoting civic engagement and its association with social capital in other social settings. In the next section, I present the literature on confidence in major societal organisations, which is closely related to generalised social capital because, similar to generalised social capital, institutional trust is determined by how we generalise our trust from our previous experience with people and organisations.

---

1 Source: World Values Survey Wave IV (Newton, 2007).
CONFIDENCE IN MAJOR SOCIETAL ORGANISATIONS

Barraket (2005) asserts that the community field, which interlinks with external networks, institutions and social systems, provides the structural framework for the development and/or mobilisation of social capital. To differentiate between the concept of interpersonal trust and institutional trust, I use the term ‘confidence in major societal organisations’ to emphasise the non-reciprocal relationship between young people and social institutions. The concept of confidence in major societal organisations is different from the concept of trust that I defined earlier: trust as the expectation that the trusted party will act in the best interest of the truster within the norm of reciprocity that the truster and the trusted will exchange favours asynchronously. I define ‘confidence in major societal organisations’ as trust in an institution involving a belief that the institution has in place processes to ensure that its people are competent and can be expected to act in a predictable, or trustworthy, manner. This definition is an adaptation of Farquharson and Critchley’s (2004:141) definition. In other words, confidence in major societal organisations means we trust that the people working in the whole social system of organisations are trustworthy.

Hardin (1998:16) says that a person’s trust in an institution very much depends on either the positive or negative outcomes of their encounters. Based on this premise, I expect that young people who actively participate in organised groups will potentially have more positive encounters with major societal organisations that will increase their confidence in them, compared to young people who do not actively participate in organised groups. For those individuals who do not have any personal experience with an organisation, the reputation of the organisation is used as important evidence in judging the institution’s trustworthiness (Hardin, 1998:16).

According to the 1995 World Values Survey, the 2001 Australian Election Study (AES), and the 2003 AuSSA, Australians have expressed very different levels of confidence in different types of societal organisations (Bean, 2005). Over three-quarters of Australians have confidence in the defence forces, the police and the universities. On the other hand, smaller percentages of Australians (23 to 49 per cent) show confidence in organisations such as the unions, the courts and legal system, the public service, churches or religious institutions, federal parliament and banks and financial institutions. Australians have shown a large fall in confidence in major companies, from
59 per cent of respondents showing confidence in 1995 to 46 per cent in 2001 and 42 per cent in 2003. According to Bean (2005), factors such as corporate collapses, corporate scandals and job losses and relocations of businesses overseas might have influenced public confidence in major Australian companies. On the other hand, Farquharson and Critchley (2004) found that Australians have the lowest trust in the media among other organisations like government, business companies, the churches and the public service. They suggest that consumers critically examine media reports and look at the interests behind the reports before making assessments about their validity. Only those sources of information which are deemed trustworthy are likely to be believed.

Bean (2005) shows that Australians maintained low levels of trust in government for the period 1984 to 2003. According to the 1984 National Social Science Survey, 43 per cent of respondents expressed their confidence in the government and this percentage decreased to 35 per cent in 1995. In the 2003 Australian Survey of Social Attitudes, 40 per cent of respondents said that they had confidence in government. Bean (2005) also shows that many of the Australians who lack generalised trust are not the same people as those who lack trust in government. However, he did not show whether these two variables were positively related to each other.

Most of the literature on institutional trust in regard to social capital focuses on trust in government and how it relates to interpersonal trust. This is another area where the literature makes conflicting claims in dealing with interpersonal trust, institutional trust (in government especially) and civic participation. Putnam (1993a) and Crystal and DeBell (2002) suggest that it is possible for interpersonal trust to have positive effects on confidence in political institutions. However, Levi (1996) criticises Putnam’s argument. She proposes that trust in government is sufficient to produce the basis of generalised trust. In other words, trust in government acts as a generator for generalised trust. Citizens who put their trust in government will tend to trust each other in the wider society because of the common belief that they have in their government. Brehm and Rahn (1997) support Putnam’s suggestion by demonstrating that confidence in political institutions is a consequence of interpersonal trust. Pickup et al. (2004) reveal that civic engagement and interpersonal trust do not lead to trust in the government. On the contrary, the Albertans (in Alberta, Canada) expressed high levels of alienation
from, and low levels of confidence in, their government despite the fact that they had high levels of interpersonal trust and civic participation in the community (Pickup et al., 2004). Thus the existing literature on the relationship between interpersonal trust and reciprocity trust in government reaches different conclusions. It offers few clues as to whether young people who build interpersonal trust within organised groups might or might not come to trust the government.

Simply put, institutional trust in this research means that one is confident that a societal organisation is operating appropriately. In the Australian context, Australians generally have had low levels of confidence in most of their societal organisations over the years, including government. How and whether these low levels of trust in major societal organisations are related to interpersonal trust and civic participation is still open for elucidation.

CONCLUSION

Family is one of the most common realms where the transmission of norms through internalisation and socialisation takes place (Winter, 2000) and family social capital is an important source of social capital in society (Fukuyama, 1999:17; Putnam, 1995a). Trust and reciprocity is learnt in the family and family members can practise trusting and show trustworthiness in the family and in the family and in other social settings. However, the strength of family ties and their impact on generalised trust in the societies varies between cultures (Banfield, 1967; Fukuyama, 1995; Woolcock, 1998). In other words, bonding social capital in the family is not necessarily a good thing that benefits our society; it will only benefit our society if family members use it as a springboard for trust and reciprocity in other areas rather than taking a step back and distrusting people from outside the kinship group.

As well as family social capital, social capital among friends is another type of bonding social capital. Homophily and proximity are two factors in determining the quality of friendships (Mouw et al., 2006; Marmaros & Sacerdote, 2006). Social capital among acquaintances and social capital in the neighbourhood setting are examples of bridging social capital. Relationships among acquaintances and neighbours are considered weak ties, where people from different backgrounds are connected (Putnam, 2000). Social cohesion and perceived safety in the neighbourhood are associated with social capital in
the neighbourhood setting. Generalised social capital is the social experience of putting trust in others and reciprocating with others in daily life. It resembles the whole social experiences in families, friendships, acquaintanceships and neighbourhoods in general. Unlike interpersonal trust, institutional trust is a non-reciprocal experience. Thus the word ‘confidence’ is used to describe how major types of societal organisations are believed to be operating appropriately.

To conclude, in this chapter, I established the concept of how social capital is formed in different social settings: in the family, among friends and acquaintances, in the neighbourhoods, and among people in general. I also established the concept of confidence in major societal organisations. In the next chapter, I will introduce the concept of young people and civic participation, including participation in organised groups.
CHAPTER 4 YOUNG PEOPLE, GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

INTRODUCTION
In this chapter I discuss young people, their social activities, and how they spend their leisure time. Then I introduce the literature on voluntary groups and associations. Next I discuss how young people could generate social capital via being active members in organised groups. I theorise that family social capital is a starting base for cultivating trust and reciprocity, hence building social capital in other social settings and confidence in major societal organisations. Lastly, I list my research questions.

YOUNG PEOPLE

The concept of youth
The concept of youth is a complex one. Many papers have been published focusing on young people. One perspective is that there is „the problematic nature of being a young person and the even more problematic nature of becoming adult“ (Wyn & White, 1997:8). Based on this perspective, Wyn and White (1997:12) list a few characteristics of the popular image of young people: rebellious; given to risky behaviours; ignorant; dependent; and irresponsible. It would be an overgeneralisation to assume that this image fits all young people, seeing them as all unhappily making the transitions towards adulthood, or even becoming a threat to the safety of society.

On the other hand, young people are also being portrayed as the hope for a better future for young people themselves and their societies (Wyn & White, 1997). In response to this perspective, a neologism, „positive youth development“, has been created to promote programs that incorporate the philosophy that young people are resources to be developed, not problems to be managed (Roth & Brooks-Gunn, 2003). From this perspective, large youth organisations in the United States such as the 4-H have actively designed a series of community programs, mostly experiential learning programs, to promote the healthy psychological development of young people.

Despite the different views on young people, Wyn and White (1997:15) argue that „youth, as a period of transition to adulthood, has meaning only in relation to the specific circumstances of social, political and economic conditions“. Thus, this research
aims to look at how family social capital may act as a firm base for social interaction to promote more social connections between young people and the wider society.

The Australian Clearinghouse for Youth Studies defines youth as those aged between 10 and 24, „in order to be as inclusive as possible in covering not only adolescence but also the overlapping issues that lead to and follow adolescence” (Allison 1999:2). In this research, I focus on young people aged 16 to 25, as this period marks the transition from adolescence to adulthood. This transition is marked by the life change of moving from high school to work or university or from university to working life. This age group is set, not because of the biological transition to adulthood (young people are physically matured by this age), but because this group of young people are going through youth-related social processes which are socially constructed and institutionalised by society.

In Australia, the legal school-leaving age is 16. However, being in an industrialised nation that focuses on education and training, most young people continue schooling to finish their Year 12 at the age of 17 or 18 (Education and Work, 2005). After that, they may spend another three or four years in college or university to get vocational training or higher education. They then enter the labour market at an approximate age of 20 to 24 years (Education and Work, 2005). However, young people may have paid jobs, often part-time, at much younger ages.

According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, in 2001 young people delayed major life tasks, such as working as a full-time employee, or adopting the social roles of spouse or parent, compared to young people in 1976 (Australian Social Trends, 2005). This report shows that, in 2001, only 16 per cent of young people in their twenties were partners in a couple with children (Australian Social Trends, 2005). However, there were over 40 per cent of young people in that category in 1976 (Australian Social Trends, 2005). One can argue that, since young people do not have major work or family responsibilities, this may be the best time for them to build their social networks and develop social capital. This is because those young people who are building meaningful relationships with adults can benefit from gaining access to adult resources such as information, assistance and support (Jarrett et al., 2005). They can also be building relationships with peers and so creating life-long friendship networks.
Young Australians and how they use their time

Are young Australians actively engaged with the community? How do young Australians aged 16 to 25 years use their time? A survey conducted by the ABS identified several categories of activity that young people aged 15 to 24 are involved in (How Australians use their time, 1998, 2008). This category closely matches the age group (16 to 25) that I targeted in this research. There are four main categories of time use defined in these reports (How Australians use their time, 2008; in Glossary).

„Necessary time” refers to activities which are essential for personal survival, such as sleeping, eating and personal hygiene. „Contracted time” describes activities such as paid work or regular education. „Committed time” refers to activities one is committed to because of previous social or community interactions, such as managing a household or volunteering. Lastly, „free time” is the amount of time left when the previous three types of time are excluded.

In 2006, young Australians spent on average 47 per cent of their time on necessary activities, 22 per cent on contracted activities, 8 per cent on committed activities and 22 per cent on free time activities (How Australians use their time, 2008). In comparison with 1997, young people are spending less time on necessary activities, but the time used on committed activities and contracted activities has increased, resulting in a decrease in their free time of about half an hour since 1997 (to five hours 19 minutes per day in 2006).

The group of Australians aged 15 to 24 consists of students and non-students, part-time or full-time workers, and those who are unemployed (How Australians use their time, 2008). All seem to allocate roughly equal amount of time to working and studying, on the one hand, and to playing on the other. Over the nine years covered by the two surveys, young people maintained their employment-related hours at about 2 hours and 55 minutes per day on average. Their average study time increased by about half an hour a day since 1997 (to two hours and 22 minutes per day). This suggests that young people are getting more serious about their education and so spend more time in studying. As a result, they spent half an hour less in recreation and leisure activities (to four hours and 30 minutes per day) and six minutes less in social and community interaction (to 49 minutes per day) compared to 1997.
Who do young people spend time with? In 2006 young people spent on average 11 hours and 51 minutes per day with family in the same household (excluding partners) (How Australians use their time, 2008). It is natural to think that young people spent their sleeping time (which would include most of the „necessary“ time) within the average 11 hours and 51 minutes per day they spent with family in the same household. They spent on average four hours and 17 minutes per day with their friends, and about two hours and 21 minutes per day by themselves. In other words, another five hours and 31 minutes per day on average would have been spent with colleagues, acquaintances, random strangers and people in the wider society. In 2006 young people spent about 56 per cent of their total time with their family, about 20 per cent of their total time with their friends and about 13 per cent with others. This suggests that young people maintain close relationships with their family members and also with their friends. Thus, it is more likely for young people to build bonding social capital with their family and friends than with other people.

In addition, young people show their community involvement by spending about an hour per day on activities that include voluntary work and care activities (17 minutes per day) and activities related to social and community interaction (49 minutes per day). Voluntary work and care activities include „physical and emotional caring activities for adults, unpaid work for organisations and assisting family, friends, neighbours and others” (How Australians use their time, 2008, in Glossary). Social and community interaction means „social interaction participation such as attending a concert, a library or amusement park. Also included are attending sports events, participating in religious ceremonies and community participation such as attendance at meetings” (How Australians use their time, 2008 in Glossary). The General Social Survey (2007) supports this data by giving evidence that 30 per cent of young people aged 18 to 24 had undertaken voluntary work in the last 12 months. In addition, this survey also shows that 70 per cent of young Australians had participated in a community event in the last 12 months (General Social Survey, 2007).

This evidence indicates that young people are socially well connected in their families, as well as in friendship networks, their neighbourhoods and the wider society. Their active participation in community activities and their time spent with non-family members imply that young Australians are actively engaged in society. The General
Social Survey (2007) shows that the participation rate of young people (aged 18 to 24) in social groups is 67 per cent. It also shows that young people are quite keenly involved in community support groups (30 per cent). However, the survey shows only an 11 per cent participation rate in civic and political groups. Thirty per cent of young people had participated in voluntary work.

Since these reports do not show whether young people belong to the organised groups they are participating in, it is worth studying whether active membership in organised groups is associated with these socially active young Australians’ social capital. I expected that socially well connected young Australians could generate social capital through active participation in organised activities.

**ORGANISED GROUPS**

I define an organised group as any formal group organised by schools/colleges/universities/workplaces, local communities, online communities, other national or international bodies in civil society. These formal organisations include hobby groups, religious organisations, sports and recreation clubs, professional groups, self-help groups, community groups, voluntary associations, non-profit organisations and work-based organisations.

Michael Edwards (2009), in his book *Civil Society*, summarises the brief history of the formation and development of civil society and, based on different school of thought, he offers different ways of defining civil society. He defines civil society in three ways. Firstly, he discusses civil society as associational life, which includes all voluntary membership and activities of associations and networks situated between the family and the state (Edwards, 2009:20). This concept of civil society emphasises pluralism, where groups and associations with multiple interests interact in this sphere to promote collective goals. Secondly, Edwards (2009:46) asserts that civil society is often portrayed as the good society where “desirable social order or self-image of modernity [is] defined in normative terms”. He explains that the positive social norms vary across places and civil society represents the institutionalisation of civility, “in which all institutions operate in ways that reinforce their positive social norms so that civil society becomes „a society that is civil”” (Edwards, 2009:47). Norms such as tolerance, non-discrimination, non-violence, trust and cooperation, freedom and democracy are
examples of desired values and behaviours in the civil society. Lastly, Edwards (2009) discusses the concept of civil society as the public sphere. He argues that public sphere is the arena for argument and deliberation about how to face common problems and resolve social issues in a peaceful way. These ideas originate from Jürgen Habermas. Edwards (2009) elaborates Habermas’s ideas that sufficient public debate in sorting out issues in the community is the vehicle to create major social change. Even though a common vision of ends and means in the good society might not be agreed by all the community members, a reconciliation of different ideas and visions can be achieved in the public sphere (Edwards, 2009).

In this research, I focus on Edwards’ (2009) first definition of civil society as associational life. This is the civil society where the vibrant American society as described by Alexis de Tocqueville took place in the 1830s (see Chapter 2). However, the boundaries between the civil, state and family sectors are always fluid (Edwards, 2009). Edwards gives as an example that civil society operates under the legal and regulatory framework provided by the state, and that the state is monitored by civil society to ensure the governing system is right on track. Furthermore, the rise of charities and foundations sponsored by business corporations also blurs the line between civil society and the market. In the setting of modern days, the vibrant civil society witnessed by Tocqueville could be translated into the blooming of the third sector, or non-profit sector. Michael Walzer (1988:123-124) emphasises that civil society is “the space of uncoerced human association and also the set of relational networks—formed for the sake of family, faith, interest and ideology—that fill this space”. He (2002) argues that activities in the marketplace and some activities in the political arena should be included in civil society. I disagree with Walzer’s idea of the inclusiveness of civil society. The market and the state are the two main entities in the society which carry clearly different agendas and these agendas are not necessarily aligned with civil groups in the society. To secure and ensure the freedom to associate, civil society (as associational life) is separate from and independent of the first and second sector (i.e. the state and the market).

Anheier and Carlson give a clearer definition of civil society and this is the definition of civil society that I use in this research:
The sphere of institutions, organisations and individuals located between the family, the state and the market, in which people associate voluntarily to advance common interests (2002:1).

The term civil society refers to neighbourhood and community organisations (e.g. neighbourhood houses, community centres, churches, voluntary organisations, sports and recreation clubs, art, music or educational associations). Looking at the interaction between states and civil societies, associational freedom legitimates a kind of state that is liberal and pluralist in allowing the associations to flourish (Walzer, 1988). Walzer (1988:140) further explains that “the civility that makes democratic politics possible can only be learned in the associational networks; the roughly equal and widely dispersed capabilities that sustain the networks have to be fostered by the democratic state”. Thus, community organisations enable people to become active citizens within civil society (the third sector) (Leonard and Onyx, 2004:76).

Civil society is interdependent with the political community and is associated with social organisations in the private domain. In civil society, members are able to realise their private interests and selfhood. This private realm is called the fourth sector (Leonard & Onyx, 2004:79). It consists of family and friendship and the day-to-day unstructured activities of people living in the community (Leonard & Onyx, 2004:79). Leonard and Onyx (2004) emphasise that it is important to recognise the contribution of the fourth sector as the source of the formation of third sector organisations. For example, the act of caring for the elderly people can start with helping them to carry their groceries, then formal, structural intervention on transportation for elderly people can be proposed via elderly citizens” clubs in the community.

Passey and Lyons (2005) defined third sector organisations, or the not-for-profit sector, or voluntary associations, as associations where people act „voluntarily and collectively to serve their own interests or those of others, without seeking personal financial benefit” (Passey & Lyons, 2005: 62). They say that voluntary associations are major service providers of community, sport and recreation, education, health care, the arts, and religious worship. They also say that voluntary associations are central to Australian life, based on the fact that there are 700 000 voluntary associations in this country and just under two-thirds of the population belonged to at least one voluntary association in 1997. In fact, The Australian Survey of Social Attitudes (AuSSA 2003)
shows that 86 per cent of respondents were then members of at least one voluntary association (Passey & Lyons, 2005).

The Australian Survey of Social Attitudes (AuSSA 2003) shows that the most popular type of association is the consumer or automobile association, such as the NRMA or RACV (Passey & Lyons, 2005). Sporting or recreation groups are the next most popular groups, where 45 per cent of respondents are members. In addition, about one-third of respondents are members of a financial co-operative, such as a credit union, and 24 per cent are members of a religious association. Twenty per cent or fewer respondents are members of other voluntary associations: neighbourhood or community-based groups, unions, professional societies, special needs groups, environmental groups, art, music or educational groups, self-help groups and political groups.

ORGANISED GROUPS AND SOCIAL CAPITAL
Cox (1995:17) says that „social capital should be the prominent and most valued form of capital as it provides the basis on which we build a truly civil society”. Many researchers discuss the concept of civic engagement in facilitating cooperation among members of society and how this relates to level of trust (Putnam, 2000; Cox, 2002). These researchers usually measure civic engagement by studying both community life, which is measured by levels of membership in clubs and associations, and generalised trust (Putnam, 2000).

Onyx and Leonard (2000:113) say that volunteering is at the core of social capital (see Figure 4.1). They refer to volunteering as unpaid labour, which contributes to the wellbeing of others and the community at large. However, they also say that there are many ways that community organisations contribute to the formation of social capital that are not specifically related to volunteering. This is because informal volunteering, or informal helping among neighbours, friends, acquaintances and neighbours, also contributes to the stock of social capital. At the broader level, civic participation is essential in the formation of social capital where community organisations provide a basis for broader civic participation. In sum, the nature of social capital involves more or less dense interlocking personal and formal networks of relationships between individuals and groups.
Uslaner (2000:569) says that “A trusting society is a civic society, and a civic society is a civil society”. What is civic participation and how far can citizens get involved in making decisions to make sure their benefits are taken into account by public officials? Arnstein (1996:246) explains that citizen participation is “a categorical term for citizen power”. She discusses eight rungs on the ladder of citizen participation which divide into three categories: non-participation; tokenism; and citizen power. Non-participation makes up of two bottom rungs of the ladder. Here, citizens are being passive and powerless in decision making regarding planning or conducting programs. The second level of participation is tokenism, where citizens are informed about their rights, responsibilities and options and are invited to give opinions. However, at this stage, it is not guaranteed that citizens’ concerns and ideas will be taken into account. The top rungs of the ladder of citizen participation are citizen power where citizens get to negotiate with powerholders to share the planning and decision-making responsibilities currently.

Skocpol’s (2003) historic analysis shows that American civic life has changed from nationwide voluntary association in the early 21st century to professionally managed associations in civil society. This new structure of civic organisations is often organised
by elites and privileged office-holders, who do not need to gain support from the majority of citizens via regular engagement and meetings. In other words, Skocpol (2003:13) agrees with Putnam’s (2000) analysis that American civic engagement has declined because most Americans now are being passive in their participation in voluntary associations (e.g. maintaining membership by signing cheques and getting newsletters via mail).

However, she disagrees strongly with Putnam’s idea that restoring local community and intimate social participation is needed to promote civic engagement and democracy. She (2003:12) says „American civic voluntarism was never predominantly local and never flourished apart from national government and politics“. Skocpol proposes (2003) top-down solutions which involve the reformation of translocal associations and national institutions. Skocpol (2003:258) criticises Putnam’s theory and she writes that, „improving local communities, and social life more generally, will not create sufficient democratic leverage to tackle problems that can only be addressed with concerted national commitment“. So, it is essential to reinvent the old-style representative federations which were grounded in specific localities in fostering civic innovation.

I think Skocpol (2003) is contradicting herself in the sense that she argues that the essence of democracy is not based on social trust as neo-Durkeimians like Putnam (2000) have emphasised. Because when she proposes the importance of encouraging more citizens to engage in civic activities, she suggests that person-to-person contact works better than repeated mailings or anonymous telephone calls. Skocpol (2003) also admits that it is efficient to use the social contacts of friends and neighbours to draw them into political campaigns. Thus, it is essential to reconnect local communities by promoting local social life. This thesis aims to test the idea that informal social connections among family members, friends, acquaintances and neighbours can produce norms of trust and reciprocity. This thesis studies whether social capital originates from the family and spreads to other networks. I hypothesise that social capital is associated with civic participation and that in turn civic participation contributes to generalised social capital to form a virtuous cycle in the community.

In the Australian context, Vromen (2003; 2004; 2007) studied the possible changing form of civic engagement for well educated, resourced and young internet users from
meeting face-to-face to building new communities on internet. She found that the frequency of Internet usage is related to political participation. It seems that the internet has been utilised by young Australians as a source of information alternative to the mainstream media. Vromen (2004) asserts that the Internet supplements social capital because the Internet is used as another means of communication, enhancing real world political participation. In other words, the Internet does not increase political participation by attracting new members of civic groups to participate either in online or face-to-face political activities. Indeed, it just facilitated political participation of the existing members.

There are two forms of participation in civic activity: via individual effort and via participation in organised groups. Those who do not wish to be affiliated with organised groups can always make individual contributions to show their concern about their communities. For example, individuals can sign a petition or write to the newspaper to express their concern about current affairs. However, working in a group with people who share the same concern requires cooperation among group members. Through the group interaction, group members put trust in each other and reciprocate exchanges to work on their common interest. This cooperation also solves the dilemma of collective action (Betts, 1998). Instead of focusing on self-interest, individuals or groups engage themselves in civic activities to improve conditions in their community for a better future. In this sense, in general, civic participants are expected to be more trusting than non-participants. Thus, civic participants are more likely to build generalised social capital than non-participants.

The literature on civic engagement as a feature of social capital often focuses on how it relates to interpersonal trust and institutional trust (Levi, 1996; Brehm and Rahn, 1997; Putnam, 2000; Crystal & DeBell, 2002). Work on group membership suggests that members tend to be more trusting and more engaged in civil society than non-members. Different findings on the relationship between trust and participation in social activities have been presented, but most of the literature agrees that civic participants are generally more trusting than non participants. But the causal direction of trust and participation (whether civic participation leads to trust, or trust leads to civic participation) is still open for debate.
Brehm and Rhan (1997) say that civic engagement and interpersonal trust are closely related to each other, but they believe that those who engage in civic activities will become more trusting rather than the other way around. Indeed, Green and Brock (1998) argue that individuals who are more trusting are more likely to engage in social activities than are those who are less trusting. Moreover, Stolle (1998) explores data on associations in Germany and Sweden and suggests that people who participate in organised groups are more trusting than people who do not participate. However, Uslaner (2000) has a different stand on the relationship between group membership and informal socialising, and levels of trust. To him, there is no linkage between most civic activities and trust; he asserts that the roots of trust are not social interaction but optimism and a moral foundation. Claibourn and Martin (2000) support Uslanel’s argument and assert that there is limited evidence to suggest that group membership has a direct positive effect on interpersonal trust. Usalner (2000) only agrees that volunteering is related to trust, where trusting people get involved in their communities by volunteering and giving to charity, which demands more commitment than joining civic associations. In other words, trusting people are more likely to get involved than are those who are less trusting (Uslanel, 2000). Recent findings show that there is a negative relationship between social trust and norms of citizenship. Those who have low generalised trust appear to be less active in civic activities (Zmerli, 2010). Thus the empirical relationship is as yet unsettled.

In the context of Australia, AuSSA 2003 also shows that members of voluntary associations express higher levels of two types of trust: generalised trust and confidence in the federal parliament, than do non-members (Passey & Lyons, 2005). White and Wyn (2008:244) explain how having low institutional trust discourages young people from engaging in the wider society. Firstly, institutional providers of amenities and public space place unnecessarily restrictive rules on the use of some amenities (White and Wyn, 2008:244). For example, some restaurants set cover charges (minimum expenses) for patrons that might make young people with limited incomes feel unwelcome in those restaurants. Secondly, young people have restricted opportunities to engage with the wider society because they are constantly monitored by the state police even when they have not committed any crime (White & Wyn, 2008:244). This gives a rationale for young people not putting their confidence in government. Finally, White and Wyn (2008:244) argue that the media in general often portray young people as
having „no real value or place in the larger scheme of things”, perhaps causing young people not to trust the media.

To conclude here, the literature is in disagreement about the relationship between group membership and generalised trust and also confidence in government. Thus, I hope that this research could shed some light on the problem.

TYPES OF MEMBERSHIP

When we think of organised groups we can place people into three categories: active members; passive members; and non-members. Putnam (2000:48-64) documents a decline in generalised social capital in the USA by showing that Americans have stopped attending meetings of social organisations. If they belong to civic organisations now, it is only as passive members who sign cheques and send in their membership fees or donations (Putnam 2000:51). In other words, in his view passive members are no different to non-members in terms of their contribution to social capital, because in both there is a lack of face-to-face socialisation in cultivating norms of trust and reciprocity.

However, Wollebæk and Selle (2003) have a different view of the role of passive members. They found that both active and passive members are more trusting in general than are non-members. However, passive membership is not associated with as high levels of institutional trust as is active membership is. In addition, Wollebæk and Selle (2003) find that civic engagement is related to membership in organised groups. In other words, they find that both passive and active members of organised groups are more trusting and more civically engaged than are non-members. Overall, Wollebæk and Selle (2003) agree with Putnam’s position that participation in voluntary associations is important in the generation of social capital. However, they emphasise that passive members are important too, because passive supporters show a more politicised view of the association’s role in democracy, while active members emphasise conditions in their immediate surroundings. Passive members care about the operation of their associations and are willing to actively participate if needed. In addition, passive support also represents the modern attitude that people like to preserve their individual autonomy by exerting influence on the organisation and actively participating only when needed (Wollebæk & Selle, 2003). Thus, to them, passive members are reserve activists and they are not as passive as Putnam suggests.
In the Australian context, AuSSA 2003 divides membership into three categories: ordinary; active; and office-holders (Passey & Lyons, 2005). Ordinary members are “those who are content to pay their membership dues and enjoy the benefits that membership brings, such as access to (often subsidised) services or socialising” (Passey & Lyons, 2005:69). Active members are those who effectively perform a range of volunteer tasks for the association in order for the association to operate. Office holders are those who take legal responsibility for their association and perform governance activities. The majority of memberships (74 per cent) involve people acting as ordinary members, 20 per cent involve people acting as active members and 6 per cent involve people serving as officeholders. Passey and Lyons (2005) argue that active membership in Australian voluntary associations is associated with political involvement. They find that active members and office-holders are three time more likely to engage in political activities than ordinary members.

However, I do not agree with Passey and Lyons’s (2005) definition of „ordinary members”. In the questionnaire, the AuSSA researchers asked respondents to categorise themselves into: members; active members; or office-holders. It is stated in the questionnaire that „being a member means you pay membership fees or a subscription to make donations, paying membership fees”. Thus, a member, or in Passey and Lyons’s term, an „ordinary member” has access to the services (e.g. getting information through newsletters) but they are not socialising in the particular group they are affiliated with. Indeed, active member are „those who regularly participate in group activities such as attending but you do not get any more involved”; „being an active member means you are regularly involved in the group activities as well as paying membership fees or a subscription or making donations” (Wilson & Gibson, 2003:8). The wording „but you do not get any more involved” stated clearly that there is no further participation involved other than attending meetings. In my interpretation, the definition of „a member” in AuSSA 2003 is equivalent to „passive member” according to Putnam (2000) and (Wollebæk and Selle, 2003).

To conclude, building on Putnam’s (2000) theory of the relationship between membership of associations and generalised trust, this research aims to provide more empirical evidence: Do different types of membership (i.e. passive membership versus active membership) in organised groups affect the level of trust and reciprocity
members have in other social settings and their confidence in major societal organisations, and how do members of both types of members compare to non-members on these variables? In the next section, I present previous studies regarding youth-specific research on social capital which are of relevance to my research questions.

YOUNG PEOPLE AND SOCIAL CAPITAL
This thesis is about young people and social capital. I studied how active participation in organised groups is related to social capital. This research also intended to find out whether close family members and their social capital constitute a basis for young people to develop social capital in other social settings.

Why focus on young people? As mentioned earlier, young people’s transition to adulthood is an important stage in establishing social capital with people in their expanding social networks. Rahn and Transue (1998) argue that young people with low levels of interpersonal trust will become adults with low levels of interpersonal trust. In addition, other researchers claim that young people who participate in school clubs and school government are more likely to engage in civic activities in adulthood than are youths who are uninvolved (Verba et al., 1995:422-426). Thus, if participation in organised groups promotes higher levels of interpersonal trust that then leads to social capital formation, social policy should have a special focus on encouraging young people to participate in organised groups.

Putnam (2000) argues that social capital has dropped among Americans in general, and that young people are less interested in political engagement, less likely to join voluntary groups, less involved in religious meetings and that they are less likely to socialise with friends than are people in their parents’ generation. He also points out that, even if they belong to organised groups, younger Americans are less likely to attend group meetings than their parents’ generation. In fact, contemporary Americans tend to only sign up to a mailing list, or contribute money to organisations. In other words, young people lack the face-to-face interaction with non-kin necessary to build broader networks of trust and reciprocity. This worries thinkers who take the perspective that young people are the hope for a better future (Wyn & White, 1997).
Is Australian society facing the same problem as American society? In 2007 the majority of young Australians were actively participating in organised groups such as social groups, community support groups and civic and political groups in the previous 12 months (General Social Survey, 2007). According to the same survey, 53 per cent of young Australians aged 18 to 24 felt that „most people” could be trusted. In addition, 70 per cent of them had participated in a community event in the past six months. However, young Australians lacked participation in civic activities: only 20 per cent of them had participated in at least in one civic activity in the past 12 months.

These data show that there are gaps in measuring and explaining young Australians’ social capital. The issue is the lack of data on young Australians’ group membership. The majority of young Australians may be just occasionally active in organised groups but not affiliated to these groups. In addition, there is a lack of data on passive membership. Were those young Australians who were not active in organised groups passive members, or not members at all? Secondly, did the majority of the young Australians who generally trusted most people do so partly because of their active participation in communities? Thirdly, why are young Australians not keen on civic participation?

The interests of my study are focused on young people’s family social capital and their active membership of organised groups; I wanted to know whether having higher family social capital and joining groups affects their social capital in other settings. The core measurement of social capital (norms of trust and reciprocity) was repeatedly tested for each of the social contexts explored in this research because it was assumed that different types of relationships produce different levels of social capital (Stone & Hughes, 2002b). Putnam (2000:137) measures social capital in terms of trust and number of formal group memberships. He uses the trust question in the General Social Survey and World Values Survey: „Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?” I think that this question does not fulfil my definition of trust as the three-part relation, A trusts B to do X. Fukuyama (1999:20-24) points out that it is important to differentiate between trust in family members, co-ethnics, co-religious believers and trust in strangers. Thus, a different set of questions was adapted to measure norms of trust and reciprocity. More discussion of the measurements is presented in Chapter 5.
Group membership refers to joiners of clubs and associations in school, college or university, or workplace, community groups, national or international groups, or online communities. I am interested in whether being a passive member or an active member of organised groups has an impact on the social capital young people develop in different parts of their life and on their social capital in different social settings and their confidence in major societal organisations. Moreover, I aimed to find out whether a young person’s participation in organised groups enhanced their experience of social capital in other realms and whether their likelihood of participating was affected by the level of trust and reciprocity in their families. In the following section, I present my research questions on how young people generate social capital.

**Informal social capital acts as the starting base**

My first proposal is that the internalisation and transmission of norms of trust and reciprocity start from family social capital and then spread to other social settings. Coleman (1988a) studies the relationship between family social capital and children’s educational outcomes. He investigates how family social capital can help in producing human capital. Instead of putting the focus solely on parents’ effort, I investigate how young people play active roles in transmitting the trust and reciprocity that they have learned in the family to other social settings. This is a new exploration as there is a lack of prior research on the correlation between young people’s experiences of different forms of social capital across a range of social settings.

Fukuyama (1995) studies the influence of culture on family social capital and how levels of family social capital affects generalised trust in society. He says that strong trust in the family has the same negative impact that familistic societies have on generalised trust. This interests me, prompting my exploration of whether strong bonds of trust in family members will discourage young people from joining clubs and associations in society, or whether such bonds may serve as a firm basis of trust to empower young people with the capacity to learn to trust others and show their trustworthiness in order to build social capital with people beyond their families.

Nevertheless, Fukuyama’s theory is mostly based on the societies formed in monocultural societies like China, Korea, Japan and Germany. In the multicultural context of Australia, I expect a different result because the openness of the society and the
tolerance between different cultures may stem from young people’s education and socialisation in the family. In other words, young people would have to learn trust and reciprocity in the family before they could step out of their family and trust and reciprocate with people from other non-kinship group. Thus, I expected to find that high levels of family social capital are related to high levels of social capital among friends and acquaintances, in neighbourhood settings and with people in general. I also expected to find that high levels of family social capital are associated with confidence in major societal organisations. This expectation is shown in Figure 4.2.

My second proposition, as shown in Figure 4.3, is that high bonding social capital among friends will be associated with higher levels of social capital in other realms plus higher levels of activity in organised groups. Young people spend a considerable amount of time with their friends (How Australians use their time, 2008). They also build bonding social capital with close friends. So young people might be confident to
build social networks in organised groups through practicing norms of trust and reciprocity with their friends. Based on the principle of homophily, young people might be influenced by their friends to join organised groups (Mouw et al., 2006). Thus I expect that young people who experience high social capital with friends are more likely to be active members of organised groups than are young people who experience low social capital with friends. In addition, interpersonal trust is related to institutional trust (Levi, 1996; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Crystal & DeBell, 2002). Thus, I expect that young people who generate high social capital among friends will have a greater tendency to have high confidence in most of the societal organisations than will young people who generate lower social capital among friends. Lastly, generalised social capital might be an extension of interpersonal trust (i.e. trust and reciprocity among family members, friends and neighbours), (Putnam, 2000). Young people might extend their trust and reciprocity among people in general through practicing bonding social capital among friends. So I expect that young people who experience high social capital with friends are more likely to report high generalised social capital than are young people who experience lower social capital with friends.

My third proposition, shown in Figure 4.4, is that high bridging social capital with neighbours is likely to be generated in non-metropolitan areas, by long periods of residence, active participation in neighbourhood activities, perceived neighbourhood
safety and perceived neighbourhood cohesion and, in turn, high bridging social capital with neighbours will be associated with higher levels of social capital in other social settings plus higher levels of activity in organised groups. The experience of long periods of residence might motivate young people to build social capital among neighbours based on their familiarity with their neighbourhoods. Residents in rural areas generate higher social capital than those who live in urban areas (Onyx & Bullen, 2000). So I expect that young people who live in large towns or rural areas are more likely to build social capital with neighbours than are those who live in metropolitan areas. Young Australians are actively involved in voluntary work and community activities (General Social Survey, 2007; How Australians use their time, 2008). This factor might help to generate social capital among neighbours. Perceived neighbourhood safety and neighbourhood cohesion are closely related to social capital with neighbours (Chong, 2008). So I expect that young people who perceive their neighbourhood to be safe and cohesive are more likely to share social capital with neighbours than are those who perceive their neighbourhood to be less safe and less cohesive.

Based on Putnam’s (2000) work on generalised social capital, as shown in Figure 4.4, I also expect that young people who generate high social capital with their neighbours are more likely to report high generalised social capital than are those who generate low social capital among neighbours. In addition, young people’s experience of building social capital with neighbours might extend to trust in major societal institutions (Levi, 1996; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Crystal & DeBell, 2002). Lastly, young people who build high bridging social capital with neighbours are expected to have greater tendency to be active members of organised groups than those who build low social capital with neighbours. This is because interpersonal trust is related to institutional trust (Levi, 1996; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Crystal & DeBell, 2002).
Institutional trust and active membership in organised groups

Based on White and Wyn’s (2008) findings that young people’s low level of institutional trust might be the cause of their restricted civic engagement, I build my fourth proposition, that confidence in societal institutions is associated with membership of organised groups (see Figure 4.5). Figure 4.5 shows that, if White and Wyn’s theory is correct, low confidence in major societal organisations should be associated with non-membership of organised groups. I expect that young people who have low confidence in most of the major societal organisations would be more likely to be non-members of organised groups than young people who have high confidence in most of the major societal organisations.
My fifth proposition, as shown in Figure 4.6, is about active membership of organised groups. I test Putnam’s (2000) theory of social capital in which he focused on how active membership of organised groups is associated with high generalised trust and reciprocity, and civic participation. I also expect that active membership of organised groups will be associated with high social capital among friends and vice versa, based on the principle of homophily (Mouw et al., 2006). Also, if Putnam is correct, social capital among friends should be related to organised group membership, and that members of organised groups should have higher levels of generalised social capital and civic participation.
**Overall theoretical proposition**
Based on these models, my overall model predicts that young Australians generate social capital with their family members, friends, neighbours and that they also build confidence in major societal organisations. I theorise that informal social capital and confidence in formal institutions act as a springboard to active membership of organised groups (see Figure 4.7). Active membership of organised groups is expected to be associated with high generalised social capital and civic participation. In addition, I also theorise that family social capital acts as a firm base for cultivating social capital among friends, acquaintances and neighbours. Finally, I expect that generalised social capital and confidence in major societal organisations are extended from social capital among family members, friends and neighbours.
Figure 4.7 Overall theoretical proposition: informal social capital as a base for cultivating trust and reciprocity.
RESEARCH QUESTIONS
My study tests five propositions. In order to do so, I ask the following research questions.

1. Are young people who have high trust in and reciprocity with their close family members more likely to be active members of organised group(s) and to generate more social capital in other social settings and do they have higher levels of confidence in major societal organisations than do young people who have lower levels of trust and reciprocity with their close family members?

2. Are young people who have high levels of social capital with their friends more likely to be active members of organised groups and are they more likely to generate high social capital in other social settings?

3. Are young people who have high levels of trust and reciprocity with their neighbours more likely to be active members of organised groups than young people who do have lower levels of trust and reciprocity with their neighbours and are they more likely to experience higher social capital in other realms?

4. Are young people who have higher levels of confidence in major societal organisations more likely to be active members of organised groups than young people who do have lower levels of confidence in major societal organisations?

5. Do young people who are active members of organised group(s) have higher levels of trust in and reciprocity with people in general and with their friends than do non-members or passive members and do they have higher tendency to engage in civil society?

CONCLUSION
The focus of this thesis is to test whether informal social capital is the starting base for young people to develop trust and reciprocity in other social settings and confidence in major societal organisations. Young people who have higher informal social capital and confidence in major societal organisations are expected to be active members of organised groups. Another objective of this research is to investigate whether active membership of organised groups is associated with higher levels of generalised social capital and civic participation. The transition of young people from the school environment to a university or working environment broadens their social networks in the community. One of the ways in which young people could contribute to the creation
or sustenance of social capital is via participation in organised groups. Detailed research methods are discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5 RESEARCH METHODS

INTRODUCTION
In this chapter I discuss my research methods. I describe the research techniques used in the quantitative research, including the research design, sampling, research procedures, data collection, and the data analysis methods. Finally, I identify some of the limitations of this study.

RESEARCH DESIGN
This study uses an inferential statistic based quantitative research design. This type of research allows me to determine which variables are related and to study the possible patterns of cause and effect among the responses (McBurney, 2001). A quantitative method was chosen as the tool to obtain data from young people, both Australian born and permanent residents, aged 16 to 25. Putnam’s (2000) descriptive research on social capital in the USA and Stone’s and Hughes” (2002b) validation of social capital measurement have provided a base of reference for this empirical study. This study was designed to investigate young Australians’ experience of social capital. The main purpose of this study was to describe young people’s levels of social capital in different social contexts and with respect to major societal organisations. An online survey was designed to answer the research questions by comparing young people’s levels of social capital across different social settings and with respect to major societal organisations and its relationships with their type of membership in organised groups.

This research was designed to provide evidence relating to my research questions (see Chapter 4). It aims to provide empirical evidence to test my propositions about where young people generate their social capital and whether the process of generating social capital can be applied in different social settings. I have already established my research questions and defined the related concepts and I will next explain how I have used quantitative methods to find evidence to answer my research questions.

The quantitative method
A quantitative method is chosen in this research because quantitative data provides numerical answers to my research questions. I then can use the numerical data to answer
all my research questions. Survey questions were designed to get numerical measurements of young Australians’ and permanent residents’ experience of levels of social capital in different social settings and of their confidence in major societal organisations, and to see whether these levels of social capital and of confidence varied with the respondent’s level of family social capital and their membership of organised groups. As compared to qualitative methods, quantitative methods allow large amounts of data to be quantified and then used to describe how the variables relate to each other. Furthermore, my findings could be suggestive and allow a new conceptual model to be developed and tested further.

Responses from my structured questionnaire (see Appendix B) were accumulated and analysed using both descriptive and inferential statistics to compare each social capital measurement scale. I looked for the patterns in my data for the set of cases. For example, one of my research questions concerns whether levels of family social capital (independent variable) produce an effect on levels of generalised social capital (dependent variable). Please note again that I do not mean to assume causation by using the terms independent and dependent variables; the former is simply selected because it is a more likely antecedent of the latter. I also need to employ these terms in order to lay out bivariate tables. But a variable (the independent variable) is selected as the likely antecedent of the other. Level of family social capital and type of membership in organised group membership are treated as the main independent variables in most of the cases. Social capital among friends, acquaintances, neighbours and people in general, confidence in major types of societal organisations, and civic participation are treated as my dependent variables in most of the cases. However, I also analysed levels of social capital among friends and neighbours, and confidence in major types of societal organisations (treated as independent variables) and their relationships with type of membership in organised groups (treated as dependent variable).

An online survey was designed for this study. An internet survey is an effective tool for questionnaire administration. Respondents can choose where and when to answer the survey at their convenience, provided there is internet access. Thus, it is overall less costly and more flexible than the traditional paper questionnaire which has to be mailed out to the respondent and mailed back to the researcher as Dolnicar et al. (2009) summarise. Due to the complex branching in the questionnaire, which required filters and skips, the computer-
assisted administration method was the best way to keep the administration process smooth and less complicated (De Vaus, 2002: 128). In addition, an engaging and attractive interface on the computer screen can help respondents to stay interested in answering the questionnaire (Couper et al., 2001). Another advantage of web-based surveys is that the response speed is quicker than with paper based surveys (Dolnicar et al., 2009).

As a sampling method, coverage and sampling errors are major sources of error in web-based surveys (Couper, 2000). Coverage error is a function of the mismatch between the target population (young adult population of Australia) and the frame population (young adults who have email addresses) (Couper, 2000). In addition, Couper (2000) refers to sampling error as problematic in measuring all members of the frame population. It is problematic when not all people in the target population are in the frame population. In addition, it is hard to construct the frame for web surveys because not everyone has access to the internet. According to *Australian Social Trends* (2008), more than 76 per cent of young Australians aged 15 to 24 had access to the Internet at home and used it at home in 2006-07. This indicates that respondents to an internet survey could be somewhat representative of young Australians.

Most of the previous studies show that mailed paper surveys have higher response rates than web based surveys. These studies are summarised in Dolnicar et al. (2009). Some of the reasons related to the lower response rate for Internet surveys are low computer and internet usage, low familiarity level with the internet, frequent e-mail address changes and higher numbers of undeliverable invitations (Dolnicar et al., 2009). Couper (2000) says that the response rate is unknowable because, if an open invitation to participate in a survey is issued on a web portal, the denominator (those eligible to participate) is typically not known. However, for non-random survey methods, the issue of low or non response has little meaning as this method is not necessarily designed to identify respondents from the frame population (Couper, 2000). The term frame population refers to “the materials or devices which delimit, identify, and allow access to the elements of the target population” (Wright & Tsao, 1983:26). All residential telephone numbers and all personal electronic mail addresses are examples of frames.
Nevertheless, Denscombe (2006) concludes that there are no significance differences between paper-based and internet-based methods in terms of quality and completion rates. Indeed, he says that due to the lack of conclusive evidence pointing to a mode effect associated with web-based surveys, researchers should use web-based questionnaires with confidence (Denscombe, 2006).

Records of all the responses in this research were stored in a secured online database. One of the administration functions shows that my online survey website was browsed 1361 times. However, the same person could browse several times on the survey website. There were only 383 completed responses. After screening for missing data, 283 responses were collected for this study, because the percentage of missing data in more than two sections in the questionnaire was more than 70 per cent. There were six sections in my questionnaire in total. Missing data was not replaced with any value and was not counted in the results.

The sampling approach
Non-random sampling methods were used in this research to minimise the coverage and sampling errors that occur in web-based surveys if a random sampling method is applied. Thus, the snowballing and convenience approaches were used to recruit respondents for this study. Snowball sampling is „a type of non-random sample in which the researcher begins with one case, then, based on information about interrelationships from that case, identifies other cases, and then repeats the process again and again“ (Neuman, 2003:545). The two key characteristics of respondents in this research are *Australian citizenship or permanent residence* and *aged 16 to 25 years old*. The snowball technique is used so that more respondents with the same characteristics can participate in this research. In the snowballing process, respondents are encouraged to recommend and pass on the questionnaire website link to peers with the same characteristics. Then, these peers will pass on the website link to their friends. Eventually the snowballing process will end when the researcher decides that there have been enough respondents for the study.

Convenience sampling was also used in the recruitment of respondents. Haphazard or convenience sampling uses „a type of non-random sample in which the researcher selects anyone he or she happens to come across“ (Neuman, 2003:536). The questionnaire’s web
address was advertised on the Swinburne university website to recruit any respondents who met the two characteristics mentioned above. Further efforts to recruit respondents are discussed in next section.

The disadvantages of these sampling methods are that the results of this study cannot be generalised to all young Australians. Due to the open invitations on portals for my survey, there were no access restrictions and little or no control over multiple completions. Nevertheless, there are no identical responses on key demographic variables in my sample. This research studies the relationship between different levels of family social capital and different types of membership in organised groups and the social capital of only the young people who had participated in this research. This study provides a specific and unique picture of young people in my research which tests current theories of social capital to establish a new model based on the characteristics of young people’s families of origin, their memberships of organised groups, and the association between these two variables and the levels of social capital that young people experience in a range of other social settings.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES
Once written ethics approval was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee of Swinburne University of Technology, the pilot tests were commenced. Pilot tests were conducted before the data collection commenced „to establish how to phrase each question, to evaluate how respondents interpret the question’s meaning and to check whether the range of response alternatives is sufficient” (De Vaus, 2002:114). After the pilot tests were completed the questionnaire was placed online and the data collection phase, including pilot tests, lasted from October 2005 until July 2006.

My first pilot test took place at Swinburne University of Technology. Twenty-two printed questionnaires were distributed to sociology students from 19 October 2005 to 8 November 2005. I spoke to the students, gave a brief introduction to my research and requested that those sociology students comment on my questionnaire. It was optional for them to answer all the questions, but they were encouraged to write their comments on my questionnaire if they had doubts regarding the meaning of any question and to give their suggestions for improvements. Those who agreed to participate in the pilot test were given a stamped
addressed return envelope. Pilot-test participants were encouraged to return the questionnaire within two weeks. In total there were 16 responses to the pilot questionnaire. Fourteen respondents commented on parts of the questionnaire. Another two respondents just answered the questions with no comments. Based on these responses, I amended some phrases in the questions to make them clearer and added further alternative responses for some questions.

Next, I piloted the questionnaire on the website (http://opinio.online.swin.edu.au/s?s=257). The youth leader and the members of 3Phase Productions (a music group) at Boroondara Youth Services were invited to participate in the pilot test. In order to gain more understanding of the whole experience of respondents in answering the questionnaire, I sat side by side with them while they were answering and recorded their comments on the spot. In this way, I managed to improve my understanding of some website technical issues and so improved the layout of the questionnaire.

The final step of my pilot testing was administered (online) to another three members of 3Phase Productions who were potential respondents to my real data collection. The purpose of this final stage was to get feedback on the overall experience in answering the questionnaire. In order to study the interconnection of social capital in different social settings, I found that it was necessary to create six sections in the questionnaire (plus the last section on demographic details). I was aware that a lengthy questionnaire is not recommended in order to avoid incomplete responses due to boredom and lack of motivation (McBurney, 2001). To solve this problem, I selected similar electronic layouts for each section in order to create familiarity with the same social capital questions in different sections. In addition, the screen layout allows each section be separated with different frames. This creates the effect that the questionnaire is less lengthy than a single frame of screen layout would have done.

Next, I recorded the amount of time respondents took to answer each section and the total time was then added up. After the final pilot test, I interviewed these respondents briefly to discuss the overall flow of the sections in the survey and their changing moods and levels of attention during their participation. I also asked for their comments on the length of the questionnaire. I found that they liked the online layout of the questionnaire, which included
an indicator of how many more sections they still had to answer, and that they were surprised that the 30 minutes or so that it took to answer the questions passed quickly. It seems that online layout helped to reduce the chance that respondents would retire early from participating in the questionnaire because of boredom. Thus, I did not make any further changes to my online survey. I included these three responses in my results and launched the online survey.

**Recruitment of respondents**

As well as the link on Swinburne’s website, flyers and posters were designed to advertise my study. I advertised it at Boroondara Youth Services in the community centre, where I had done an earlier observation of young Australians who actively participated in organised groups. I encouraged members of the organised groups to participate in the survey and to recommend to their peers that they participate in the survey, irrespective of their peers’ status regarding membership in organised groups. I also gathered all the postal addresses of youth centres in every council in Metropolitan Melbourne on the Australian Local Government Association website and sent cover letters and posters to those centres.

I used personal networking to invite my friends, acquaintances from university and housemates (both Australian citizens and permanent residents) to participate in the survey. I also gave them some of the flyers, requesting them to pass them on to their peers.

Then I began to contact big youth organisations like the YMCA sports and recreation centre, Scouts Australia, libraries under city councils and churches online to advertise the website. I wrote emails to youth group leaders and attached the same cover letter and flyers.

During the orientation week at Swinburne University of Technology in 2006, I gave a short briefing on my research and invited all the new students present to participate in the online survey. With the help of IT support at Swinburne, I posted a message to all students of this university on the student communication website (Blackboard) with the URL link to my online survey. I also put up posters on university notice boards.
Measurements

Three items measuring social capital were repeatedly used in this thesis: one item of trust, two items of reciprocity. These items were adapted from Stone and Hughes’ (2002b) research of 1500 Australian households where they measured social capital among family/kin, friends, workmates, and neighbours. The validity of this approach was tested by Stone and Hughes (2002b) in work which showed that the scale was reliable (alpha scores were more than 0.7 in each social context). These items of social capital appeared to have the highest face and content validity for this study as compared to other measurements of social capital (Onyx & Bullen, 1997; Putnam, 2000; Narayan & Cassidy, 2001). Social capital items developed by Stone and Hughes best reflected Hardin’s (2000) concept of trust, which I used in this thesis. Stone (2001) and Stone and Hughes (2002a; 2002b) had done a series of content validations in order to assure that these items represented the theoretical concept of social capital. Furthermore, the criterion construction of these items of social capital was further validated by Western et al. (2005).

More importantly, Stone and Hughes (2002b) demonstrated that measures of norms of trust and reciprocity from different social groups cohere into one principal component. This indicates that these items are a relatively reliable measure of overall social capital norms. This result shows the strength of these items in measuring social capital across different social groups as compared to the measures of social trust used by Putnam. Putnam (2000) measures trust by asking individuals if they agree that „most people can be trusted”. This item was not chosen in this thesis because it did not appear to have the face validity to measure the concept of trust that I adopted in this thesis, which was Hardin’s (2000) concept of trust as the three-part relation, A trusts B to do X. Thus, Putnam’s item is insufficient in measuring „X”, which is the expectation of „A”, the truster of „B”, the trusted party. Secondly, this item is only suitable in measuring generalised trust but not norms of trust and reciprocity in other social groups. Thus, items of social capital developed by Stone and Hughes (2002b) were chosen because comparisons of levels of social capital could be made across family, friends, acquaintances (and neighbours) and people in general.

Many of the questions in my survey were adapted from the Australian Survey of Social Attitudes 2003 (AuSSA) and the World Bank’s social capital research. Detailed discussion
of my measurements will be presented in the findings chapters. The last section of my questionnaire was on the respondent’s personal background; all of the questions were adapted from AuSSA (see Wilson & Gibson, 2003). Measures are also described in the Glossary (please refer to Appendix A).

SAMPLE
In total, 283 young Australian citizens or permanent residents aged 16 to 25 participated in this study. Eighty-eight per cent of the young people (n = 248) in this study were born in Australia. Thirty per cent of the respondents are males (n = 86) and seventy per cent are females (n = 194). The average mean age of all respondents was 21. Seventy-three per cent of the respondents were TAFE or university students (n = 221). Thirty-four per cent of my respondents were full-time students who worked part-time for pay (n = 96). There were 128 young people who did not belong to any organised groups and 155 young people who belonged to at least one organised group. Of all members of organised groups, 33 were passive members, 97 were active members and 25 were office holders. Due to the small number of office holders, I collapsed this category into active members (n = 122). Although the number of passive members of organised groups was small, this category was not collapsed into members of organised groups because passive membership is one of the key variables I wished to explore in this thesis.

Most of the respondents (72 per cent) in my sample who were members of organised groups participated in more than one organised group. I found that the majority of these young people (65 per cent) participated in organised groups within their communities. Forty-four per cent of the organised groups that young people participated in consisted of fewer than 50 members. The majority of the young people who were members belonged to at least one hobby group (77 per cent). Hobby groups include sporting and recreation groups, art/music/film/educational groups and various other hobby groups which were mentioned by respondents. One third of the young people who were members had participated in these organised groups for less than one year, one third for one to three years, and another one third for more than four years.
Table 5.1 The sample: background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Descriptive characteristics</th>
<th>Total N (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian born</td>
<td>248 (88)</td>
<td>35 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86 (30)</td>
<td>194 (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school students</td>
<td>25 (9)</td>
<td>221 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or postgraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised group membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office holders</td>
<td>25 (9)</td>
<td>97 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals vary due to missing data.

DATA ANALYSIS METHOD

In this study, the data were analysed by descriptive and inferential statistics to test the direction and strength of the proposed relationships among variables in my hypotheses. This study is not meant to generalise to all young Australians due to the non-random sampling design. However, inferential testing allows me to present a more complete model to picture the interconnections of all types of social capital in different social groups which is understudied in the literature. This analysis was expected to reveal an overall model of social capital for young people. As a result, findings from this thesis, which was based upon 283 residents of in Victoria, Australia, could provide a theoretical testing ground for large scale research in future.

Parametric and non-parametric statistics were carefully selected for different types of data. Continuous data were analysed using parametric statistics including Pearson’s correlation test, T-tests and Analyses of Variance (ANOVA). Categorical data were analysed using non-parametric statistics including Chi-square. The main data analysis method in this study was to compare the levels of social capital experienced by respondents separated into the three categories of membership of organised groups. This type of analysis provides the associations between the independent variables and the dependent variables. The findings show the comparison among different types of members and their levels of trust in and
reciprocity with other people in different social contexts, and their level of confidence in major types of societal organisations. Prior to this analysis I also explored the association between levels of family social capital and social capital in other settings.

LIMITATIONS

This study has a number of limitations. First, the use of inferential statistical was not sufficient to make generalisations to the whole population because of the non-random sampling methods. Thus, the data and discussion in this study cannot be generalised to the whole population of young Australians and permanent residents aged between 16 and 25. Second, individual-level data is used in this study. So the data is bounded by the perceptions and experience of respondents and does not provide objectively measured data, such as could be derived from the perspective of other parties (Stone & Hughes, 2002a). Third, it was impossible to identify who completed the survey. Although I had carefully advertised the survey URL only to the target groups, I cannot be sure of the true identities of the respondents; for example, I cannot be certain that they met my sampling criteria. So this might affect the reliability of my data. Finally, this sample appears to be biased towards university students.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have described the research methodologies and approaches that I adopted in this study. I have described the way in which I developed and tested my questionnaire and my approach to collect the sample. Finally, I pointed to some of the limitations of the study. The following four chapters outline the findings of my study. I begin by analysing family social capital.
CHAPTER 6 FAMILY SOCIAL CAPITAL

INTRODUCTION
This chapter explores social capital between family members. Family social capital (FSC) refers to the norms of trust in and reciprocity with family members. I will discuss results comparing the levels of social capital reported by respondents with respect to both their nuclear and extended families in terms of their experience of social capital in other social settings and their type of membership, or non-membership, of organised groups. Respondents are classified as either non-members of organised groups, passive members of organised groups or active members of organised groups. Thus this chapter focuses on the first research question set out in Chapter 4.

Membership of a social network can be exclusive; when this occurs one can describe the network’s structure as closed (Coleman, 1988a:S105-108). In the family context, Coleman (1988a:S106) refers to intergenerational closure as the closure of a social structure which consists of parents and children and relatives outside the nuclear family. In the family network, intergenerational closure can be formed between one and one’s cousins, parents and aunts or uncles. In this type of social network, norms can be easily enforced in the group and social capital formed within the social relations because of the implementation of collective sanctions (Coleman, 1988a:S106). Family members in a closed structure also have to show their trustworthiness to each other by fulfilling obligations to and expectations of other family members in order to avoid sanctions (Coleman, 1988a:S106). Thus, Coleman (1988a:S106) claims that ‘closure creates trustworthiness in a social structure.’ In other words, a closed structure in a family contributes to bonding social capital.

Moreover, Coleman (1988a:S111) says that single-parent families are the most prominent example of structural deficiency in FSC. In other words, the lack of either parent in these families limits the chance for the children involved to generate as much social capital as do children from two-parent families. The absence of a second parent in the household means less practice in building trust and reciprocity; hence children from single-parent families are, he says, less resourceful than children from two-parent families. Furthermore, single-parent family structures have less capacity to create closed networks with other family members or with people outside the kinship network, in
order for strong sanctions to be applied. So, I expect young people from single-parent families to have less FSC than do those from two-parent families.

The strongest level of bonding social capital in the family is formed through complete trust in and reciprocity among nuclear family members, which also means that they have achieved very high social capital in the family. Putnam (2000:22-23) defines bonding social capital as that which is developed and reinforced in homogenous groups which share the same identity in a ‘repeated, intensive, multistranded network’ such as are found in family and friendship relationships. The experience of very high levels of FSC means that family members do not have any sense of distrust towards their other family members. It also means that family members have the highest encapsulated trust in each other (Hardin, 2002). Families of this kind can be conceived of as a safety net which guarantees trust and reciprocity in return, as long as the family members keep knitting the net together. Where it exists, this type of a perfect trusting and reciprocating relationship among nuclear family members provides an environment for young people to establish a strong foundation of social capital. Based on this foundation, young people should be able to spread their trust and reciprocity to other people in other social contexts (i.e. acquaintances, friends and neighbours) and to institutions and people in general. They should also be more likely to join organised groups.

Levels of FSC
In this study, family members include: father, mother, stepfather, stepmother, brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts, male cousins, female cousins, grandfathers and grandmothers. Trust and reciprocity in the family might be solely generated by obligations. Family members might help each other out based on the fact that they are related by blood and that their relationships are protected by law. For example, John is 14 years old and he has a distant relationship with his father and they have not spoken intimately for years, even though they live under the same roof. When John needs money, he will ask his father and his father will provide it. However, in this situation, it is hard to grow a trusting relationship and to produce norms of trust and reciprocity in the family. Thus, I studied details of young people with close family members from whom they could get emotional resources or practical resources. A close family member is someone whom the young person is close to, is comfortable with, and whom he or she can share private matters with, and ask for help when needed.
In this chapter, I will explore to what extent young people trusted in and reciprocated with their nuclear family members and extended family members. I expected to find the distribution of young people who report low and high levels of FSC to be roughly proportionate but, on a scale from low to high to very high, my data showed that 99 per cent of young people had at least high levels (above mid-point) of FSC. Moreover, 30 per cent of respondents completely trusted and reciprocated with their family members; that is, they enjoyed very high levels of FSC. This is because I only asked respondents only to refer to family members whom they felt close to. This flaw of the research design does not enable me to compare young people with low trust in and reciprocity in family. Those who experienced this are a unique group of young people who appear to have unconditional trust in and reciprocity with their family members. They are the ones who have the least possibility of distrusting their family members or refusing to help them or receiving their help.

This research focuses on young people who reported high and very high levels of FSC instead of low and high levels of FSC. I hypothesised that it would be easier for young people who completely or almost completely trust in and reciprocate with their family members to generate trust in and reciprocity with other people than it will be for young people who have lower levels of such trust and reciprocity. This is because they will have had practice in developing and maintaining trusting relationships. Since the raw score of FSC is left-skewed, with the mass of distribution concentrated on the right side of the distribution figure, I decided to use the median as the cut-off point for young people who report high levels of FSC and very high levels of FSC. The details of the analysis will be presented in the next section.

I test twelfth hypotheses in this chapter. These hypotheses test the theory shown that FSC contributes to levels of social capital in other aspects of a young person’s life. Hypothesis 1 concerns young people who have close nuclear and extended family members compared to those who only have close nuclear family members in terms of their FSC. Coleman (1988) argues that the intergenerational closure type of network (which involved children and parents and other relatives) in the family enhances trust. Based on this I expected that young people who have both close nuclear and close

---

1 I am using the term ‘hypothesis’ fairly loosely in the body of this research to refer to aspects of each of the research questions set out on page 80 in Chapter 4.
extended family members would be more likely to report higher levels of FSC than would young people who only have close nuclear family members.

Hypothesis 2 is based on Coleman’s (1988: s111) argument that children of single-parent families are deficient in FSC simply because they live in single-parent families. This group of young people might hold less trust in and reciprocity with their parent and siblings as compared to young people who grew up in two-parent households. Thus, my second hypothesis was that young people who grew up in single-parent households would have significantly lower means of FSC than young people who did not grow up in single-parent households.

My third hypothesis concerns the differences between levels of FSC and social capital among close friends. The type of social capital in the family and among close friends is bonding social capital. In both social settings, young people have to trust in and reciprocate with the same people repeatedly in continuous and usually long term relationships. Thus it should be easier for young people to build bonding social capital with their close friends if they have very high levels of FSC as a basis. I hypothesise that young people who report very high levels of FSC will have significantly higher means of social capital among friends (FRSC) than young people who report high levels of FSC.

My fourth hypothesis was that young people who report very high levels of FSC have significant higher means of social capital among acquaintances than young people who report high levels of FSC. Acquaintances are defined as people in the respondents’ social circles who are not family, friends or co-members of organised groups. Acquaintances might also be people respondents know at school or university or in the workplace, or just people in the neighbourhood where they live. Respondents know these people at least to say hello to or work side-by-side with, but see them as acquaintances rather than close friends. This hypothesis tests whether bonding social capital in the family is related to young people’s social capital with their acquaintances.

My fifth hypothesis was that young people who report very high levels of FSC have significantly higher means of social capital among neighbours (NSC) than young people who report high levels of FSC. Neighbours are people who lived in the same
neighbourhoods with the respondents in this study. These are weak ties that form social capital for young people. Considering that neighbours are part of young people’s networks of weak ties, there might be an overlap, in that people discussed as acquaintances may also appear as neighbours. Young people who have learnt in their families to trust in and reciprocate with their family members can expand what they have learnt with their neighbours. For example, Jason helps his younger neighbours with their homework; sometime Jason’s neighbours offer him a lift to school or into town when they see him at a bus stop.

My sixth hypothesis was that young people who report very high levels of FSC have significantly higher means of generalised social capital (GSC) than young people who report high levels of FSC. For my research, I define generalised social capital as trust in and reciprocity in generalised others (people in general, including strangers) in the wider society. Members of the wider society trust and reciprocate in semi-asynchronous ways. This is because, beyond face-to-face daily interaction with those whom one knows, one has to rely on one’s acquaintances or total strangers. Sometimes strangers exchange small favours like offering a hand to carry a heavy burden, giving directions, returning one’s lost belonging and so on. The favour may be as slight as a stranger offering you a smile and a greeting as he or she passes you in the park. Manifestations of this trust and reciprocity may take place unexpectedly and the recipient may not get to know the stranger well enough to return the favour in future. But they may keep in mind a sense of obligation for these strangers’ kindnesses and feel obliged to reciprocate, not to these same strangers exactly, but to other people. Therefore the idea of direct reciprocity —you do something for me and I’ll do something for you later — does not work so well at the generalised level because strangers may not be seen as specific persons to whom one is likely to feel one owes a direct obligation to return favours.

My seventh hypothesis was that young people who report very high levels of FSC are significantly more likely to be members of organised groups than are young people who report high levels of FSC. Having strong bonding social capital in the family might encourage them to step out of their comfort zone and interact with other people in wider society. Thus, young people who report very high levels of FSC may be motivated to participate actively in organised groups because they tend to want to trust in and
reciprocate with other people outside their kinship group. Hypothesis 8 tests whether those with very high levels of FSC are more likely to be active members of organised groups.

Hypotheses 9 to 12 speculate that young people who report very high levels of FSC would have significantly higher means of confidence in the four types of major societal organisations than young people who report high levels of FSC. I expected that they would be more likely to have high confidence in these four major types of organisations: government, business organisations, the media and educational institutions. I define ‘confidence in major societal organisations’ as follows: trust in an institution involves a belief that the institution has in place processes to ensure that its people are competent and can be expected to act in a predictable and trustworthy manner (Farquharson & Critchley, 2004:141). Institutional trust is different from the concept of interpersonal trust and reciprocity in informal social settings (i.e. family, friends and acquaintances, and neighbours). However, interpersonal trust is related to institutional trust (Levi, 1996; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Crystal & DeBell, 2002). Thus, I expected that young people who have very high levels of FSC would be likely to have significantly higher levels of confidence in most of the major societal organisations than are young people who have high levels of FSC.

To summarise, my hypotheses for this chapter are:

Hypothesis 1: Young people who have close nuclear and extended family members have significantly higher means of FSC than young people who only have close nuclear family members.

Hypothesis 2: Young people who grew up in single-parent households have significantly lower means of FSC than young people who did not grow up in single-parent households.

Hypothesis 3: Young people who report very high levels of FSC have significantly higher means of social capital among friends (FRSC) than young people who report high levels of FSC.

Hypothesis 4: Young people who report very high levels of FSC have significantly higher means of social capital among acquaintances than young people who report high levels of FSC.
Hypothesis 5: Young people who report very high levels of FSC have significantly higher means of social capital among neighbours (NSC) than young people who report high levels of FSC.

Hypothesis 6: Young people who report very high levels of FSC have significantly higher means of generalised social capital (GSC) than young people who report high levels of FSC.

Hypothesis 7: Young people who report very high levels of FSC are significantly more likely to be members of organised groups than are young people who report high levels of FSC.

Hypothesis 8: Young people who report very high levels of FSC are significantly more likely to be active members of organised groups than are young people who report high levels of FSC.

Hypothesis 9: Young people who report very high levels of FSC have higher means of confidence in government than young people who report high levels of FSC.

Hypothesis 10: Young people who report very high levels of FSC have significantly higher means of confidence in business organisations than young people who report high levels of FSC.

Hypothesis 11: Young people who report very high levels of FSC have significantly higher means of confidence in the media than young people who report high levels of FSC.

Hypothesis 12: Young people who report very high levels of FSC have significantly higher means of confidence in educational institutions than young people who report high levels of FSC.

MEASURING FAMILY SOCIAL CAPITAL

Measuring FSC is difficult because of the different compositions of families. These range from: nuclear family to extended family structures; living in the same or different households; differences in age and sex; family roles; size; frequency of contact; and so on. So, instead of investigating every single family member who might or might not maintain trusting and reciprocal relations with young people, I only asked young people to select family members whom they are close to. FSC data was drawn from young people who had at least one close family member whom they felt at ease with, could talk to about private matters, or could call on for help. In other words, ‘family members’
in this chapter always refers to ‘close family members’. This strategy turned out to be a design flaw in my research as it does not enable me to identify respondents with low FSC.

Close family members were divided into two categories: those in the nuclear family and those in the extended family. The nuclear family members consist of father, mother, stepfather, stepmother, brothers and sisters, and the extended family members consists of uncles, aunts, male cousins, female cousins, grandfathers and grandmothers. Due to the low percentage of young people in their 20s who have partners and their own biological children (Australian Social Trends, 2005), I have not included partners, children or in-laws in the family category. In my sample of 283, 21 (seven per cent) young persons were married or in de facto relationships (only one had children), and two (one per cent) were divorced and had children.

To measure FSC, respondents were first asked how many family members (parents, brothers, sisters, grandparents, aunts, uncles) they feel close to, with the question: ‘E1. How many family members who you feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help?’ Multiple choice answers were given: 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21 and above, and none. Such family members are termed ‘close’ in this thesis. Next, details were asked about each close family member, with the instruction: ‘E2.i. Please indicate which family members you feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help.’ A list of family members was given: father, mother, stepfather, stepmother, brother, sister, cousin (male), cousin (female), uncle, aunt, grandfather and grandmother. Respondents could only select members from their blood relatives or stepparents. These questions were adapted from Grootaert et al. (2004).

Then they were asked to answer three questions regarding FSC about each family member who they were close to: ‘E2.v. To what extent do you trust him or her to act in your best interests?’; ‘E2.vi. To what extent do you think he or she would be willing to help if you needed it (e.g. offer emotional support, physical support like practical assistance or financial help)?’ and ‘E2.vii. To what extent would you yourself be willing to help if he or she needed it? (e.g. offer emotional support, physical support like practical assistance or financial help)’. All three FSC questions were on an 11-point scale from 1 = ‘No, not at all’ to 11 = ‘Yes, completely’. These questions were adapted
from Stone and Hughes (2002b). According to Stone and Hughes (2002b), the social capital scale has good internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient reported of .72. In the current study the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was .86. Cronbach’s alpha measures reliability of a measure (Briggs and Cheek, 1986), and a score of .70 is generally considered to be evidence that a measure is reliable (Briggs and Cheek, 1986).

To test Hypothesis 1, FSC mean scores of young people who have both nuclear and extended family members whom they were close to were compared to young people who have only nuclear family members whom they were close to. Here the FSC scores were also treated as continuous data and were not categorised into any groups.

To test Hypothesis 2, I categorised young people into two groups: those who grew up in single-parent households and those who did not, and then compared their FSC mean scores (see Question G16.). Here the FSC scores were treated as continuous data and were not categorised into any discontinuous groups. The term single-parent household is problematic as it is not easy to define. This is because young people might live with their parent and their parent’s partner at various times in their childhood or they might alternate, spend more time with one biological parent and some time with the other one. The interaction between young people and this step-parental figure might or might not have an influence on the generation of social capital. Thus, I decided to leave the categorisation of single-parent household for the respondents to decide themselves.

To test Hypotheses 3 to 12, I analysed FSC of young people in general (it did not matter if the FSC was just nuclear or just extended FSC or both). I divided the young people into two categories: those who report high levels of FSC, and those who report very high levels of FSC. Descriptive statistics of the combined scores of FSC show that the mean was 10.13, the median was 10.45 and the mode was 11. The data was very left-skewed. To respondents of this research, the score ten or 11 on an 11-point scale might literally means very high. Thus I use the median as the cutting point in order to divide my respondents equally into two groups: high and very high. Respondents with high levels of FSC consist of young people who report a combined score between six and 10.44. Those whose combined score was between 10.45 and 11 were categorised as having very high levels of FSC. Those who have close family members with a FSC
combined score between one and six were treated as missing cases. This is because there were so few of them (n = 2).

Due to my strategy of measuring bonding social capital among close family members of young people, I did not measure FSC of young people who do not have any close family members; the questionnaire did not ask respondents to report on levels of social capital with family members who they were not close to. In retrospect this was a mistake as it did not allow me to explore relationships between social capital of young people who do not have any close family members (n = 21) and other variables. These young people who do not have any close family members were counted as missing data. In addition, I did not collect data on distant family members of young people. Thus I cannot analyse the influence of distant family members on FSC.

MEASURING SOCIAL CAPITAL AMONG FRIENDS
Measuring social capital among close friends (FRSC) is difficult because young people could define their friends in different degrees of closeness by calling their friends mate, buddy, pal, ‘brother’, ‘sister’, good friend, intimate friend, best friend, partner or soulmate. Regardless of what young people call their close friends, these friends may fulfil one or more of these six functions: companionship, stimulation, physical support, ego support, social comparison and intimacy/affection (Parker & Gottman, 1989). In the process of making friends and keeping friends to fulfil the functions above, one must learn whom one can trust, in what circumstances, and also how to be a trustworthy person who merits friendship oneself. Then norms of trust and reciprocity will develop between friends and enhance the connection in their friendships.

In this research, I am interested in finding out young people’s experience of social capital. Thus I focus only on young people who report that they have close friends. Those who do not have any close friends were not included in this part of my research (n = 8).

I first asked young people to consider all of their friends whom they feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help. These friends are people who are not spouses, romantic partners or immediate members of the young people’s families. Three social capital questions were asked in the questionnaire: 'D2. To what extent do
you trust these friends to act in your best interests?’; ‘D3. To what extent would they be willing to help you if you needed it (e.g. by offering emotional support, physical support like practical assistance or financial help)?’; ‘D4. To what extent would you yourself be willing to help these friends if they needed it (e.g. by offering emotional support, physical support like practical assistance or financial help)?’ All of these social capital questions were on an 11 point scale, (1 =, No, not at all, 11 = Yes, completely). These questions were adapted from Stone and Hughes (2002b). To test the internal consistency of this scale, a reliability analysis was run and it revealed that Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was .72. This score is lower than Stone and Hughes (2002b), with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient reported of .85.

To test Hypothesis 3, FRSC interval scores were treated as continuous data in order to compare FRSC mean scores between young people who report very high levels of FSC and young people who report high levels of FSC.

MEASURING SOCIAL CAPITAL AMONG ACQUAINTANCES AND NEIGHBOURS
To test Hypothesis 4, I defined acquaintances as people in respondents’ social circles who were not family, friends or members of organised groups. Acquaintances also might be people respondents knew at school or university or in the workplace, or just residents in the neighbourhood where they lived. Respondents knew these people at least to say hello to or to work side-by-side with, and saw them as acquaintances rather than as close friends. Considering that neighbours are part of young people’s networks of weak ties, there might be an overlap, in that people discussed as acquaintances could also appear as neighbours. Three social capital questions about acquaintances were asked in the questionnaire: ‘F1. To what extent do you trust these acquaintances to act in your best interests?’; ‘F2. To what extent they would be willing to help you if you needed it (e.g. by lending them a hand with carrying heavy things or letting them use your phone)?’; ‘F3. To what extent would you yourself willing to help the acquaintances if they needed it (e.g. by lending you a hand with carrying heavy things or letting you use their phone)?’ All of these social capital questions were on an 11 point scale, (1 =, No, not at all, 11 = Yes, completely). These questions were adapted from Stone and Hughes (2002b) which revealed a good internal consistency with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient reported .78. In this study, this scale was .83 which
indicates high reliability. The combined scores of social capital among acquaintances were treated as continuous data in this chapter.

In this thesis, social capital among neighbours (NSC) is defined as norms of trust and reciprocity held by young people and their neighbours. In other words, it serves the expectation that the neighbours would act in the best interests of each other within the norms of reciprocity with the expectation that neighbours exchange favours asynchronously. The term ‘neighbourhood’ is not defined in the questionnaire because it is a subjective concept of one’s living environment which is hard to define by some fixed geographical area. For example, Jason might travel to a different suburban area (which the government labels with a different postcode) for schooling continuously for 16 years. At the same time, he and his family members go shopping in yet another suburban area every weekend. To Jason, ‘neighbourhood’ might mean the suburban areas where his house is located, or the region containing his house and his school, and the shopping area he is familiar with. Thus, I gave respondents the space and choice to use their own definition of neighbourhood.

To get the combined scores of NSC, respondents were given the following question, which was adapted from Stone and Hughes (2002b): ‘A3. To what extent do you trust your neighbours to act in your best interests?’ (11-point scale, 1 =, No, not at all, 11 = Yes, completely), to determine how much they trust their neighbours. To measure reciprocity, respondents were asked: a) ‘A4. To what extent would your neighbours be willing to help you? (e.g. by lending toolbox, collecting post for neighbours who are on long holidays)’, and b) ‘A5. To what extent would you yourself be willing to help your neighbours? (e.g. by lending toolbox, collecting post for neighbours who are on long holidays)’. In the current study the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was .86. This result supported Stone and Hughes’s study (2002b) that the social capital scale has good internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient they reported of .78.

To test Hypothesis 5, the neighbourhood social capital combined score is treated as continuous data in order to compare the NSC mean scores between young people who report very high levels of FSC and young people who report high levels of FSC.
MEASURING GENERALISED SOCIAL CAPITAL

To obtain the combined scores of generalised social capital (GSC), young respondents were asked to answer three questions regarding GSC about most people whom they might meet in an average day (‘including people whom you know and strangers’): ‘To what extent do you trust him or her to act in your best interests?’ ‘To what extent do you think he or she would be willing to help if you needed it (e.g. giving directions or returning a dropped bag)?’ and ‘To what extent would you yourself be willing to help if he or she needed it? (e.g. giving directions or returning a dropped bag)’. For the complete questions, please refer to question A14 in Appendix B. These questions are adapted from Stone and Hughes (2002b). All three generalised social capital questions were on an 11-point scale from 1 = ‘No, not at all’ to 11 = ‘Yes, completely’. Reliability analysis shows that this scale has good internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient score of .79. This result supported Stone and Hughes’s study (2002b) that the social capital scale has good internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient they reported of .78. To test Hypothesis 6, comparison of GSC mean scores between young people who report very high levels of FSC and high levels of FSC was drawn using the continuous data of combined GSC scores.

MEASURING TYPE OF MEMBERSHIP

To test Hypotheses 7 and 8, respondents were asked about their membership in organised groups. In the organised groups section of the survey, the first question given to the respondent was: ‘B2. Now we would like to ask you about organised groups organised by school/ college/university/workplace, community, online community, national or international organisations. Are you a member of any organised group?’ Then, participants were asked to report their type of membership (member, active member or office-holder). The meaning of being a non-member, active member or office-holder was explained earlier as: a) a non-member does not belong to any organised group; b) a passive member pays a subscription, makes donations or is on a mailing list, but he or she is not any more involved than this; c) an active member is regularly involved in the group's activities; d) an officeholder has a decision-making role in the group, for example, being a committee member, activity organiser or webmaster.
Due to the small number of officeholders in this sample (n = 25), I collapsed the category of ‘officeholders’ into ‘active members’. First I compared the levels of FSC between non-members and members for Hypothesis 7. Then I compared two types of group membership: passive member; and active member for Hypothesis 8. Non-member referred to those who did not belong to any organised groups. Those participants who claimed that they belonged to one or more organised groups as a member only (not active member or office-holder) were labelled passive members. A respondent who participated as an active member in any group was categorised as an active member. For example, Ann participated in a religious group as a passive member; at the same time she was also an active member of an ethnic group. She was categorised as ‘active member’.

MEASURING CONFIDENCE IN MAJOR SOCIETAL ORGANISATIONS
To test Hypotheses 9 to 12, confidence in major societal organisations was measured. Respondents were asked to indicate their levels of confidence in 20 major societal organisations using multiple choice answer (1 = No confidence at all, 2 = Not very much confidence, 3 = Not sure, 4 = Quite a lot of confidence, 5 = A great deal of confidence). This list of organisations was given: banks and financial institutions, public transport system, local trade and business people, the federal parliament, local government, major Australian companies, the courts and legal system, the defence forces, the police in your state (or territory), commercial radio stations, the ABC, newspapers, commercial television channels, teachers and schools, lecturers and TAFE, college and universities, doctors and hospitals, the unions, churches and religious institutions, public services, and charities. This question is adapted from the AuSSA (Wilson & Gibson, 2003). For the complete question, please refer to question C3 in Appendix B. I transformed each score of respondents for each organisation to: 1 = No confidence at all, 2 = Not very much confidence, 3 = Quite a lot of confidence, 4 = A great deal of confidence, 0 = Not sure.

In order to group the variables into meaningful categories, a principal components analysis (PCA) was run using SPSS Version 12. All twenty types of organisations were used in this analysis. I first inspected the correlation matrix, which revealed the presence of many coefficients of 0.3 and above. Next, the Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin value was 0.85, exceeding the recommended value of 0.6 (Kaiser, 1974) and the Barlett’s Test
of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) reached statistical significance. These results supported the use of PCA for grouping the variables.

Principal components analysis showed the presence of five components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 35.6 per cent, 9.1 per cent, 8.6 per cent, 7.3 per cent and 6.3 per cent of the variance respectively. In addition, the screeplot revealed a clear break after the sixth component. However, the results of Parallel Analysis showed that there were only three components with eigenvalues exceeding the corresponding criterion values for a randomly generated data matrix of the same size (20 variables – 283 respondents). Due to the inconsistency in the number of components in these analyses, Varimax rotation was performed to provide a clearer picture of the division of the components. I found four variables that did not load on the components obtained: confidence in charities, confidence in churches or religious institutions, public services and trade unions. Thus, I removed these four variables and repeated the analysis. There were five components extracted from the analysis. Varimax rotation was performed to give a clearer division of these five components. The rotated solution showed that these components consisted of a number of strong loadings and almost all variables loading substantially on only one component except for the confidence in banks and financial institutions variable. The confidence in banks and financial institutions variable loaded moderately on the first and the fifth component. Moreover, only two variables, confidence in public transportation and confidence in banks and financial institutions loaded in the fifth component. So there is a chance that confidence in public transportation could be an independent variable. Therefore, I re-ran PCA again and requested for the specific four components.
Table 6.1 shows that there were four components extracted from the analysis. The results of this analysis supported four elements that could be categorised as business organisations: local trade and business people, major Australian companies, banks and financial institutions and public transport system. For the government component, there were seven elements: federal parliament, local government, the police, the courts and legal system, the defence forces, the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) and health care institutions. The third component, the media component, consisted of three elements: newspapers, commercial radio stations and television channels. Finally the fourth component, educational institutions, consisted of teachers and schools, lecturers and TAFE, college and universities.

To test Hypotheses 9 to 12, I compared mean scores of confidence in the following four types of major societal organisations: government, business organisations, the media and educational institutions between young people who report very high levels of FSC and young people who report high levels of FSC. Thus, scores of confidence in major societal organisations were treated as continuous data.
RESULTS

My first hypothesis was that young people who have close nuclear and extended family members have significantly higher means of FSC than young people who only have close nuclear family members. An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the FSC score for these two groups of young people. There was no significant difference in scores for young people who have both nuclear and extended family members ($M = 10.02, SD = 1.22$) and those who only have nuclear family members ($M = 10.17, SD = .96; t(247) = -1.06, p = .29$). Thus, this result did not lend support to Hypothesis 1.

My second hypothesis was that young people who grew up in single-parent households ($n = 43$) have significantly lower means of FSC than young people who did not grow up in single-parent households ($n = 205$). FSC mean scores of young people who grew up with a single-parent were 10.08 ($SD = .94$) and a similar mean score ($M = 10.07, SD = 1.17$) was found in young people who did not grow up in single-parent households. The results of an independent-sample t-test revealed that there were no significant differences between these two groups of young people in terms of their FSC, $t(246) = -.05, p = 0.97$. Thus Hypothesis 2 was rejected because single-parent households did not seem to create less FSC than two-parent households. However, due to the very small number of young people who grew up in single-parent families in this sample, further investigation should be undertaken to study the influence of type of family on family social capital.

My third hypothesis was that young people who report very high levels of FSC have significantly higher means of social capital among friends (FRSC) than young people who report high levels of FSC. An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the different mean scores of these two groups of young people. The results revealed that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of young people who report high levels of FSC ($M = 8.95, SD = 2.83$) and young people who report very high levels of FSC ($M = 9.94, SD = 1.80; t(247) = -3.29, p = .001$). It appears that FRSC mean scores of young people who report very high levels of FSC are significantly higher than young people who report high levels of FSC. Thus my hypothesis was supported because having very high levels of FSC was related to higher FRSC.
My fourth hypothesis was that young people who report very high levels of FSC have significantly higher means of social capital among acquaintances than young people who report high levels of FSC. The results of an independent-sample t-test revealed that there were no significant differences found between young people who report high levels of FSC ($M = 7.35$, $SD = 1.17$) and young people who report very high levels of FSC [$M = 7.43$, $SD = 1.95$; $t(208) = -.42$, $p = .68$]. Bonding social capital in the family did not influence social capital among acquaintances. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

My fifth hypothesis was that young people who report very high levels of FSC have significantly higher means of social capital among neighbours (NSC) than young people who report high levels of FSC. The results of an independent sample t-test revealed that there are no significant differences of NSC between these two groups of young people [$t(245) = -.18$, $p = .24$]; the mean score for young people who report high levels of FSC is 7.14 and the mean score for young people who report very high levels of FSC is 7.48. Thus, Hypothesis 5 was not supported: NSC was not affected by levels of FSC. This finding was consistent with the result for Hypothesis 4, in which bonding social capital in the family was not associated with social capital among acquaintances.

Hypothesis 6 tested whether young people who report very high levels of FSC have higher generalised social capital (GSC) than young people who report high levels of FSC. Descriptive statistics show that mean scores of GSC for young people who report high levels of FSC ($M = 6.42$, $SD = 1.56$) were similar to young people who reported very high levels of FSC ($M = 6.41$, $SD = 1.87$). An independent sample t-test was conducted to further compare these mean scores. The results showed no significant difference in GSC mean scores between the two groups, [$t(248) = .07$, $p = .94$]. Thus, Hypothesis 6 was not supported: young people who report very high levels of FSC were not reporting higher GSC than young people who report high levels of FSC.

My seventh hypothesis was that young people who report very high levels of FSC are significantly more likely to be members of organised groups than are young people who report high levels of FSC. Table 6.2 shows that similar percentages of young people who had very high levels of FSC and who had high levels were AOGMs. A Chi-square test was run to confirm the similar proportion of each type of membership in high levels
of FSC and very high levels of FSC categories. The results showed that Chi-square value was .01, which had significance levels greater than .05. In other words, there was no significant difference in percentage between young people who had very high levels of FSC and those who had high levels of FSC in reporting their membership of organised groups. In fact, these results were not convincing for making the claim that FSC was related to type of membership of organised groups. Thus, Hypothesis 7 was not supported.

Table 6.2 Type of membership of organised groups by FSC (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of membership</th>
<th>FSC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOGM</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGM</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Missing data (n = 33) not included in subtotals.

My eighth hypothesis was that young people who report very high levels of FSC are significantly more likely to be active members of organised groups than are young people who report high levels of FSC. I found a bigger percentage of young people who had very high levels of FSC had actively participated in organised groups than those who had high levels of FSC as shown in Table 6.3. I tested the differences using a Chi-square test, which showed no significant differences in each type of membership by level of FSC. The Chi-square value was .60, with an associated significance level of .44. Thus, Hypothesis 8 was not supported.

Table 6.3 Type of membership of organised groups by FSC, group members only (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of membership</th>
<th>FSC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POGM</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOGM</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Missing data (n = 20) not included in subtotals.

Hypotheses 9 to 12 measured whether young people who reported very high levels of FSC had significantly higher means in confidence in the four types of major societal organisations (government, business organisations, the media and educational
institutions) than young people who reported high levels of FSC. Table 6.3 shows no significant differences in the mean scores of these four types of major societal organisations between the two groups. In other words, levels of FSC were not associated with the confidence in any types of major societal organisations. Thus, Hypotheses 9 to 12 were not supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-test for equality of means</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in government</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in business orgs</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in the media</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in education insts</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION
In this chapter, my findings shed some light on how bonding social capital in the family is related to single-parent families, bonding social capital among close friends, bridging social capital among acquaintances, generalised social capital, major societal organisations, and level of activity in organised groups. There was only one significant result in this chapter (see Figure 6.1 below). Young people who reported very high levels of FSC expressed higher social capital among their close friends than did young people who report high levels of FSC. Thus, trust in and reciprocity with family members may be a platform for encouraging young people to trust in and reciprocate with their close friends. Young people might find that they could transfer the practice of trust and reciprocity in the family into the friendship realm.

Figure 6.1 Findings on the influence of family social capital on social capitals among friends
I found no significant differences in FSC mean scores between young people who reported both close nuclear and extended family and their counterparts who only purported close nuclear family members. This finding does not lend support to Coleman’s (1988a) argument that the intergenerational type of closure network is more effective in generating FSC. Having close extended family members did not appear to reinforce the dense norms of trust and reciprocity in the family and building more trust and reciprocity in young people’s FSC as Coleman (1988a) suggests. Having extended family as well as nuclear family in close family networks does not seem to make it easier to form very high levels of FSC than having only close nuclear family members, and vice versa. This suggests that young people form a strong basis for FSC in their nuclear family as well as in their extended family. This is also evident in that almost all of my participants reported at least high FSC, regardless of the type of their family network. Only two of the respondents reported low FSC.

There were also no significant differences in FSC between young people who grew up in single-parent households and their counterparts who are from two-parent households. It appears that, at least for these participants, having a single-parent family is not a significant factor negatively affecting FSC. In other words, young people from two-parent households do not necessarily benefit from having more opportunities to practise trust in and reciprocity with their family members. Thus these findings do not lend support to Coleman’s (1988a:S111) argument that children who are from single-parent households have less capacity for learning trust and reciprocity; the physical absence of a parent from a household did not lower the chances for young people to build social capital in the family. This implies that single-parent households have the same potential as two-parent household for forming high levels of FSC. Rather, the quality of social interaction between parent(s) and children might be more important than the physical presence of parent(s) in the household in forming FSC. This implies that young people benefit from interaction with parents in either type of household.

The young people did report higher trust in and reciprocity with their friends if they reported very high trust in and reciprocity with their family members. In other words, bonding social capital in the family was associated with high social capital among close friends. The experience of interacting with family members intensively might provide guidelines to young people as to how they should interact with their close friends. Both
bonding social capital in the family and among friends involve ‘thick’ relationships which Hardin (2002:21) explains as ‘overlapping iterated interactions over broad ranges of matters’. Over time, young people might treat their close friends like their family members based on the model of trust and reciprocity that they have learned and practised with their close family members.

My findings showed no differences in social capital among acquaintances and NSC between young people who reported high levels of FSC and those who reported very high levels of FSC. This shows that bonding social capital does not increase bridging social capital in my results. Acquaintances (including neighbours) are weak ties in young people’s social networks. In contrast to strong ties in the family and among close friends, acquaintances do not play multifunctional roles in young people’s lives, so they do not seem to be as important to the young people. Acquaintances may often sink into the background in young people’s lives due to fewer meaningful interactions as compared to close family members and close friends. Thus, having very high levels of FSC does not seem to help in expanding young people’s trust and reciprocity in their acquaintances.

There was also no significant difference in levels of GSC reported between young people who reported high levels of FSC and those who reported very high levels of FSC. These findings do not lend support to Fukuyama’s (1995) theory that trust and reciprocity in the family tend to create low generalised trust in the society. According to his theory, young people who have learned to trust highly in and reciprocate with their family may not be motivated to spread their trust and reciprocity in society. However, my findings show that young people who report very high trust in and reciprocity with their family members did not appear to be less trusting and to reciprocate less with other people in general. In fact, there were no significant differences in levels of GSC between these young people with different levels of FSC.

Levels of FSC were also not associated with membership in organised groups. Young people who had very high levels of FSC and those who had high levels of FSC were almost equally likely to be members of organised groups. There were also equally likely to actively or passively participated in organised groups. Thus, these two results do not support Fukuyama’s argument that in-group trust in the family brings distrust of people
outside the group, i.e. non-kin, and so discourages members of families with in-group trust from joining social associations (Fukuyama, 1995). The choice of whether to participate in organised groups was not influenced by levels of FSC for my participants. Thus I did not find any evidence of dark social capital’s alleged malign effects in my data.

Young people who reported very high and high levels of FSC were similarly likely to report high levels of confidence in the four types of the major societal organisations. My results do not support the argument that interpersonal trust is related to trust in government or political institutions (Putnam, 1993a; Crystal & DeBell, 2002; Brehm & Rahn, 1997). FSC does not seem to act as a strong basis for young people to put high confidence in major societal organisations. It appears that interpersonal trust and reciprocity in the family do not expand to formal institutional trust in most of the types of major societal organisation.

Most of my findings were not significant and went against what the literature predicted. Social capital within the family does not appear to work as a safety net and a starting base for the expansion of social capital to other social groups as expected. I also have insufficient evidence to suggest that the structure of the family is related to the formation of family social capital. There are a few reasons that could explain this situation. Firstly, my findings might be different because of the different measurements I used for family social capital. For Coleman (1988a), the strength of the relations between parents and child is the measure of the social capital, and he correlated family social capital with the school dropout rate. Secondly, the convenience sampling method which I used was different from the random sampling method Coleman (1988a) used. Coleman collected data from 4000 high students. Thirdly, the age group that Coleman recruited was younger (Grade 10 and Grade 12 students in high schools) where as the mean age of my sample was 21.

To conclude, bonding social capital in the family was only associated with young people who build bonding social capital with their close friends. Experience in developing and maintaining social bonds at home helps young people to engage with their close friends. However, family social capital did not increase generalised social capital and social capital among neighbours. In addition, Coleman’s argument that
single-parent families have lower capacity to build social capital than two-parent families was not supported. Young people’s participation in organised groups was also not related to family social capital. Having complete trust in and reciprocity with one’s family does not appear to help young people to expand their trust and reciprocity in the community and wider society. In the next chapter I further explore friendship social capital (FRSC).
CHAPTER 7 SOCIAL CAPITAL AMONG FRIENDS

INTRODUCTION
This chapter explores young people’s social capital with their friends. First, I show how social capital among friends and the other variables are measured. Next, I discuss my results. My main findings are that, for the young people in this study, high levels of social capital among friends was associated with active participation in organised groups and with increased levels of generalised social capital. Thus this chapter focuses on the second research question from Chapter 4.

The literature on social capital among friends mainly focuses on how friendship networks can help individuals in job searches (Lin et al., 1981; Flap & De Graaf, 1986; De Graaf & Flap, 1988; Montgomery, 1992; Stone et al., 2003; Davern & Hachen, 2006). This trend in the literature on friendship networks can be traced back to Granovetter’s (1973:1361-1362) idea of ‘the strength of weak ties’. Granovetter says that weak ties are more advantageous in job-searching and getting information than are strong ties. This is because building weak ties require less time and effort than the formation of strong ties and weak ties are more likely to link people into different networks than are strong ties. Indeed Granovetter’s weak ties could be taken as an early reference to bridging social capital.

Putnam (2000:22-23) explains that bonding social capital is developed and reinforced in homogenous groups which share the same identity, in ‘repeated, intensive, multistranded networks’ like family and friendship relationships. The term multistranded refers here to the inter-connections in close friendship groups when most or all of the members are mutual friends. In such a network, the linkages are not centred only on one member of the network because all other members are connected. Close friends in the same network trust in and reciprocate with one another, because norms can be imposed more easily in a closed network than an open network (Coleman, 1988a:s107-108). Thus, my first hypothesis was that young people who report that their close friends are all mutual friends will have higher FRSC than their counterparts who report fewer of their close friends are friends with each other and those who report none of their close friends are friends with each other.
On the other hand, Putnam (2000:22) introduced the concept of bridging social capital as a feature of open networks (i.e., networks that connect people ‘across diverse social cleavages’). However there is a lack of research on social capital among close friends. Thus in this chapter, I will explore social capital among close friends and its relationship to active participation in organised groups. Close friends are defined as friends who young people feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or can call on for help.

Green and Brock (1998) argue that individuals who are more trusting are more likely to engage in social activities than are those who are less trusting. Accordingly, Hypothesis 2 is that young people who report a very high level of trust in and reciprocity with their friends should be more likely to be members of organised groups than those who have high levels. It is likely that young group members’ close friends are also members of the same organised groups. Active participation might be a way to enhance their friendship by creating more opportunities for them to interact with one another. Thus, my third hypothesis was: young people who have very high levels of social capital with their close friends are more likely to be active members of organised groups (AOGMs) than are those who have high levels.

Generalised trust and reciprocity is an extension of bonding social capital (Putnam, 2000). Young people who build social capital with their close friends are likely to extend their interpersonal trust and reciprocity to people whom they meet in daily life. Thus, my fourth hypothesis was: young people who report very high levels of FRSC will have significantly higher means of generalised social capital (GSC) than young people who report high levels of FRSC.

Interpersonal trust is claimed to be related to institutional trust (Putnam, 1993a; Levi, 1996; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Crystal & DeBell, 2002; Pickup et al., 2004). Young people who trust in and reciprocate with their close friends might also expand their social capital to either the system of institutions or to the people who represent these institutions. Thus, Hypotheses 5 to 8 speculate that young people who have a very high level of social capital with their close friends are likely to report higher levels of confidence in government, in business organisations, in the media and in educational organisations than are those who only have a high level of FRSC.
To summarise, my hypotheses for this chapter are:

Hypothesis 1: Young people who report that their close friends are all mutual friends have higher FRSC compared with their counterparts who report that fewer of their close friends are friends with each other and compared with those who report that none of their close friends are friends with each other.

Hypothesis 2: Young people who report a very high level of FRSC are more likely to be members of organised groups than are young people who report only a high level of FRSC.

Hypothesis 3: Young people who report a very high level of FRSC are more likely to be active members of organised groups than are young people who report only a high level of FRSC.

Hypothesis 4: Young people who report a very high level of FRSC have significantly higher means of generalised social capital (GSC) than do young people who report only a high level of FRSC.

Hypothesis 5: Young people who report a very high level of FRSC have significantly higher means of confidence in government than do young people who report only a high level of FRSC.

Hypothesis 6: Young people who report a very high level of FRSC have significantly higher means of confidence in business organisations than do young people who report only a high level of FRSC.

Hypothesis 7: Young people who report a very high level of FRSC have significantly higher means of confidence in the media than do young people who report only a high level of FRSC.

Hypothesis 8: Young people who report a very high level of FRSC have significantly higher means of confidence in educational institutions than do young people who report only a high level of FRSC.

MEASURING SOCIAL CAPITAL AMONG FRIENDS
To measure social capital among friends, I first asked young people to consider all of their friends who they feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help. These friends are people who are not spouses, romantic partners or immediate
members of the young people’s families. The details of this measurement were discussed in Chapter 6.

In order to test Hypothesis 1, the existence of multistranded connections between members in the close friendship groups of respondents was investigated, by asking the following question: ‘To what extent do your close friends know one another?’ on an 11-point scale, (1 = No, not at all, 11 = Yes, completely). Three categories of the extent to which the close friends of respondents know one another were studied in this chapter: ‘a few close friends know one another’, ‘some close friends know one another’, ‘all close friends know one another’. Young people who reported a maximum score (11 points on the 11 point scale) were categorised in ‘all close friends know one another’. Those whose score were between one and 5.99 were categorised as ‘a few close friends know one another’. Next, those whose combined score was between 6.00 and 10.99 were categorised as ‘some close friends know one another’. In order to compare FRSC mean scores of these three groups of young people, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. FRSC is treated as continuous data.

To test Hypotheses 2 and 3, the young people were divided according to their type of membership of organised groups. To test Hypotheses 4 to 8, young people’s levels of FRSC were compared according to GSC and to confidence in major types of societal organisations in order. Here both GSC and confidence in major types of societal organisations are treated as continuous data. The details of these measurements were discussed in Chapter 6.

In order to find out if there were any differences in membership of organised groups, GSC and institutional trust between young people with different levels of FRSC, I divided FRSC into two categories: high and very high using the median score (10.00). Young people who reported a high level of FRSC consist of those who have FRSC combined scores between 6.00 and 9.99; those whose combined scores are between 10.00 and 11.00 are categorised as having very high levels of FRSC. Only six young people reported that they did not have any close friends, so their data was excluded in testing all the hypotheses.
RESULTS
My first hypothesis was that young people who report that their close friends are all mutually friends what have higher FRSC than their counterparts who reported that either some of their close friends were friends with each other or a few or none of their close friends are friends with each other. A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of having mutual close friends on FRSC. Subjects were divided into three groups according to the extent of how many of their close friends know each other [Group 1: a few (n = 28); Group 2 (n = 182): some; Group 3: all (n = 30)]. There was a significant difference at the \( p < .01 \) level in FRSC for the three groups of young people \( F(2, 245) = 10.63, p = .00 \). Next, a post-hoc comparison using Tukey HSD test indicated the mean score for Group 3 (\( M = 10.59, SD = .73 \)) was different from Group 1 (\( M = 9.17, SD = 1.78 \)) and Group 2 (\( M = 9.58, SD = 1.25 \)).

This result revealed that young people with the highest levels of FRSC were those whose friends all knew each other, followed by lower FRSC for young people where some of their close friends know each other, and even lower for young people who had a few or no mutual friends in their close friendship networks. This suggests that high FRSC maybe much easier to build in intense and multistranded networks than in loose and unrelated networks. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

My second and third hypotheses were about FRSC and membership of organised groups. First I tested whether young people who reported very high levels of FRSC were more likely to be OGMs than were young people who reported high FRSC. Table 7.1 shows that a larger percentage of young people who reported very high levels of FRSC (62 per cent) were OGMs than young people who reported high FRSC (44 per cent). A Chi-square test was run to confirm the different proportion of each type of membership in high levels of FRSC and very high levels of FRSC categories. The results show that Chi-square value is 8.8, with an associated significance level of .00. This indicates that young people’s motivation to participate in organised groups is associated with the experience of very high levels of social capital with their friends. Young people who reported very high levels of FRSC were less likely to be NOGMs than young people who reported high FRSC. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was supported: young people who had a very high level of FRSC were more likely to be OGMs than were young people who had only a high level of FRSC.
Table 7.1 Type of membership of organised groups by FRSC (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of membership</th>
<th>FRSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOGM</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGM</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Missing data (n = 8) not included in subtotals.

To test Hypothesis 3, I compared young people who reported very high levels of FRSC and those with high FRSC in terms of how active their membership in organised groups was. As shown in Table 7.2, a larger percentage of young people who reported very high levels of FRSC (83 per cent) were AOGMs than were young people who reported high FRSC (74 per cent). However, a Chi-square test showed that the differences were not associated at a significant level, where Chi-square value is 1.68, with an associated significance level of .20. It appears that the level of activity in organised groups was not strongly associated with FRSC. Young people maybe equally likely to be AOGMs regardless of their levels of FRSC. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was not supported: young people with a very high level of FRSC were not more likely to be AOGMs than are young people who had only a high level of FRSC.

Table 7.2 Type of membership of organised groups by FRSC, group members only (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of membership</th>
<th>FRSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POGM</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOGM</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Missing data (n = 7) not included in subtotals.

My fourth hypothesis was that young people who reported a very high level of FRSC would have significantly higher means of generalised social capital (GSC) than young people who report only a high level of FRSC. The results of an independent-sample t-test reveal that there was a significant difference found between young people who reported high levels of FRSC ($M = 6.62, SD = 1.78$) and young people who reported very high levels of FRSC [$M = 6.10, SD = 1.68; t(273) = -2.43, p = .02$]. This result revealed that FRSC has a significant associated with GSC: high GSC is associated with very high levels of FRSC. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was supported.
Hypotheses 5 to 8 speculated that young people who had a very high level of social capital with their close friends would be likely to report higher levels of confidence in government, in business organisations, in the media and in educational organisations than would those who only have a high level of FRSC. Table 7.3 shows that none of the independent sample t-tests I ran showed significant results. There were no significant differences between young people who reported high levels of FRSC and very high levels FRSC in confidence in these major societal organisations. Thus, Hypotheses 5 to 8 were not supported.

Table 7.3 T-test results of confidence in four major types of social organisations for young people who report very high levels of FRSC and high levels of FRSC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major societal organisations</th>
<th>t-test for equality of means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in government</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in business organisations</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in the media</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in educational institutions</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

One of my main findings in this chapter is that very high levels of FRSC are more likely to be found in closed networks where the close friends of the young people knew one another (see Figure 7.1). This suggests that FRSC might particularly benefit members of dense networks. Another main finding in this chapter, shown in Figure 7.1, is that young people who with very high levels of FRSC were more likely to be active members of organised groups. Because my findings do not indicate causal direction, this model only suggests variables mentioned below are related. This implies that relatively high levels of FRSC might act as a firm basis for young people to interact with other members in organised groups in formal settings or that participation in organised groups increases social capital in one’s friendship networks. Lastly, levels of FRSC had a significant impact on GSC as young people with very high levels of FRSC reported higher GSC than their counterparts who report high levels of FRSC. To conclude here, my data did not support the idea of bad social capital. Indeed, tightly knit groups of friends seem to be out-going contributors to society in general.
My findings suggest that young people’s FRSC is highest when their close friends are from the same social network. It seems that the young people maintained their social capital with close friends in close-knit networks with multistranded and intense social connections. This description of close friendship fits the concept of bonding social capital (Putnam, 2000) and also lends support to Coleman’s (1988a) argument that social capital can be built easily in closed networks because the norms of trust can be more effective in the closed networks than open ones.

FRSC was also related to membership in organised groups. In particular, having very high levels of FRSC may have motivated the young people to be OGMs as opposed to NOGMs. This lends support to Putnam’s (2000) argument that interpersonal trust is related to civic engagement. The experience of having FRSC with close friends may encourage young people to meet more people by joining organised groups. It seems that FRSC may act as a springboard for young people to propel themselves into the wider society and became active members of organised groups. In other words, FRSC may act as a platform for young people to reach out to the community and engage in organised group activities from. My finding suggests that building very high levels of FRSC might act as a bridge between young people and society. On the other hand, having FRSC only at a high level is more likely to produce NOGMs. Those with lower levels of FRSC appeared less motivated to participate in organised groups. To conclude here, having a very high trust and reciprocity with close friends may play an important role in young people’s participation in organised groups. This contrasts with the role of FSC discussed in the previous chapter.

Figure 7.1 A very high level of FRSC is associated with closed networks and is associated with active membership of organised groups and it has significant impacts on GSC.
Interestingly, young people with very high FRSC were not significantly more likely to be AOGMs than were those with only high FRSC. So while FRSC was associated with membership of organised groups, it had no significant impact on how active the memberships were. Young people might be influenced by their close friends either to just sign up with organised groups or to be very active in those groups. Indeed, POGMs and AOGMs reported similar chances to build social capital with their friends.

Young people’s trust in and reciprocity with people in general was also associated with levels of FRSC. This implies that generalised social capital may be an extension from FRSC, as Putnam (2000) suggests. Through practising norms of trust and reciprocity with their close friends, young people may be able to extend their trust in and reciprocity with people in general, lending support to Putnam’s (2000) suggestion that personal networks allow trust to be extended to people in general. Thus, building and maintaining social capital among friends may lead to the generalised social capital which is essential to encourage members in the wider society to cooperate with one another. These findings do not support Fukuyama’s (1995) theory that closed networks could produce high social capital which discourage members of the informal networks from widen their formal networks and in turn also prevent them in generating trust in people in general in the broader society. Indeed, my findings show that closed networks of friends may encourage young people to build very high social capital with friends and in turn promote membership of organised groups in civil society and higher generalised social capital. Again, this is in contrast to FSC, which was not associated with GSC.

FRSC had no significant impacts on confidence in the major types of societal organisations. Putnam (1993a) argues that interpersonal trust leads to confidence in government and his argument is also supported by other researchers (Levi, 1996; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Crystal & DeBell, 2002). However, my findings showed no significant association between FRSC and confidence in government. My findings also did not find a negative association between FRSC and confidence in government. Thus, this contradicts Pickup et al. (2004) who assert that interpersonal trust leads to distrust in government. Indeed, the experience of building FRSC does not seem to expand young people’s institutional trust to other major types of societal organisations. In other words, interpersonal trust and reciprocity might only be related to institutional trust to a limited
extent for this sample. This implies that bonding social capital might be restricted to
dense and multistranded networks and that it is very different from the experience of
placing confidence in organisations.

To conclude, young people’s FRSC is associated with their active participation in
organised groups. Closed networks seem to have enhanced very high levels of FRSC
and young people with very high levels of FRSC were more likely to participate in
organised groups and to report high levels of GSC than those with lower FRSC. In the
next chapter, I shift from discussing bonding social capital to discussing bridging social
capital with neighbours.
CHAPTER 8 SOCIAL CAPITAL AMONG NEIGHBOURS

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I focus on the formation of social capital among neighbours (NSC). In Chapter 6, social capital among neighbours was treated as a dependent variable. Here social capital among neighbours is examined in greater depth and treated as a topic of interest in its own right, both as a dependent variable and as an independent variable with possible associates with social capital in other contexts. First, I show how social capital among neighbours and other neighbourhood variables are measured. Next, I discuss my results. From my analysis of the data, I discover that young people who have lived in their neighbourhoods for a long time and perceive their neighbourhoods to be safe enjoy higher social capital with their neighbours than do young people who are relatively new to the neighbourhood and who perceive their neighbourhoods to be less safe. I expected that high social capital with neighbours would be associated with active membership of organised groups in general (OGM) and active membership (AOGM) in particular, but my findings show that these two variables were not significantly related. I also conclude that NSC is positively related with GSC and confidence in societal organizations. This chapter therefore focuses on the third research question set out in Chapter 4.

Reciprocity creates interdependence amongst neighbours. ‘Today I scratch your back, tomorrow you scratch mine’ or ‘I help someone today, and down the road someone will help me’. These are philosophies which describe the reasons one might help others in a continuous relationships. Helping each other out in the neighbourhood when necessary creates the credit slips which are the basis of social capital (Coleman, 1988a:S102). For example, when a new family moves into a neighbourhood, the next-door neighbour might bake a cake to welcome them. In return, the new family might bake some cookies. But as time goes by and their neighbourly relationships get closer and stronger, continuous helping behaviour between neighbours becomes a norm as there is always a chance to return favours in the future.

My first hypothesis is that young people who have lived in their neighbourhoods for 11 years and above will have significantly higher NSC compared with their counterparts who report their residence period as between one year to ten years and those who have
resided for less than one year. A long period of residence may provide a sense of familiarity with the neighbourhood. This sense of familiarity may give young people more confidence to interact with their neighbours.

My second hypothesis is that young people who live large towns or rural areas will have significantly higher NSC compared with their counterparts who live in outer-metropolitan areas and inner-metropolitan areas. Onyx and Bullen (2000) suggest that rural areas generate higher social capital than urban areas. Large towns or rural areas are relatively low in population density. Thus, social capital might be easier to build via interconnected social networks in rural areas than in urban areas.

My third hypothesis is that young people who participate in neighbourhood activities frequently will have significantly the higher NSC compared with their counterparts who are not frequent participants and those who never participate in neighbourhood activities. Young people who are used to participating in their neighbourhoods are expected to report high social capital with their neighbours because they will have more opportunities to practise trust and reciprocity with each other than will those who seldom or never participate in neighbourhood activities.

My fourth hypothesis is that young people who perceive their neighbourhoods to be safe will have significantly higher NSC than those who do not perceive their neighbourhoods to be safe. Ziersch et al. (2005) argue that perceptions of safety increase with the level of neighbourhood trust. The existence of neighbourhood social capital therefore very much depends on perceived safety in the neighbourhood, as fear and insecure feelings about crime destroy trust among neighbours (Ross and Yang, 2000).

My fifth hypothesis is related to perceived neighbourhood social cohesion. Social cohesion refers to the degree of group togetherness, sense of belonging, and cooperation in the neighbourhood. Cohesive neighbourhoods bring neighbours closer in community settings through the process of solving neighbourhood problems together. In addition, living in cohesive neighbourhoods also means that young people may identify themselves as belonging to those neighbourhoods. Neighbours also tend to know one another in cohesive neighbourhoods. The third element of social cohesion, cooperation among neighbours, overlaps with the concept of social capital. It is important to
describe to what extent neighbours are willing to work together for the benefit of their
neighbourhoods. Because of the similarities between the concept of social capital and
social cohesion, my fifth hypothesis is that young people who perceive their
neighbourhoods as cohesive will have significantly higher NSC than young people who
do not perceive their neighbourhoods as cohesive.

My sixth and seventh hypotheses are about perceived neighbourhood safety and type of
membership. I expect that neighbourhoods perceived to be safe will be significantly
more likely to produce members of organised groups than those perceived as less safe.
Onyx et al. (2005) found that young people are not keen to participate in community
activities partly because they do not feel safe. Thus, young people who live in
neighbourhoods that they perceive to be less safe are more likely to be non-members of
organised groups because the lack of a sense of security in their neighbourhoods
discourages them from interacting with more people in group settings. Also, my seventh
hypothesis tests whether young people who perceived their neighbourhoods to be safe
are also more likely to be active members than those who perceived their
neighbourhoods as less safe.

Cohesive neighbourhoods may also provide supportive settings for young people to
actively participate in organised groups because their active involvement in the
neighbourhood may motivate them to join organised groups too. Thus, my eighth
hypothesis is that cohesive neighbourhoods are significantly more likely to produce
members of organised groups than less cohesive neighbourhoods. In addition,
Hypothesis 9 also tests neighbourhood cohesion and type of membership. I expect that
young people who perceived their neighbourhoods as cohesive are more likely to be
active members of organised than those who perceived their neighbourhoods as less
cohesive.

For Hypotheses 10 and 11, I was interested in studying young people’s social capital in
their neighbourhoods in particular, because young people becoming familiar with their
neighbourhoods might facilitate participation in organised groups. In neighbourhoods
where young people have the chance to interact with their neighbours on a daily basis,
those who have high social capital may be able to generalise norms of social interaction
from neighbourhood settings to active participation in organised groups. Thus, my tenth
hypothesis is that young people who have high levels of NSC will be more likely to be members of organised group than young people who have low levels of NSC. I also expect that those with high NSC will be more likely to be active OGMs, which is my eleventh hypothesis.

Generalised trust and reciprocity is an extension of bonding social capital (Putnam, 2000). I explore whether social capital with neighbours is related to generalised social capital in this chapter. I expect that young people who build social capital in their neighbourhoods will be able to extend their trust and reciprocity to strangers whom they meet in daily life. Thus, my twelfth hypothesis is that young people who have significantly high levels NSC have higher GSC than young people who have low levels of NSC.

Interpersonal trust is claimed to be related to institutional trust (Putnam, 1993a; Levi, 1996; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Crystal & DeBell, 2002; Pickup et al., 2004). Social interactions taking place in neighbourhoods might be related to institutional trust, especially for those organisations that are located in local neighbourhoods. Thus, Hypotheses 13 to 16 examine whether young people who reported high levels of NSC had significantly higher confidence in the four types of major societal organisations than do young people who reported low levels of NSC.

To summarise, my hypotheses for this chapter are:

Hypothesis 1: Young people who have lived in their neighbourhoods for 11 years and above have significantly higher NSC compared with their counterparts who report their residence period as in between one year to ten years and those who have resided for less than one year.

Hypothesis 2: Young people who live large towns or rural areas have significantly higher NSC compared with their counterparts who live in outer-metropolitan areas and inner-metropolitan areas.

Hypothesis 3: Young people who participate in neighbourhood activities frequently have significantly the higher NSC compared with their counterparts who are not frequent participants and those who never participate in neighbourhood activities.
Hypothesis 4: Young people who perceive their neighbourhoods as safe have significantly higher NSC than those who do not perceive their neighbourhoods as safe.

Hypothesis 5: Young people who perceive their neighbourhoods as cohesive have significantly higher NSC than young people who do not perceive their neighbourhoods as cohesive.

Hypothesis 6: Neighbourhoods perceived to be safe are significantly more likely to produce members of organised groups than neighbourhoods perceived to be less safe.

Hypothesis 7: Neighbourhoods perceived to be safe are significantly more likely to produce active members of organised groups than neighbourhoods perceived to be less safe.

Hypothesis 8: Cohesive neighbourhoods are significantly more likely to produce members of organised groups than less cohesive neighbourhoods.

Hypothesis 9: Cohesive neighbourhoods are significantly more likely to produce active members of organised groups than less cohesive neighbourhoods.

Hypothesis 10: Young people who have high levels of NSC are significantly more likely to be members of organised groups than young people who have low levels of NSC.

Hypothesis 11: Young people who have high levels of NSC are significantly more likely to be active members of organised groups than young people who have low levels of NSC.

Hypothesis 12: Young people who have high levels NSC have significantly higher GSC than young people who have low levels of NSC.

Hypothesis 13: Young people who have high levels of NSC have significantly higher confidence in government than young people who have low levels of NSC.

Hypothesis 14: Young people who have high levels of NSC have significantly higher confidence in business organisations than young people who have low levels of NSC.

Hypothesis 15: Young people who have high levels of NSC have significantly higher confidence in the media than young people who have low levels of NSC.
Hypothesis 16: Young people who have high levels of NSC have significantly higher confidence in educational institutions than young people who have low levels of NSC.

MEASURING SOCIAL CAPITAL AMONG NEIGHBOURS

Social capital among neighbours was treated as a dependent variable for Hypotheses 1 to 5 and it was treated as an independent variable for Hypotheses 10 to 16. To test Hypotheses 6 and 7, perceived neighbourhood safety is measured and is treated as independent variables. To test Hypotheses 8 and 9, I measured neighbourhood cohesion and it was treated as independent variable.

To test hypotheses that were related to NSC (i.e. Hypotheses 1 to 5 and Hypotheses 10 to 16), young people’s levels of social capital among neighbours were measured. For more details on the measurement of social capital among neighbours please refer to Chapter 6. To test Hypotheses 1 to 5, the neighbourhood social capital combined score is treated as continuous data in order to compare the NSC mean scores between young people who report very high levels of FSC and young people who report high levels of FSC. To test Hypotheses 10 to 16, young people were divided into two groups according to their levels of NSC. Descriptive statistics of the combined scores of NSC show that the mean was 7.13, the median was 7.5 and the mode was 8.5. Due to the slight difference between the mean score and the median score, I decided to use the median score as the cut-off point to categorise young people who report low levels of NSC and those who report high levels of NSC. Thus I get almost equal numbers of respondents in these two groups for a fair comparison.

To test Hypothesis 1, respondents were asked to report the duration that they had lived in their neighbourhoods (A1. ‘How long have you been living in your neighbourhood?’). This question is adapted from the AuSSA (Wilson and Gibson, 2003). There were five choices: ‘less than a year’, ‘one to five’, ‘six to 10’, ‘11 to 15’ and ‘16 and above’. Due to the small number of participants who had lived in their neighbourhoods between one to ten years, I collapsed the ‘one to five’ and ‘six to 10’ categories into ‘one to ten years’ for statistical purposes. I also collapsed ‘11 to 15’ and ‘16 and above’ into ‘11 years and above’.
To test Hypothesis 2, respondents were asked to report the location of their neighbourhoods: ‘G15. Would you say you now live in ...’. There were six choice categories of numbers of people in the questionnaire i.e. ‘a. inner metropolitan area of a major city (over 100,000 people)’, ‘b. outer metropolitan area of a major city (over 100,000 people)’, ‘c. a large town (over 25,000 people)’, ‘d. a large country town (over 10,000 people)’, ‘e. a small country town (under 10,000 people)’, ‘f. a rural area or on a farm’. This question is also adapted from the AuSSA (Wilson & Gibson, 2003). Due to the small numbers of participants in the last three groups, I collapsed the last four categories, the ‘large towns’, ‘large country towns’, ‘small country towns’ and ‘rural areas or on farms’ into ‘large towns or rural areas’ for statistical purposes.

To test Hypothesis 3, respondents were asked about their participation in neighbourhood activities (see Question A12. ‘In the last 12 months, how often have you or anyone living with you in your household participated in any neighbourhood activity? e.g. parties at neighbours houses, community festival.’). The frequency of participation in neighbourhood activities was measured on a four point scale (0 = never, 1 = a few times in a year, 2 = a few times in 6 months, 3 = at least once a month). There were small numbers of young people who participated in their neighbourhood activities at least once a month (N = 22) and a few times over six months (N = 36). Thus, for my analysis, I collapsed ‘at least once a month’ and ‘a few times in 6 months’ into ‘frequent’. The responses of ‘a few times in a year’ were recategorised as ‘not frequent’.

In order to identify the loading of neighbourhood variables, a principal components analysis (PCA) was run using SPSS Version 12. Six items were loaded in this analysis: a) Question A9. Do you feel safe to walk alone in the neighbourhood after dark (say up to midnight)?; b) Question A10. Do you feel safe at home after dark?; c) Question A11. Is it safe to use public transport at night (say up to midnight)?; d) Question A6. To what extent do the residents in your neighbourhood know one another?; e) Question A2. Thinking now in your neighbourhood, do you think there is a community spirit in this area?; f) Question A8. If there was a problem in this neighbourhood (e.g. people dumping garbage in the park), to what extent would you and other neighbourhood residents cooperate to try to work on the problem?. These six questions were asked using the same 11-point scale, from 1 = No, not at all, to 11 = Yes, completely.
The requirements for running a PCA were met. Firstly, inspection of the correlation matrix revealed the presence of many coefficients of 0.3 and above. Secondly, the Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin value was 0.7, exceeding the recommended value of 0.6 (Kaiser, 1974) and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) reached statistical significance. These results supported the factorability of the correlation matrix.

The PCA showed the presence of two components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 45.1 per cent and 28.4 per cent of the variance respectively. In addition, the screeplot revealed a clear break after the second component. This was further supported by the results of Parallel Analysis, which showed that there were only two components, safety and cohesion, with eigenvalues exceeding the corresponding criterion values for a randomly generated data matrix of the same size (six variables – 283 respondents).

Table 8.1 Pattern/Structure for coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component 1 Safety</th>
<th>Component 2 Cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2 Neighbours share an identity</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Neighbours know one another</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7 cooperation between neighbours</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8 Neighbourhood safety</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9 Safety at home</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10 Safety on public transport</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Varimax rotation was performed to give a clearer division of these two components. The rotated solution showed that both components consisting of a number of strong loadings and all variables loading substantially on only one component. The results of this analysis support the use of the safety items and the cohesion items as separate scales.

To test Hypotheses 4, 6, 7 respondents were asked to rate their perception of their neighbourhood’s safety. There were three variables which measured safety in the neighbourhood: a) feeling safe to walk alone in the neighbourhood after dark up to midnight; b) feeling safe at home after dark; c) feeling safe riding on public transport at night up to midnight. These three questions were asked using the same 11-point scale, from 1 = No, not at all, to 11 = Yes, completely; (see Questions A9. to A12. in
Appendix B). These three variables were added up and averaged then divided into low and high levels of perceived neighbourhood safety. Those respondents who scored from one to six points were considered to have low levels of perceived neighbourhood safety. High levels of perceived neighbourhood safety were those with scores from 6.01 to 11 points.

To test Hypotheses 5, 8 and 9, the perceived social cohesion of respondents’ neighbourhoods was measured. I was interested in investigating perceived levels of social cohesion among neighbours in young people’s neighbourhoods from the young people’s perspective. I did not measure social cohesion in the sense of the degree of identification that young people themselves feel with their neighbours, rather I focused on their perception of these feelings among others. Three variables were identified in operationalising social cohesion: a) whether neighbours shared an identity as part of the neighbourhood (Question A2. ‘Thinking now in your neighbourhood, do you think there is a community spirit in this area?’, 11-point scale, 1 = No, not at all, 11 = Yes, completely); b) the extent to which neighbours know one another (Question A6. ‘To what extent do the residents in your neighbourhood know one another?’, 11-point scale, 1 = No, not at all, 11 = Yes, completely); c) cooperation between neighbours to solve neighbourhood problems (Question A8. ‘If there was a problem in this neighbourhood (e.g. people dumping garbage in the park), to what extent would you and other neighbourhood residents cooperate to try to work on the problem?’, 11-point scale, 1 = No, not at all, 11 = Yes, completely).

All three variables were added up for each respondent to measure the social cohesion variable and the total score was averaged. Then perceived social cohesion was divided into two categories: high and low. Those respondents who scored from one (the minimum) to six are categorised as having perceived a low level of social cohesion. A high level of social cohesion is defined as that experienced by those participants who scored from 6.01 to 11 points.

For Hypotheses 6 to 11, type of membership of organised groups is treated as a dependent variable. Details of this measurement were explained in Chapter 6. To test Hypotheses 12 to 16, young people’s generalised social capital and confidence in major organisations were studied with respect to social capital among neighbours. Again,
details of the measurement of generalised social capital and confidence in major organisations were explained in Chapter 6.

RESULTS
My first hypothesis was that young people who have lived in their neighbourhoods for 11 years and above would have higher NSC compared with their counterparts who reported their residence period as in between one year to ten years and those who have resided for less than one year. How long a young person had lived in their neighbourhood did appear to have an impact on their NSC.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of residence period on NSC. Subjects were divided into three groups according to their length of residence in their neighbourhoods [Group 1: less than a year (n = 61); Group 2: one year to ten years (n = 107); Group 3: 11 years and above (n = 115)]. There was a significant difference at the $p<.05$ level in NSC for the three groups of young people [$F(2, 277) = 10.80, p = .00$]. Next, post-hoc comparison using Tukey HSD test indicated the mean score for Group 3 ($M = 7.13, SD = 2.27$) was different from Group 1 ($M = 6.35, SD = 2.27$) and Group 2 ($M = 6.77, SD = 2.26$). This shows that young people who have resided in their neighbourhoods for more than 11 years reported higher levels of NSC than young people who were new residents and those whose residence period was between one to 10 years. Also, there was no significant difference of NSC between young people who had lived in their neighbourhoods for less than ten years and young people who were new to their neighbourhoods. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported as long residence period was associated with higher levels of NSC.

My second hypothesis was that young people who lived in large towns or rural areas would have significantly higher NSC compared with their counterparts who live in outer-metropolitan areas and inner-metropolitan areas. Most of the young people in this study lived in inner-metropolitan areas ($N = 158$). The next largest group was people who lived in outer-metropolitan areas ($N = 94$), followed by those who lived in large towns or rural areas ($N = 28$).

To test Hypothesis 2, a one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the association between location of neighbourhood and NSC. I categorised
respondents into three groups according to the extent of how long they have resided in
their neighbourhoods (Group 1: large towns or rural areas; Group 2: outer-metropolitan;
Group 3: inner-metropolitan). There was no significant difference at the $p > .05$ level in
NSC for the three groups of young people [$F(2, 277) = .07$, $p = .93$]. It appears that the
NSC mean score for Group 1 ($M = 7.13$, $SD = 2.83$) was not significantly different from
Group 2 ($M = 7.20$, $SD = 2.39$) and Group 3 ($M = 7.08$, $SD = 2.23$). Thus, Hypothesis 2
was not supported: young people who lived outside metropolitan areas and in
metropolitan areas are similarly likely to report high NSC. There were relatively few
respondents who resided in large towns or rural areas, thus further research is needed to
better test this relationship.

My third hypothesis was that young people who participated in neighbourhood activities
frequently would have significantly higher NSC compared with their counterparts who
are not frequent participants and those who never participated in neighbourhood
activities. A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to test this
hypothesis. I compared the mean score in NSC for three groups of subjects. The first
group consists of those who never participated in any neighbourhood activities (Group
1: never, $n = 85$). The second group of respondents were those who had participated in
neighbourhood activities but they were not the frequent participants (Group 2: not
frequent, $n = 58$). Third group of young people participated in activities on a frequent
basis (Group 3: frequent, $n = 78$). There was a significant difference at the $p < .05$ level
in NSC for the three groups of young people [$F(2, 216) = 37.95$, $p = .00$]. Next, post-
hoc comparison using Tukey HSD test indicated the mean score for Group 1 ($M = 5.85$,
$SD = 2.20$) was significantly different from Group 2 ($M = 8.21$, $SD = 2.04$) and Group 3
($M = 8.38$, $SD = 1.85$). It appears that young people who never participated in any
neighbourhood activities enjoy less NSC than both occasional participants and frequent
participants. In other words, young people who at least participated once (either
occasionally or frequently) in neighbourhood activities reported significantly higher
NSC than did those who never participated in any. Hypothesis 3 was not supported in
the form in which it was stated because the most active participants of neighbourhood
activities did not enjoy more NSC than both groups of their counterparts. However,
participation in neighbourhood activities (at any frequency) was associated with higher
levels of NSC.
My fourth hypothesis was that young people who perceived their neighbourhoods to be safe would have significantly higher NSC than those who did not perceive their neighbourhoods to be safe. The results of an independent-sample t-test reveal that there was a significant difference found in NSC between young people who reported low levels of perceived neighbourhood safety \( (M = 6.30, SD = 2.22) \) and those who reported high levels \( [M = 7.41, SD = 2.32; t(275) = -3.48, p = .00] \). This result reveals that perceived neighbourhood safety had a significant impact on NSC: high NSC was associated with high levels of perceived neighbourhood safety. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was supported: people who perceive their neighbourhoods as safe were more likely to report high NSC than are those who did not perceive their neighbourhoods as safe.

My fifth hypothesis was that young people who perceived their neighbourhoods as cohesive would have significantly higher NSC than young people who did not perceive their neighbourhoods as cohesive. I compared the mean score of NSC for these two groups of young people with different levels of perceived neighbourhood cohesion by using an independent-sample t-test. The result showed that there was a significant difference found between young people who report low levels of cohesive \( (M = 5.76, SD = 2.03) \) and young people who reported high levels of cohesive \( [M = 8.94, SD = 1.34; t(265) = -14.46, p = .00] \). This result revealed that having cohesive relationships with neighbours was associated with higher levels of NSC among young people. Thus, Hypothesis 5 was supported: high cohesiveness in neighbourhoods had a significant association with NSC.

We now move from examining the NSC in its role as dependent variable to investigating its possible role as an independent variable vis-à-vis type of membership of organised groups and social capital in other settings. My sixth and seventh hypotheses were about perceived neighbourhood safety and membership of organised groups. I first tested whether young people who perceived their neighbourhoods as safe were significantly more likely to be members of organised groups than those from less safe neighbourhoods. The Chi-square test results showed that the slightly different proportion of OGMs between the two groups was not significant, with a Chi-square value of .94, at a significance level of .33. Similar results were found when I tested Hypothesis 7. Here I compared young people who had high perceived neighbourhood safety and those with low perceived neighbourhood safety in their level of activity in
organised groups using a Chi-square test. The test showed that the differences between these two groups of were not significant, with the Chi-square value of .02, which had significance levels greater than .05. It seems that the levels of activity in organised groups were not related to perceived neighbourhood safety. Thus, both hypotheses 6 and 7 were not supported.

My eighth and ninth hypotheses were about the levels of social cohesion in neighbourhoods and memberships of organised groups. Hypothesis 8 examined whether young people who lived in cohesive neighbourhoods were significantly more likely to be active members of organised groups than those from less cohesive neighbourhoods. A Chi-square test revealed that non-members and members of organised groups are spread almost equally between respondents grouped by their perceptions of low and high levels of neighbourhood social cohesion. I found a Chi-square value of .01, at a significance level of .91. The results of the Chi-square test confirmed that these two factors, neighbourhood cohesion and membership of organised groups, were not related. In addition, Hypothesis 9 was about the levels of neighbourhood cohesion and levels of activity in organised groups. I used the Chi-square test to examine differences between young people who perceived their neighbourhoods as cohesive and those who perceived their neighbourhoods as not cohesive. There were no differences between these two groups of young people in their levels of activity in organised groups, as a Chi-square value of .72, at significance level of .79 was found. Thus, Hypotheses 8 and 9 were not supported: high cohesiveness in neighbourhood was not associated with participation in organised groups at any levels.

My tenth and eleventh hypotheses concerned levels of NSC and type of membership of organised groups. Hypothesis 10 tested whether young people who reported high levels of NSC were significantly more likely to be members of organised group than were young people who reported low levels of NSC. A Chi-square test revealed no relationship between NSC and OGM, with a Chi-square value of .21, and significance level of .65. Hypothesis 11 examined whether young people with high levels of NSC would be more likely to be AOGMs than those with low levels of NSC. The result showed that the Chi-square value was .30, which had significance levels greater than .05. So there was a lack of statistical evidence to support Hypothesis 10 and 11; there was no relationship between high levels of NSC and OGM.
My twelfth hypothesis was that young people with high levels NSC would have significantly higher GSC than young people with low levels of NSC. To test this hypothesis, I compared the mean score of GSC for these two groups of young people by using an independent-sample t-test. There was a significant difference in GSC found between young people who reported low levels of NSC ($M = 5.98$, $SD = 1.76$) and those who reported high levels of NSC [$M = 6.76$, $SD = 1.68$; $t(277) = -3.82$, $p = .00$]. This result revealed that NSC had a significant association with GSC: high GSC was associated with high levels of NSC. Hypothesis 9 was supported: young people with high NSC also reported higher generalised social capital than are young people with low NSC.

Hypotheses 13 to 16 tested whether young people who reported high levels of NSC had significantly higher confidence in the four types of major societal organisations than did young people who have low levels of NSC. Table 8.5 shows T-test results of the comparison of mean scores in confidence in government, business organisations, the media and educational institutions between young people who reported low levels of NSC and those who reported high levels of NSC.

Hypotheses 13, 15 and 16 were supported, as young people who reported high levels of NSC also reported higher confidence in government, the media, and educational institutions than did those who reported low levels of NSC. The T-test results, all shown in table 8.5, also indicated that Hypothesis 14 was not supported. Thus NSC appears to be an important factor in explaining one’s level of confidence in government, the media and educations institutions but not one’s confidence in business organisations.

### Table 8.2 T-test results of confidence in the four major types of social organisations for young people who report very high levels of NSC and high levels of NSC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence in organisation</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in government</td>
<td>-3.70</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in business organisations</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in the media</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in educational institutions</td>
<td>-2.25</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter revealed that four neighbourhood factors were related to high NSC. The four factors associated with high NSC were period of residence, participation in neighbourhood activities, safety and neighbourhood cohesion. These four factors appeared to foster norms of trust and reciprocity among neighbours and may be important in the generation of generalised social capital. NSC, in turn, was associated with generalised social capital and confidence in societal organisations. Figure 8.1 summarises the key findings of this chapter.

![Figure 8.1 High social capital among neighbours may be generated by four neighbourhood factors and it is associated with high generalised social capital.](image)

I’ve found a clear pattern showing that the percentage of those who reported high NSC increased according to their period of residence in their neighbourhoods. More than two thirds of the young people who had lived in their neighbourhood for more than 11 years reported high NSC. Looking at the age range of young people in this research (16 to 26 years old, mean age 21 years), those young people who had lived more than 11 years in the neighbourhood had probably lived there for most of their lives. This suggests that growing up in the one neighbourhood is important in building NSC. The sense of familiarity with the neighbourhood may provide a greater chance for young people, over time, to build NSC via daily social interaction. My findings show that the longer the period of residence, the greater the tendency for young people to report high NSC.
Onyx and Bullen’s (2000) research suggested that young people who live in large towns (non-metropolitan regional centres) or rural areas would report higher NSC than do those who lived in inner or outer metropolitan areas. There is slight difference in the direction predicted by the hypothesis but it is too small to count. Due to the small numbers of young people in my sample who lived in large towns and rural areas (n = 28), further research into this is needed.

Young people who participated in neighbourhood activities (either occasionally or frequently) were more likely to report high NSC than those who did not. This result is not surprising because participation in neighbourhood activities provides more opportunities for young people to interact and so to build NSC. This suggests that informal social interaction among neighbours is associated with high NSC. In other words, young people who are more accustomed to social interaction in neighbourhood settings have a greater tendency to build high NSC.

Safety was important contributor to NSC. This lends support to previous research which showed that perceived neighbourhood safety was related to NSC (Ross & Yang, 2000; Ziersch et al., 2005). Safe neighbourhoods provide conducive environments for cultivating trust in and reciprocity with neighbours because neighbours do not have to be wary of each other in terms of security. In other words, socialising among neighbours takes place more easily in neighbourhoods which are perceived as safe than in neighbourhoods which are not perceived as safe.

Similarly, young people who perceived their neighbourhoods as cohesive were more likely to report high NSC than are those who did not. Almost all young people who perceived their neighbourhoods as cohesive also reported high NSC. Feelings of belongingness and togetherness in neighbourhoods appear to foster NSC. This is not surprising because the concepts of social cohesion and social capital overlap. Both concepts emphasise cooperation and reciprocity among neighbours.

Safety and cohesion were not associated with either OGM or AOGM. My findings do not lend support to Onyx and colleagues’ (2005) investigation into rural young people, where they found that young people were not keen to participate in community activities because they did not perceive their neighbourhoods as safe.
In terms of cohesion, it appears that young people’s decisions to participate in organised groups were not affected by their perceptions of neighbourhood social cohesion. This is a surprising result because living in a cohesive neighbourhood by definition means that most neighbours know one another, and that the respondents are actively involved in the matters of their neighbourhoods. Thus, living in a relatively cohesive environment should increase the motivation for young people to participate actively in organised groups. However, my findings show that level of cohesiveness in neighbourhood was not associated with levels of participation (or non-participation) in organised groups. So there was no evidence to support the notion of bad social capital which produces negative consequences in neighbourhoods. Although it would seem that living in a cohesive neighbourhood could encourage young people to join groups, this was not the case. Likewise, NSC was also not associated with OGM in general or with AOGM.

NSC was associated with positive outcomes for both GSC and confidence in societal organizations. It seems that maintaining high social capital with neighbours helps in spreading trust and reciprocity with people in general. It is not surprising that young people would extend their trust in and reciprocity with neighbours whom they might not know very well to people in general including strangers. In other words, building more social capital with loose ties helps young people to build generalised social capital. My results also support the argument that interpersonal trust is related to trust in government or political institutions (Putnam, 1993a; Crystal & DeBell, 2002; Brehm & Rahn, 1997).

Unlike the bonding social capital of FRSC and FSC, NSC, loose connections with one’s neighbours, is associated with increased GSC and confidence in societal organisations. This suggests that the types of social capital young people generate in different social settings are qualitatively different and have different consequences for society. NSC in particular seems important for broader processes of social cohesion.
CHAPTER 9 PARTICIPATION IN ORGANISED GROUPS

INTRODUCTION
Type of membership in organised groups has thus far been the dependent variable in previous chapters. In this chapter I treat type of membership of organised groups as an independent variable. Thus I shift the focus from whether social capital in different social realms may be important in encouraging young people to participate in organised groups, to how group membership may be related to young people’s civic engagement, social capital among friends, generalised social capital and confidence in major societal organisations in the wider society. First, I show how the variables in this chapter are measured, then I discuss my results.

My main finding is that passive membership is as important as active membership for promoting civic participation and generalised social capital or, at least, that the two types of membership have equal levels of association with civic participation and generalised social capital. Indeed, active members of organised groups did not report higher levels of generalised social capital than passive members, nor did they become more active in civic participation than passive members of organised groups. Any membership was enough for there to be positive associations with respect to generalised social capital. I also found that participation in organised groups (at any level) is not associated with institutional trust. This chapter focuses on the fourth and fifth research questions set out in Chapter 4.

I define civic engagement as voluntary participation in that sphere of institutions, organisations and individuals which is located between the family, the state and the market, to promote the common interests of civil society. Using this definition, this study concentrates on the engagement of young people in different ways: signing petitions; boycotting or buying certain products for environmental, ethical or political reasons; participating in demonstrations, protests or marches; working together with people who share the same concerns; writing to the newspapers; calling talkback radio programs; voicing opinions via public media; making contact with government officials (local, state or federal); participating in community consultations and attending public meetings. The main reason of measuring civic engagement by using this list of activities
is that it is separate from young people’s membership of organised groups and young people can participate these activities at an individual level.

White and Wyn (2008:244) suggest that having low institutional trust discourages young people from engaging with the wider society. Thus, Hypotheses 1 and 2 test whether young people who reported low confidence in major societal organisations (government, business organisations, the media and educational institutions) are significantly less likely to be members or active members of organised groups than are those who reported high confidence. Hypotheses 1 and 2 treat membership of organised groups as a dependent variable and all other hypotheses treat it as an independent variable.

Putnam (2000) argues that civic engagement involves face-to-face interaction among community members and that this interaction generates social capital. Active members of organised groups who attended meetings regularly were expected to participate in other civic activities too. This is because making contacts in organised groups should increase the chances that young people will be influenced by other members of organised groups to know more about current issues and to be more involved in civil society. Thus, my third and fourth hypotheses examine whether being a group member in general is associated with civic participation, and whether being an active member in particular has an impact on civic participation.

Civic engagement and interpersonal trust are closely related to each other and civic engagement enhances interpersonal trust (Brehm & Rhan, 1997). Accordingly, active members of organised groups might be more likely than passive members or non-members of organised groups to report high levels of trust in and reciprocity with their friends, due to their social interaction in organised groups. There is a possibility that members of an organised group will build friendships with other members beyond their interaction in the group setting. Also people who are already friends may join a group together, enhancing their relationship in the process. Thus, my fifth and sixth hypotheses test whether members of organised groups have higher levels of friendship social capital (FRSC) than non-members, and whether active members have significantly higher levels of FRSC than either passive or non-members.
Green and Brock (2005) argue that participation in formal groups is positively related to generalised trust. Putnam (2000:136) claimed that trust in ‘generalised others’ (‘thin’ trust) such as trust in a new acquaintance one has just met in a coffee shop, makes it possible for trust to be extended from the personal network to people in general. Furthermore, ‘thin’ trust of this kind is strongly related to other forms of civic engagement and social capital (Putnam, 2000:136). For my research, I define generalised social capital (GSC) as thin trust in and reciprocity with generalised others (people in general, which includes strangers) in the wider society. Hypothesis 7 and 8 are about group membership and GSC. I expected that: members of organised groups (OGMs) will have significantly higher levels of GSC than non-members; and active members of organised groups (AOGMs) will have significantly higher levels of GSC than passive members (POGMs).

Civic participation at the individual level also has been studied in this research. Other than membership of group organisations, Putnam (2000) also stresses that participation in civic activities is essential to enhance generalised social capital. In this research I study the relationship between civic participation and generalised social capital. My Hypothesis 9 is that young people who have engaged in civil society have significantly higher levels of GSC than those who have not engaged in civil society.

Vromen (2003; 2004; 2007) found that the frequency of internet usage is related to political participation. In this chapter I examine the relationship between internet usage and civic participation. In Hypothesis 10 I test whether young people who chose the internet as their favourite news media are significantly more likely to have engaged in civil society than are their counterparts who chose other type of news media. On the other hand, Hypothesis 11 speculates that young people who participate in organised groups in online mode are more likely to engage in civil society than are those who participate in organised groups in face-to-face mode.

To summarise, my hypotheses for this chapter are:

Hypothesis 1: Young people who have lower levels of confidence in the four types of major societal organisations are less likely to be members of organised groups than those who have higher levels.
Hypothesis 2: Young people who have lower levels of confidence in the four types of major societal organisations are less likely to be **active** members of organised groups than those who have higher levels.

Hypothesis 3: Members of organised groups are significantly more likely than non members to have engaged in civil society.

Hypothesis 4: Active members of organised groups are significantly more likely than passive members to have engaged in civil society.

Hypothesis 5: Members of organised groups have significantly higher levels of FRSC than non members.

Hypothesis 6: Active members of organised groups have significantly higher levels of FRSC than passive members.

Hypothesis 7: Members of organised groups have significantly higher levels of GSC than non members.

Hypothesis 8: Active members of organised groups have significantly higher levels of GSC than passive members.

Hypothesis 9: Young people who have engaged in civil society have significantly higher levels of GSC than those who have not engaged in civil society.

Hypothesis 10: Young people who chose the internet as their favourite news media are significantly more likely to have engaged in civil society than are young people who chose other type of news media.

Hypothesis 11: Young people who participate in organised groups online are more likely to engage in civil society than are those who participate in organised groups in face-to-face mode.

**MEASURING CIVIC ENGAGEMENT AND OTHER MEASUREMENTS**

To test Hypotheses 1 and 2, confidence in four types of major societal organisations was the measure used (see Chapter 6 for a detailed discussion of these measures). To give a fair comparison between young people who reported higher levels of institutional trust in each major types of societal organisations and those who report lower levels, I divided respondents into two groups using the median (value 3.00), as the cut-off point. For Hypothesis 1, I categorised respondents into two groups. The first group consisted of those who had high levels of confidence in each major societal organisation. The second group included young people who had low levels of confidence in each major societal organisation. Then their status of membership was compared: holding a
membership of any organised groups and not holding any membership of any organised
groups. Thus, I formed a two-by-two table (higher and lower levels of confidence in
each major societal organisation by type of membership). For Hypothesis 2, I also
formed a two-by-two table. As before, respondents were categorised into those who had
high levels of confidence in each major societal organisation and those who had low
levels of confidence in each major societal organisation. Then their levels of
membership (active versus passive) were compared.

To test Hypotheses 3 and 4, participants were asked to indicate whether they were
involved in any of the 11 activities listed in the questionnaire (please refer to Appendix
B for the complete list of questions at C1). These questions are adapted from AuSSA
(Wilson & Gibson, 2003). Participants were then categorised into two groups: those
who had participated in at least one of the activities in the 12 months prior to
participation in this research, and those who had not. In testing this hypothesis, I
formed three by two table (types of membership by civic engagement).

To test Hypotheses 5 and 6, I compared young people’s levels of friendship social
capital (FRSC) according to the type of membership. To test Hypotheses 7 to 9,
generalised social capital (GSC) was measured. FRSC and GSC are treated as
continuous data in this chapter.

To test Hypothesis 10, measurement of favourite news media was asked in the
questionnaire (C7. Which are the three most frequent types of media you use to follow
current affairs and news?). There were five choices: ‘newspapers’, ‘magazines’,
‘television’, ‘radio’ and ‘internet’. In addition, I asked how frequently young people
followed news and current news with this question: ‘C6. Do you follow news and
current affairs? If yes, how often? There were seven choices: ‘every day’, ‘a few times a
week’, ‘at least once a week’, ‘at least once a fortnight’, ‘at least once a month’, ‘less
than once a month’ and ‘I don’t follow news and current affairs’.

To test Hypothesis 11, I studied whether young people were registered with any
organised groups which were organised by an online community. I listed five types of
group organiser (those who organised or sponsored the groups) in the questionnaire:
school/ college/ university/ workplace; community; national; international; and online community. There were only 21 young people who selected an internet community as the organiser of the organised groups they joined in. The majority of the young people (n = 134) participated in groups that were organised by parties which they had met face-to-face.

RESULTS
Hypothesis 1 asked whether young people who have lower levels of confidence in major types of societal organisations (government, business organisations, the media and educational institutions) were significantly less likely to be members of organised groups (OGM) than those with higher levels.

A Chi Square test was used to explore the relationship between confidence in each major societal organisation and organised group membership. Table 9.1 shows that all chi-square results had significance levels greater than .05. This indicates that confidence in government, business organisations, the media and educational institutions was not associated with whether one was a member of an organised group. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence in organisation</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in government</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in business organisations</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in the media</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in educational institutions</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2 investigated whether young people with lower levels of confidence in major types of societal organisations (government, business organisations, the media and educational institutions) were significantly less likely to be active members of organised groups (OGM) than those who have higher levels. Table 9.2 shows that all four Chi-square values in these tests had significance levels greater than .05. It appears that levels of confidence in all four major types of societal organisation (i.e. government, business organisations, the media and educational institutions) did not make any difference to how active a young person was in their organised group. My second hypothesis was not supported.
Table 9.2 Chi-square results of confidence in the four major types of societal organisations for AOGMs and POGMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in government</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in business organisations</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in the media</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in educational institutions</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My third hypothesis was that members of organised groups will be significantly more likely than non members to have engaged in civil society in one of the listed ways. This is because making contacts in organised groups increases the chance that young people will be influenced by other organised group members to know more about current issues and to be more involved in civil society.

A Chi-square test was used to explore the relationship between having membership of organised groups and civic engagement. Table 9.3 shows that OGMs (70 per cent) were more likely to participate in civic activities than were NOGMs (58 per cent). The Chi-square result confirms that this proportion is significantly different as the Chi-square value is 4.8 at a significance level $p = .03$. This indicates that participation in organised groups at any levels is associated with civic engagement. So, being a member of organised groups (either as a passive member or active member) could be seen as encouraging young people to also participate in civil society activities. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was supported.

Table 9.3 Civic engagement by type of membership of organised groups (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic engagement</th>
<th>NOGM</th>
<th>OGM</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My fourth hypothesis was that active members of organised groups would be significantly more likely than passive members to have engaged in civil society. Table 9.4 shows similar percentages of active members of organised groups (AOGMs) and
passive members of organised groups (POGMs) had participated at least once in civil society activity in the past 12 months. A Chi-square test was run to explore the different proportion of each type of membership in categories of engagement in civic activities and non-engagement in civic activities at the significance level <.05. The results show that Chi-square value is 0.08, with an associated significance level of .93. This indicates that the levels of activity in organised groups was not related to the experience of engagement in civic activities, therefore Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

Table 9.4 Civic engagement by type of membership of organised groups (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic engagement</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POGM</td>
<td>AOGM</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My fifth hypothesis was that members of organised groups would have significantly higher levels of FRSC than non members of organised groups. A t-test was used to explore the differences between OGMs and NOGMs in their FRSC. The t-tests results showed no significant difference between these two groups of young people, OGMs ($M = 9.45$, $SD = 2.69$) and NOGMs in their FRSC [$M = 8.8$, $SD = 3.44$]; $t(279) = -1.73$, $p = .09$. Thus, Hypothesis 5 was not supported.

My sixth hypothesis was that active members of organised groups would have significantly higher levels of FRSC than passive members of organised groups. I ran a t-test to explore the differences between AOGMs and POGMs in reporting their levels of FRSC. Unexpectedly, the Levene’s test for equality of variance showed that the variances of scores between AOGMs and POGMs were not the same at the significance level of $p = .001$. This violates the assumption of equal variation of score therefore alternative t-value was used. This t-test showed no significant difference between AOGMs and POGMs, AOGMs ($M = 9.71$, $SD = 1.96$) and POGMs in their FRSC [$M = 8.5$, $SD = 4.35$]; $t(35.63) = 1.57$, $p = .13$. This result shows that AOGMs did not report higher levels of FRSC than POGMs. This indicates that level of participation in organised groups was not associated with young people’s levels of social capital in their close friends. So, Hypothesis 6 was not supported.
My seventh hypothesis was that members of organised groups would have significantly higher levels of GSC than non members. A t-test was used to explore the differences between OGMs and NOGMs in their GSC. The t-tests results showed a significant difference between OGMs and NOGMs, OGMs ($M = 6.58, SD = 1.71$) reported higher levels of GSC than NOGMs [$M = 6.09, SD = 1.78$]; $t(280) = -2.43, p = .02$. In other words, members of organised groups in general might have learned to extend their trust in and reciprocity with generalised others by either passive or active involved in the organised groups. Thus, Hypothesis 7 was supported.

My eighth hypothesis was that active members of organised groups would report significantly higher levels of GSC than passive members of organised groups. I tested this hypothesis using a t-test. The results showed that the difference between AOGMs ($M = 6.77, SD = 1.67$) and POGMs ($M = 6.53, SD = 1.73$) in their GSC was not significant, $t(152) = 0.71, p = .48$. Thus, Hypothesis 8 was not supported. AOGMs did not report higher levels of GSC than POGMs.

My ninth hypothesis was that young people who had engaged in civil society would have significantly higher levels of GSC than those who had not. The results of an independent-sample t-test revealed no significant difference in generalised social capital between young people who did and did not participate in civil society ($M = 6.11, SD = 1.63$) and those who did ($M = 6.49, SD = 1.81$); $t(280) = -1.75, p = .08$. It appears that civic participants enjoy building generalised social capital with others as much as non-civic participants. Thus, Hypothesis 9 was also not supported.

My tenth hypothesis asked whether young people who chose the internet as their favourite news media would be significantly more likely to have engaged in civil society than are young people who chose other type of news media. A Chi-square test was used to explore the relationship between internet news followers and civic engagement. Table 9.5 shows that similar percentages were found between internet news followers and non-internet news followers in civic engagements. Internet news followers (65 per cent) were as likely as non-internet news followers (65 per cent) to participate in civic activities. A Chi-square test was used to find out whether the similar percentages were different at significance level, $p < .05$. The results confirm that this proportion is significantly not different as Chi-square value is .03 at significance level $p$.
= .95. This reveals that internet usage is not associated with civic engagement. Thus, Hypothesis 10 was not supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic engagement</th>
<th>Internet news followers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 11 speculated that young people who participated in organised groups online would be more likely to engage in civil society than would those who participated in organised groups in face-to-face mode. Table 9.6 shows that the percentage of young people who joined in online groups and were active in civic engagement was slightly larger than their counterparts. I ran a Chi-square test on these variables and found that the differences between young people who joined in online groups and their counterparts in civic engagement was not significant, as the Chi-square value showed .49 at significance levels greater than .05. Thus, Hypothesis 10 was not supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic engagement</th>
<th>Type of organiser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION
My main finding in this chapter is that being just a group member (either active or passive) is enough to produce an association with civic participation and generalised social capital with the broader community. Young people with any type of group membership reported higher levels of civic participation and generalized social capital than did those who were not group members. Figure 9.1 shows the key findings of this chapter.
White and Wyn’s (2008:244) research suggested that young people refrained from civic engagement due to low institutional trust. According to their study, young people are discouraged from participating in the wider society because they have conflicts with local business organisations, the police, and the media (White & Wyn, 2008:244). My findings do not indicate this. Rather, they show no relationship between group membership, one of my measures for civic engagement, and confidence in major societal organisations.

OGMs were more likely to actively participate in civic activities than non-members. Interestingly, just being a member was enough. Although I had expected that active participation would be associated with higher levels of civic participation than passive participation, this was not the case. Passive membership was also associated with civic engagement, even though passive members did not make the effort to meet regularly with their groups. This lends support to Wollebæk and Selle’s (2003) argument that passive members are also important because they are reserve activists; they are not passive in the sense that Putnam suggests. In fact, my findings echo Wollebæk and Selle’s (2003), where they found that both AOGMs and POGMs were more civically engaged than NOGMs. In addition, their detailed investigation into passive members creates insights into considering both passive and active members of organised groups as activists in civil society.

My findings suggest that, in terms of civic participation, young people who attended regular meetings were no different from those who just signed up and paid for

---

**Figure 9.1** Active membership of organised groups is associated with civic participation, generalised social capital.
membership fees. These findings contradict Putnam’s (2000) argument that face-to-face interaction in association and clubs is more important in generating social capital than passive involvement (i.e. limited to paying membership fees). It appears that young group members participate in civic activities regardless of their levels of activity with their group and that they do so to a greater extent than do non-members.

OGMs did not report higher levels of FRSC than NOGMs. These findings indicate that participation in organised groups did not increase young people’s levels of trust in and reciprocity with their close friends. It did not lend support to Brehm and Rhan’s (1997) findings that civic engagement enhances interpersonal trust. AOGMs were also not more likely to report higher levels of FRSC than are POGMs. Although the experience of participating in organised groups probably gives active members chances to have more social interaction in group settings, it does not appear to help in generating more FRSC among young people.

Although OGM was not associated with higher FRSC or higher confidence in organisations, OGMs were more likely than NOGMs to report high generalised social capital. Non-participation in organised groups was associated with low levels of generalised social capital, as non-members reported much lower trust in and reciprocity with generalised others was than did either POGMs or AOGMs. This finding lends support to Wollebæk and Selle’s (2003) findings, as they also found that both active and passive members were more trusting in generalised others than were non-members. This study provides evidence that being a member of an organised group at any level makes a difference to one’s level of generalised trust when compared with those who have not joined any group. This finding supports most of the previous research which found that group membership is related to generalised trust (Putnam 1993a, 2000; Stolle 1998; Green & Brock 2005; Seippel 2006).

Why is POGM as good as AOGM for generating an association with high levels of generalised trust and civic participation? It would seem that being an active group member should have a greater impact than being an active/passive member. Perhaps the explanation is that POGMs have at least made an active decision to be part of their organised group(s).
Civic participation was not associated with higher levels of generalised social capital. This result agrees with Uslaner’s (2000) idea that civic activities are not related to social trust. My result also supports Zmerli’s (2010) argument that generalised trust appears to be associated with lower levels of civic activity. In addition, online users were not significantly different from non-online users in terms of their civic engagement. In fact, online media and online community were not popular choices of the majority of the young people. Thus, my findings disagree with Vromen’s (2004) argument that online groups are a new vehicle for young Australians to show their civic actions. Indeed, the young people preferred to attend face-to-face meetings for activities in civil society. In addition, their decision to be active on internet did not influence their motivation to build generalised social capital.  

To conclude, both passive and active levels of membership of organised groups seemed equally important in motivating young people to engage in civic activities and to become more trusting of people in general. My findings reveal that face-to-face interaction was not a key factor contributing to generalised social capital.

---

1 A series of hypotheses on internet usage (including online participation of organised groups, online media, online communication mode with family members and friends) and its impacts on civic engagement and generalised social capital was tested. I found that internet usage was not related to civic engagement and generalised social capital.
CHAPTER 10 YOUNG PEOPLE AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

INTRODUCTION
In this chapter I summarise my hypotheses and my findings and then discuss whether my findings are consistent with my hypotheses and what other researchers have suggested or differ from their predictions. Finally I discuss the limitations of the study and give suggestions for further research.

SUMMARY OF MY THEORETICAL MODEL
There were two main research objectives in this thesis. First, I wanted to know whether informal social capital was the starting base for young people to develop trust and reciprocity in other social settings and confidence in major societal organisations. Second, I was interested in whether active membership of organised groups was associated with higher levels of generalised social capital and civic participation that either passive membership or not being a member. I investigated these objectives by testing five main propositions in this research as shown in Figure 10.1. Firstly, I theorised that high bonding family social capital would be associated with higher levels of social capital in other social settings plus higher levels of activity in organised groups. Secondly, high bonding social capital among friends was expected to be associated with higher levels of social capital in other social settings plus higher levels of activity in organised groups. Thirdly, high bridging social capital with neighbours was thought to be more likely to be generated in non-metropolitan areas and to be associated with long periods of residence, active participation in neighbourhood activities, perceived neighbourhood safety and perceived neighbourhood cohesion. In turn, high bridging social capital with neighbours was expected to lead to higher levels of social capital in other social settings plus higher levels of activity in organised groups. Fourthly, low confidence in major societal organisations was expected to be associated with high rates of non-membership of organised groups. Finally, active membership of organised groups was expected to lead to civic engagement, higher social capital among friends and higher generalised social capital.
Figure 10.1 Overall proposition: informal social capital as bases for cultivating trust and reciprocity.
SUMMARY OF MY FINDINGS

There were several key findings. First, friendship social capital and neighbourhood social capital did appear to be starting bases for young people to develop trust in and reciprocity with generalised others and confidence in major societal organisations. Second, membership of organised groups was associated with higher levels of generalised social capital and civic participation.

My first main proposition suggested that family would be the common ground for young people to learn trust and reciprocity and then these qualities would spread to their friendship realm, neighbourhoods, social institutions and people in general. I also expected that family social capital would be related to membership of organised groups. I found that virtually all respondents had high family social capital. In addition, almost everyone listed close family that they had developed norms of trust and reciprocity with. This research highlights that one third of the respondents had complete trust in and reciprocity with their close family members, as I discussed in Chapter 6. Almost no one had low family social capital. Evincing the cooperation phenomenon demonstrated in the mind game „Prisoner’s dilemma“, people will tend to cooperate with one another to achieve the best outcome in iterated interactions with trusted partners. So in the long run of iterated family interactions, family members who trust each other and reciprocate with one another are able to cooperate and to create a win-win situation. For young people, this might be especially true because, generally speaking, the basic social unit people form first is the family. Thus young people normally have their very first experience of learning trust and reciprocity in their families.

There is only one finding that supports my first main proposition: bonding family social capital was related to bonding social capital among friends. Those with high family social capital also had high friendship social capital, so there was support for the idea that norms of trust and reciprocity learned in family settings could translate to friendship settings. Family social capital, a form of bonding social capital, might teach young people how to form bonding social capital more generally. However, young people with very high family social capital were not more likely to experience higher levels of social capital in social groups such as acquaintances (including neighbours), people in general, or to experience higher levels of confidence in major societal organisations. Furthermore, bonding family social capital was not related to
membership of organised groups. To conclude here, family social capital does not extend to weak-ties and generalised others. But it did not have demonstrable negative effects on social capital in other realms. I did not find a dark side to bonding social capital in families.

My second main proposition was about bonding social capital among friends. My findings showed that a large majority of the young people in the sample reported high levels of social capital with their friends. They tended to report very high social capital with their friends when there was closure in their friendship networks. My second proposition was partly supported because young people who had very high social capital with their friends were more likely to report high generalised social capital than those with lower levels. This suggests that young people who have made close connections with friends, people outside of their kinship group, are also more likely to trust in generalised others. In addition, those with very high social capital within friendship groups were more likely to be members of organised groups. Organised group membership appears to have positive effects on society as it seems to promote generalised social capital and civic engagement. Organised group membership should be encouraged, then, as it is good for society. Again, the dark side of social capital was not apparent. Bonding social capital, if anything, was positively associated with bridging social capital.

My third main proposition was about social capital among neighbours. First I identified factors that contributed to social capital among neighbours. Neighbourhood social capital was highest when young people lived in their neighbourhood for a long time, they participated in neighbourhood activities and the neighbourhood was cohesive and safe. Neighbourhood social capital was not related to either family social capital or friendship social capital. It appears that neighbourhood social capital, a form of bridging social capital, is a qualitatively different type of social capital from either family social capital or friendship social capital. So the norms of trust and reciprocity that we practice in our bonding relationships do not seem to impact on the types of norms of trust and reciprocity we experienced with our neighbours, and possibly our acquaintances. So neighbourhood social capital has different processes around its accumulation.
Young people who had built high social capital with their neighbours were more likely to report high generalised social capital than were those who had built low levels. In addition, the higher the social capital among neighbours was, the higher the confidence in major societal organisations. Neighbourhood social capital may also be important for society as it is associated with generalised social capital and confidence in major societal organisations.

My fourth main proposition, that low confidence in major societal organisations was expected to be associated with low rates of membership of organised groups, was not supported. Indeed, confidence in major societal organisations was not related to either active or passive membership of organised groups.

My fifth proposition was about membership of organised groups. My findings show that passive members of organised groups were as likely as active members to participate in civic activities. Passive members were also as likely as active members to report high generalised social capital. Thus my fifth proposition was not supported as stated; however, my findings do not contradict my fifth proposition. This is because active members of organised groups were more likely than non-members to report higher levels of generalised social capital and to be civically active.

Overall, it appears that bonding social capital may be as important as bridging social capital in extending networks of trust and reciprocity to society as a whole. In other words, developing social capital with those outside of family networks may be important for the development of social capital with generalised others. In addition, group membership at any level seemed to be associated with greater participation in civic activities and higher generalised social capital.

DISCUSSION
Previous research in the literature offers only limited details about young people’s social capital across different informal social groups (i.e. family, close friends and neighbours), confidence in major societal organisations, generalised social capital and civic engagement in the wider society. This research attempts to address this gap in the literature.
Bonding social capital

My first and second propositions were about the positive relationship between bonding social capital (i.e. family social capital and social capital among close friends) and social capital in other social settings: neighbourhood social capital, generalised social capital and institutional trust.

I expected that building social capital with family would be the first practice ground for young people to cooperate with people beyond their kin. Leonard and Onyx (2004) say that family social capital „may be strongly bounded, allowing no access to those outside the family”. My findings do not support this assertion. Indeed, I found that young people with high family social capital might become more trusting in and reciprocating with close friends, which supports Winter’s (2000) notion that social capital could be spread to other social groups via internalisation and transmission of norms of trust and reciprocity in the family. My findings show that young people who have learnt about trust and reciprocity in their families are likely to generate the same type of trust in and reciprocity with their close friends. This is expected because family social capital and friendship social capital shared the same qualities of networks, which are repetitive, intensive and multistranded, that are essential to form stable relationships (Putnam, 2000).

Bonding social capital was formed through repeated interactions characterised by intense relationships, shaped by complete trust in and reciprocity with their close family members and friends. This explains how family social capital is related to social capital among friends, because both family ties and close friend ties are considered multistranded networks where members in such networks tend to trust each other and reciprocate practical and emotional support. My findings on bonding social capital in the family and among friends support Putnam’s conceptualisation of bonding social capital. And my findings did not show that strong bonding social capital among family and friends had any negative effects on bridging social capital.

I expected that family social capital would be related to membership of organised groups: that those with high family social capital would be more like to be group members than those with lower family social capital. Fukuyama (1995) also suggested that distrust in people from outside the kinship group is an obstacle to forming
voluntary associations. I found that a young person’s levels of family social capital was not related to his or her membership of organised groups. It appears that having very high family social capital does not stop young people from being active members of organised groups but, on the other hand, it does not appear to promote any type of membership. Thus, this finding does not support Fukuyama’s argument that interpersonal trust is negatively related to membership of organised groups. There is insufficient evidence to show that young people who have very high trust in and reciprocity with their family members do or do not step out of the comfort zone (i.e. family environment) to actively or passively participate in organised groups.

On the other hand, I expected that social capital among friends could motivate young people to be active members or passive members of organised groups and my findings supported this proposition. Green and Brock (1998) argue that individuals who are more trusting are more likely to engage in social activities than are those who are less trusting. My findings lend support to Green and Brock’s (1998) argument. This suggests that building informal social capital outside families is associated with, and may promote, active membership of organised groups. It appears that having social connections beyond families may be important in creating membership of organised groups.

**Bridging social capital**

A large part of my proposition about social capital among neighbours was supported. To achieve social capital among neighbours, four factors seemed to be important: long periods of residence, active participation in neighbourhood activities, perceived neighbourhood cohesion and safety. My findings suggest that perceived neighbourhood cohesion is “a bottom-up process founded upon local social capital” (Forrest & Kearns, 2001:2137). These findings are consistent with Putnam’s (1995a) argument that social capital enables neighbours to work together among themselves. Furthermore, my findings suggest that the trust-based cooperation among neighbours may also be extended to people in general. Thus, this contradicts the argument that neighbourhood social cohesion is the “the downside of social capital” which will lead to social exclusion (Forrest & Kearns, 2001:2137).

In addition, my findings show that perceived neighbourhood safety is associated with high levels of social capital among neighbours. These findings lend support to previous
literature which emphasises that feelings of safety are an important factor in determining the quality of social interaction among neighbours in order to build social capital and promote active participation in organised groups (Onyx & Bullen, 2000; Leonard & Onyx; 2004; Ziersch et al., 2005; Chong, 2008).

Next, my findings shed some lights on the implications of long periods of residence and active participation in neighbourhood activities in building social capital among neighbours. It appears that long periods of residence create a familiar and stable environment for cultivating social capital among neighbours. In addition, social activities in neighbourhoods prepare young people to trust in and reciprocate with their neighbours. I found that neighbourhood location was not related to social capital among neighbours. Young people from rural areas were not more likely to have high social capital among neighbours as Onyx and Bullen (2000) suggest. Further research into this is needed due to the small numbers of young people in my sample who lived in large towns and rural areas (n = 28).

In addition, interpersonal trust and reciprocity among neighbours could be extended to the community level, where young people reinforced their generalised social capital by building social capital among neighbours. This is a new finding. Previously Putnam (2000) suggested that generalised social capital is an extension of personal networks. Thus I theorised that neighbourhood social capital could be extended to generalised others too. My findings suggest that neighbourhood social capital could be a cooperation platform for young people to build more trust and reciprocity, which they could then apply to people in general. So building social capital in neighbourhoods seems to be beneficial to the wider society.

Furthermore, my findings reveal that institutional trust and social capital among neighbours are related. This lends support to previous findings that interpersonal trust is related to institutional trust (Putnam, 1993a; Levi, 1996; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Crystal & DeBell, 2002; Pickup et al., 2004). It appears that social interactions taking place in neighbourhoods are related to institutional trust. Institutional trust, especially for those institutions which are situated in neighbourhoods, could be fostered by neighbourhoods which are characterised as having friendly neighbours who are willing to trust in and reciprocate with one another.
I expected that both family social capital and friendship social capital would be associated with neighbourhood social capital. However, my findings show that these forms of bonding social capital were not related to neighbourhood social capital. In other words, bonding social capital does not help or hinder the formation of social capital among neighbours. It appears that neighbourhood social capital is a qualitatively different type of social capital from either family social capital or friendship social capital. So the norms of trust and reciprocity that we practice in our bonding relationships do not seem to impact on the types of norms of trust and reciprocity that we experienced with our neighbours. This is a new finding and it suggests that young people might use a different mechanism in the accumulation of neighbourhood social capital.

**Social structure of strong ties and weak ties: closed networks versus open networks**

I found that closed networks between close friends were associated with very high social capital among close friends. This suggests that higher levels of social capital among close friends are generated within a close-knit group with multistranded and intense social connections. This description of close friendship fits the concept of bonding social capital (see Putnam, 2000). In fact, closed friendship networks also generated higher social capital among friends than open networks which consisted of looser contacts and less intense social connections, as Coleman (1988a) suggests. As with families, closed networks of friends seemed to generate stronger social capital than do open networks.

Almost all young people who perceived their neighbourhoods to be cohesive built high levels of social capital with their neighbours. A cohesive neighbourhood created a sense of togetherness between neighbours where neighbours tended to know one another and to be concerned about neighbourhood matters. This suggests that high neighbourhood cohesion (characterised as a closed network among neighbours who work together and cooperate) tends to generate more social capital among neighbours than does low neighbourhood cohesion (characterised as an open network with less cooperation among neighbours). These findings support Coleman’s contention that closed networks foster the development of social capital. To conclude here, both friendship and neighbourhood networks have to provide the space for iterated interacted to occur and it is very important for social capital to flourish in such environment.
However, my findings on the influence of network structure are not consistent. Family networks are closed networks as compared to friendship and neighbourhood networks. Within the family networks, Coleman (1988a) proposed that intergenerational closure of family network which involved parents and children and other members of the extended family in the network produces more family social capital. I found that being close to both nuclear and extended family members did not reinforce family social capital. This finding conflicts with Coleman’s (1988a) theory that intergenerational closure is a strong social structure that reinforces trust in the family. Young people who have both close nuclear and extended family members did not seem to be more likely to form very high social capital with their combined family members than did those who only reported close nuclear family members. However, this might due to the nature of family network which is exclusive to family members only. Thus, adding extended family members in the circle of trust and reciprocity does not make much difference to levels of family social capital. To conclude here, I have established the idea that closed networks are associated with higher levels of social capital among friends and neighbours.

**Group membership**

According to Putnam (2000), active group membership is a key indicator of social capital. My findings support this, but they also indicate with some consistency that passive members of organised groups were just as likely as active members to report high generalised social capital and to participate in civic activities. This contradicts Putnam’s (1995:51) findings that the increase in passive participation indicates a decrease in generalised social capital. For Putnam (2000), face-to-face interaction is crucial in generating trust and reciprocity. I expected that active members of organised groups would generate more friendship social capital and generalised social capital than passive members of organised groups, but this was not the case. Passive membership was enough. My findings lend support to Wollebæk and Selle’s (2003) argument that passive members are also likely to express high levels of generalised social capital even though they do not attend regular meetings of the organised groups to which they belong.

Indeed, the intention and simple actions of signing up to organised groups and receiving newsletters seem to be enough to impact on how young people react to generalised
others. It appears that the sense of belonging to organised groups may give young people the sense of belonging to generalised others in the wider society too, and that this identification of the wider society may help young people to accumulate more generalised social capital. Thus I argue that belonging to organised groups might enhance the experience of building social capital with generalised others for both active and passive members. It is rewarding for both types of group membership to enjoy higher levels of social capital and in turn it is beneficial for all members of the wider society in general.

In addition, I expected that active members of organised groups would share responsibilities as citizens and participate in civic activities. So my findings do not contradict with Putnam’s (2000) theory that active participation in organised groups and civic activities are important in creating social capital in the community. Indeed, my findings echo Wollebæk and Selle’s (2003) suggestion that participation need not be active and face-to-face for it to be related to civic engagement. So my findings imply that civic engagement at the individual level may be closely related to civic engagement at group level. This suggests that young people might be motivated to participate in civic activities based on their experience of civic engagement in organised groups, or, vice versa. Thus signing up for organised groups is as important as signing a petition in encouraging more young people to actively involved in civic engagement.

**Generalised social capital and civic engagement**

I expected that friendship social capital, neighbourhood social capital and membership of organised groups would be related to generalised social capital and my findings supported this proposition. However, my findings show that trust in and reciprocity with family members were not related to generalised social capital. This is not what I had expected. These findings also do not lend support to Fukuyama’s (1995) theory that family social capital leads to distrust of people from other kinship groups. In fact, generalised social capital appears to be an extension of social capital among neighbours and close friends, rather than of family social capital. These findings partially support Putnam’s (2000) theory that generalised social capital is extended from personal networks to people in general.
My findings suggest that building social capital among close friends is important in spreading trust and reciprocity to all members of society in general. The experience of building social capital among friends is also related to membership of organised groups. It appears that bonding social capital among friends may act as a firm base for generalised trust and reciprocity and civic engagement in organised groups to flourish in the wider society. Family social capital was not directly associated with the generation of generalised social capital and participation in organised groups in civil society. To conclude here, not all types of bonding social capital have the same effects on generalised social capital.

I also found that social capital among neighbours was directly related to higher generalised social capital and confidence in major societal organisations. The generation of trust and reciprocity in the neighbourhood appears to contribute directly to the formation of social capital with people in general in the wider society. Thus this type of weak ties may be important for young people to leap from their bonding social capital with family members and close friends to unfamiliar and distant networks. As a result, young people could become more open in trusting in and reciprocating with people in general. This explanation also fits my findings that social capital among neighbours was related to confidence in major societal organisations. These findings support previous research which claims that interpersonal trust may be related to institutional trust (Putnam, 1993a; Levi, 1996; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Crystal & DeBell, 2002; Pickup et al., 2004).

**Confidence in organisations**

I expected that social capital in every face-to-face social setting would be related to confidence in major societal organisations. However, only neighbourhood social capital was related to confidence in major societal organisations. It appears that experience in dealing with neighbours, but not family or close friends, was associated with impressions of major societal organisations. This finding lends support to previous findings that interpersonal trust is related to institutional trust (Putnam, 1993a; Levi, 1996; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Crystal & DeBell, 2002; Pickup et al., 2004). This suggests that bridging social capital may play an important role in deciding how young people perceived major societal organisations. The processes involved in developing bonding social capital may be quite different from those involved in developing bridging social capital.
capital, and it is bridging social capital that appears to foster trust in institutions. For example, the repeated and multistranded networks in bonding social capital are very different from the customer and service provider type of relationships involved in dealing with institutions. Thus, in order to enhance institutional trust, it is important to have social capital flourish at the neighbourhood level and vice versa.

**Revised theoretical model**

Based on my findings I have revised my theoretical model. The new model is shown in Figure 10.2. In summary, this research concludes that passive membership of organised groups may be as important as active membership in building generalised social capital and participation in civic activities. Family social capital is related to social capital among close friends, in turn, young people with very high social capital among close friends may generalise their trust in and reciprocity with their close friends to people in general.

At the community level, young people also seem to reinforce their generalised social capital by participating in organised groups and by building social capital with their neighbours. It appears that institutional trust and social capital among neighbours are related. So promoting neighbourhood social capital could benefit society as a whole.

In terms of civil society, young people who were members of organised groups were also likely to be active civic participants. The more active a group member was in civic participation, the more active he or she was in their organised groups. In addition, I identified four factors that related closely to social capital among neighbours: residence period, perceived neighbourhood safety, neighbourhood cohesion and levels of participation in neighbourhood activities. These four factors, rather than bonding social capital of family and friendship networks, seem to foster the formation of social capital among neighbours. This revised model highlights that the generation of social capital with neighbours, who were weak-ties, was not related to the formation of social capital with strong ties in the family and in friendship networks.
IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORIES OF SOCIAL CAPITAL

The unique features of this research are that, first, whereas most previous studies explore the formation of social capital within one particular social group (i.e. family or friendship or neighbourhood) or within institutions, this research provides a overall picture of the interrelationship of social capital across different social groups. In this respect, the findings of this research support the notions of interrelated bonding social capital in different social groups (family and friends networks), interrelated bonding social capital (friendship social capital) and bridging social capital (neighbourhood social capital), and interrelated bridging social capital (neighbourhood social capital) and institutional trust. In addition, there is insufficient evidence to prove that bonding social capital is related to building social capital with weak ties (i.e. neighbours).

The findings of this research provide new insights into the development of young people’s social capital. First, friendship social capital is identified as the only type of social capital that channels young people who enjoy very high family social capital to build trust in and reciprocity with non-family members. This highlights the importance of socialisation into the norms of trust in and reciprocity in family as a gateway for
further positive social interaction beyond kinship. But will the reinforcement of these two bonding social capital leads to the “dark side” of social capital? The answer is “no” because the second important finding in this research shows that high social capital among friends seems to promote membership of organised groups. This implies that interactions among close friends do not remain static in friendship networks, but can be extended to civil society for those young people who have signed up for organised groups. Thus, bonding social capital does not have the negative consequence predicted by some analysts who argue that young people in closely bonded friendship networks will start to distrust non-members of these networks.

Third, the results in this research found that levels of confidence in major societal organisations are associated with levels of neighbourhood social capital. This suggests that the source of one-way institutional trust that young people put in major societal organisations may be affected by the norms of trust and reciprocity in neighbourhoods. It seems that the quality of neighbourhood lives reflects the levels of confidence that young people place in major societal organisations. Neighbourhood experiences may be used as signposts for young people to further expand their trust in major societal organisations. This implies that institutional trust is locally based in everyday neighbourhood life. Thus the neighbourhood could be a basic analysis unit to predict levels of institutional trust at national level.

Fourth, the results in this research found that the formation of social capital with neighbours is not related to bonding social capital with either family or friends. Family and friendship networks are very different from neighbourhood networks. Also, young people do not choose to expand their neighbourhood networks via family and friendship networks. More specifically, the effort to contribute to the norms of trust in and reciprocity within family and friendship networks seems to be naïve. Young people do not have any intention to treat bonding networks as their stepping stones for making new acquaintances and new accesses to other social networks. In other words, the intersection between bonding social capital and bridging social capital is almost non-existent. This phenomenon suggests that the mechanism in putting trust in strong ties and weak ties is different. Thus, this implies that maybe formal social agents (i.e. community organisers and youth workers) could play their roles in connecting people
from different types of social networks and promote more social capital to the wider society.

These insights imply that the development of young people’s development as far as social capital is concerned is not necessarily home based. Indeed, if young people could master the social skills of maintaining trusting and reciprocal relationship with their friends and neighbours, they could expand this trust and reciprocity to generalised others easily. Thus, the new formula to empower young people with social capital should be focusing on social networking beyond young people’s kin, which are friendship and neighbourhood networks.

Furthermore, this research also identified direct and indirect relationships between social capital (in each social group) and membership of organised, an area that has not received much attention in empirical studies on factors influencing generalised social capital and civic engagement. Friendship social capital was the only bonding social capital network that was related to membership of organised groups, and in turn, members of organised groups were more likely to engage in civic activities and enjoy higher levels of generalised social capital than were their counterparts who did not belong to any organised groups. A vibrant civil society comprises civic engagement at both individual levels (via participation in civic activities) and groups levels (via membership of organised groups). Then, the outcome that can be harvested from this vibrant civil society is high levels of generalised social capital. Again, this finding shows that non-family networks are important and that more research should be focussing on the detailed characteristics of friendship networks and the mechanism of generating social capital among friends. Next, this finding shows that the influence of friends may be one of the important motivation in bringing more young people to participate in organised groups. In other words, by understanding how friendship and organised group participation reinforce each other, peer group participation in formal organised groups might provide the space for young people to enjoy high levels of social capital.

Further, generalised social capital can be fostered in three ways, via socialisation and practices of trust in and reciprocity with close friends, via participation in organisations at any levels, and via trusting in and reciprocating with neighbours. These findings are
expected because generalised social capital by definition refers to the practice of trust in and reciprocity with people in general, including people who young people know, acquaintances and strangers. Hence, experiences of building social capital with strong ties are as important as are those with weak ties. This research reveals that bonding social capital is not necessarily the „dark side” that restricts young people from trusting in and reciprocating with people beyond their familiar realms of family and friendship groups. In addition, the experience of participation in organised groups in civil society may also be beneficial to young people in that it may enable them to enjoy more social capital with all others members of the wider society. Again, informal ties and formal ties beyond kin are equally important in the formation of norms of trust and reciprocity that will sustain the iterated cooperation among community members.

In addition, this research presents an examination of the closed network factors which may contribute to the generation of social capital, including the connection between intergenerational closure and family social capital, between closed network and friendship social capital, and between social cohesion and neighbourhood social capital. Intergeneration closure was not associated with family social capital. This might be due to the fact that the family network is naturally a closed network. Hence the involvement of extended family members in nuclear family structures of young people does not seem to have much impact on the formation of family social capital. On the other hand, closed networks appear to be associated with high friendship social capital and neighbourhood social capital. This finding shows that a familiar environment may be crucial in cultivating collective actions of trust and cooperation. More importantly, the stability of one network provides iterated chances of cooperation among members. Thus, closed networks play an important role in the formation of social capital in involving both strong and weak ties. In my research there is no evidence that closed networks and bonding social capital have bad effects. Taken together, the results of this research constitute an important contribution to the social capital literature.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL POLICY
Understanding relationships between social capital in different social setting provides a overall picture of where social capital might be generated and to where it might be extended.
The following recommendations are made, in the light of this research, with regard to youth policy makers involved in Australian organised groups in communities. A key proposition for fostering generalised social capital and civic engagement is the idea of participation in organised groups in formal settings. Policy makers interested in promoting these qualities should begin with building social connections with people beyond young people’s families. Improving the quality of neighbourhood life should also be a goal for social policy makers.

The findings of this research may assist community organisations, especially organisers of youth development programme, to develop ways to encourage and extend learning about norms of trust and reciprocity in order to promote meaningful social relationships among young people. This research provides a detailed picture of young people’s profile of social capital with regards to their membership status (members or non-members) and levels of activity of their membership (passive or active members). The findings enhance our understanding of young people’s social capital and civic engagement at organised group level, which enable the development of improved civility of young people in civil society.

Further, this research recommends the development of a more extensive consultation program in neighbourhoods prior to community planning. Such programs need to cover issues such as neighbourhood safety and perceived neighbourhood safety, expectations of norms of trust and reciprocity, as well as details about the specific neighbourhood cultural activities. These programs could be of benefit to those people making decisions about neighbourhood policy. Local councils in every neighbourhood area can organise anti-crime campaigns in order to increase awareness of crime intolerance with hopes to reduce crime rates. More importantly, local councils should provide better facilities such as bright street lights and they could activate neighbourhood watch programs. Detailed statistics about crime rates and classifications should also be addressed in order for residents of neighbourhoods have a fair judgment of neighbourhood safety. Local authorities, including the police, could also build clean, fast and efficient image to boost perceptions neighbourhood safety, in turn providing a healthy environment for neighbours to generate social capital. The correlation found between social capital among neighbours and confidence in government (including the police) thus suggests that a virtuous circle can be formed in neighbourhood via the cooperation of the
government, local councils and the residents of neighbourhoods. An additional point from the findings of this research, which youth workers should be aware of, relates to safety issues such as night rides on public transport, especially when youth programs are held at night.

Policy makers should also turn their attention to neighbourhood cohesion and cultural activities, particularly for residents in the early stages of arrival in new neighbourhoods. As such, community planners should provide information resources as well as offer help and advice to new residents who are temporarily experiencing adjustments to local culture. In this way, the local neighbourhood house or community centre could provide formal networking for new residents to build new relationship with neighbours. Informal social activities in neighbourhoods such as music, food and seasonal festivals would also provide more chances for neighbours to meet up in a fun and warm environment. These repeated interactions with neighbours through neighbourhood activities could also form a sense of familiarity and belonging to the new neighbourhoods. These factors should foster social networks among neighbours and so generate social capital. The results of this research show that it is important for young people to grow up in the same neighbourhood in order to build social capital with neighbours. Policy makers should support home ownership programs so that parents can provide a stable environment for their children to grow up in the same neighbourhood over time. Hence, the research suggests that the successful generation of neighbourhood social capital is partly determined by home ownership, especially for households with children, because it promotes residential stability.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH
My data do not extend to the family social capital of young people who do not have close relationships with their family members. It would be worthwhile to find out how low family social capital affects young people’s social capital in different social settings and societal organisations. This research also includes only a small number of passive members of organised groups. Further exploration into passive membership of organised groups should be undertaken to study the differences among the three categories: non-members of organised groups, and passive and active members.
My findings revealed that institutional trust is not related to levels of social capital among family members, friends and neighbours, and that it does not lead to participation in organised groups. These findings contradict previous research which claims that interpersonal trust may be related to institutional trust (Putnam, 1993a; Levi, 1996; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Crystal & DeBell, 2002; Pickup et al., 2004). Thus, further research should be undertaken to investigate why institutional trust is not related to interpersonal trust in the family and neighbourhood settings and among friends.

My findings do not support previous findings that rural young people are more likely to build high social capital among neighbours (Onyx & Bullen, 2000). Further research into this is needed due to the small numbers of young people in my sample who lived in large towns and rural areas.

Qualitative research could also be undertaken to investigate what types of social interaction foster trust and reciprocity in the family and in what ways these types of social interaction similar to and different from those that occur among friends. Qualitative data also can provide some clues in explaining the reasons why bridging networks and bonding networks are not interrelated. In addition, it would be worthwhile to research individual experiences of neighbourhood lives and the implications of these lived experiences for building social capital among neighbours.

CONCLUSION
My findings provide insights into the experience of building social capital for the group of young Australians who participated in my research. This study indicates that young people’s social connections with their family members, friends and neighbours may be crucial in the accumulation and mobilisation of social capital. It is partly true that young people who trust others at the micro level (informal social capital) are likely to trust others at the macro level (generalised social capital).

Bonding family social capital is only directly related to social capital among friends. Indeed, very high family social capital might be a starting base for building social capital among friends and, in turn, friendship could motivate young people to become members of organised groups; finally, membership of organised groups helps in promoting generalised social capital and civic engagement. I argue that the experience
of long term interaction among neighbours, neighbourhood safety and cohesion, and an active neighbourhood environment all contribute to social capital among neighbours. As a result, young people become more trusting in and reciprocative with people in general. This is a desirable goal in society because such attitudes and behaviour are broadly associated with public health, political stability, lower crime rates, economic development and social wellbeing (Rosenfeld et al., 2001; Hyypa & Maki, 2003; Helliwell & Putnam, 2004; Iyer et al., 2005; Kim & Kawachi, 2006; Salmi, 2006).

Moreover, social connections beyond families are important in promoting membership of organised groups. Young people might become members of organised groups because of their experience in building social capital with their friends. Becoming members of organised groups at any level is helpful because it is associated with civic engagement and higher levels of generalised social capital. This suggests that members of organised groups benefit from building social capital with their close friends and in turn become more trusting in and reciprocative with people in general. My findings in this research suggest that, through participation in organised groups, young people may become active in civic activities too. Thus, both passive and active participation in organised groups may be the keystone in building social capital for young people.
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APPENDIX A GLOSSARY

Civic engagement

Nominal definition
I define civic engagement as voluntary participation in that sphere of institutions, organisations and individuals which is located between the family, the state and the market, to promote the common interests of civil society.

Operational definition
This study concentrates on the engagement of young people in different ways. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were involved in any of the 11 activities listed in the questionnaire in the past 12 months prior to this study: signing petitions; boycotting or buying certain products for environmental, ethical or political reasons; participating in demonstrations, protests or marches; working together with people who share the same concerns; writing to the newspapers; calling to ‘talkback’ radio programmes; voicing their opinions via public media; making contact with government officials (local, state or federal); participating in community consultations and attending public meetings.

Closeness

Nominal definition
An individual is close to someone else when he or she is comfortable being with that someone, can share private matters with them, and can ask them for help when help is needed. One could get more emotional resources or practical resources from someone who is closer than one who is more distant.

Operational definition
Close members were defined as those whom the respondent of the questionnaire feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help. Respondents were asked to recall the number of family members, friends, acquaintances, neighbours who fitted this description. Respondents of my survey question were asked: ‘How many members (family, friends, acquaintances, neighbours) are there who you feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help?’
Family social capital

Nominal definition
Family social capital is defined as norms of trust and reciprocity held by young people and their close family members.

Operational definition
Three social capital questions were asked about young people’s family members: ‘To what extent do you trust him or her to act in your best interests?’, ‘To what extent do you think he or she would be willing to help if you needed it (e.g. offer emotional support, physical support like practical assistance or financial help)?’ and ‘To what extent would you yourself be willing to help if he or she needed it? (e.g. offer emotional support, physical support like practical assistance or financial help)?’

Generalised social capital

Nominal definition
Generalised social capital is defined as norms of trust and reciprocity held among people in general.

Operational definition
Three social capital questions were asked about most people who they might meet in an average day (‘including people whom you know and strangers’): ‘To what extent do you trust him or her to act in your best interests?’, ‘To what extent do you think he or she would be willing to help if you needed it (e.g. giving directions or returning a dropped bag)?’ and ‘To what extent would you yourself be willing to help if he or she needed it? (e.g. giving directions or returning a dropped bag)?’

Group

Nominal definition
I define a group as a number of individuals who share a sense of membership in a formal organised group, an informal social group or wider society.
Operational definition
Participants were asked whether they were members of seven types of formal organised groups listed: a) hobby group: a sporting or recreation group or art, music, film or educational group; b) a religious group; c) service group: a group that helps people with special needs, a group that promotes rights, an environmental lobby group or aid organisation or a group working to improve the environment; d) community group: an ethnic community group or cultural group, a neighbourhood or community-based group; e) occupation related group: a union or professional group; f) political group: a political party or a lobby group that seeks to change specific government policies, g) self-help group: a self-help or consumer health group.

Informal social groups refer to neighbours, family members, friends and acquaintances, and people in general.

Reciprocity
Nominal definition
Reciprocity means that the truster and the trusted will exchange favours asynchronously. Reciprocity was measure by two questions: ‘To what extent do you think he or she would be willing to help if you needed it (e.g. offer emotional support, physical support like practical assistance or financial help)?’ and ‘To what extent would you yourself be willing to help if he or she needed it? (e.g. offer emotional support, physical support like practical assistance or financial help)?’

Social capital
Nominal definition
Social capital is defined as norms of trust and reciprocity held by a group of individuals or organisations.
Operational definition
Social capital is measured by levels of trust and reciprocity in family, friends, acquaintances, neighbourhood and generalised others. Three social capital questions regarding trust and reciprocity questions were asked repeatedly in different sections of the questionnaire for different groups of individuals: ‘To what extent do you trust him or her to act in your best interests?’, ‘To what extent do you think he or she would be willing to help if you needed it?’ and ‘To what extent would you yourself be willing to help if he or she needed it?’

Social capital among friends
Nominal definition
Social capital among friends is defined as norms of trust and reciprocity held by young people and their close friends.

Operational definition
Three social capital questions were asked about young people's close friends: ‘To what extent do you trust him or her to act in your best interests?’, ‘To what extent do you think he or she would be willing to help if you needed it (e.g. offer emotional support, physical support like practical assistance or financial help)?’ and ‘To what extent would you yourself be willing to help if he or she needed it? (e.g. offer emotional support, physical support like practical assistance or financial help)’. All three questions were on an 11-point scale from 1 = ‘No, not at all’ to 11 = ‘Yes, completely’.

Social capital among neighbours
Nominal definition
Social capital among neighbours is defined as norms of trust and reciprocity held by young people and their neighbours.
**Operational definition**

Three social capital questions were asked about young people’s close friends: ‘To what extent do you trust your neighbours to act in your best interests?’ to determine how much they trust their neighbours. To measure reciprocity, respondents were asked: a) ‘To what extent would your neighbours would be willing to help you? (e.g. by lending toolbox, collecting post for neighbours who are on long holidays)’, and b) ‘To what extent would you yourself be willing to help your neighbours? (e.g. by lending toolbox, collecting post for neighbours who are on long holidays)’.

**Societal organisations**

**Nominal definition**

Major societal organisations are banks and financial institutions, the public transport system, local trade and business people, the federal parliament, local government, major Australian companies, the courts and legal system, the defence forces, the police, commercial radio stations, the ABC, newspapers, commercial television channels, teachers and schools, lecturers and TAFE, college and universities, doctors and hospitals and charities.

**Trust**

**Nominal definition**

Trust is the expectation that the trusted party will act in the best interest of the truster.

**Operational definition**

Social capital questions were asked repeatedly in different sections of the questionnaire for different groups of individuals (in bracket): ‘To what extent do you trust him or her (family members, friends, acquaintances, neighbours, generalised others) to act in your best interest?’
APPENDIX B QUESTIONNAIRE

Note: The format of answers for Questions A1, A12, A14, B2, B5, B6, B19, C6, D11, E2, E4, G2, G4, G6, G9, G10, G11, G12, G13, G15, G19, G21, G22, G23 and G24 had been modified from drop down menu to listed answers. All other parts of the questionnaire remain the same as the online version.
WELCOME TO
YOUNG AUSTRALIANS AND
COMMUNITY SURVEY
Young Australians and Community

Investigators: Assoc. Prof. Katharine Betts, Ms Sheau Tsuey Chong

Dear Participant,

Welcome to this website! You are invited to participate in this survey of young Australians and their integration into their community.

Are you an Australian citizen or permanent resident aged 16 to 25? If you are, we would be very grateful if you would complete this online survey. It takes about 30 minutes.

Let's find out more about this research before you click to the next page!

Why are we doing this research
We want to learn more about young people's integration into different social circles and the links between these circles and the wider society.

The survey asks about any organised groups you might belong to, and any friends or family members whom you live with or feel close to. There are no right or wrong answers. If you are uncertain about how to answer, your first reaction is usually best.

Privacy and confidentiality
Your answers are anonymous. You cannot be identified at any stage of the research, unless you choose to volunteer for a follow-up interview and add your contact details at the end. (We can only interview people who live in Melbourne.)

The results will be included in an academic thesis and will also be published in an academic journal or journals. But no individual will be identifiable in any publication.

Participation is voluntary
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary throughout. If there are any questions that you’d rather not to answer, please just skip them.

Second stage of this research (the interviews)
If you are 18 years old or above, we would like to invite you to take part in a follow-up interview. You can leave your contact details with us and we will try to arrange an interview time with you. There is a link for you to click at the end of the survey where you can leave these details.

Further information or any problems
If you have any question about this project, please contact either investigator. Our contact details are:

Dr Katharine Betts
Assoc. Prof. Sociology
Faculty of Life and Social Sciences,
Swinburne University of Technology,
PO Box 218, Hawthorn, Victoria 3122.
Phone: (03) 9214 8201.
Email: kbetts@swin.edu.au

Ms Sheau Tsuey Chong
Phd candidate (Sociology)
Faculty of Life and Social Sciences
Swinburne University of Technology
PO Box 218, Hawthorn, Victoria 3122.
Phone: (03) 9214 4396
Email: stchong@swin.edu.au
If you have a complaint about the way you were treated during this study, please contact:

The Chair
Human Research Ethics Committee
Swinburne University of Technology,
PO Box 218
Hawthorn, Victoria, 3122
Telephone: 03-9214 5223.

Thank you for your participation. We value your response and appreciate your time and effort very much.

Please print this page and keep it for your information.

Yours sincerely,

Katharine Betts
Sheau Tsuey Chong
Sample Questions and Answers

1. To answer most of the questions you only need to click the appropriate button with your mouse.

To what extent do the residents in your neighborhood know one another?

If only about half of the residents in your neighborhood know one another, you would click the 5th button as shown.

2. To answer most of the questions you only need to click the appropriate box with your mouse.

In general how do you prefer to contact your friends? (You may tick more than one box.)

- Meet (face-to-face)
- Phone calls
- Via internet (email, video, audio conference)
- Post (ordinary mail)
- SMS (Short Message Service)

3. Next, you will see some drop down questions like this:

How often do you contact at least some of them?

If you contact your friends at least once a week, you could scroll down and choose on the line 'At least once a week'.

4. You will see some questions in a matrix like this:

Do you belong to any of these groups?

If you are an active member of a football club organised by your school, you could click on the button as shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of membership</th>
<th>Type of group</th>
<th>Type of membership</th>
<th>Type of organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>A sporting or recreation group</td>
<td>Active Member</td>
<td>School, College, University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Please select a group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Sometimes you are asked to write in an answer. In that case, simply type your answer in the space provided.

If you are working for pay, how many hours would you work per week on average?

If you are working 3 hours per week, you could type in ‘3’ in the box given.

3 hours
## A) Community and Neighbourhood

A1. How long have you been living in your neighbourhood?

- a. less than 1 year
- b. 1-5 years
- c. 6-10 years
- d. 11-15 years
- e. 16 years and above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A2. Thinking now in your neighbourhood, do you think there is a community spirit in this area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A3. To what extent do you trust your neighbours to act in your best interests?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A4. To what extent your neighbours would be willing to help** you if you needed it? **e.g. lending toolbox, collecting post for neighbours who are on long holidays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A5. To what extent would you yourself be willing to help** your neighbours? **e.g. lending toolbox, collecting post for neighbours who are on long holidays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A6. To what extent do the residents in your neighbourhood know one another?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A7. How diverse are your neighbours in terms of cultural background to you?

- No, not at all
- Yes, completely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A8. If there was a problem in this neighbourhood (e.g. people dumping garbage in the park), to what extent that you and other neighbourhood residents will cooperate to try to work on the problem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A9. Do you feel safe to walk alone in your neighbourhood after dark (say up to midnight)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A10. Do you feel safe at home after dark?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A11. Is it safe to use the public transport at night (say up to midnight)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A12. In last 12 months, how often have you or anyone living with you in your household participated in any neighbourhood activities?  
**e.g. parties at neighbours’ houses, community festival.**

- a. At least once a month  
- b. A few times in 6 months  
- c. A few times a year  
- d. Never  
- e. Not applicable. My neighbourhood doesn't hold any activities.

A13. How many people do you know in the neighbourhood who you feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help?

- a. 1-5  
- b. 6-10  
- c. 11-15  
- d. 16-20  
- e. 21 and above  
- f. None

A14. From the scale "1-No, not at all" to "11-Yes, completely", please indicate the level of trust, the level of giving help and receiving help according to different group of people as listed in rows below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Most people who you might meet in an average day (including people who you know and strangers)</th>
<th>II. To what extent do they would be willing to help** you if you needed it?</th>
<th>III. To what extent would you yourself be willing to help** them if they needed it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Generally speaking, to what extent do you trust them to act in your best interest?</td>
<td>Please select from the scale &quot;1-No, not at all&quot; to &quot;11-Yes, completely&quot;.</td>
<td>Please select from the scale &quot;1-No, not at all&quot; to &quot;11-Yes, completely&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Most people of different cultural backgrounds</td>
<td>Please select from the scale &quot;1-No, not at all&quot; to &quot;11-Yes, completely&quot;.</td>
<td>Please select from the scale &quot;1-No, not at all&quot; to &quot;11-Yes, completely&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Most people of different religions</td>
<td>Please select from the scale &quot;1-No, not at all&quot; to &quot;11-Yes, completely&quot;.</td>
<td>Please select from the scale &quot;1-No, not at all&quot; to &quot;11-Yes, completely&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**e.g. giving directions or returning a dropped bag.
### B) Organised Group

B1. Now we would like to ask you about organised groups which organised by school/college/university/workplace, community, online community, national or international organisations.

**Are you a member of any organised group?**
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
B2.
i. What type of group(s) are you participating in?

ii. Are you a member*, an active member**, or an officeholder*** in the organised group(s)?

iii. Who organises the group? Your school (college or university) or workplace, a community group (e.g. church, youth services, community centre, sport centre), a national or international organisation, online community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of membership</th>
<th>Type of group</th>
<th>Type of membership</th>
<th>Type of organiser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Please select a group</td>
<td>You are a(n)...</td>
<td>The organiser is...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category: Hobby group</td>
<td>a. Member</td>
<td>a. School/ College/ University/Workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. A sporting or recreation group</td>
<td>b. Active Member</td>
<td>b. Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Art, music, film or educational group</td>
<td>c. Office-holder</td>
<td>c. National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Other hobby group</td>
<td>d. International</td>
<td>e. Online community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category: Religious group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. A religious group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category: Service group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. A group that helps people with special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. A group that promotes rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. An environmental lobby group or aid organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. A group working to improve the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category: Community group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. An ethnic community group or cultural group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j. A neighbourhood or community-based group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category: Occupation related group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k. A union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l. Professional group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category: Political group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m. A political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n. A lobby group aimed to change government policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category: Special need group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o. A self-help/consumer health group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 2 Please select a group You are a(n)... The organiser is...

Group 3 Please select a group You are a(n) ... The organiser is...

Group 4 Please select a group You are a(n) ... The organiser is...

Group 5 Please select a group You are a(n) ... The organiser is...

Other group. Please specify

Group 6 You are a(n) ... The organiser is...

Group 7 You are a(n) ... The organiser is...

*Being a **member** means you pay a subscription, make donations, or are on a mailing list, but you are not any more involved than this.

**Being an **active member** means you are regularly involved in the group’s activities.

***Being an **officeholder** means you have a decision-making role in the group, for example, being a committee member, activity organiser, or webmaster.
Please think of **ONE group that is the most important to you** for the rest of the questions on this page.

**B3. Could you tell us which category the group (the most important group) falls into?**

- [ ] Hobby
- [ ] Religious
- [ ] Service
- [ ] Community
- [ ] Occupation related
- [ ] Political
- [ ] Special need
- [ ] None of the above

**B4. How did you become a member of this group? (You may tick more than one box)**

- [ ] Voluntary choice (interested)
- [ ] Required to join (by work, school, college or university or some other authority)
- [ ] Other. Please specify [ ]

**B5. There are how many members in this organised group in total?**

- [ ] a. 1-10
- [ ] b. 11-20
- [ ] c. 21-30
- [ ] d. 31-40
- [ ] e. 41-50
- [ ] f. 50 and above

**B6. For how long have you been a member of this group?**

- [ ] a. Less than 1 year
- [ ] b. More than 1 years
- [ ] c. More than 2 years
- [ ] d. More than 3 years
- [ ] e. More than 4 years
- [ ] f. More than 5 years

**B7. Thinking now of all the groups you belong to, do you yourself get any benefit from belonging to them (or it, if you only belong to one)? (You may tick more than one box.)**

- [ ] I have the chance to express my talents.
- [ ] I’ve developed generic skills or professional skills.
- [ ] Belonging helps me in my study or career development.
- [ ] I’ve made friends.
- [ ] I’ve made potentially useful connections.
- [ ] I’ve gained a better understanding on my community.
- [ ] None of the above.
- [ ] I get no benefits.
- Other. Please specify [ ]

**B8. Still thinking of this one group, are you an active member or an office holder?**

- [ ] Yes, I am an active member or office holder
- [ ] No
B9. How many members of this group (the most important group) do you feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help?
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21 and above
- None

Please refer to the group members who you feel at ease with them, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help to answer the rest of the questions in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B10. To what extent do you trust these group members to act in your best interest?</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B11. Thinking now of activities outside the formal purpose of the group, to what extent do you think they would be willing to help** you if you needed it? **e.g. offer each other lifts, or call or visit if someone was ill.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12. To what extent would you yourself willing to help** these group members if they needed it? **e.g. offer each other lifts, or call or visit if someone was ill?</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13. Do you think there is a team spirit in this group?</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14. To what do extent the group members know one another?</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B15. How similar is their background as compared to yours?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarity</th>
<th>All/Most are similar</th>
<th>Some are similar</th>
<th>A few are similar</th>
<th>None are similar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Their occupations (or being a student)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. The language they speak</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Their education level</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Their gender</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B16. What age group are these people from? (You may tick more than one box.)
- a. 1-10
- b. 11-15
- c. 16-20
- d. 21-25
- e. 26-30
- f. 31-40
- g. 41-50
- h. 51-60
- i. 60 and above
- j. I don't know
B17. Do all or most of them live close to your place (i.e. within 3 kilometres)?
   ○ All or most live nearby
   ○ Some live nearby
   ○ A few live nearby
   ○ None live nearby

B18. In general which is the most frequent mode of communication do you use to contact this set of members?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Most frequent mode</th>
<th>2nd most frequent mode</th>
<th>3rd most frequent mode</th>
<th>4th most frequent mode</th>
<th>The least frequent mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet (face to face)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via internet (emails, video/audio conference, blog, online forum, etc.)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post—ordinary mail or fax</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS (Short Message Service)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B19. How often do you contact at least some of them?
   ○ a. Every day
   ○ b. A few times a week
   ○ c. At least once a week
   ○ d. At least once a fortnight
   ○ e. At least once a month
   ○ f. Less than once a month
C) Wider Society

Now we would like to ask you about the wider society.

C1. *(In the last 12 months)* Have you done any of the following: *(Please select as many as may apply)*

- [ ] No.
- [ ] Contacted federal government official
- [ ] Contacted state government official
- [ ] Contacted local government official
- [ ] Written to the newspapers
- [ ] Signed a petition
- [ ] Phoned a *talkback* radio program
- [ ] Participated in a political campaign
- [ ] Participated in a community consultation or attended a public meeting
- [ ] Taken part in a demonstration, protest or march
- [ ] Worked together with people who shared the same concern
- [ ] Boycotted or bought certain products for environmental, ethical or political reasons
- [ ] Participated in a civic activity. Please specify: 

C2. If yes, have you experienced a barrier to participation in the civic activities listed in the previous question C1? *(Please select as many as may apply)*

- [ ] No, not at all.
- [ ] Yes, I'm not sure I could do it.
- [ ] Yes, I don't get enough information about civic activities.
- [ ] Yes, I don't know how to get involved.
- [ ] Yes, there is no civic organisations in the area.
- [ ] Yes, I have child-care responsibilities.
- [ ] Yes, I have other caring responsibilities (elderly, persons with a disability, ill etc.)
- [ ] Yes, I have personal disability, or physical or mental health issues.
- [ ] Yes, due to a lack of money.
- [ ] Yes, due to a lack of time due to paid work.
- [ ] Yes, due to a lack of sufficient private/public transport.
- [ ] Yes, I have no one to go with.
- [ ] Yes, I feel unwelcome.
- [ ] Yes, I have language barrier/difficulties.
- [ ] Other. Please specify: 

## C) Wider Society

C3. How much confidence do you have in the following organisations? Confidence here means you believe that these organisations are doing their job in a fair and impartial way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>A great deal of confidence</th>
<th>Quite a lot of confidence</th>
<th>Not very much confidence</th>
<th>No confidence at all</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The defence forces</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors and hospitals</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public transport system</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial television channels</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial radio stations</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The unions</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The courts and the legal system</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The federal parliament</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public service</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local trade and business people</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Australian companies</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks and financial institutions</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches or religious institutions</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in your State (or Territory)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers and TAFE, college and universities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and schools</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C4. We've already asked you about organised groups, but we are all part of other informal groups. Some are more important to us than others when we think of ourselves.

In general, which in the following list is most important to you in describing who you are? And the second and third most important?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>The most important</th>
<th>2nd most important</th>
<th>3rd most important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Your current or previous occupation (or being a student or homemaker)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Your race/ethnic background</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Your gender (that is, being male or female)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Your age group (that is, being young)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Your nationality/Citizenship</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Your family or marital status (that is, being a son or daughter, mother or father, husband or wife, or being single)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. The formal organised group(s) which you are active in</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Your friendship with friends</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Your religion (or being agnostic or atheist)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Your preferred political party, group or movement</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Your social class (that is working, middle or upper class)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
L. The part of Australia that you live in

M. Other. Please specify.

C5. Some people say that the following things are important for being truly Australian. Others say they are not important. How important do you think each of the following ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Fairly important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. to have been born in Australia</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. to have Australian citizenship</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. to have lived in Australia for most of one’s life</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. to be able to speak English</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. to feel Australian</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. to have Australian ancestry</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. to be Christian</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. to respect Australian political institutions and laws</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Other. Please specify</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C6. Do you follow news and current affairs? If yes, how often?
- a. Every day
- b. A few times a week
- c. At least once a week
- d. At least once a fortnight
- e. At least once a month
- f. Less than once a month
- g. I don’t follow news and current affairs

C7. Which are the three most frequent types of media you use to follow current affairs and news?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The most frequent media</th>
<th>2nd most frequent media</th>
<th>3rd most frequent media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. newspapers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. magazines</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. television</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. radio</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. the internet</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C9. At the time of your birth, were both, one or either of your parents citizens of Australia?
- Both were citizens of Australia
- Only father was a citizen of Australia
- Only mother was a citizen of Australia
- Neither parent was a citizen of Australia

C10. How proud are you being Australian?
- Very proud
- Somewhat proud
- Not very proud
- Not proud at all
- I am not Australian
D1. How many friends** do you have whom you feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help?

** (Someone who is NOT a spouse, romantic partner, or immediate member of your family)

- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21 and above
- None

Please refer to those friends whom you feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help to answer the rest of the questions in this section.

D2. To what extent do you trust these friends to act in your best interest?

Not at all □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ Completely □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

D3. To what extent they would be willing to help** you if you needed it?

**e.g. offer emotional support, physical support all like practical assistance or financial help

Not at all □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ Completely □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

D4. To what extent would you yourself willing to help** these friends if they needed it?

**e.g. offer emotional support, physical support all like practical assistance or financial help

Not at all □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ Completely □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

D5. To what extent do these friends know one another?

Not at all □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ Completely □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

D6. If you mentioned that you are an active group member (or an office-holder) of an organised group or groups in Section B, does this group of close friends overlap with members of that group or groups?

- Yes, a lot
- Yes, a little
- Not at all
- Not applicable, I'm not an active member of any group.

D7. What age group these friends mostly from? (You may tick more than one box.)

- a. 1-10 □ f. 31-40
- b. 11-15 □ g. 41-50
- c. 16-20 □ h. 51-60
- d. 21-25 □ i. 60 and above
- e. 26-30 □ j. I don't know
D8. How similar is their background as compared to yours?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i. Their occupations (or being a student)</th>
<th>All Most are similar</th>
<th>Some are similar</th>
<th>A few are similar</th>
<th>None are similar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii. The language they speak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Their education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Their gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D9. Do all or most of them live close to your place (i.e. within 3 kilometres)?

- All or most live nearby
- Some live nearby
- A few live nearby
- None live nearby

D10. In general which is the most frequent mode of communication do you use to contact your friends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most frequent mode</th>
<th>2nd most frequent mode</th>
<th>3rd most frequent mode</th>
<th>4th most frequent mode</th>
<th>The least frequent mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet (face to face)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via the internet (emails, video/audio conference, blog, online forum, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-- ordinary mail or fax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS (Short Message Service)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D11. How often do you contact at least some of them?

- a. Every day
- b. A few times a week
- c. At least once a week
- d. At least once a fortnight
- e. At least once a month
- f. Less than once a month
Now we would like you to think about members of your family of origin (parents, brothers, sisters, grandparents, aunts, uncles).

E1. How many family members who you feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help?
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21 and above
- None

E2.
i. Please indicate which family members you feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help.
ii. Does the family member live close to your place (within 3 km)?
iii. Does he/ she have the same level of education as you now have (or will have when your studies are complete)?
iv. Is the language he/ she speaks at home the same as yours?

Please indicate your answer between 1 point for "No, not at all" to 11 points for "Yes, completely" in questions below.
v. To what extent do you trust he/she to act in your best interest?
vi. To what extent do you think he or she would be willing to help if you needed it**?
vii. To what extent would you yourself willing to help if he or she needed it**?
**(e.g. offer emotional support, physical support like practical assistance or financial help)

Leave blank if not applicable or if you have no (living) family member in this role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please select</th>
<th>Please select</th>
<th>Please select</th>
<th>Please select</th>
<th>Please select</th>
<th>Please select</th>
<th>Please select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Father</td>
<td>a. less than 3 km</td>
<td>a. higher</td>
<td>a. different</td>
<td>a. 1 No, not at all</td>
<td>a. 1 No, not at all</td>
<td>a. 1 No, not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Stepfather</td>
<td>b. more than 3 km</td>
<td>b. lower</td>
<td>b. same</td>
<td>b. 2</td>
<td>b. 2</td>
<td>b. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mother</td>
<td>c. same household</td>
<td>c. same</td>
<td>c. 3</td>
<td>c. 3</td>
<td>c. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Stepmother</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>d. 4</td>
<td>d. 4</td>
<td>d. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Brother</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>e. 5</td>
<td>e. 5</td>
<td>e. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Sister</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>f. 6</td>
<td>f. 6</td>
<td>f. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Cousin (male)</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>g. 7</td>
<td>g. 7</td>
<td>g. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Cousin (female)</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>h. 8</td>
<td>h. 8</td>
<td>h. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Uncle</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>i. 9</td>
<td>i. 9</td>
<td>i. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Aunt</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>j. 10</td>
<td>j. 10</td>
<td>j. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Grandfather</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>k. 11 Yes, completely</td>
<td>k. 11 Yes, completely</td>
<td>k. 11 Yes, completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Grandmother</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Please select</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E3. In general which is the most frequent mode of communication do you use to contact these family members?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most frequent mode</th>
<th>2nd most frequent mode</th>
<th>3rd most frequent mode</th>
<th>4th most frequent mode</th>
<th>The least frequent mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I live with them (or most of them)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet (face to face)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via internet (emails, video/audio conference, blog, online forum, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-- ordinary mail or fax</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS (Short Message Service)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E4. How often do you contact most of these family members?

- a. I live with them (or with most of them)
- b. At least once a week
- c. Once a fortnight
- d. Once a month
- e. Less than once a month
- f. It differs a lot for different family members

E5. Would you agree that you and these family members feel close to each other?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you agree?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, not at all</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, completely</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now we’d like to ask you to think about the other people in your social circle who are **NOT** family, friends or members of groups that you belong to. They might be the people you know at school/university/work, or just people in the neighbourhood where you live. You know them at least to say hello to. Indeed you may work side-by-side. But you think of these people more as acquaintances than close friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F1. To what extent do you trust these acquaintances to act in your best interest?</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F2. To what extent they would be willing to help** you if you needed it?</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**e.g. lending you a hand with carrying heavy things or letting you use their phone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F3. To what extent would you yourself be willing to help** the acquaintances if they needed it?</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**e.g. lending you a hand with carrying heavy things or letting you use their phone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F4. Approximately how many acquaintances would you have whom you could ask for help of this kind?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ a. 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ b. 6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ c. 11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ d. 16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ e. 20 and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now we would like to ask you a few questions about yourself.

G1. Firstly, are you ...
- Male
- Female

G2. What year were you born?
- a. 1980
- b. 1981
- c. 1982
- d. 1983
- e. 1984
- f. 1985
- g. 1986
- h. 1987
- i. 1988
- j. 1989
- k. 1990
- l. 1991
- m. 1992

G3. Which state or territory are you currently living in?
- ACT
- NSW
- NT
- QLD
- SA
- TAS
- VIC
- WA

G4. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
- a. Still at TAFE/college
- b. Still at university
- c. Not now at school and did not complete secondary school to Year 10
- d. Completed secondary school to Year 8
- e. Completed secondary school to Year 9
- f. Completed secondary school to Year 10
- g. Completed secondary school to Year 11
- h. Completed secondary school to Year 12
- i. Trade qualification or apprenticeship
- j. Certificate or Diploma (TAFE or business college)
- k. Bachelor Degree (including Honours)
- l. Postgraduate Degree or Postgraduate Diploma

G5. What type of secondary school did you attend (or are now attending)?
- a. Government
- b. Catholic
- c. Other non-government
G6. Last week, please tell us which of the following best describes what you were doing?
* Please select ONE response only
  ○ a. A full-time student
  ○ b. A full-time student working part-time for pay
  ○ c. A full-time student working full-time for pay
  ○ d. Working full-time for pay
  ○ e. Working part-time for pay
  ○ f. Working a few hours a week for pay
  ○ g. Unemployed—looking for work
  ○ h. Household duties
  ○ i. Helping a family member
  ○ j. Living with a disability
  ○ k. Other
Other. Please specify: ____________________________

G7. Have you changed what you are doing in the previous three months or plan to change it in the next three months?
  ○ a. Yes, I have pursued (or will pursue) my education in a new education institute.
  ○ b. Yes, I have started (or will start) working full-time for pay.
  ○ c. No, things are still the same.
Other. Please specify: ____________________________

G8. What kind of work do you do?
* If you are unemployed or had a job in the past, please tell us about your last regular paid job.
* If you have NEVER worked for pay, please go to the next question.
Job title: ____________________________

-----If you are in paid work, how many hours would you work per week an average?

  hours

G9. Which country were you born in?
  ○ a. Australia
  ○ b. United Kingdom
  ○ c. New Zealand
  ○ d. Italy
  ○ e. Vietnam
  ○ f. Greece
  ○ g. China
  ○ h. Germany
  ○ i. Philippines
  ○ j. India
  ○ k. Netherlands
  ○ l. South Africa
  ○ m. Malaysia
  ○ n. Lebanon
  ○ o. Republic of Ireland
  ○ p. Other
Other. Please specify: ____________________________
G9. Which country was your mother born in?
   o a. Australia
   o b. United Kingdom
   o c. New Zealand
   o d. Italy
   o e. Vietnam
   o f. Greece
   o g. China
   o h. Germany
   o i. Philippines
   o j. India
   o k. Netherlands
   o l. South Africa
   o m. Malaysia
   o n. Lebanon
   o o. Republic of Ireland
   o p. Other

Other. Please specify:

G9. Which country was your father born in?
   o a. Australia
   o b. United Kingdom
   o c. New Zealand
   o d. Italy
   o e. Vietnam
   o f. Greece
   o g. China
   o h. Germany
   o i. Philippines
   o j. India
   o k. Netherlands
   o l. South Africa
   o m. Malaysia
   o n. Lebanon
   o o. Republic of Ireland
   o p. Other

Other. Please specify:

G12. Do you speak a language other than English at home?
   o a. No, English only
   o b. Yes, Italian
   o c. Yes, Greek
   o d. Yes, Cantonese
   o e. Yes, Mandarin
   o f. Yes, Arabic
   o g. Yes, Vietnamese
   o h. Yes, other

Other. Please specify:
G13. What is your ancestry?
   ○ a. English
   ○ b. Irish
   ○ c. Italian
   ○ d. German
   ○ e. Chinese
   ○ f. Scottish
   ○ g. Greek
   ○ h. Dutch
   ○ i. Lebanese
   ○ j. Indian
   ○ k. Vietnamese
   ○ l. Polish
   ○ m. Australian
   ○ n. Other
   Other. Please specify:

G14. Do you identify yourself as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

G15. Would you say you now live in ...
   ○ a. Inner metropolitan area of a major city (over 100,000 people)
   ○ b. Outer metropolitan area of a major city (over 100,000 people)
   ○ c. A large town (over 25,000 people)
   ○ d. A larger country town (over 10,000 people)
   ○ e. A small country town (under 10,000 people)
   ○ f. A rural area or on a farm

G16. Did you grow up in a single parent household?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ Not applicable. I have not lived with either parent since at least the age of 13.

G17. Do you live at home with one or both of your parents?
   ○ a. I live with my parents (or parent).
   ○ b. I live away from parents during term time but go home for holidays.
   ○ c. I live independently from my parents.
   ○ d. Other. Please specify:

G18. Do you live together with a partner?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

G19. What is your current marital status?
   ○ a. Single, never married
   ○ b. Married (including de facto)
   ○ c. Divorced
   ○ d. Separated but not divorced
   ○ e. Widowed
G20. Do you have any children?
- Yes
- No

G21. How many people live in your household?
- a. 1
- b. 2
- c. 3
- d. 4
- e. 5
- f. 6
- g. 7
- h. 8
- i. 9
- j. 10 and above

G22. Do you have a religion?
- Yes
- No

----- If you have a religion, is it...
- a. Catholic
- b. Anglican/Church of England
- c. Uniting Church/Methodist
- d. Presbyterian and Reformed
- e. Orthodox
- f. Buddhist
- g. Baptist
- h. Islam
- i. Lutheran
- j. Pentecostal
- k. Hinduism
- l. Judaism
- m. Other

Other: Please specify.

----- How often do you attend religious services?
- a. Several times a week
- b. Once a week
- c. 2 or 3 times a month
- d. Once a month
- e. Several times a year
- f. Once a year
- g. Less frequently
- h. Never
G23. What is your gross personal income, before tax or other deductions, from all sources? Please include any scholarship, youth allowance or any other government benefit, plus any regular allowance paid to you by your parent or parents, and income from interest or dividends.

- a. $0
- b. $1- $39 per week ($1- $2,079 per year)
- c. $40- $79 per week ($2,080- $4,159 per year)
- d. $80- $119 per week ($4,160- $6,239 per year)
- e. $120- $159 per week ($6,240- $8,319 per year)
- f. $160- $199 per week ($8,320- $10,399 per year)
- g. $200- $299 per week ($10,400- $15,599 per year)
- h. $300- $399 per week ($15,600- $20,799 per year)
- i. $400- $499 per week ($20,800- $25,999 per year)
- j. $500- $599 per week ($26,000- $31,199 per year)
- k. $600- $699 per week ($31,200- $36,399 per year)
- l. $700- $799 per week ($36,400- $41,599 per year)
- m. $800 per week or more ($41,600 a year or more)

G24. Do you find it hard to meet daily living expenses?

- a. Yes, it's really hard
- b. Yes, it's hard
- c. Yes, it's hard although I have other financial resources.
- d. No, it's not hard
- e. No, it's not hard at all
- f. It's not hard because I don't just depend on my own personal income
MODIFICATIONS TO APPROVED PROJECT PROTOCOLS

All conditions pertaining to the clearance were properly met, except for the number of participants. Participant numbers are not consistent with the approved protocol as it was exceeding the 200 participants granted. A final report has been submitted to the Human Research Ethics Committee.
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