PSC Discussion Papers Series

Volume 21 | Issue 7 Article 1

6-2007

Social Capital of Women Measured: Differentials by Family Structures

Zenaida R. Ravanera
University of Western Ontario, ravanera@uwo.ca

Rajulton Fernando
University of Western Ontario, fernando@uwo.ca

ISSN 1183-7284

Social Capital of Women Measured: Differentials by Family Structures

by
Zenaida R. Ravanera
Fernando Rajulton

Discussion Paper no. 07-07

ravanera@uwo.ca; fernando@uwo.ca

June 2007

On the web in PDF format: http://sociology.uwo.ca/popstudies/dp/dp07-07.pdf

Paper presented at the 2007 International Conference on Extended and Extending Families organized by the Centre for Research on Families and Relationships. Edinburgh, 27-29 June. Funding support from the Strategic Policy Research Directorate of Human Resources and Social Development Canada is gratefully acknowledged. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the official policy of HRSDC. .

Population Studies Centre
University of Western Ontario
London CANADA N6A 5C2

Social Capital of Women Measured: Differentials by Family Structures

Zenaida R. Ravanera and Fernando Rajulton
Population Studies Centre, University of Western Ontario
London, Canada N6A 5C2

Abstract

Social capital has often been invoked to explain differences in children's well-being by family structure; that is, developmental outcome for children in lone parent or step family is not at par with that of children from intact family because parental investments on children may be lower not only in financial and human capital but also in social capital. This proposition has been difficult to examine in greater depth because of lack of conceptual clarity and of data to measure social capital. Using a definition of social capital as the "ability to secure benefits through membership in networks and other social structures", we analyze social capital engendered by three types of networks - *informal ties* with kin, families, friends, neighbours, and workmates; *generalized relationships* with local people, people in civic groups, and people in general; and *relationships through institutions*. We examine differences in the measures of social capital among women living with no children in various marital arrangements, and women living with children in intact, step, and lone parent families.

Results of our study, using the Canadian 2003 General Social Survey on Social Engagement, confirm that social capital is greater in intact families than in lone parent families. Mothers in intact families (especially married mothers) have larger informal networks, are members of more primordial and purposive organizations, have greater trust in people in the family, in the neighbourhood, and in people in general, and have greater confidence in government or business institutions. In general, social capital of mothers in step families is in between that of married mothers in intact families and lone mothers.

Introduction: Family Structure and Social Capital

The initial conceptualization of social capital was closely linked to the family. Coleman's (1988, 1990) description of social capital - including how it is created and its properties - could encompass different organizations and networks. However, family is prominent in his illustration of the benefits of social capital. He studied the impact of social capital on youth's achievement, using measures such as presence of both parents in the household and employment of mothers. Since then, several studies have examined the impact of family social capital on development of children and youth using different measures of both social capital and childhood and youth outcomes (see for example, Bianchi and Robinson, 1997; Boisjoly, Duncan, and Hoffert, 1995; Hoffert, Boisjoly, and Duncan, 1998; McLanahan and Sadefur, 1994; Modell, 1994; Runyan et al, 1998; Teachman, Paasch and Carver, 1997). Findings have not been consistent possibly because measures often used in attempts to provide empirical evidence of the effect of social capital on children's outcomes - such as number of parents, number of siblings, and church attendance - have been, as Morrow (1999: 748) described, "crude and somewhat arbitrary".

There are reasons why family structure, often measured by whether or not both parents are present in the household, is used as a measure of social capital. Compared to two parents, single parents would not have as much time and attention to interact with their children. Family disruption through divorce often leads to change of residence that in turn breaks established relations in previous residence. However, empirical findings show that these reasons for using family structure as a proxy for social capital do not always hold true. For example, development outcomes of children and youth in two-parent step families are not much better than those in one-parent families (Kerr and Michalski, 2007; McLanahan and Sandefur, 1994; Teachman, Paasch, and Carver, 1996); single-parenting has no effect on time spent with children (Bianchi and Robinson, 1997); and, geographic mobility has not affected education outcome of children from high income families (Hoffert, Boisjoly, and Duncan, 1998).

Furstenberg and Hughes (1995) suggest that, rather than using a unitary concept of social capital, it may be more useful to relate the various outcomes on early adulthood to different types of social capital (such as parental social network and embeddedness in the community), in effect, giving up on family structure (or presence of one or two parents) as indicator of social capital. However, there could be benefits to understanding how family structure itself relates to social capital, particularly because different family types have emerged from changes in formation and dissolution of unions over the past decades. Types of families could differ in the ways of acquisition, management, and deployment of social capital to benefit the members, including children.

An assumption behind the research of Coleman and others is that intact family has greater social capital than lone-parent family. This assumption has not been examined in depth for two reasons: lack of data and of conceptual clarity about social capital.

In this paper, we aim at a better understanding of social capital and its relationship to different types of families (including cohabiting and step families) using empirical data and a more focused conception of social capital.

We start with a discussion of definition of social capital, focusing on a definition that is amenable to measurement. We then describe our data and methodologies, discuss the results of our analysis - mainly for influence of family structure but also for those of work status, religiosity and length of stay in the neighbourhood. We conclude with possible explanations for and implications of our findings.

Social Capital Defined

A number of authors have examined the evolution of the concept of social capital, its various meanings, and its use in research (see for example, Furstenberg, 2005; Portes, 1998; Field, 2003; Wilson, 2006; Fine, 2001; Lin, Cook, and Burt, 2001; Lin, 2001), and thus will only be briefly discussed here. Coleman (1990) and Bourdieu (1985) are often cited as the early proponents of the concept of social capital, both of whom have drawn upon the sociological tradition pioneered by Durkheim (1951). Coleman's concept of social capital assumes that "individuals are embedded in a system of normative obligations created by social consensus" (Furstenberg, 2005: 810). This system is drawn upon by families to benefit the members, an idea that is similar to Bourdieu's concept that families' symbolic and material resources could be mobilized for the benefit of its members (Furstenberg, 2005).

The introduction of the concept of social capital among political scientists is attributed to Putnam (1995, 2000) who has in turn drawn from the writings of de Tocqueville (1945) on political participation (Furstenberg, 2005). In this line of thinking, social capital is seen in terms of social trust and civic participation.

Social capital when viewed in terms of "network" seems to be most amenable to being measured. Portes (1998: 8) defines social capital as the "ability to secure benefits through membership in networks and other social structures". The Policy Research Initiative (PRI, 2005; Frank, 2005:9) adapts a similar definition: "Social capital refers to the social networks that may provide access to resources and social support." A definition we deem to be most useful for an empirical research such as ours is "networks of social relations characterized by norms of trust and reciprocity" (Stone, Gray, and Hughes, 2003).

Social capital takes different forms, has multiple dimensions, and can be measured for various units of analysis. For many proponents (for example, Bourdieu, 1985; Lin, 2001; and Astone *et al.*, 1999), social capital is an attribute of individuals; however, for others, such as Coleman (1990) and McLanahan and Sandefur (1994), social capital is also possessed by families[1] and communities. Putnam's (1995, 2000) concept of social capital

[1] In analysis of children and youth outcomes, intra-family social capital is prominent and focuses on parent-children interactions, including communication, monitoring, and parental expectations. While this type of

- and that of others, particularly of those working at the World Bank (for example, Serageldin and Grootaert, 2000; Narayan and Cassidy, 2001) - is for an even larger group such as regions or nations. While it is desirable to examine social capital at different levels, given the available data (the 2003 General Social Survey), this research uses *individuals* as units of analysis.

Stone and Hughes (2002: 2) distinguish three types of networks - *informal ties* with kin, families, friends, neighbours, and workmates; *generalized relationships* with local people, people in civic groups, and people in general; and *relationships through institutions*. In the interest of measuring social capital, they also identified dimensions of networks, which include size and extensiveness (for example, number of neighbors personally known) density and closure (that is, whether network members know each other), and diversity (ethnic, education, and cultural mix of networks). The type of networks and dimension of diversity could be used to distinguish between the "bonding" and "bridging" nature of social capital (Gittell and Vidal, 1998, Woolcock, 2001, Granovetter, 1973, 1995; Erickson, 2003). Close relationships or "strong" bonds that engender sense of belonging could be confined to a limited number of individuals, whereas bridging social capital or "weak" bonds - and its variant, the "linking" social capital that refers to a relation with people in position of power - may have a wider outreach that could prove more useful, say, for economic outcomes.

In whatever way social capital is defined along with its dimensions, advancing our understanding of social capital calls for distinguishing social capital from its *determinants* and its *outcomes*. A criticism about the conceptualization of social capital is that it is often confounded with its effects (see for example, Portes, 1998; Fine, 2001; Edwards, 2004; Morrow, 1999). The frameworks of analysis proposed by various authors (for example, Lin, 2001, Narayan and Cassidy, 2001; Stone and Hughes, 2002; and PRI, 2005) differentiate the elements of social capital from its determinants and outcomes. Lin (2001: 245-246) includes in the *determinants* "the factors in the social structure and each individual's position in the social structure, both of which facilitate or constrain the investment of social capital." Investment of social capital is expected to yield returns in terms of better social, economic, political, and health *outcomes*. At the individual level, the outcomes could include better physical and mental health, life satisfaction, wealth, power and reputation (Lin, 2001: 246), or the capacity to "get by" and to "get ahead" (Stone and Hughes, 2002:2).

In this paper, we focus on family structures as *determinant* of social capital that is measured by three types of networks - informal network, relationship through civic groups and people in general, and relationships through institutions. The first type of network broadly falls within the sociological stream of thinking about social capital, the latter two within political science.

---

social capital is important, it is not dealt with in this paper, mainly because intra-family relations were not covered by the survey that is used in this research.

Methodological Approach

The 2003 General Social Survey

The General Social Survey on Social Engagement was conducted by Statistics Canada with 24950 respondents representing a target population of all persons in Canada 15 years and older excluding residents of Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut, and all-time residents of institutions (Statistics Canada, 2004). In this analysis we focus on 8250 women who, at survey date, were 30-64 years old, the ages at which variation in family structures is greatest.

The survey gathered information on a wide-range of topics including the respondent's civic engagement, social networks, and participation in clubs, associations, and organizations, and voting and volunteering. The survey also asked information about the person's background including education, work status, cultural background, health and well-being and information about his/her parents and partners.

Variables used in the analysis

Measures of Social Capital: We use information from the survey that allow deriving measures of network dimensions – that is, the network size, norms of trust and reciprocity, and diversity[2]. For *informal* networks, for example, the survey asked questions on the number of relatives and friends, and neighbors that one knows, answers to which were used as indicators of size of informal network (see Appendix Table 1 for list of variables that are used to measure the types of networks and their dimensions; see also Ravanera (2006) for the analysis of informal networks of men). The survey also asked questions about the level of trust in one's family, people at work, or in one's neighbors. For the diversity dimension, respondents were asked how similar the friends are with regards to level of education, family income, age, or ethnic group.

For measures of *networks through generalized relationship* with people and civic groups, we used the information on whether or not the respondent was a member or participant in different organizations. Aggregating the response provides the number of organizations the individual is involved in, which we use as an indicator of network size. As the family is an interest in this research, we derived two different measures of this dimension following a distinction made by Coleman (1990: Ch.22) between *primordial* structures that are based on or derivative from the family (such as neighborhood and religious groups) and *purposive* structures that are independent of the family (such as firms, trade unions, and professional associations). The measure of diversity is based on questions as to whether the people that one met through the organizations were similar in terms of education, income, ethnic group, and age. Questions of trust in strangers were also asked which is used as an indicator of trust in people in general.

[2] "Density and closure", another dimension identified by Stone and Hughes (2002), is not included as there were no questions in the survey (such as whether network members know each other) that could have been used as indicators of this dimension.

The level of confidence in various institutions such as the police, health care system, school system, etc., is used as an indicator of the trust dimension of the third type of network, the *relationship with institutions*. Information that would have been useful is the number of persons one knows who are working in the various institutions, but these questions were not asked in the survey.

Statistical Methods

Reliability Tests and Factor Analysis: We used statistical techniques to obtain more parsimonious measures as there were several survey questions, the responses to which could be used as indicators of the various dimensions of social capital. In instances where a measure is categorical or a binary as in the case of whether or not a respondent is a member of an organization, we summed up responses to questions on membership in a number of organizations. Whenever the level of measurement (rank or interval) allows, reliability tests were done to find out which variables were correlated. These groups of variables were factor analyzed, and factor scores were derived for measures of the following dimensions: (a) size of informal networks of friends and relatives, (b) trust in people in the neighbourhood, (c) income-education-age diversity of friends, (d) income-education-age diversity of members of organizations, (e) confidence in government institutions, and (f) confidence in business institutions. Appendix Table 1 shows the variables and the survey questions that were used.

Bivariate and Multivariate Analysis: We used bivariate analysis to detect differences in the dimensions of networks by family structure categorized as follows:

1. Living with Children: (a) Intact – Married; (b) Intact – Cohabiting; (c) Step – Married; (d) Step – Cohabiting; (e) Lone Parent
2. Not Living with Children: (a) Married; (b) Cohabiting; (c) Never Married; (d) Divorced or separated; (e) All Others including the widowed and other living arrangements.

These categories are combinations of motherhood and marital statuses. Living with children (or motherhood status) could affect the acquisition of social capital. While not supported by data, Furstenberg (2005: 813) assumes that "… the presence of children requires parents to reach out to potential connections in the larger kinship system and the neighbourhood, through involvement in local community institutions". Inclusion of marital status is meant to capture the differences in stability of relationship conducive to involvement with people outside of the family, with the community, and with institutions. Marriage is assumed to be more stable than cohabiting relationship.

To see whether the relationship between family structure and measures of social capital holds after controlling for other variables, we did appropriate multivariate analyses progressively including in the models family structure, demographic (age), socio-economic (education, work status, income), cultural (religiosity, migration status), geographic (region of residence, urban-rural) and personal situation variables (length of

stay in neighbourhood and self-perceived health status). Binary logistic, ordinal, or ordinary least squares regression models were used, depending on the scale of measurement (binary, rank, or interval) of the dependent variable.

Our discussion of the results will focus on the differences in social capital by types of families. However, we will also present the results for three of the control variables that have been often used as indicators of social capital, in particular, *work status* (as women employment has been cited as possible reason for decline of social capital), *religiosity* (as the values among those who frequently attend religious services is assumed to foster social capital), and *length of stay in neighbourhood* (as mobility breaks ties with neighbours, communities, and schools, in the case of presence of children.

Results

A little more than half (57%) of women aged 30-64 in Canada are living with children (Table 1). Most (65%) of these mothers are married, a fifth are lone mothers, and the rest (about 5% each) are mothers cohabiting with their partners, married step-mothers, or step mothers in cohabiting relationships. Of the women not living with children, more than half (55%) are married. Many of these married women (and formerly married – divorced, separated, widowed) lived with children who may have grown up and have left the parental home.

Table 1: Canadian Women Aged 30-64 by Combined Motherhood and Marital Status, 2003

Living With Children	Number	% of Women	% within Categories
Married Mother	3088	37.4	65.4
Cohabiting Mother	269	3.3	5.7
Married Step Mother	221	2.7	4.7
Cohabiting Step Mother	194	2.3	4.1
Lone Mother	948	11.5	20.1
All Women Living with Children	4720	57.2	100.0
Not Living with Children			
Married	1932	23.4	54.7
Cohabiting	394	4.8	11.2
Never Married	560	6.8	15.9
Divorced or Separated	464	5.6	13.1
Widowed and All Others	180	2.2	5.1
All Women Not Living with Children	3530	42.8	100.0
All Women	8249	100.0	

Source: 2003 General Social Survey on Social Engagement

Results from various bivariate analyses show that social capital does vary with family structure. (See for example Appendix Tables 2 – Informal Network Indicators by Combined Motherhood and Marital Status). However, many of the differences declined or disappeared with the inclusion of other factors in multivariate analyses. Appendix Table 3, for example, presents the six regressions models to analyze the size of neighborhood networks. The bivariate model shows that step mothers have significantly

smaller size of neighbourhood network compared to married mothers but after controlling for other variables, especially for length of stay in the neighbourhood, the difference is no longer significant.

Tracing the changes in influence of family structures on the various indicators of social capital as control variables are progressively introduced is interesting and provides insights into how the two are related but an adequate discussion of the findings requires a much longer paper or several papers. In the interest of providing an overall view of the differences in the three types of social capital, our discussion of the results will focus on the results of the final models, that is, models wherein all the independent variables have been included.

Social Capital through Informal Networks: Differentials by Family Structure

Table 2 shows the result for family structure variable (with mothers in intact family, referred to in the table as "married with children", as reference category) from the final regression models for dimensions of informal network – its size, norm of trust and reciprocity, and diversity.

Table 2: Results of Final Models of Regression of Informal Network Indicators
Canadian Women Aged 30-64, 2003
Family Structure Variables

	Size of Networks				Trust and Reciprocity						Diversity of Friends			
	Factor score # of Friends & Relatives		Number of Neighbors Known		Trust in Family		Trust in People at Work /Sch.		Factor score Trust in Neighbors		Factor score Income, edu & age divers		Ethnic Diversity of Friends	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Motherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)														
Living with Children														
Intact - Cohabiting	-0.109	*	-0.006		0.257		0.104		-0.116	*	0.162	**	0.023	
Step - Married	-0.069		-0.220		-0.779	***	-0.235	*	-0.204	***	0.201	***	0.063	
Step - Cohabiting	-0.186	***	-0.199		-0.763	***	-0.331	**	0.019		0.146	*	0.316	*
Lone Mother	-0.188	***	-0.381	***	-0.488	***	-0.192	**	-0.367	***	0.328	***	0.280	***
Not Living with Children														
Married	-0.052	*	-0.255	***	-0.312	***	-0.040		-0.019		0.061	*	0.049	
Cohabiting	-0.081		-0.648	***	-0.240	*	0.029		-0.188	***	0.202	***	0.077	
Never Married	-0.106	**	-1.082	***	-0.360	***	-0.286	***	-0.459	***	0.271	***	0.465	***
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.147	***	-0.893	***	-0.542	***	-0.279	**	-0.443	***	0.298	***	0.286	***
Widowed/ Others	-0.132	*	-0.543	***	-0.439	**	0.107		-0.180	**	0.232	***	-0.030	

Significance levels: * 10%, ** 5%, *** 1%

Source: 2003 General Social Survey; extracted from Appendix Table 4

Size of Networks, and Trust and Reciprocity. Children do connect parents to networks beyond the family and help increase the size of neighbourhood network. As can be seen in Table 2, compared to women with spouses or partners and living with children (that is, all mothers except lone mothers), women not living with children have significantly smaller number of neighbours known. Children also play a role in generating greater trust in neighbours. Women who are not living with children in all marital statuses, except married women, have significantly lower levels of trust in neighbours than married women living with children. That married women not living with children do not differ

from married mothers in their level of trust in neighbours may be partly because many of them may have lived with children in the past.

The influence of children is evident even among lone mothers. Compared to mothers in intact families, they fare considerably worse: their network size is smaller - they have fewer relatives, friends, and neighbors - and their level of trust in people in the family, at work or school, or in the neighbourhood is significantly lower. But, compared to divorced or separated women not living with children (with -0.89 coefficient), lone mothers (-0.38) know a greater number of neighbours. The same could be said about cohabiting women – those not living with children have significantly less number of neighbors known than cohabiting women living with children.

Marital status matters as well, with marital disruption a differentiating factor. Among women living with children, the informal network of intact families differs significantly from those in step-families. Step mothers, whether married or cohabiting, have significantly lower levels of trust, especially trust in family members, than mothers in intact family. Married step mothers have also significantly lower trust in neighbours. Among women who are not living with children, similar differences exist between the married and the divorced or separated; that is - divorced women have fewer neighbours that they personally know, and have lower levels of trust particularly in people at work and in the neighbourhood. All these indicate that when marriage breaks down, much more than the family is dissolved; the networks of friends, relatives and neighbours are disrupted as well. Furthermore, subsequent re-marriage or cohabitation does not seem to mitigate the impact. An often cited factor related to disruption is physical mobility, that is, marital dissolution frequently necessitates a change of residence. However, this effect is net of the influence of length of stay in the neighbourhood, which has been controlled for in this analysis.

The manner of family formation - marriage or cohabitation - does not seem to matter greatly when there are children: the dimensions of informal network of married and cohabiting women in intact families do not differ much, indicated by coefficients (intact – cohabiting) that are not, or only weakly, significantly different from the reference category (married with children). Similarly, among mothers living in step-families, there are more similarities than differences between the married step-mothers and cohabiting step-mothers. This is most likely an indication that when children are born within a union (or when there are children in the family), whether or not a couple goes through formal marriage no longer matters very much in terms of the relationship with friends, relatives, and neighbours.

Diversity of Friends. Table 2 also shows the results of regression models on indicators of diversity in social status (measured by a factor score derived from information on education, income, and age), and ethnicity of friends. Married mothers stand out as different from women in all other categories in that their friends are most similar to them in terms of income, education, and age. Lone mothers, and never married and divorced or separated women not living with children have friends that are more ethnically diverse.

Diversity of networks is meant to capture the difference between "bonding" and "bridging" social capital. The results of our analysis shows that married mothers in intact families have stronger bonds and women in other categories have weaker bonds. It would be tempting to conclude that the weak "bonding" social capital of women in the other categories is compensated for by the greater diversity of friends and thus greater "bridging" social capital that is generally regarded as useful in many ways, such as for generating economic outcomes. However, there are indications that this may not the case. As shown above, the size of informal networks is largest among married mothers. Furthermore, results for education and income (see Appendix Table 4), also show that women with higher education or income, are more likely to have friends of similar social status and age. If there is indeed a polarization of family life in Canada - that is, women of lower social status tend to marry young, bear children at early age, and go through marital or union dissolution (Ravanera and Rajulton, 2006, Lochhead, 2000) - married women may have homogenous friends but these friends are more likely to have higher education and income like themselves. In contrast, women in other categories may have more heterogeneous friends in terms of social status and ethnicity, but many of these friends may also have low education and income, and thus their "bridging" or "linking" social capital would not be higher than those of the married women in intact relationship.

Social Capital through Informal Networks: Differentials by Work Status, Religiosity, and Length of Stay in Neighbourhood

Early proponents of social capital have assumed that employment of women decreases the social capital as they would not have had the time to interact with their neighbours. As shown in Table 3, this is partly supported by data. Compared to non-employed women, employed women, whether working part-time or full-time, know fewer neighbors. However, working women have significantly greater number of friends and relatives, and their levels of trust in people, in the family or in the neighbourhood do not differ from the unemployed. Furthermore, the trust in people at work or at school is significantly lower among women with part-time employment than women employed full-time. (The question of trust in people at work or in school were asked only of those who were employed or in school; at age 30-64, very few women belong to the "not-employed, or in school" category, and thus comparison is made mainly between part-time or full-time employed.)

The use of religiosity as an indicator of social capital seems to be warranted. As can be seen in Table 3, highly religious women are more likely to have more friends and relatives and know a greater number of neighbours. Further, women who profess no religion have significantly lower level of trust in people than women who are highly religious.

Table 3: Results of Full Model Regression of Informal Network Indicators
Canadian Women Aged 30-64, 2003
Work Status, Religiosity, and Length of Stay in Neighbourhood

	Size of Networks				Trust and Reciprocity						Diversity of Friends			
	Factor score: # of Friends & Relatives		Number of Neighbors Known		Trust in Family		Trust in People at Work /Sch.		Factor score: Trust in Neighbors		Factor score: Income, educ & age diversit		Ethnic Diversity of Friends	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Work Status (Not Employed)														
Part-time	0.075	***	-0.229	***	-0.142				0.005		0.017		0.124	
Full-time	0.081	***	-0.125	**	0.076				0.057	*	0.025		0.173	**
Work Status (Full-time Employed)														
Part-time							-0.274	***						
Not-Employed or in school							0.179							
Religiosity (High religiosity)														
Moderate religiosity	-0.145	***	-0.166	***	0.042		-0.262	***	-0.006		-0.084	***	-0.392	***
Low religiosity	-0.310	***	-0.532	***	0.002		-0.078		-0.060	*	-0.007		-0.528	***
No religion	-0.260	***	-0.451	***	-0.241	***	-0.201	***	-0.063	**	-0.017		-0.456	***
Length of Stay in Neighborhood (5 years or more)														
Less than one year	0.001		-2.121	***	-0.313	***	-0.202	**	-0.216	***	0.001		-0.040	
One year to less than 3	-0.021		-1.276	***	-0.131		-0.117		-0.221	***	-0.015		0.015	
Three years to less than 5	0.023		-0.695	***	0.058		0.068		-0.063	*	-0.045		0.049	

Significance levels: * 10%, ** 5%, *** 1%

Source: 2003 General Social Survey; extracted from Appendix Table 4

Length of stay in the neighbourhood is also a reasonable indicator of social capital but only as it refers to embeddedness in the community – that is, the longer the stay in the community the greater are the number of neighbours known and the greater the level of trust in people in the neighbourhood. Understandably, the number of friends and relatives do not depend on the length of stay in the neighbourhood as friendship and kinship are not geographic-based. And, it looks like 3 years or more of stay in the neighbourhood generates a greater level of trust in people in the family and in the workplace or school.

Diversity of friends does not differ significantly by length of stay in the neighbourhood, and only weakly by work status - friends of full-time employed women seem to be somewhat more ethnically diverse. Religiosity is associated with ethnic diversity of friends, which is open to two possible explanations – attendance in religious services facilitates friendship with people belonging to different ethnic groups, or the highly religious people come from diverse non-mainstream ethnic groups, which lends to a greater probability of friendship with the more plentiful mainstream ethnic groups.

Social Capital through Membership in Organizations, and through Institutions: Differentials by Family Structure

The effects of family structure on membership in primordial organizations - religious-affiliated groups, school groups (such as parent teacher associations), and neighbourhood or community associations (such as block parents and neighbourhood watch) - are very much similar to those of number of neighbours known (as seen in Table 3, discussed above). Women living with children are significantly more likely to be members of primordial organizations, and lone mothers, though lagging behind women with partners, are more likely to be members of primordial organization compared to women not living

with children. This is a further evidence of the active role that children play in connecting parents to communities, this time through family-related organizations.

Table 4: Final Models of Regression Anaysis - Networks through Membership in Organizations and through Institutions, Canadian Women Aged 30-64, 2003
Family Structure

	Membership in Org.				Trust in		Confidence in Institutions				Diversity of members			
	Primordial		Purposive		People		Government		Business		Ed./ Inc./Age		Ethnic	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Motherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)														
Living with Children														
Intact - Cohabiting	-0.303	*	-0.266	**	-0.138	**	0.150	**	-0.011		-0.079		0.156	
Step - Married	0.043		0.302	**	-0.009		-0.095		-0.041		0.208	**	0.199	
Step - Cohabiting	-0.201		0.172		-0.158	**	-0.167	**	-0.082		0.187		-0.015	
Lone Mother	-0.356	***	-0.045		-0.233	***	-0.164	***	-0.152	***	0.285	***	0.232	**
Not Living with Children														
Married	-0.521	***	-0.013		-0.037		-0.057		-0.038		0.071		0.145	*
Cohabiting	-0.827	***	-0.125		-0.165	***	-0.061		0.073		0.128		0.196	
Never Married	-0.697	***	-0.081		-0.154	***	-0.062		-0.076		0.227	***	0.408	***
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.619	***	0.061		-0.206	***	-0.170	***	-0.145	***	0.322	***	0.132	
Widowed/ Others	-0.685	***	-0.382	**	-0.103		-0.014		-0.029		0.361	**	-0.243	

Significance levels: * 10%, ** 5%, *** 1%

Source: 2003 General Social Survey; extracted from Appendix Table 5

Married mothers in intact or step families and married women not living with children have higher levels of trust in people in general than lone mothers, cohabiting women with or without children, women who have never married, and divorced or separated women not living with children. It may be that positive experience in marriage reinforces the trust in people while marital disruption reduces trust not only in people in the family but people in general. However, as the analysis is based on cross-sectional data, a 'selection effect' explanation may also be possible - women who have greater trust in people may be more likely to get married and to stay married.

Membership in purposive organizations is not significantly (or only weakly) influenced by parenthood or marital status. This is to be expected given that these organizations or associations do not have much to do with families.

Lone mothers and the divorced or separated women have significantly lower confidence in institutions, both government and business. This sets them apart from the never married and cohabiting women not living with children, who like them, have also lower trust in people in general. It may be reasonable to surmise that experience of marital dissolution has also eroded the confidence in all types of institutions be they government or business, just as it had weakened their trust in people – whether in the family, in the neighbourhood, and people in general.

The diversity in social status of members of organizations to which the individuals belong is significantly greater for lone mothers and divorced or separated women not living with children than for married mothers. This is an indication of weaker bonding social capital but, whether this translates to stronger bridging social capital is open to question. Given that marital dissolution often leads to a decrease in income for women, it seems likely that their "linking" capital, that is, their bridge towards people with more

power and resources, is less than that of married mothers even though membership in their organizations is more diverse.

The never married women stand out in the greater diversity of membership, both in social status and ethnicity, of organizations that they belong. Possibly, their having neither spouse nor children make them more free to join associations with greater diversity of members, just as they do associate with people from all walks of life, as seen in their diversity of friends (shown in Table 2 above). Recall however that their size of networks – whether informal networks of friends and neighbours or formal through civic groups – is smaller than those of married women.

Social Capital through Membership in Organizations, and through Institutions: Differentials by Work Status, Religiosity, and Length of Stay in Neighbourhood

Contrary to the oft-cited assumption that employment of women leads to lower membership in civic organizations, Table 5 shows that women employed (whether full time or part-time) are more likely (than women not employed) to be members of primordial or purposive organizations. This implies that time (or lack thereof) is only one factor that influences membership in organization; another factor is exposure to and knowledge of organizations. Unemployed women may have the advantage of having more time but employed women may have a greater advantage in terms of the latter. The organizations to which employed women belong have also more diverse membership in terms of social status.

Table 5: Final Models of Regression Anaysis - Networks through Membership in Organizations and through Institutions, Canadian Women Aged 30-64, 2003 Work Status, Religiosity, and Length of Stay in Neighbourhood

	Membership in Org.				Trust in		Confidence in				Diversity of members			
	Primordial		Purposive		People		Government		Business		Ed./ Inc./Age		Ethnic	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Work Status (Not Employed)														
Part-time	0.371	***	0.423	***	0.066		-0.098	**	-0.050		0.193	***	0.117	
Full-time	0.236	***	0.216	***	0.041		-0.077	**	-0.052		0.122	**	-0.016	
Religiosity (High religiosity)														
Moderate religiosity	-1.502	***	-0.244	***	-0.019		0.001		0.000		-0.157	***	-0.189	***
Low religiosity	-2.198	***	-0.550	***	0.017		-0.089	***	-0.051		-0.211	***	-0.221	***
No religion	-1.789	***	-0.312	***	0.053	*	-0.268	***	-0.224	***	-0.194	***	-0.018	
Length of Stay in Neighborhood (5 years or more)														
Less than one year	-0.211	**	-0.171	**	-0.072	*	0.046		0.028		-0.033		-0.077	
One year to less than 3	-0.234	***	-0.166	**	-0.085	***	0.006		-0.011		-0.071		-0.001	
Three years to less than 5	-0.181	**	-0.118	*	0.037		0.033		-0.075	*	0.062		0.135	

Significance levels: * 10%, ** 5%, *** 1%

Source: 2003 General Social Survey; extracted from Appendix Table 5

As can be seen in Table 5, religiosity has a significant positive influence on membership in organizations, whether primordial or purposive, and on confidence in institutions, government or business. When taken with the results on informal networks (Table 3), this indicates that high religiosity is a good indicator of social capital. In comparison to women who profess no religion or women whose attendance in religious services is

infrequent, highly religious individuals have higher social capital whether seen in terms of size of informal or formal networks, in norms of trust and reciprocity, or in confidence in institutions. The organizations to which they belong are also more likely to be diverse in social status and ethnicity.

In contrast, length of stay in a neighbourhood has its influence mainly on membership in primordial organizations and trust in people - those with less than 3 years of stay in the neighbourhood is less likely to be members and have lower trust.

Conclusion

In studies that examined the impact of social capital on children's outcome, most often measured crudely by whether or not children live with one or two parents, explanations were usually focused on *intra-family* social capital, indicated for instance by parental time spent with children, parental expectations, monitoring of children's activities, and parent-child communication. Many of these might be better viewed as parenting practices, rather than social capital seen as networks of relationships buttressed by norms of trust and reciprocity. In this study, we looked at the embeddedness of different types of families in the community through informal networks of families, relatives, friends, and neighbours, and networks through organizations and institutions. Making use of various measures of network size and norms of trust, our study shows that social capital is greater in intact families than in lone parent families. Compared to lone mothers, mothers in intact families (especially married mothers) have larger informal networks, are members of more primordial and purposive organizations, have greater trust in people in the family, in the neighbourhood, and in people in general, and have greater confidence in government or business institutions. Most indicators that we have used also show that social capital of mothers in step families is in between that of married mothers in intact families and lone mothers.

Children help embed families in the communities. This is most clearly seen in the number of neighbours known, trust in neighbours, and membership in primordial organizations, all of which are greater among mothers than women not living with children.

The cross-sectional data used in the analysis precludes putting forward definitive causes for the differentials in social capital by family structures. In an attempt to advance the discussion however, we proffer some plausible explanations. As with intra-family social capital, lack of time to interact with the community may be one reason for social capital deficits of lone mothers. However, the similarly low social capital of divorced and separated women who are not living with children indicates that lack of time is not a sufficient explanation as presumably women not living with children would have greater amount of time to interact with friends, relatives, and neighbours or be members of organizations should they desire to do so. Another possible explanation therefore could be sought in the experience of marital disruption, common to lone mothers and to divorced and separated women. Marital dissolution, often accompanied with acrimony

and severance of ties with family members, possibly brings about breaking of ties with informal and formal networks and consequently decreases trust in people.

The explanations cited above do not however hold for the significantly lower social capital (in comparison to married mothers) of never married and cohabiting women without any children. A more plausible explanation may be sought in "selection effect"; that is, women who marry are selected for certain characteristics (such as sociability, and desire to settle or for stability) conducive to networking in the community, which are not dominant among those who have not married.

Measures of diversity of friends and organization members are meant to capture the strength of bonding social capital (implying that the more homogeneous, the greater the bonding) and the extent of bridging social capital (implying that greater diversity promotes better linkage and bridging). With few exceptions, the measures of diversity in terms of education, income, and age (that we also refer to as social status diversity) and ethnic diversity indicate that married mothers have friends who are more similar to them in terms of social status and ethnicity than other categories of women, in particular, lone mothers, divorced and separated, and never married women. While this could be taken to mean that married women have greater bonding social capital, it is more difficult to conclude that they have lower bridging or linking social capital. For one, their networks of friends and the number of organization to which they belong are larger. Furthermore, if there is polarization in family life – that is, those with lower social status are more likely to form unions, have children at earlier age, and experience marital dissolution, which is probably the case among younger women in Canada – the networks of married mothers may consist of women with similarly higher education and income as they have. The homogeneity of networks of women in intact families may be a result of deliberate choices but the network diversity of women in other categories may have come about by chance. In sum, this means that measures of diversity may not be good indicators of bridging social capital.

The results for other family-related variables deemed to affect social capital are mixed. Employed women tend to know fewer neighbours but they have greater number of relatives and friends and belong to greater number of organizations – both primordial and purposive – than women not employed. Religiosity has all the expected effects – compared to women who profess no religion, highly religious women are more likely to have larger networks both informal and through organizations and have greater levels of trust in people and confidence in institutions. The social status and ethnic diversity of their friends and of members of organizations to which they belong is also greater. Understandably, the length of stay in the neighbourhood is positively related mainly to number of neighbours known, trust in neighbours, and membership in primordial organizations.

Our study provides further evidence of the vulnerability of lone mothers, who as noted above, comprise about 20% of all mothers. This vulnerability is accentuated by finding in this study that lone mothers do not have as extensive a network – informal or through organizations – to fall back on as mothers in intact families have. What set lone mothers

apart from divorced and separated women (who also have lower social capital) are their children who need caring. Reaching out to women who have undergone marital dissolution is made complicated by their having low confidence in institutions, public or private.

References:

Astone, N.M., C.A. Nathanson, R. Schoen, and Y. J. Kim.1999. "Family Demography, Social Theory, and Investment in Social Capital." *Population and Development Review* 25(1):1-31.

Bianchi, Suzanne M. and John Robinson. 1997. What Did You Do Today? Children's Use of Time, Family Composition, and the Acquisition of Social Capital. *Journal of Marriage and the Family,* 59(2):332-344.

Boisjoly, Johanne, Greg J. Duncan, and Sandra Hoffert. 1995. Access to Social Capital. *Journal of Family Issues* 16(5):609-631.

Bourdieu, P. 1985. "The Forms of Capital." In J.G. Richardson (ed) *Handbook of Theory of Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood. 241-58.

Coleman, J.S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94(S95-S120).

Coleman, J.S.1990. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

de Tocqueville, A. 1945. Democracy in America. New York: Knopf.

Durkheim, Emile. 1951. Suicide: A Study in Sociology. Glencoe, Ill: Free Press.

Edwards, Rosalynd. 2004. "Present and Absent in Troubling Ways: Families and Social Capital Debates." *The Sociological Review* 52:1-21.

Erickson, Bonnie. 2003. "Social Networks: The Value of Variety." *Contexts* 2(1): 25-31.

Field, John. 2003. *Social Capital*. London: Routledge.

Fine, Ben. 2001. *Social Capital versus Social Theory: Political Economy and Social Science at the turn of the Millennium*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Franke, Sandra. 2005. "Measurement of Social Capital: Reference Document for Public Policy Research, Development, and Evaluation." Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.

Furstenberg, Frank F. 2005. "Banking on Families: How Families Generate and Distribute Social Capital." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 67 (November): 809-821.

Furstenberg, F.R. and M.E. Hughes. 1995. “Social Capital and Successful Development among At-Risk Youth.” *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57:580-92.

Gittel, R. and A. Vidal. 1998. *Community Organizing: Building Social Capital as a Development Strategy*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Granovetter, Mark S. 1973. “The Strength of Weak Ties.” *The American Journal of Sociology* 78 (6):1360-1380.

Granovetter, M.S. 1995. “The Economic Sociology of Firms and Entrepreneurs.” In A. Portes (ed) *The Economic Sociology of Immigration*. New York: Russel Sage: 128-65.

Hoffert, Sandra L., Johanne Boisjoly, and Greg J. Duncan. 1998. Parents’ Extrafamilial Resources and Children’s School Attainment. Sociology of Education 71(3): 246-268.

Kerr, Don and Joseph Michalski. 2007. Family Structure and Children’s Hyperactivity Problems: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 32(1).

Lin, Nan. 2001. *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. Cambridge University Press.

Lin, Nan, Karen Cook, and Ronald S. Burt (eds). 2001. *Social Capital: Theory and Research*. NY: Walter de Gruyter.

Lochhead, C. 2000. The trend toward delayed first childbirth: health and social implications. *ISUMA: Canadian Journal of Policy Research Autumn:* 41- 44.

McLanahan. S. and G. Sandefur. 1994. *Growing Up with a Single Parent: What Hurts, What Helps*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Modell, John. 1994. When may Social Capital Influence Children’s School Performance. In Petersen, Anne C. and Jeylan T. Mortimer (eds) *Youth Unemployment and Society*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 51-68.

Morrow, Virginia. 1999. “Conceptualising Social Capital in Relation to the Well-Being of Children and Young People: A Critical Review.” *The Sociological Review* 47: 744-65.

Narayan, Deepa and Michael F. Cassidy. 2001. “A Dimensional Approach to Measuring Social Capital: Development and Validation of a Social Capital Inventory.” *Current Sociology* 49(2):59-102.

Policy Research Initiative. 2005. Social Capital as a Public Policy Tool: Project Report. Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.

Portes, A. 1998. “Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology.” *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24:1-24.

Putnam, R.D. 1995. “Bowling Alone: America’s Declining Social Capital.” *Journal of Democracy* 6:65-78.

Putnam, R.D. 2000. *Bowling Alone : The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York : Simon & Schuster.

Ravanera, Zenaida. 2006. Informal Networks Social Capital of Fathers: What Does the Social Engagement Survey Tell Us? *Social Indicators Research.* Published online in 2006; forthcoming in 2007 in print.

Ravanera, Zenaida and Fernando Rajulton. 2006. Social Status Polarization in the Timing and Trajectories to Motherhood. *Canadian Studies in Population,* 33(2): 179-207. Available online at http://janus.ssc.uwo.ca/popstudies/cps/

Runyan, Desmond K., Wanda M. Hunter, Rebecca R.S. Socolar, Lisa Amaya-Jackson, Diana English, John Landsverk, Howard Dubowitz, Dorothy H. Browne, Shrikant I. Bangdiwala and Ravi M. Mathew. Children who prosper in unfavorable environments: the relationship to social capital. *Pediatrics* 101(1): pp12(7).

Serageldin, Ismail and Christiaan Grootaert. 2000. “Defining Social Capital: An Integrating View.” In Dasgupta, P. and I. Serageldin (eds) Social Capital: A Multifaceted Perspective. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Statistics Canada. 2004. General Social Survey of Canada (GSS), 2003. Cycle 17: Social Engagement [machine readable data file]. 1st Edition. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.

Stone, W. and J. Hughes. 2002. “Social Capital: Empirical Meaning and Measurement Validity.” Research Paper No. 27. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Stone, W., M. Gray, and J. Hughes. 2003. “Social Capital at Work: An Australian Illustration.” *Horizons* 6(3) 55-60.

Teachman, Jay D., Kathleen Paasch, Karen Carver. 1996. Social Capital and Dropping Out of School Early. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 58:773-783.

Teachman, Jay D., Kathleen Paasch, Karen Carver. 1997. Social Capital and the Generation of Human Capital. *Social Forces* 75(4): 1343-1359.

Wilson, Lou. 2006. “Developing a Model for the Measurement of Social Inclusion and Social Capital in Regional Australia.” *Social Indicators Research* 75: 335-360.

Woolcock, Michael. 2001. “The Place of Social Capital in Understanding Social and Economic Outcomes.” *Isuma* (2)1: 11-17.

Appendix Table 1 : List of Variables to Measure Dimensions of the Three Types of Networks

Social Capital through Informal Networks:

A. Size of networks:

(1) Factor score of number of friends and relatives, derived from:
- (a) How many relatives do you have who you feel close to?
- (b) How many close friends do you have, that is, people who are not your relatives, but who you feel at ease with, can talk to about what is on your mind, or call on for help?
- (c) How many other friends do you have who are not relatives or close friends?

(2) Would you say that you know: most, many, a few, or nobody else in your neighbourhood?

B. Trust and Reciprocity:

(3) How much do you trust: people in your family?

(4) How much do you trust: people in your workplace or school?

(5) Factor score of trust in neighbours, derived from:
- (a) How much do you trust: people in your neighbourhood?
- (b) Would you say that you trust: most, many, a few, or nobody else in your neighbourhood?
- (c) If you lost a wallet or purse that contained two hundred dollars, how likely is it to be returned with the money in it if it was found by someone who lives close by?
- (d) Would you say this neighbourhood is a place where neighbours help each other?

C. Diversity of Friends:

(6) Factor score of social status diversity, derived from:
- person, by telephone, or by e-mail. Of all these people: how many have roughly the same level of education as you?
- (b) …how many are from a similar family income level as you?
- (c) …how many are in the same age group as you?

(7)…how many come from an ethnic group that is visibly different from yours?

Social Capital through Civic Organizations and Institutions

D. Membership in Civic Organizations

(8) Membership in Primordial Organizations, derived from sum of responses to:

In the past 12 months, were you a member or participant in a …
- (a) religious-affiliated group (such as church youth group, choir)?
- (b) school group, neighbourhood, civic or community association (such as PTA, alumni, block parents, neighbourhood watch)?

(9) Membership in Purposive Organizations, derived from sum of responses to:

In the past 12 months, were you a member or participant in a …
- (a) union or professional association?
- (b) political party or group?
- (c) sports or recreation organization (such as hockey league, health club, golf club)?
- (d) cultural, education or hobby organization (such as theatre group, book club or bridge club)?
- (e) service club or fraternal organization (such as Kiwanis, Knights of Columbus, the Legion)?
- (f) any other type of organization that you have not mentioned?

E. Diversity of Organization Members

(10) Factor score of social status diversity, derived from:

Thinking of all the people you met through this organization,
- (a) … how many have roughly the same level of education as you?
- (b) …how many are from a similar family income level as you?
- (c) .. how many are in the same age group as you?

(11) … how many come from an ethnic group that is visibly different from yours?

F. Trust and Reciprocity in People in General

(12) Factor score of trust in people in general, derived from:
- (a) Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people?
- (b) How much do you trust strangers?
- (c) If you lost a wallet or purse that contained two hundred dollars, how likely is it to be returned with the money in it if it was found: by a complete stranger?

G. Confidence in Institutions

(13) Confidence in government institutions, factor score derived from:

How much confidence do you have in … (a) the police, (b) the justice system/courts, (c) health care system, (d) school system, (e) federal parliament,

(14) Confidence in business institutions, factor score derived from:

How much confidence do you have in …(a) banks, (b) major corporations, (c) local merchants and business people.

Source: 2003 General Social Survey

Appendix Table 2: Informal Network Indicators by Combined Motherhood and Marital Status
Canadian Women Aged 30-64, 2003

Indicators (overall mean score)	Living with Children											
	Intact				Step				Lone Mother		Total	
	Married		Cohabiting		Married		Cohabiting					
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Size of Networks												
FScore - Number of Friends & Relatives (0)	0.124	2999	-0.263	265	0.044	218	-0.301	188	-0.163	908	0.023	4578
Number of Neighbors Known (2.675)	2.844	3044	2.733	266	2.631	218	2.520	193	2.542	926	2.754	4646
Trust and Reciprocity												
Trust in Family (0.817)	0.856	2989	0.845	265	0.724	218	0.697	190	0.768	915	*0.825*	4576
Trust in People at Work or School (3.925)	3.971	2307	3.816	209	3.804	182	3.687	167	3.793	732	3.904	3598
FScore -Trust in Neighbors (0)	0.122	2764	-0.188	249	-0.166	202	-0.048	161	-0.330	800	*-0.004*	4176
Diversity of Friends												
FScore - income, education, age diversity (0)	-0.126	2611	0.063	229	0.091	197	0.046	168	0.218	768	-0.030	3973
Ethnic Diversity of Friends (0.534)	0.550	3050	0.393	266	0.511	215	0.449	193	0.604	924	*0.546*	4647

	Not Living with Children											
	Married		Cohabiting		Never Married		Divorced/ Sep.		Widowed/ Others		Total	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Size of Networks												
FScore - Number of Friends & Relatives (0)	0.024	1879	-0.146	390	-0.019	541	-0.150	451	-0.103	174	-0.031	3435
Number of Neighbors Known (2.675)	2.771	1897	2.405	391	2.210	551	2.315	460	2.573	177	2.570	3476
Trust and Reciprocity												
Trust in Family (0.817)	0.824	1855	0.789	388	0.789	537	0.766	453	0.801	173	*0.805*	3406
Trust in People at Work or School (3.925)	4.060	1183	3.883	301	3.769	453	3.886	329	4.021	100	3.956	2366
FScore -Trust in Neighbors (0)	0.233	1671	-0.148	352	-0.397	463	-0.325	378	-0.002	147	*0.010*	3011
Diversity of Friends												
FScore - income, education, age diversity (0)	-0.037	1547	0.078	333	0.101	463	0.213	370	0.174	130	0.041	2844
Ethnic Diversity of Friends (0.534)	0.487	1897	0.409	388	0.675	543	0.569	456	0.493	176	*0.519*	3460

Notes: (1) Numbers in parenthesis after each variable name are average for all women.
(2) Numbers in *italics* indicate that difference by motherhood status is not statistically significant at 1% level.

Source: 2003 General Social Survey

Appendix Table 3: Results of Ordinal Regression of Number of Neighbours Known
Canadian Women Aged 30-64, 2003

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Motherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)												
Living with Children												
Intact - Cohabiting	-0.218	*	-0.136		-0.131		-0.116		-0.040		-0.006	
Step - Married	-0.418	***	-0.390	***	-0.410	***	-0.430	***	-0.392	***	-0.220	
Step - Cohabiting	-0.690	***	-0.650	***	-0.657	***	-0.602	***	-0.590	***	-0.199	
Lone Mother	-0.614	***	-0.638	***	-0.647	***	-0.634	***	-0.603	***	-0.381	***
Not Living with Children												
Married	-0.153	***	-0.302	***	-0.311	***	-0.301	***	-0.406	***	-0.255	***
Cohabiting	-0.924	***	-0.971	***	-0.977	***	-0.920	***	-0.965	***	-0.648	***
Never Married	-1.381	***	-1.383	***	-1.362	***	-1.369	***	-1.325	***	-1.082	***
Divorced/ Sep.	-1.146	***	-1.313	***	-1.331	***	-1.312	***	-1.261	***	-0.893	***
Widowed/ Others	-0.561	***	-0.773	***	-0.801	***	-0.825	***	-0.850	***	-0.543	***
Age Groups (Age 30-39)												
Age 40-49			0.284	***	0.277	***	0.238	***	0.278	***	-0.002	
Age 50-59			0.392	***	0.381	***	0.308	***	0.345	***	-0.045	
Age 60-64			0.560	***	0.533	***	0.382	***	0.441	***	-0.034	
Resp. Education (Less than HS)												
High school diploma					-0.058		-0.038		0.009		-0.038	
Some university or college					-0.110		-0.121		-0.027		-0.053	
College, technical graduate					0.007		0.002		0.032		0.041	
Bachelors or higher graduate					-0.125		-0.049		0.091		0.097	
Work Status (Not employed)												
Part-time					-0.123		-0.154	*	-0.244	***	-0.229	***
Full-time					-0.011		-0.027		-0.040		-0.125	**
Personal Income (Less than $20000)												
$20000-$39999					-0.015		-0.021		0.042		-0.010	
$40000-$59999					-0.013		-0.037		0.087		0.035	
$60000 and higher					0.051		0.025		0.152	*	0.086	
Missing					-0.008		0.052		0.059		-0.009	
Religiosity (High religiosity)												
Moderate religiosity							-0.254	***	-0.158	***	-0.166	***
Low religiosity							-0.653	***	-0.563	***	-0.532	***
No religion							-0.553	***	-0.468	***	-0.451	***
Migration Status (Born in Canada)												
Before 1980							-0.211	***	-0.054		-0.071	***
Between 1980 and 2003							-0.803	***	-0.596	***	-0.378	***
Region (Atlantic provinces)												
Quebec									-0.635	***	-0.708	***
Ontario									-0.269	***	-0.174	*
Prairies									-0.375	***	-0.297	***
British Columbia									-0.304	***	-0.171	*
Urban-Rural (Urban)												
Rural including PEI									1.298	***	1.326	***
Length of Stay in Neighborhood (5 years or more)												
Less than one year											-2.121	***
One year to less than 3											-1.276	***
Three years to less than 5											-0.695	***
Self-rated Health Status (Excellent Health)												
Very good											-0.214	***
Good											-0.166	***
Fair or poor											-0.276	***
Threshold: Nobody	-3.225	***	-3.037	***	-3.140	***	-3.681	***	-3.680	***	-4.647	***
A few	-0.162	***	0.042		-0.051		-0.508	***	-0.416	***	-1.083	***
Many	0.657	***	0.865	***	0.775	***	0.342	***	0.493	***	-0.119	
R Square	5.4%		6.2%		6.3%		9.8%		17.0%		25.6%	

Source: 2003 General Social Survey

Appendix Table 4: Results of Final Models of Regression of Informal Network Indicators
Canadian Women Aged 30-64, 2003

	Size of Networks				Trust and Reciprocity						Diversity of Friends			
	Factor score # of Friends & Relatives		Number of Neighbors Known		Trust in Family		Trust in People at Work /Sch.		Factor score Trust in Neighbors		Factor score Income, edu & age divers		Ethnic Diversity of Friends	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Motherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)														
Living with Children														
Intact - Cohabiting	-0.109	*	-0.006		0.257		0.104		-0.116	*	0.162	**	0.023	
Step - Married	-0.069		-0.220		-0.779	***	-0.235	*	-0.204	***	0.201	***	0.063	
Step - Cohabiting	-0.186	***	-0.199		-0.763	***	-0.331	**	0.019		0.146	*	0.316	*
Lone Mother	-0.188	***	-0.381	***	-0.488	***	-0.192	**	-0.367	***	0.328	***	0.280	***
Not Living with Children														
Married	-0.052	*	-0.255	***	-0.312	***	-0.040		-0.019		0.061	*	0.049	
Cohabiting	-0.081		-0.648	***	-0.240	*	0.029		-0.188	***	0.202	***	0.077	
Never Married	-0.106	**	-1.082	***	-0.360	***	-0.286	***	-0.459	***	0.271	***	0.465	***
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.147	***	-0.893	***	-0.542	***	-0.279	**	-0.443	***	0.298	***	0.286	***
Widowed/ Others	-0.132	*	-0.543	***	-0.439	**	0.107		-0.180	**	0.232	***	-0.030	
Age Groups (Age 30-39)														
Age 40-49	0.005		-0.002		-0.068		0.235	***	0.226	***	0.047		-0.154	***
Age 50-59	-0.014		-0.045		0.081		0.760	***	0.357	***	0.060	*	-0.165	**
Age 60-64	0.078	*	-0.034		0.467	***	0.898	***	0.474	***	0.041		-0.326	***
Resp. Education (Less than HS)														
High school diploma	0.187	***	-0.038		0.065		0.370	***	0.144	***	-0.171	***	0.021	
Some university or college	0.351	***	-0.053		-0.165		0.288	***	0.163	***	-0.082	*	0.539	***
College, technical graduate	0.322	***	0.041		0.076		0.273	***	0.218	***	-0.122	***	0.414	***
Bachelors or higher graduate	0.535	***	0.097		-0.020		0.618	***	0.392	***	-0.146	***	0.673	***
Work Status (Not Employed)														
Part-time	0.075	***	-0.229	***	-0.142				0.005		0.017		0.124	
Full-time	0.081	***	-0.125	**	0.076				0.057	*	0.025		0.173	**
Work Status (Full-time Employed)														
Part-time							-0.274	***						
Not-Employed or in school							0.179							
Personal Income (Less than $20000)														
$20000-$39999	0.041		-0.010		0.066		-0.261	***	-0.011		-0.160	***	0.095	
$40000-$59999	0.124	***	0.035		0.288	***	-0.345	***	0.054		-0.243	***	0.114	
$60000 and higher	0.178	***	0.086		0.081		-0.313	***	0.108	**	-0.189	***	0.151	
Missing	0.048		-0.009		0.184	**	-0.292	***	-0.089	***	-0.092	**	0.050	
Religiosity (High religiosity)														
Moderate religiosity	-0.145	***	-0.166	***	0.042		-0.262	***	-0.006		-0.084	***	-0.392	***
Low religiosity	-0.310	***	-0.532	***	0.002		-0.078		-0.060	*	-0.007		-0.528	***
No religion	-0.260	***	-0.451	***	-0.241	***	-0.201	***	-0.063	**	-0.017		-0.456	***
Migration Status (Born in Canada)														
Before 1980	-0.089	***	-0.071	***	-0.055		-0.354	***	-0.200	***	0.092	**	0.701	***
Between 1980 and 2003	-0.417	***	-0.378	***	-0.051		-0.673	***	-0.347	***	0.271	***	0.605	***
Region (Atlantic provinces)														
Quebec	-0.463	***	-0.708	***	-0.538	***	-0.681	***	-0.418	***	0.190	***	-0.088	
Ontario	0.050		-0.174	*	0.111		-0.157		-0.039		-0.037		0.827	***
Prairies	0.089	**	-0.297	***	0.108		0.030		-0.054		0.094	*	0.909	***
British Columbia	0.196	***	-0.171	*	0.155		0.023		-0.066		0.016		1.239	***
Urban-Rural (Urban)														
Rural including PEI	0.089	***	1.326	***	-0.016		0.462	***	0.372	***	0.064	**	-0.416	***
Length of Stay in Neighborhood (5 years or more)														
Less than one year	0.001		-2.121	***	-0.313	***	-0.202	**	-0.216	***	0.001		-0.040	
One year to less than 3	-0.021		-1.276	***	-0.131		-0.117		-0.221	***	-0.015		0.015	
Three years to less than 5	0.023		-0.695	***	0.058		0.068		-0.063	*	-0.045		0.049	
Self-rated Health Status (Excellent Health)														
Very good	-0.081	***	-0.214	***	-0.231	***	-0.199	***	-0.121	***	-0.009		-0.031	
Good	-0.210	***	-0.166	***	-0.583	***	-0.527	***	-0.289	***	0.057	*	0.103	
Fair or poor	-0.295	***	-0.276	***	-0.564	***	-0.534	***	-0.407	***	0.261	***	0.252	***
Constant	0.006				2.070	***			-0.358	***	-0.043		-0.973	***
Threshold: Nobody/ 1 Can't be trusted			-4.647	***			-4.290	***						
A few / 2 …			-1.083	***			-2.924	***						
Many / 3 …			-0.119				-1.251	***						
/ 4 ... (5 trusted a lot)							0.465	***						
R Squares of full models	16.7%		25.6%		6.2%		10.9%		18.3%		5.6%		17.4%	
Type of Regression	OLS		OLS		Binary		Ordinal		OLS		OLS		Binary	

Significance levels: * 10%, ** 5%, *** 1%
Source: 2003 General Social Survey

Appendix Table 5: Final Models of Regression Anaysis - Networks through Membership in Organizations and through Institutions, Canadian Women Aged 30-64, 2003

	Membership in Org.				Trust in		Confidence in Institutions				Diversity of members			
	Primordial		Purposive		People		Government		Business		Ed./ Inc./Age		Ethnic	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Motherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)														
Living with Children														
Intact - Cohabiting	-0.303	*	-0.266	**	-0.138	**	0.150	**	-0.011		-0.079		0.156	
Step - Married	0.043		0.302	**	-0.009		-0.095		-0.041		0.208	**	0.199	
Step - Cohabiting	-0.201		0.172		-0.158	**	-0.167	**	-0.082		0.187		-0.015	
Lone Mother	-0.356	***	-0.045		-0.233	***	-0.164	***	-0.152	***	0.285	***	0.232	**
Not Living with Children														
Married	-0.521	***	-0.013		-0.037		-0.057		-0.038		0.071		0.145	*
Cohabiting	-0.827	***	-0.125		-0.165	***	-0.061		0.073		0.128		0.196	
Never Married	-0.697	***	-0.081		-0.154	***	-0.062		-0.076		0.227	***	0.408	***
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.619	***	0.061		-0.206	***	-0.170	***	-0.145	***	0.322	***	0.132	
Widowed/ Others	-0.685	***	-0.382	**	-0.103		-0.014		-0.029		0.361	**	-0.243	
Age Groups (Age 30-39)														
Age 40-49	0.140	**	0.192	***	0.226	***	0.028		-0.042		0.023		-0.1772	***
Age 50-59	0.091		0.245	***	0.322	***	0.051		-0.014		-0.088		-0.2954	***
Age 60-64	0.324	***	0.255	***	0.350	***	0.050		0.019		-0.253	***	-0.655	***
Resp. Education (Less than HS)														
High school diploma	0.402	***	0.220	***	0.229	***	-0.012		-0.043		-0.057		0.0496	
Some university or college	0.836	***	0.873	***	0.395	***	-0.091	**	-0.214	***	0.073		0.2331	**
College, technical graduate	0.754	***	0.962	***	0.379	***	-0.006		-0.134	***	-0.013		0.1974	*
Bachelors or higher gradua	1.478	***	1.723	***	0.642	***	0.053		-0.232	***	0.039		0.1475	
Personal Income (Less than $20000)														
$20000-$39999	-0.250	***	0.428	***	0.009		0.029		-0.035		-0.111	**	0.2431	***
$40000-$59999	-0.172	*	0.765	***	0.077	**	0.044		-0.071	*	-0.115	*	0.113	
$60000 and higher	-0.149		0.985	***	0.136	***	0.048		-0.042		-0.228	***	0.3944	***
Missing	-0.351	***	0.050		-0.141	***	-0.121	***	-0.131	***	-0.231	***	0.2317	***
Work Status (Not Employed)														
Part-time	0.371	***	0.423	***	0.066		-0.098	**	-0.050		0.193	***	0.1173	
Full-time	0.236	***	0.216	***	0.041		-0.077	**	-0.052		0.122	**	-0.0157	
Religiosity (High religiosity)														
Moderate religiosity	-1.502	***	-0.244	***	-0.019		0.001		0.000		-0.157	***	-0.1886	***
Low religiosity	-2.198	***	-0.550	***	0.017		-0.089	***	-0.051		-0.211	***	-0.2207	***
No religion	-1.789	***	-0.312	***	0.053	*	-0.268	***	-0.224	***	-0.194	***	-0.0184	
Migration Status (Born in Canada)														
Before 1980	-0.220	**	-0.318	***	-0.200	***	0.032		-0.173	***	0.030		0.486	***
Between 1980 and 2003	-0.581	***	-1.309	***	-0.283	***	0.280	***	-0.001		-0.089		0.937	***
Region (Atlantic provinces)														
Quebec	-0.524	***	-0.164	*	-0.541	***	0.098	**	-0.021		0.186	**	-0.0836	
Ontario	0.309	***	0.226	***	-0.032		-0.166	***	-0.053		0.087		0.8093	***
Prairies	0.585	***	0.384	***	0.070		-0.224	***	-0.065		-0.038		0.6329	***
British Columbia	0.904	***	0.663	***	0.070		-0.375	***	-0.102	*	0.094		1.09	***
Urban-Rural (Urban)														
Rural including PEI	0.262	***	0.168	***	0.122	***	-0.015		0.087	***	0.126	***	-0.7729	***
Length of Stay in Neighborhood (5 years or more)														
Less than one year	-0.211	**	-0.171	**	-0.072	*	0.046		0.028		-0.033		-0.0772	
One year to less than 3	-0.234	***	-0.166	**	-0.085	***	0.006		-0.011		-0.071		-0.0012	
Three years to less than 5	-0.181	**	-0.118	*	0.037		0.033		-0.075	*	0.062		0.1346	
Self-rated Health Status (Excellent Health)														
Very good	-0.115	*	-0.101	*	-0.065	**	-0.054	*	-0.071	**	0.049		0.1039	
Good	-0.245	***	-0.257	***	-0.244	***	-0.158	***	-0.124	***	0.151	***	0.1955	***
Fair or poor	-0.417	***	-0.320	***	-0.297	***	-0.292	***	-0.198	***	0.236	***	0.3646	***
Constant	-0.259						0.334	***	0.334	***	-0.139			
Threshold: 0 organization / None			0.882	***									0.0229	
1 organization /A few			2.358	***									2.3693	***
(2 or more) /About Half													3.4124	***
/Most													4.7277	***
(All)														
R Squares of full models	30.6%		23.1%		17.6%		6.5%		3.6%		4.5%		14.9%	
Type of Regression	Binary		Ordinal		OLS		OLS		OLS		OLS		Ordinal	

Significance levels: * 10%, ** 5%, *** 1%

Source: 2003 General Social Survey