

5-25-2007

Membership in Organizations and Confidence in Institutions: Men's Social Capital and Its Differentials by Family Structures

Zenaida R. Ravanera

University of Western Ontario, ravanera@uwo.ca

Rajulton Fernando

University of Western Ontario, fernando@uwo.ca

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/pscpapers>

Recommended Citation

Ravanera, Zenaida R. and Fernando, Rajulton (2007) "Membership in Organizations and Confidence in Institutions: Men's Social Capital and Its Differentials by Family Structures," *PSC Discussion Papers Series*: Vol. 21 : Iss. 6 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/pscpapers/vol21/iss6/1>

**Membership in Organizations and Confidence in Institutions:
Men's Social Capital and Its Differentials by Family Structures**

**by
Zenaida R. Ravanera
Fernando Rajulton**

Discussion Paper no. 07-06

ravanera@uwo.ca; fernando@uwo.ca

May 25, 2007

On the web in PDF format: <http://sociology.uwo.ca/popstudies/dp/dp07-06.pdf>

Paper to be presented at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Population Society
Saskatoon, May 31-June 2.

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**

Membership in Organizations and Confidence in Institutions: Men's Social Capital and Its Differentials by Family Structures

Zenaida R. Ravanera and Fernando Rajulton
Population Studies Centre, University of Western Ontario

Introduction

Family was prominent in the early conceptualization of social capital. Coleman (1988, 1990), for example, studied the impact of social capital on youth's achievement. However, findings from subsequent studies that have examined the impact of family social capital on development of children and youth have not been consistent, possibly because many of the indicators used such as presence of both parents in the household (or family structure) and employment of mothers do not adequately measure social capital.

Among the proffered 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 are: compared to two parents, single parents would not have as much time and attention to interact with their children; and family disruption through separation and 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). This, in effect, gives 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. Ravanera (2007), for example, found that social capital of men generated through networks of friends, relatives, and neighbours varies by family structure. Similarly, social capital of women, measured in a number of ways – informal networks, membership in organizations, and confidence in institutions – differed by motherhood and marital status (Ravanera and Rajulton, 2007).

In this paper, building on the earlier study of Ravanera (2007) on men's social capital through informal networks, we aim at a better understanding of social capital and its relationship to different types of families (including cohabiting and step families) using a

concept of social capital measured in terms of memberships in organizations and confidence institutions. In recent years, the role of men in the family and the influence of fathers in the development of children and youth have been the subject of closer scrutiny. This study aims at contributing towards this growing body of knowledge about men and families.

We start with a discussion of definitions of social capital, focusing on one that is amenable to measurement. We then describe our data and methods, discuss the results of our analysis - mainly for influence of family structure. We conclude with possible explanations for and implications of our findings.

Definition of Social Capital

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.

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 – individuals, families¹, communities or 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 distinction made by Furstenberg (2005), the first type of network (informal ties) is an approach mainly used in sociology, whereas the networks through civic groups and through institutions are more in the realm of political science.

In the interest of measuring social capital, Stone and Hughes (2002) also identified dimensions of networks, which include size and extensiveness (for example, number of

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

organizations to which an individual belong) and diversity (ethnic, education, and cultural mix of members of organizations). Diversity could be used to distinguish between the “bonding” and “bridging” nature of social capital (Gittel and Vidal, 1998, Woolcock, 2001, Granovetter, 1973, 1995; Erickson, 2003). Close relationships or “strong” bonds could be confined to a limited number of homogeneous 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 to more diverse individuals, which 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* (Lin, 2001, Narayan and Cassidy, 2001; Stone and Hughes, 2002; and Policy Research Initiative, 2005). 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.” At the individual level, 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 involvement in two of the three types of social capital networks identified by Stone and Hughes (2002) – through memberships in organizations and through institutions. We also examine the differentials by family structure of the diversity of members in organizations to which individuals belong, and the level of trust in people in general, which are dimensions related to these two types of networks. Social capital generated through informal networks, the third type identified by Stone and Hughes, was the subject of an earlier paper (Ravanera, 2006) using data from the same survey described below.

Data and Methods

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 6840 men 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: 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, diversity of members of organization and trust in people in general. Table 1 lists the variables and the survey questions used to measure social capital based on organization membership and through institutions.

Table 1 : List of Variables to Measure Social Capital Generated through Membership in Organization and through Institutions

Social Capital through Civic Organizations and Institutions

A. Membership in Civic Organizations

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

In the past 12 months, were you a member or participant in a ...

- (a) religion-affiliated group (such as church youth group, choir)?
- (b) school group, neighbourhood, civic or community association (such as PTA, alumni, block parents, neighbourhood watch)?

(2) 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?

B. Diversity of Organization Members

(3) 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?
- (4) ... how many come from an ethnic group that is visibly different from yours?

C. Trust and Reciprocity in People in General

(5) 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?

D. Confidence in Institutions

(6) 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,

(7) 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.

The number of organizations to which an individual belongs is used as an indicator of network size. As the family is an interest in this research, we derived two different measures of membership in organization 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. Responses to questions of trust in strangers were used to derive an indicator of trust in people in general.

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 social capital, through *relationship with institutions*. Information that would have been useful an indicator of the size of network through institutions is the number of persons one knows who are working in the various institutions (Stone and Hughes, 2002), 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. Groups of variables were factor analyzed, and factor scores were derived for measures of the following dimensions: (a) income-education-age diversity of members of organizations, (b) trust in people in general, (c) confidence in government institutions, and (d) confidence in business institutions (see Table 1).

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 fatherhood and marital statuses. Living with children (or fatherhood 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. We start with the bivariate relation between the indicators of social capital and the family structure. We then move on to discuss how this relationship is modified by introduction of control variables.

Results

To put in perspective the results of the analysis discussed below, the distribution of men as to their fatherhood and marital status is presented in Table 2. Fifty-five percent of Canadian men aged 30-64 are living with children, three-quarter (76%) of whom are married, with the rest somewhat evenly distributed (5% to 6%) among cohabiting fathers, step fathers – married or cohabiting, and lone fathers. Half of the men not living with children are married and about a quarter (23%) have never been married.

**Table 2: Canadian Men Aged 30-64
by Combined Fatherhood and Marital Status, 2003**

	Number	% of Men	% within Categories
Living With Children			
Married Father	2873	42.0	76.2
Cohabiting Father	244	3.6	6.5
Married Step Father	219	3.2	5.8
Cohabiting Step Father	194	2.8	5.1
Lone Father	240	3.5	6.4
Total	3770	55.1	100.0
Not Living with Children			
Married	1522	22.3	49.6
Cohabiting	360	5.3	11.7
Never Married	715	10.5	23.3
Divorced or Separated	373	5.5	12.1
Widowed and All Others	100	1.5	3.3
Total	3070	44.9	100.0
All Men	6840		

Source: 2003 General Social Survey on Social Engagement

Differentials by Family Structures

Table 3 shows two panels of the results of regression analysis of the various indicators of social capital dimensions. The first panel consists of bivariate relationships between family structures and the various social capital indicators (Model 1). These results are similar to what could be obtained through a crosstabulation by family structures of, for example, percent of members of primordial or purposive organizations shown in Appendix Table 1. As can be seen in Table 3 (and App. Table 1), in comparison to married fathers, membership in primordial organizations is significantly lower among the various other categories of men, except for step fathers who have higher, and men in

widowed/others category who have lower levels, which differences not statistically significant.

**Table 3: First and Final Models of Regression Analysis - Relationship through Civic Groups and through Institutions
Canadian Men Aged 30-64, 2003**

	Model 1												
	Membership in Org.				Trust in People	Confidence in				Diversity of members			
	Primordial		Purposive			Government	Business		Ed./ Inc./Age	Ethnic			
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.			
Fatherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)													
Living with Children													
Intact - Cohabiting	-0.909 ***		-0.413 ***		-0.365 ***		0.049		-0.051		-0.032		-0.305 *
Step - Married	0.070		-0.044		0.185 ***		-0.136 *		-0.040		0.117		-0.264
Step - Cohabiting	-0.952 ***		-0.197		-0.317 ***		-0.094		-0.081		-0.044		-0.610 ***
Lone Father	-0.344 **		-0.082		-0.125 *		-0.072		-0.057		0.097		-0.142
Not Living with Children													
Married	-0.226 ***		0.018		0.018		-0.092 ***		0.042		0.073		-0.086
Cohabiting	-1.179 ***		-0.121		-0.229 ***		-0.153 ***		-0.110 *		0.035		-0.405 ***
Never Married	-0.967 ***		-0.330 ***		-0.287 ***		-0.220 ***		-0.119 ***		0.025		0.281 ***
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.570 ***		-0.221 **		-0.089		-0.187		-0.142 *		0.154 *		-0.137
Widowed/ Others	-0.050		-0.440 **		-0.025		0.040		0.185 *		-0.036		0.030
Model 6													
	Membership in Org.				Trust in People	Confidence in				Diversity of members			
	Primordial		Purposive			Government	Business		Ed./ Inc./Age	Ethnic			
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.			
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.			
Fatherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)													
Living with Children													
Intact - Cohabiting	-0.063		-0.247 **		-0.024		0.033		0.001		-0.071		0.215
Step - Married	0.179		0.012		0.180 ***		0.008		0.012		0.134		-0.237
Step - Cohabiting	-0.258		-0.006		-0.110		-0.033		-0.001		-0.042		-0.297
Lone Father	-0.023		0.027		-0.013		-0.006		-0.003		0.074		0.117
Not Living with Children													
Married	-0.130		0.071		0.003		-0.039		0.038		0.058		0.070
Cohabiting	-0.465 ***		0.003		-0.058		-0.116 **		-0.033		0.021		-0.131
Never Married	-0.514 ***		-0.102		-0.121 ***		-0.107 **		-0.004		-0.014		0.334 ***
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.195		0.042		0.004		-0.057		-0.060		0.179 **		-0.093
Widowed/ Others	0.121		-0.046		0.114		0.033		0.194 *		-0.020		-0.091
R Square of Full Models	29.3%		15.8%		16.0%		9.8%		3.6%		3.5%		12.8%
Type of Regression Analysis	Binary		Ordinal		OLS		OLS		OLS		OLS		Ordinal

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

Source: 2003 General Social Survey, Model 6 extracted from Appendix Table 2, Model 1 extracted from various tables.

A general point that can be made from looking at Panel 1 of Table 3 is that married fathers seem to have greater social capital compared to cohabiting fathers and step fathers, particularly in membership in primordial organizations and trust in people, though they are more likely to belong to organizations whose members are ethnically more homogenous. One might also say that fathers, especially married fathers, have generally greater confidence in government institutions than men not living with children.

However, the 2nd Panel of Table 3 showing results of final models (Model 6, extracted from Appendix Table 2) – that is, the results for family structures after controlling for the other variables – indicates that there are only a few significant differences between married fathers and the rest of fathers or men not living with children. The never married men remain significantly different in that they are less likely to be members of primordial organizations and have lower level of trust in people. The members of organizations

wherein they belong are also more ethnically diverse than in organizations to which married fathers belong. Like the never married, cohabiting men with no children are less likely to belong to primordial organization. And, married step fathers have significantly higher trust in people than married fathers.

What these shift in results indicate is that, for men, family structures' impact on social capital (acquired through membership in organizations or through confidence in institutions) is influenced by, or mediated through, other variables. In the next sections, we discuss these other variables and how they influence membership in primordial and purposive organizations, trust in people, confidence in government institutions, and ethnic diversity of organization members. We do not discuss further confidence in businesses and social status diversity of members of organizations as the regression analysis shows that family structures and all other variables included in the analysis do not have much influence on them, as indicated by the low R² (shown as 3.6% and 3.5% respectively in Table 3).

Socio-economic Influences

The socio-economic effect on social capital is best seen in its influence on membership in purposive organizations. Table 4 (extracted from Appendix Table 3), shows that the inclusion of education and income variables in Model 3 reduced to insignificance the differences by family structure of membership in purposive organizations. The higher the education and income, the greater are the probabilities of membership in organizations such as professional associations, sports, recreational, cultural and hobby groups. This indicates that the better socio-economic situation of married men with children accounts for much of the differences in organization membership between them and men in other categories – particularly men with children in cohabiting relationship, never married and formerly married men.

**Table 4: Results of Ordinal Logistic Regression of Membership in Purposive Organizations
Canadian Men 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.
Fatherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)												
Living with Children												
Intact - Cohabiting	-0.413	***	-0.397	***	-0.184		-0.327	***	-0.254	**	-0.247	**
Step - Married	-0.044		-0.041		0.070		0.021		-0.021		0.012	
Step - Cohabiting	-0.197		-0.192		-0.030		-0.079		-0.054		-0.006	
Lone Father	-0.082		-0.084		0.079		-0.020		0.002		0.027	
Not Living with Children												
Married	0.018		0.044		0.136		0.077		0.054		0.071	
Cohabiting	-0.121		-0.113		0.006		-0.080		-0.025		0.003	
Never Married	-0.330	***	-0.316	***	-0.071		-0.157		-0.132		-0.102	
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.221	**	-0.225	**	0.036		-0.034	*	-0.029		0.042	
Widowed/ Others	-0.440	**	-0.408	**	-0.191		-0.102		-0.098		-0.046	
Resp. Education (Less than HS)												
High school diploma					0.363	***	0.391	***	0.400	***	0.381	***
Some university or college					0.693	***	0.723	***	0.726	***	0.708	***
College, technical graduate					0.693	***	0.739	***	0.747	***	0.719	***
Bachelors or higher graduate					1.257	***	1.459	***	1.498	***	1.469	***
Personal Income (Less than \$20000)												
\$20000-\$39999					0.563	***	0.539	***	0.531	***	0.499	***
\$40000-\$59999					0.972	***	0.887	***	0.895	***	0.841	***
\$60000 and higher					1.197	***	1.059	***	1.068	***	1.004	***
Missing					0.403	***	0.430	***	0.401	***	0.368	***

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

Source: 2003 General Social Survey, extracted from Appendix Table 3.

Socio-economic conditions also have a big influence on trust in people (Appendix Table 4). Men with higher education or higher income are more likely to have greater trust. Similarly, education has a significant positive impact on membership in primordial organizations – that is, neighbourhood and other family-oriented organizations (Appendix Table 5). However, there are other influences at work (like influence of values and regional differences discussed below) such that even after controlling for education and

income variables, significant differences remain between married men with children and men of other categories.

Influence of Values

That religiosity has a great influence on the membership in primordial organizations is to be expected as men who frequently attend religious services are also more likely to be members of groups centered around the family (Appendix Table 5). Many religions have family values ingrained in their teachings. In addition to its impact on primordial organizations, however, values influence social capital in other ways. Religious men are also more likely to be members of purposive organizations – that is, organizations that are not family-centered (Appendix Table 3).

Furthermore, as seen in Table 5 (extracted from Appendix Table 6), the higher the religiosity, the greater is the confidence in government institutions. Religiosity's influence is such that its inclusion in Model 4 decreased to insignificant levels the differences between the married men and men in other categories, particularly men not living with children.

Table 5: Results of Linear Regression of Factor Scores - Confidence in Government Institutions Canadian Men 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.
Fatherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)												
Living with Children												
Intact - Cohabiting	0.049		0.061		0.069		0.168 **		0.018		0.033	
Step - Married	-0.136 *		-0.132 *		-0.100		-0.046		0.004		0.008	
Step - Cohabiting	-0.094		-0.087		-0.058		0.047		-0.055		-0.033	
Lone Father	-0.072		-0.073		-0.062		0.024		-0.007		-0.006	
Not Living with Children												
Married	-0.092 ***		-0.129 ***		-0.108 ***		-0.049		-0.042		-0.039	
Cohabiting	-0.153 ***		-0.161 ***		-0.164 ***		-0.039		-0.121 **		-0.116 **	
Never Married	-0.220 ***		-0.216 ***		-0.213 ***		-0.099 *		-0.121 ***		-0.107 **	
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.187		-0.205 ***		-0.182 ***		-0.094		-0.084		-0.057	
Widowed/ Others	0.040		0.014		0.033		0.023		0.020		0.033	
Religiosity (High religiosity)												
Moderate religiosity							-0.038		-0.089 ***		-0.085 **	
Low religiosity							-0.156 ***		-0.192 ***		-0.190 ***	
No religion							-0.356 ***		-0.330 ***		-0.321 ***	

Significance levels *** 1%, ** 5%, * 10%
Source: 2003 General Social Survey, extracted from Appendix Table 6.

Regional Differences

The differences by region of residence are seen most clearly in the ethnic diversity of members of organization. Table 6 (extracted from Appendix Table 7) shows the East-West, and rural-urban divide in Canada: organizations in British Columbia, the Prairies, and Ontario have more ethnically diverse organization memberships than the Atlantic and Quebec, as do organizations in urban than in rural areas. These findings reflect the existing differences in ethnic compositions of the populations. That is, in regions where

Table 6: Results of Ordinal Logistic Regression of Ethnic Diversity of Organization Members Canadian Men 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.
Living with Children												
Intact - Cohabiting	-0.305 *		-0.351 **		-0.315 *		-0.144		0.211		0.215	
Step - Married	-0.264		-0.274 *		-0.244		-0.169		-0.231		-0.237	
Step - Cohabiting	-0.610 ***		-0.641 ***		-0.629 ***		-0.498 ***		-0.263		-0.297	
Lone Father	-0.142		-0.122		-0.094		0.023		0.121		0.117	
Not Living with Children												
Married	-0.086		-0.042		-0.050		0.042		0.080		0.070	
Cohabiting	-0.405 ***		-0.425 ***		-0.412 ***		-0.251 *		-0.090		-0.131	
Never Married	0.281 ***		0.199 *		0.163		0.294 ***		0.352 ***		0.334 ***	
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.137		-0.110		-0.115		-0.041		-0.046		-0.093	
Widowed/ Others	0.030		0.035		0.002		-0.073		-0.071		-0.091	
Region (Atlantic provinces)												
Quebec									-0.121		-0.114	
Ontario								0.754 ***		0.750 ***		
Prairies								0.626 ***		0.622 ***		
British Columbia								0.887 ***		0.889 ***		
Urban-Rural (Urban)												
Rural including PEI								-0.621 ***		-0.618 ***		

Significance levels *** 1%, ** 5%, * 10%
Source: 2003 General Social Survey, extracted from Appendix Table 7.

the population is more ethnically diverse, members of various organizations are also likely to belong to different ethnic groups.

Inclusion of regions in the analysis reduced to insignificant level the difference between married men with children and cohabiting fathers in ethnic diversity of members of organizations (Table 6 and Appendix Table 7). This reduction of the differences between married men living with children and cohabiting men upon inclusion of the region variable is seen as well in membership in organization – both primordial and purposive, and in trust in people (Appendix Tables 3, 4, and 5). This occurs because a greater proportion of cohabiting men live in Quebec than the rest of Canada, and Quebec residents have, in general, significantly lower membership in primordial and purposive organization, and lower level of trust in people (see Appendix Table 2 for a summary of the effects of regions). However, Quebec stands out in one measure of social capital – compared to men in the Atlantic region and the rest of Canada, men residing in Quebec have more confidence in government institutions (seen in Appendix Table 2 and Appendix Table 6).

Conclusion

Compared to findings about the relationship of family structures with social capital measured through informal networks of men (Ravanera, 2006), the relationship with social capital measured through membership in organizations and confidence in institutions is weaker. In general, fatherhood and marital statuses do not seem to make much difference in the latter measures of social capital when socio-economic and cultural variables, and regions of residence are controlled for. There are a few exceptions: in comparison to married men with children, never married and cohabiting men have significantly lower membership in primordial organizations; never married men have lower trust in people; organizations to which never married men belong have more ethnically diverse members; and married step fathers have higher level of trust in people. A “selection” effect may be a plausible explanation - that is, men who are more inclined to participate in organizations and who have greater trust in people are more likely to marry and have children. As for the greater ethnic diversity of members in organizations to which never married men belong, it is possible that absence of partner or spouse and children may be contributing to a less constraining lifestyle that includes participation in more diverse organizations.

That controlling for socio-economic conditions (measured by levels of education and income), values (religiosity), and place of residence (region and urban-rural) reduces the influence of family structure on membership in organizations, trust in people, and confidence in institutions shows that these factors are of greater importance in differentiating levels of social capital among men. In contrast, family structures significantly differentiate social capital of women regardless of the measures used (Ravanera and Rajulton, 2007). For example, lone mothers and divorced or separated women not living with children have significantly lower levels of membership in primordial organizations, trust in people, and confidence in both government or business institutions, even after controlling for the similar variables used in the analysis for men.

This is a possible indication that, in comparison to men, women benefit more from or are more constrained by presence or absence of children and spouses or partners, in terms of social capital.

In using a more focused definition of social capital as networks that encompass three types of relationships – through informal networks of family, relatives, friends, and neighbors, through civic organizations and trust in people in general, and through institutions – and empirically measuring these types of social capital using survey data and statistical methods, we had a hope of developing an overall measure of social capital. However, the findings from this analysis taken together with those from earlier papers (Ravanera, 2006; Ravanera and Rajulton, 2007) suggest that deriving a single measure for social capital may not be possible. In general, social capital that has been the focus of interest in sociology and measured in our studies in terms of informal social networks of family, relatives, friends, and neighbors seems to be conceptually different from the social capital of interest to political science, here measured in terms of membership in organizations, trust in people in general, and confidence in institutions. Analysis of benefits or influence of social capital has to take cognizance of the conceptual differences and use as appropriate a measure as possible. In spite of the impossibility of arriving at a unitary measure, however, we think that social capital is still useful as a broad concept, distinct from human and financial/material capital, to describe social relations giving rise to networks characterized by norms of trust and reciprocity that could be mobilized for certain benefits.

References:

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

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.

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

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.

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. 2007. Informal Networks Social Capital of Fathers: What Does the Social Engagement Survey Tell Us? *Social Indicators Research* 83(2):351-373.

Ravanera, Zenaida and Fernando Rajulton. 2007. Social Capital of Women Measured: Differentials by Family Structures. Paper to be presented at the CRFR International Conference on Extended and Extending Families. Edinburgh, June 27-29.

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.

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

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.

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

**Appendix Table 1: Membership in Primordial and Purposive Organizations
by Fatherhood and Marital Status, Canadian Men Aged 30-64, 2003**

Indicators	Fathers: Men living with children					
	Intact		Step		Lone Father	All Fathers
	Married	Cohabiting	Married	Cohabiting		
Primordial Organizations						
% Member	30.9	15.2	31.2	14.4	23.8	28.6
N	2853	244	218	194	239	3748
Purposive Organizations						
% Member of at least one organization	62.6	52.3	59.3	58.2	60.1	61.3
% Member of 1 organization	30.3	27.6	25.0	29.9	29.4	29.7
% Member of 2 organizations	21.1	17.7	22.7	20.1	18.9	20.8
% Member of 3 or more organizations	11.2	7.0	11.6	8.2	11.8	10.8
N	2842	243	216	194	238	3733
	Non-Fathers: Men not living with children					
	Married	Cohabiting	Never Married	Divorced/ Separated	Widowed/ Others	All Non- Fathers
Primordial Organizations						
% Member	26.2	12.3	14.5	20.8	30.2	21.3
N	1508	358	710	370	96	3042
Purposive Organizations						
% Member of at least one organization	62.9	61.2	54.3	56.6	46.3	59.4
% Member of 1 organization	30.2	33.0	28.6	28.5	15.8	29.5
% Member of 2 organizations	21.2	19.3	17.5	18.2	18.9	19.7
% Member of 3 or more organizations	11.5	8.9	8.2	10.0	11.6	10.2
N	1506	358	707	369	95	3035

Source: 2003 GSS on Social Engagement

**Appendix Table 2: Final Models of Regression Analysis - Network through Relationship with
People in General and with Civic Groups, Canadian Men Aged 30-64, 2003**

	Membership in Org.		Trust in People	Confidence in		Diversity of members			
	Primordial	Purposive		Government	Business	Ed./ Inc./Age	Ethnic		
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	
Fatherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)									
Living with Children									
Intact - Cohabiting	-0.063		-0.247 **		-0.024	0.033	0.001	-0.071	0.215
Step - Married	0.179		0.012		0.180 ***	0.008	0.012	0.134	-0.237
Step - Cohabiting	-0.258		-0.006		-0.110	-0.033	-0.001	-0.042	-0.297
Lone Father	-0.023		0.027		-0.013	-0.006	-0.003	0.074	0.117
Not Living with Children									
Married	-0.130		0.071		0.003	-0.039	0.038	0.058	0.070
Cohabiting	-0.465 ***		0.003		-0.058	-0.116 **	-0.033	0.021	-0.131
Never Married	-0.514 ***		-0.102		-0.121 ***	-0.107 **	-0.004	-0.014	0.334 ***
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.195		0.042		0.004	-0.057	-0.060	0.179 **	-0.093
Widowed/ Others	0.121		-0.046		0.114	0.033	0.194 *	-0.020	-0.091
Age Groups (Age 30-39)									
Age 40-49	0.255 ***		0.071		0.146 ***	0.008	-0.008	-0.054	-0.268 ***
Age 50-59	0.257 ***		0.126 *		0.287 ***	0.064 *	0.071 **	0.000	-0.218 ***
Age 60-64	0.108		0.007		0.295 ***	0.092 *	0.170 ***	-0.125	-0.380 ***
Resp. Education (Less than HS)									
High school diploma	0.294 **		0.381 ***		0.217 ***	-0.061	-0.146 ***	-0.164 **	0.043
Some university or college	0.919 ***		0.708 ***		0.341 ***	-0.118 ***	-0.138 ***	-0.012	0.062
College, technical graduate	0.834 ***		0.719 ***		0.317 ***	-0.111 ***	-0.149 ***	-0.054	0.116
Bachelors or higher graduate	1.467 ***		1.469 ***		0.623 ***	0.062	-0.121 ***	0.124 *	0.382 ***
Personal Income (Less than \$20000)									
\$20000-\$39999	-0.151		0.499 ***		0.050	0.010	0.038	-0.186 **	-0.254 *
\$40000-\$59999	-0.112		0.841 ***		0.129 ***	0.000	0.032	-0.222 ***	-0.158
\$60000 and higher	0.009		1.004 ***		0.181 ***	0.001	0.106 **	-0.194 **	-0.140
Missing	-0.365 ***		0.368 ***		-0.152 ***	-0.103 *	0.001	-0.280 ***	-0.062
Work Status									
Employed or in business	-0.061		0.062		0.030	0.016	0.057	-0.071	-0.005
Religiosity (High religiosity)									
Moderate religiosity	-1.616 ***		-0.133 **		-0.014	-0.085 **	-0.105 ***	-0.161 ***	0.041
Low religiosity	-2.189 ***		-0.304 ***		-0.006	-0.190 ***	-0.229 ***	-0.236 ***	-0.073
No religion	-1.977 ***		-0.278 ***		0.026	-0.321 ***	-0.317 ***	-0.093 *	-0.079
Migration Status (Born in Canada)									
Before 1980	-0.096		-0.245 ***		-0.041	0.128 ***	-0.049	0.036	0.482 ***
Between 1980 and 2003	-0.312 ***		-0.926 ***		-0.099 **	0.442 ***	0.141 ***	0.006	0.824 ***
Region (Atlantic provinces)									
Quebec	-0.512 ***		-0.271 ***		-0.665 ***	0.218 ***	0.072	0.255 ***	-0.114
Ontario	0.168		-0.123		-0.184 ***	-0.089	0.001	0.089	0.750 ***
Prairies	0.576 ***		-0.018		-0.127 **	-0.190 ***	0.000	0.204 ***	0.622 ***
British Columbia	0.739 ***		0.263 **		-0.102 *	-0.283 ***	0.101 *	0.048	0.889 ***
Urban-Rural (Urban)									
Rural including PEI	0.351 ***		0.201 ***		0.164 ***	0.026	0.078 **	0.086 *	-0.618 ***
Length of Stay in Neighborhood (5 years or more)									
Less than one year	-0.048		-0.176 **		-0.004	-0.058	-0.028	-0.118 *	0.017
One year to less than 3	-0.117		-0.143 **		-0.072 **	-0.034	-0.018	-0.045	0.068
Three years to less than 5	0.046		-0.178 **		-0.060	-0.017	0.043	-0.057	0.247 ***
Self-rated Health Status (Excellent Health)									
Very good	0.098		-0.078		-0.083 ***	-0.087 ***	-0.050	-0.011	0.123 *
Good	-0.074 ***		-0.148 **		-0.193 ***	-0.203 ***	-0.125 ***	0.031	0.113
Fair or poor	-0.360 ***		-0.427 ***		-0.352 ***	-0.395 ***	-0.260 ***	0.173 **	0.462 ***
Constant	-0.765 ***				-0.201 ***	0.303 ***	0.164 **	0.207	
Threshold: 0 org / None			0.511 ***						-0.596 ***
1 org /A few			1.916 ***						1.979 ***
2 org /About Half			3.353 ***						2.901 ***
/Most									4.527 ***
R Square of Full Models	29.3%		15.8%		16.0%	9.8%	3.6%	3.5%	12.8%
Type of Regression Analysis	Binary		Ordinal		OLS	OLS	OLS	OLS	Ordinal

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

Source: 2003 General Social Survey, Model 6 extracted from Appendix Table 2, Model 1 extracted from various tables.

Appendix Table 3: Results of Ordinal Logistic Regression of Membership in Purposive Organizations, Canadian Men 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.
Threshold: 0 organization	-0.505 ***		-0.466 ***		1.222 ***		0.786 ***		0.774 ***		0.511 ***	
1 organization	0.733 ***		0.774 ***		2.577 ***		2.176 ***		2.173 ***		1.916 ***	
2 organizations	2.068 ***		2.110 ***		3.983 ***		3.599 ***		3.604 ***		3.353 ***	
Fatherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)												
Living with Children												
Intact - Cohabiting	-0.413 ***		-0.397 ***		-0.184		-0.327 ***		-0.254 **		-0.247 **	
Step - Married	-0.044		-0.041		0.070		0.021		-0.021		0.012	
Step - Cohabiting	-0.197		-0.192		-0.030		-0.079		-0.054		-0.006	
Lone Father	-0.082		-0.084		0.079		-0.020		0.002		0.027	
Not Living with Children												
Married	0.018		0.044		0.136		0.077		0.054		0.071	
Cohabiting	-0.121		-0.113		0.006		-0.080		-0.025		0.003	
Never Married	-0.330 ***		-0.316 ***		-0.071		-0.157		-0.132		-0.102	
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.221 **		-0.225 **		0.036		-0.034 *		-0.029		0.042	
Widowed/ Others	-0.440 **		-0.408 **		-0.191		-0.102		-0.098		-0.046	
Age Groups (Age 30-39)												
Age 40-49			0.044		0.110 *		0.088		0.082		0.071	
Age 50-59			0.115 *		0.219 ***		0.151 **		0.149 **		0.126 *	
Age 60-64			-0.146 *		0.169 *		0.039		0.053		0.007	
Resp. Education (Less than HS)												
High school diploma					0.363 ***		0.391 ***		0.400 ***		0.381 ***	
Some university or college					0.693 ***		0.723 ***		0.726 ***		0.708 ***	
College, technical graduate					0.693 ***		0.739 ***		0.747 ***		0.719 ***	
Bachelors or higher graduate					1.257 ***		1.459 ***		1.498 ***		1.469 ***	
Personal Income (Less than \$20000)												
\$20000-\$39999					0.563 ***		0.539 ***		0.531 ***		0.499 ***	
\$40000-\$59999					0.972 ***		0.887 ***		0.895 ***		0.841 ***	
\$60000 and higher					1.197 ***		1.059 ***		1.068 ***		1.004 ***	
Missing					0.403 ***		0.430 ***		0.401 ***		0.368 ***	
Work Status												
Employed or in business					0.113		0.097		0.116		0.062	
Religiosity (High religiosity)												
Moderate religiosity							-0.174 ***		-0.135 **		-0.133 **	
Low religiosity							-0.331 ***		-0.309 ***		-0.304 ***	
No religion							-0.266 ***		-0.289 ***		-0.278 ***	
Migration Status (Born in Canada)												
Before 1980							-0.263 ***		-0.254 ***		-0.245 ***	
Between 1980 and 2003							-0.976 ***		-0.969 ***		-0.926 ***	
Region (Atlantic provinces)												
Quebec									-0.271 ***		-0.271 ***	
Ontario									-0.145		-0.123	
Prairies									-0.039		-0.018	
British Columbia									0.245 **		0.263 **	
Urban-Rural (Urban)												
Rural including PEI									0.209 ***		0.201 ***	
Length of Stay in Neighborhood (5 years or more)												
Less than one year											-0.176 **	
One year to less than 3											-0.143 **	
Three years to less than 5											-0.178 **	
Self-rated Health Status (Excellent Health)												
Very good											-0.078	
Good											-0.148 **	
Fair or poor											-0.427 ***	
R Square	0.6%		0.8%		12.2%		14.6%		15.4%		15.8%	

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

Source: 2003 General Social Survey, Model 6 extracted from Appendix Table 2, Model 1 extracted from various tables.

**Appendix Table 4: Results of Linear Regression of Factor Scores - Trust in People
Canadian Men 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.
Constant	0.067 ***		-0.025		-0.671 ***		-0.591 ***		-0.404 ***		-0.201 ***	
Fatherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)												
Living with Children												
Intact - Cohabiting	-0.365 ***		-0.329 ***		-0.222 ***		-0.235 ***		-0.035		-0.024	
Step - Married	0.185 ***		0.194 ***		0.235 ***		0.224 ***		0.171 **		0.180 ***	
Step - Cohabiting	-0.317 ***		-0.299 ***		-0.232 ***		-0.241 ***		-0.132 *		-0.110	
Lone Father	-0.125 *		-0.133 *		-0.060		-0.077		-0.019		-0.013	
Not Living with Children												
Married	0.018		-0.018		0.029		0.016		0.001		0.003	
Cohabiting	-0.229 ***		-0.233 ***		-0.170 ***		-0.184 ***		-0.066		-0.058	
Never Married	-0.287 ***		-0.258 ***		-0.175 ***		-0.192 ***		-0.135 ***		-0.121 ***	
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.089		-0.120 **		-0.020		-0.031		-0.024		0.004	
Widowed/ Others	-0.025		-0.043		0.068		0.072		0.102		0.114	
Age Groups (Age 30-39)												
Age 40-49			0.091 ***		0.122 ***		0.121 ***		0.137 ***		0.146 ***	
Age 50-59			0.220 ***		0.255 ***		0.249 ***		0.274 ***		0.287 ***	
Age 60-64			0.110 **		0.255 ***		0.240 ***		0.291 ***		0.295 ***	
Resp. Education (Less than HS)												
High school diploma					0.263 ***		0.266 ***		0.239 ***		0.217 ***	
Some university or college					0.388 ***		0.384 ***		0.365 ***		0.341 ***	
College, technical graduate					0.359 ***		0.360 ***		0.343 ***		0.317 ***	
Bachelors or higher graduate					0.638 ***		0.652 ***		0.666 ***		0.623 ***	
Personal Income (Less than \$20000)												
\$20000-\$39999					0.077		0.071		0.068		0.050	
\$40000-\$59999					0.182 ***		0.167 ***		0.161 ***		0.129 ***	
\$60000 and higher					0.272 ***		0.253 ***		0.226 ***		0.181 ***	
Missing					-0.061		-0.072		-0.126		-0.152 ***	
Work Status												
Employed or in business					0.073 *		0.073 *		0.079 **		0.030	
Religiosity (High religiosity)												
Moderate religiosity							-0.101 ***		-0.021		-0.014	
Low religiosity							-0.087 **		-0.014		-0.006	
No religion							0.003		0.016		0.026	
Migration Status (Born in Canada)												
Before 1980							-0.035		-0.049		-0.041	
Between 1980 and 2003							-0.131 ***		-0.118 ***		-0.099 **	
Region (Atlantic provinces)												
Quebec									-0.665 ***		-0.665 ***	
Ontario									-0.197 ***		-0.184 ***	
Prairies									-0.136 ***		-0.127 **	
British Columbia									-0.103 *		-0.102 *	
Urban-Rural (Urban)												
Rural including PEI									0.161 ***		0.164 ***	
Length of Stay in Neighborhood (5 years or more)												
Less than one year											-0.004	
One year to less than 3											-0.072 **	
Three years to less than 5											-0.060	
Self-rated Health Status (Excellent Health)												
Very good											-0.083 ***	
Good											-0.193 ***	
Fair or poor											-0.352 ***	
R Square	1.7%		2.4%		9.2%		9.5%		15.0%		16.0%	

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

Source: 2003 General Social Survey, Model 6 extracted from Appendix Table 2, Model 1 extracted from various tables.

**Appendix Table 5: Results of Binary Logistic Regression of Membership in Primordial Organizations
Canadian Men 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.
Constant	-0.796 ***		-0.911 ***		-1.713 ***		-0.663 ***		-0.882 ***		-0.765 ***	
Fatherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)												
Living with Children												
Intact - Cohabiting	-0.909 ***		-0.873 ***		-0.753 ***		-0.395 **		-0.060		-0.063	
Step - Married	0.070		0.078		0.137		0.275		0.165		0.179	
Step - Cohabiting	-0.952 ***		-0.936 ***		-0.898 ***		-0.442 **		-0.291		-0.258	
Lone Father	-0.344 **		-0.354 **		-0.303 *		-0.101		-0.045		-0.023	
Not Living with Children												
Married	-0.226 ***		-0.248 ***		-0.210 ***		-0.092		-0.138		-0.130	
Cohabiting	-1.179 ***		-1.177 ***		-1.160 ***		-0.655 ***		-0.474 ***		-0.465 ***	
Never Married	-0.967 ***		-0.934 ***		-0.921 ***		-0.586 ***		-0.538 ***		-0.514 ***	
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.570 ***		-0.594 ***		-0.524 ***		-0.217		-0.234		-0.195	
Widowed/ Others	-0.050		-0.055		-0.007		0.113		0.092		0.121	
Age Groups (Age 30-39)												
Age 40-49			0.145 **		0.233 ***		0.241 ***		0.250 ***		0.255 ***	
Age 50-59			0.200 **		0.269 ***		0.203 **		0.240 ***		0.257 ***	
Age 60-64			0.128		0.290 **		0.053		0.108		0.108	
Resp. Education (Less than HS)												
High school diploma					0.284 **		0.350 ***		0.321 **		0.294 **	
Some university or college					0.838 ***		1.004 ***		0.952 ***		0.919 ***	
College, technical graduate					0.803 ***		0.879 ***		0.863 ***		0.834 ***	
Bachelors or higher graduate					1.313 ***		1.451 ***		1.508 ***		1.467 ***	
Personal Income (Less than \$20000)												
\$20000-\$39999					-0.116		-0.107		-0.125		-0.151	
\$40000-\$59999					-0.037		-0.029		-0.061		-0.112	
\$60000 and higher					-0.005		0.116		0.068		0.009	
Missing					-0.316 **		-0.240 *		-0.334 **		-0.365 ***	
Work Status												
Employed or in business					-0.023		0.000		-0.007		-0.061	
Religiosity (High religiosity)												
Moderate religiosity							-1.687 ***		-1.618 ***		-1.616 ***	
Low religiosity							-2.211 ***		-2.190 ***		-2.189 ***	
No religion							-1.880 ***		-1.982 ***		-1.977 ***	
Migration Status (Born in Canada)												
Before 1980							-0.088		-0.111		-0.096	
Between 1980 and 2003							-0.297 ***		-0.326 ***		-0.312 ***	
Region (Atlantic provinces)												
Quebec									-0.522 ***		-0.512 ***	
Ontario									0.156		0.168	
Prairies									0.562 ***		0.576 ***	
British Columbia									0.731 ***		0.739 ***	
Urban-Rural (Urban)												
Rural including PEI									0.352 ***		0.351 ***	
Length of Stay in Neighborhood (5 years or more)												
Less than one year											-0.048	
One year to less than 3											-0.117	
Three years to less than 5											0.046	
Self-rated Health Status (Excellent Health)												
Very good											0.098	
Good											-0.074 ***	
Fair or poor											-0.360 ***	
R Square	3.7%		3.9%		9.2%		26.0%		29.0%		29.3%	

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

Source: 2003 General Social Survey, Model 6 extracted from Appendix Table 2, Model 1 extracted from various tables.

**App. Table 6: Results of Linear Regression of Factor Scores - Confidence in Government Institutions
Canadian Men 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.
Constant	0.069 ***		0.056 **		0.054		0.070		0.089		0.303 ***	
Fatherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)												
Living with Children												
Intact - Cohabiting	0.049		0.061		0.069		0.168 **		0.018		0.033	
Step - Married	-0.136 *		-0.132 *		-0.100		-0.046		0.004		0.008	
Step - Cohabiting	-0.094		-0.087		-0.058		0.047		-0.055		-0.033	
Lone Father	-0.072		-0.073		-0.062		0.024		-0.007		-0.006	
Not Living with Children												
Married	-0.092 ***		-0.129 ***		-0.108 ***		-0.049		-0.042		-0.039	
Cohabiting	-0.153 ***		-0.161 ***		-0.164 ***		-0.039		-0.121 **		-0.116 **	
Never Married	-0.220 ***		-0.216 ***		-0.213 ***		-0.099 *		-0.121 ***		-0.107 **	
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.187		-0.205 ***		-0.182 ***		-0.094		-0.084		-0.057	
Widowed/ Others	0.040		0.014		0.033		0.023		0.020		0.033	
Age Groups (Age 30-39)												
Age 40-49			-0.012		0.003		0.008		-0.005		0.008	
Age 50-59			0.063 *		0.063 *		0.071 **		0.046		0.064 *	
Age 60-64			0.112 **		0.129 **		0.121 **		0.085		0.092 *	
Resp. Education (Less than HS)												
High school diploma					-0.076		-0.080		-0.040		-0.061	
Some university or college					-0.159 ***		-0.143 ***		-0.086 *		-0.118 ***	
College, technical graduate					-0.112 ***		-0.121 ***		-0.082 **		-0.111 ***	
Bachelors or higher graduate					0.139 ***		0.082 *		0.109 ***		0.062	
Personal Income (Less than \$20000)												
\$20000-\$39999					0.006		0.024		0.031		0.010	
\$40000-\$59999					-0.035		0.011		0.037		0.000	
\$60000 and higher					-0.067		0.004		0.052		0.001	
Missing					-0.188 ***		-0.132 **		-0.075		-0.103 *	
Work Status												
Employed or in business					0.073 *		0.075 *		0.068 *		0.016	
Religiosity (High religiosity)												
Moderate religiosity							-0.038		-0.089 ***		-0.085 **	
Low religiosity							-0.156 ***		-0.192 ***		-0.190 ***	
No religion							-0.356 ***		-0.330 ***		-0.321 ***	
Migration Status (Born in Canada)												
Before 1980							0.060		0.118 ***		0.128 ***	
Between 1980 and 2003							0.390 ***		0.428 ***		0.442 ***	
Region (Atlantic provinces)												
Quebec									0.218 ***		0.218 ***	
Ontario									-0.100 **		-0.089	
Prairies									-0.202 ***		-0.190 ***	
British Columbia									-0.284 ***		-0.283 ***	
Urban-Rural (Urban)												
Rural including PEI									0.024		0.026	
Length of Stay in Neighborhood (5 years or more)												
Less than one year											-0.058	
One year to less than 3											-0.034	
Three years to less than 5											-0.017	
Self-rated Health Status (Excellent Health)												
Very good											-0.087 ***	
Good											-0.203 ***	
Fair or poor											-0.395 ***	
R Square	0.6%		0.8%		2.3%		5.8%		8.6%		9.8%	

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

Source: 2003 General Social Survey, Model 6 extracted from Appendix Table 2, Model 1 extracted from various tables.

**App. Table 7: Results of Ordinal Logistic Regression of Ethnic Diversity of Organization Members
Canadian Men 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.
Threshold: None	-1.047	***	-1.293	***	-1.183	***	-0.970	***	-0.831	***	-0.596	***
A few	1.312	***	1.078	***	1.231	***	1.486	***	1.736	***	1.979	***
About half	2.175	***	1.945	***	2.108	***	2.391	***	2.657	***	2.901	***
Most	3.760	***	3.532	***	3.694	***	4.008	***	4.280	***	4.527	***
Fatherhood -Marital Status (Married with children)												
Living with Children												
Intact - Cohabiting	-0.305	*	-0.351	**	-0.315	*	-0.144		0.211		0.215	
Step - Married	-0.264		-0.274	*	-0.244		-0.169		-0.231		-0.237	
Step - Cohabiting	-0.610	***	-0.641	***	-0.629	***	-0.498	***	-0.263		-0.297	
Lone Father	-0.142		-0.122		-0.094		0.023		0.121		0.117	
Not Living with Children												
Married	-0.086		-0.042		-0.050		0.042		0.080		0.070	
Cohabiting	-0.405	***	-0.425	***	-0.412	***	-0.251	*	-0.090		-0.131	
Never Married	0.281	***	0.199	*	0.163		0.294	***	0.352	***	0.334	***
Divorced/ Sep.	-0.137		-0.110		-0.115		-0.041		-0.046		-0.093	
Widowed/ Others	0.030		0.035		0.002		-0.073		-0.071		-0.091	
Age Groups (Age 30-39)												
Age 40-49			-0.353	***	-0.311	***	-0.301	***	-0.282	***	-0.268	***
Age 50-59			-0.312	***	-0.307	***	-0.295	***	-0.234	***	-0.218	***
Age 60-64			-0.395	***	-0.398	***	-0.451	***	-0.396	***	-0.380	***
Resp. Education (Less than HS)												
High school diploma					0.155		0.141		0.017		0.043	
Some university or college					0.291	***	0.269	**	0.042		0.062	
College, technical graduate					0.276	***	0.240	**	0.081		0.116	
Bachelors or higher graduate					0.697	***	0.527	***	0.340	***	0.382	***
Personal Income (Less than \$20000)												
\$20000-\$39999					-0.300	**	-0.233		-0.263	**	-0.254	*
\$40000-\$59999					-0.191		-0.071		-0.187		-0.158	
\$60000 and higher					-0.167		-0.009		-0.171		-0.140	
Missing					-0.042		0.061		-0.081		-0.062	
Work Status												
Employed or in business					-0.103		-0.116		-0.044		-0.005	
Religiosity (High religiosity)												
Moderate religiosity							-0.029		0.039		0.041	
Low religiosity							-0.105		-0.087		-0.073	
No religion							0.026		-0.076		-0.079	
Migration Status (Born in Canada)												
Before 1980							0.711	***	0.483	***	0.482	***
Between 1980 and 2003							1.027	***	0.837	***	0.824	***
Region (Atlantic provinces)												
Quebec									-0.121		-0.114	
Ontario									0.754	***	0.750	***
Prairies									0.626	***	0.622	***
British Columbia									0.887	***	0.889	***
Urban-Rural (Urban)												
Rural including PEI									-0.621	***	-0.618	***
Length of Stay in Neighborhood (5 years or more)												
Less than one year											0.017	
One year to less than 3											0.068	
Three years to less than 5											0.247	***
Self-rated Health Status (Excellent Health)												
Very good											0.123	*
Good											0.113	
Fair or poor											0.462	***
R Square	0.3%		1.6%		3.7%		6.9%		12.3%		12.8%	

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

Source: 2003 General Social Survey, Model 6 extracted from Appendix Table 2, Model 1 extracted from various tables.