

HOW DO OUR RELATIONS IN EVERYDAY LIFE INFLUENCE OUR TRUST IN STRANGERS? THEORY AND EVIDENCE FROM TWENTY-SEVEN DEMOCRACIES

Cerem I. CENKER-ÖZEK¹

Abstract

Generalized trust is important in democratic societies because it fosters co-operative norms which matter for citizen's-level activism. Individual's daily social interactions are among the significant determinants of generalized trust. Yet studies often measure social interactions at the group level such as those with the family, colleagues and the neighbors. Present study suggests that rather than group level relations, individual's both the structure- the extent of the weak and the strong ties-, and the content- whether they are mobilized for expressive action or instrumental action- of informal relations provide better explanations for generalized trust. Thus, the main objective of this study is to explore the relational foundations of generalized trust with individual level tie-based data. For this purpose, the study counts on International Social Science Program's (ISSP) survey of 2001 on social networks; hence the hypotheses are tested within a comparative cross-country perspective. The analysis suggests positive and significant influence of the kinship ties, which are mobilized for power and wealth and the non-kinship ties, which are mobilized for emotional support, on generalized trust. These findings, in turn, invite for a re-consideration of the conceptual discussion social capital literature posits between informal social relations and generalized trust.

Keywords: Generalized trust, Bonding social capital, Bridging social capital, Tie-level data, Multinomial logistic regression

GÜNLÜK HAYATTAKİ İLİŞKİLERİMİZ YABANCILARA GÜVENİMİZİ NASIL ETKİLER? TEORİ VE YİRMİ YEDİ DEMOKRASİDEN BULGULAR

Özet

Kişiler arası güven, demokratik toplumlarda vatandaşların siyasete aktif katılımları için gerekli olan iş birliği normlarını geliştirdiği için önemlidir. Günlük ilişkiler, kişiler arası güven belirteçlerinden bir tanesidir. Çalışmaların bir çoğu bu ilişkileri, genellikle, aile, iş arkadaşı ya da komşularla ilişkiler gibi, grup seviyesinde ölçülen değişkenlerle analiz eder. Bu çalışma, kişilerin sahip olduğu ilişkilerin yapısı- güçlü ya da zayıf bağların sayısı- ve içeriğinin-bu bağların kendini ifade etme ya da araçsal sebeplerle mobilize edilmesi- kişiler arası güveni daha iyi açıkladığını öne sürmektedir. Bu bağlamda, çalışmanın temel amacı kişiler arası güvenin ilişkisel temellerini bağ seviyesinde ölçülen verileri kullanarak araştırmaktır. Bu amaçla, 2001 yılında Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Programı'nın (USBP) sosyal ağlar üzerine yaptığı anket verisi kullanılmıştır. Bu veri, hipotezlerin uluslararası bir perspektifle değerlendirilmesine olanak sağlamaktadır. Analiz, güç ve zenginlik için mobilize edilen akrabalık ilişkileri ile duygusal destek için mobilize edilen aile ve akrabalık bağı dışında oluşan ikincil ilişkilerin, kişiler arası güveni pozitif ve anlamlı şekilde etkilediğini ortaya koymuştur. Bu bulgular ışığında, sosyal sermaye literatürünün günlük ilişkiler ve kişiler arası güven arasında öngördüğü nedenselliğin kavramsal tartışması tekrar ele alınmalıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kişiler arası güven, Bağlayıcı sosyal sermaye, Köprü kurucu sosyal sermaye, Bağ-seviyesinde veri, Multinomial logit analizi

¹ Yrd. Doç. Dr., Uluslararası Antalya Üniversitesi, cerem.cenker@antalya.edu.tr

Introduction

Generalized trust is among the significant civic attitudes which closely relates to democratic institutionalization. It is about an individual's regard of the other as the fellow citizen, so that co-operation with those others outside one's primordial relations and close associates becomes more likely. This co-operative spirit, in turn, is expected to encourage citizens' participation in different social systems. Hence, across trusting societies, citizens are expected to be better endowed with political and civic activism.

Among different types of trust, generalized trust corresponds to trust in people whom we do not know. We reveal such kind of trust to strangers because we regard them as the fellow citizens. Though they are strangers, we choose to extend trust because we find them familiar to ourselves. We regard them as not only harmless, but also worthy of association and co-operation. This positive attitude towards the fellow citizens lies at the heart of generalized trust. Accordingly, generalized trust is different from particularized trust, which refers to trust in people we know. It is also different from institutional trust, which pertains to confidence individuals have in a series of institutions (Giddens, 1990, s. 83-88; Luhmann, 1988, s. 94-109; Seligman, 1997, s. 13-44).

Generalized trust has started to be discussed more extensively in political research with the advent of the social capital literature. This literature pointed out the formal, institutional and the informal, everyday societal relations and networks as foundations of generalized trust. Civil society participation was examined extensively as individual's formal relations (Paxton, 2007, s. 47-76; Pichler and Wallace, 2007, s. 423-435). Alternatively, individual's informal relations were conceptualized as the bonding and the bridging social capital respectively (Narayan 1999, s. 1; Putnam 2000, s. 22-23; Woolcock and Narayan, 2000, s. 226-227). The bonding social capital referred to individual's primordial and close relationships and this type of social capital was argued to constrict individual's relations outside of the familiar environments. Hence it was negatively connected to generalized trust. The type of social capital conducive for generating trust was designated as the bridging social capital which concerned relations of more professional and distant nature such as the associates from the workplace, the school and/or the various civil society organizations (Farole vd., 2007; s. 15-16; Putnam, 2000, s. 22-23).

Though the social capital literature frequently mentions the significance of the bonding and the bridging social capital for generalized trust, their tests remained limited in comparison with studies which focus on civil society activism. Moreover, they were often measured at the group level, which explored frequency of contact with various informal social groups such as the family, neighbors, colleagues and other friends (Alesina and Guiliano, 2007, s. 4-5; Farole vd., 2007, s. 15-16). However the conceptual definition of both the bonding and the bridging social capital lies in Granovetter's seminal differentiation between the weak and the strong ties (Granovetter, 1973, s. 1360-1380; Putnam, 2000, s. 22-23). Hence an emphasis on the structure and the content of the relational ties, which are informed from individual level tie-based data, may provide new light to research which enquires social network underpinnings of generalized trust.

Present study is an attempt in this direction. It seeks to explore relational foundations of generalized trust within a cross-country comparative perspective. It, in particular,

seeks to answer the question: "How do our relations in everyday life influence our trust in strangers?" For this purpose, the study focuses on both the structure-- the extent and the weight of individual's ties-- and the content--the purpose for which the ties are mobilized--of individual's everyday social ties. Doing so, the present study aims to contribute to social capital research by focusing on the influence of tie-level properties on generalized trust.

The organization of the study is as follows. The first part discusses the relationship between democracy, generalized trust, and the informal relations. The second part focuses on the relevance of informal, everyday relationships for generalized trust and it introduces the hypotheses of the study. The following third section explains the data and the variables. The fourth section, then, presents the model and it discusses the empirical results. Last section will conclude the study.

Democracy, Generalized Trust and Informal, Everyday Relations

Political science in general and democracy studies in particular focus on generalized trust because people's co-operation and association for common interests as well as public goods are necessary conditions for functioning democracies (Almond ve Verba, 1963, s. 208-244; Putnam vd., 1993, s. 163-181). Generalized trust provides an enabling social environment in which individuals easily connect with each other. This potential of connectivity is what lends generalized trust significance to underscore a good portion of democratic sustenance (Inglehart, 1997, s. 160-216; Inglehart and Welzel, 2005, s. 149-173). Besides, in-depth case studies also showed how the absence of generalized trust fostered either individual isolation and social anomie, or the emergence of mafia-like organizations, which proved detrimental for democratic regimes (Banfield, 1958, s. 83-103; Gambetta, 1988, s. 158-175; Gambetta, 1993, s. 15-53).

There is a general consensus in political research that generalized trust is good for democratic regimes, but what is good for generalized trust?

Determinants of generalized trust have started to be discussed more in detail with the advent of the social capital literature. Putnam and his collaborators (1993, s. 167) used social capital to denote the widespread availability of generalized trust and networks of civic engagement in a given polity, which had significant bearings on democratic and economic institutional performance. This line of research prioritizes the micro-level determinants of generalized trust and it points out the relevance of individual's formal and informal relationships for generalized trust.

Why would civil society involvement and informal social relationships influence generalized trust? As it is noted, generalized trust is about a general positive orientation towards the fellow citizens. Since it concerns trust in people we do not know, individuals take risks when they choose to trust. Hence a certain level of familiarity with different human conditions and behaviors would help to take such risk. Indeed both the civil society activism and the abundance of informal relations are regarded as channels through which individual level differences and social cleavages are mutually recognized; crosscut; negotiated; and understood at the societal level (Putnam, 2007, s. 159-165).

The bulk of research already enquired the influence of civil society activism on gene-

ralized trust (Knack and Keefer, 1997, s. 1271-1274; Knack 2003, s. 341-355; Paxton, 2007, s. 54; Uslaner, 2002, s. 130). Fewer researches were conducted on individual's informal relations (Alesina and Guiliano, 2007, s. 4-5; Dekker 2005, s. 94-95; Farole et.al., 2007, s. 15-16; Uslaner 2002, s. 123-125).

As it is noted, the differentiation between the bonding and the bridging social capital informs many studies which focus on informal relations. Putnam (2007, s. 143) defined bonding social capital as "ties to people who are like you in some important way". It is hypothesized to influence generalized trust negatively because strong ties are assumed to strengthen in-group solidarity, which breed suspicion about out-group relations. An alternative to bonding social capital is the bridging social capital which implies individual's involvement in different types of social networks besides his/her close and primordial relations. Putnam (2007, s. 143) defined it as "ties to people who are unlike you in some important way". Bridging social capital is hypothesized to influence generalized trust positively because the relations with out-group members as well as the knowledge about them are expected to provide familiarity with the variable human conditions and behaviors, which discounts the risks involved in trust relations.

Notwithstanding the neat differentiation between the bonding and the bridging social capital as well as the relations with the in-groups and the out-groups, the empirical evidence so far pointed out a more complicated relationship between everyday, informal relations and generalized trust.

Alesina and Guiliano (2007, s. 18-19), for instance, designated a negative and significant influence of strong family relations on generalized trust. Likewise, Farole and his collaborators (2007, s. 21-23) designated time spent with close friends as a negative determinant of generalized trust, whereas they underscored time spent with work or professional colleagues as a positive determinant of generalized trust. Uslaner (2002, s. 123-125) also examined the influence of everyday, informal relations on generalized trust. In his study, variables of informal relations were wide-ranging from going to bars and restaurants, playing cards to visiting friends and families and talking to neighbors. Likewise, Dekker (2005, s. 94-95) examined the extent of informal socialization through questions of the neighborhood level relations. Both Uslaner and Dekker could not find any substantial influence of informal socialization on generalized trust.

These researches fell short in attempting to prove the viable influence of informal relations on generalized trust. Yet, based on these examples, it is also difficult to argue the contrary case. The reasons are twofold. The first reason is the lack of a general consensus about what types of relations constitute either the bonding or the bridging types of relations. Putnam (2007, s. 143) for instance regarded relations with colleagues of similar age, sex and race as bonding social capital, whereas Farole and his collaborators (2007, s. 15) regarded relations with the colleagues as the bridging social capital. The second reason is related to the measurement of the informal relations. Though frequent references are made to different types of ties, social capital research on informal relations rely heavily on different social groups such as the family, close friends, colleagues and neighbors rather than social ties.

How Do Informal, Everyday Relations Influence Generalized Trust?

Modern societies provide individuals many avenues for socialization; hence, more often, people possess many different ties to different others. The basic category that has motivated the research on social networks is the differentiation made between the kinship and the non-kinship relations (Scott, 1991, s. 7-38). Indeed, relations established outside one's kin group is accepted as one of the strongest indicators of modern societies and the complexity it confers, which, in turn, makes the discussion of generalized trust relevant (Luhmann, 1979, s. 39; Simmel, 1922/1955, s. 134-140). Hence the focus on the kinship and the non-kinship ties may provide a first step to discern whether or not individual's informal ties have any bearing on his/her decision to trust the fellow men.

The first two hypotheses of the study are about the size of both the kinship and the non-kinship ties. As it is noted, social capital research assumes that a positive orientation towards the generalized others becomes more likely to the extent people get familiar with different others. Hence the potential of the weak ties would expand with an increase in the non-kinship relations. A contrary case would be people's reliance on their strong kinship relations.

H1: Extensive non-kinship ties influence generalized trust positively.

H2: Extensive kinship ties influence generalized trust negatively.

The basis of the above hypotheses is the assumption that people have relatively stronger attachments to their primordial kinship relations. These attachments would increase as the weight of the kinship ties increase. Hence the above difference will become more pronounced to the extent the kinship ties are stronger. Hence the third hypothesis is about the weight of the kinship ties:

H3: Stronger kinship ties influence generalized trust negatively.

The hypotheses so far deal with the structure of the relationships rather than their content. Yet besides the structure of individual's relational ties, the content of these ties such as the purpose for which they are mobilized may also prove significant. In his study on social capital, Lin (2007, s. 10) differentiated ties on the basis of the purpose of action. Ties which were mobilized for expressive action were for "preserving and maintaining resources" (Lin, 2007, s. 10). In general, these types of ties "have physical health, mental health, and life satisfaction as returns" (Van der Gaag and Snijders, 2005, s. 21). Alternatively, ties may be mobilized for instrumental action as well. They are for "searching for and obtaining resources" (Lin, 2007, s. 10) and they are used to increase one's "wealth, power and reputation" (Van der Gaag and Snijders, 2005, s. 21).

Though the research on bonding and bridging capital hardly mentions this differentiation, it seems vital to reason why certain types of relations may hinder one's tendency to trust the fellow citizens, while others ease such tendency. After all, social capital research prioritizes the weak and the bridging ties for trust relations because they are regarded as strategic to associate with different others and to reach alternative sources of information. However people forge relations outside of their kinship groups for expressive reasons as well. Likewise though people, in general, rely on their kinship relations for expressive reasons, they may also find these relations useful for instrumental reasons. Do the kinship and the non-kinship relations have a uniform influence

on generalized trust, regardless of the difference in purpose of action? In line with the social capital literature, the fourth and the fifth hypotheses assume a uniform influence:

H4: Reliance mostly on non-kinship ties for both expressive and instrumental action influence generalized trust positively.

H5: Reliance mostly on kinship ties for both expressive and instrumental action influence generalized trust negatively.

Data and Model

Present analysis tested the above hypotheses by using ISSP survey data of 2001, which focused on social networks. By the time this survey was conducted, ISSP had thirty-eight member nations. The analysis accounted for countries rather than nations; hence the Northern Ireland sample was not included in the analysis. Moreover, East and West Germany were coded as the single country of Germany. Likewise, Israeli Jews and Arabs were coded as a single country of Israel. Subsequently, the present analysis counted on twenty-seven countries for its enquiry into the relational foundations of generalized trust.²

The dependent variable of the empirical model was generalized trust. ISSP provided a three-item trust module to measure individual's trust in both the known and the unknown others. The respondents indicated agreement to each item along 1-5 scale where 1 stood for "Agree strongly" and 5 stood for "Disagree strongly". These items were as follows:

"There are a few people I can trust completely."

"Most of the time you can be sure that other people want the best for you."

"If you are not careful, other people will take advantage of you."

The third statement in this module was used as the generalized trust question; because, it came close to the conventional generalized trust question, which was "Generally speaking, do you believe most people can be trusted or that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people?" In surveys such as World Values Survey (WVS), Eurobarometer and General Social Survey (GSS), the respondents who said they cannot be too careful in dealing with people were accepted as people who lacked trust in unknown other people. This statement was reminiscent of the ISSP statement "If you are not careful, other people will take advantage of you." The explicit reference given in the statement to the "other people" was also important because generalized trust concerned individuals' orientations towards generalized others. Also, this statement underscored a general suspicion towards the intentions of other people, which lied at the foundation of lack of trust. Hence, those respondents who either disagreed strongly or disagreed with this statement were treated as respondents who revealed trust in the fellow citizens. Nearly

² Countries which are included in the analysis are Finland, Denmark, Switzerland, France, Norway, Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Canada, Israel, Great Britain, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Philippines, Russia, United States, Latvia, Italy, Germany, Austria, Spain, South Africa, Chile, Slovenia, Brazil, Poland, and Hungary. Also see ISSP Codebook for 2001 Survey on Social Networks, 7. See <http://www.issp.org/>

sixteen percent of all respondents indicated trust.

Trust levels differed substantially across countries. More than forty percent, for instance, indicated trust in fellow citizens in Finland and Denmark. The figure was lower than five percent in Poland and Hungary and less than ten percent in Spain, South Africa, Chile, Slovenia, and Brazil.³

In order to test the hypotheses, the study modelled a series of tie-based variables as the key independent variables. These variables are explained in detail below.

Size of adult kinship ties: The size of adult kinship ties corresponded to a respondent's total number of ties to his/her brothers/sisters and sons/daughters, who were eighteen or older as well as to their parents, who were still alive. This was a continuous variable, which changed between 0 and 36. The mean of this variable was 4,6 and 95% of distribution lies between 0 and 10.

Weight of adult kinship ties: The weight of adult kinship ties variable was computed on the basis of the frequency of contact variables. It corresponded to the average frequency of contact with the most contacted brother/sister, son/daughter as well as the father and the mother. It was a continuous variable and its values changed between zero and seven.

Size of the non-kinship ties: Size of the non-kinship ties was the sum of respondent's friends from the workplace, the neighborhood and the other places. It was a continuous variable and its values changed between 0 - 294. Nearly 95% of distribution was within the 0 to 33 range.

Kinship ties for expressive action/Non-kinship ties for expressive action: ISSP asked respondents' their first and second choices of contact when they felt ill and depressed respectively. Those family and relatives' ties⁴ which were used in times of illness and feeling depressed, were used to generate the kinship ties for expressive action variable. In case non-kinship ties⁵ were mentioned for the above expressive actions, these ties were counted as non-kinship ties for expressive action. The values of both variables changed between 0 and 4.

Kinship ties for instrumental action/ Non-kinship ties for instrumental action: ISSP asked respondents' their first and second choices of contact when they needed to borrow large sums of money. Also, the survey asked the contact who was used for the present (or the last) employment. The indicated family and the relatives' ties made up the kinship ties for instrumental action variable. In case non-kinship ties were mentioned for the above instrumental actions, these ties were counted as non-kinship ties for

3 The trusting respondents were those who either disagreed strongly or disagreed with the statement 'If you are not careful, other people will take advantage of you'.

4 Spouse, mother, father, daughter, son, daughter-in-law, son-in-law, brother, sister were accepted as family. Other blood relatives, other in-law relatives and god-parents are accepted as relatives. Though god-parent may not be a relative, it is likely that this person will be close to the respondent's parents. Hence he /she is different from one's friends. God-parent was coded as relative because he/she was as close as parents but not from the immediate family. Contacts with family and relatives made up the kinship relations.

5 Close friends, acquaintances, neighbors, someone from work, and someone else were coded as friends and acquaintances, which are labeled as non-kinship relations.

instrumental action. The values of both variables changed between 0 and 3.

Besides the key independent variables, the empirical model also explored the robustness of the estimates to the inclusion of other potential generalized trust determinants. These control variables along with usual socio-demographic variables are explained below.

Institutional contact for expressive action: ISSP questions on expressive and instrumental action indicated above also provided choices for institutional contacts⁶ besides the kinship and the non-kinship ties. In case the respondents preferred institutional contacts when they felt ill and/or depressed, these contacts made up institutional contact for expressive action variable. Its values changed between 0 and 4.

Institutional contact for instrumental action: In case the respondents preferred institutional contacts when they needed to borrow large sums of money and/or finding a job, sum of these contacts corresponded to institutional contact for instrumental action variable. Its values changed between 0 and 3.

Relations with the relatives: ISSP asked frequency of contact questions with a series of relatives along 1-4 scale which indicated higher values for less frequent contact. This scale was re-coded along 0 - 3 so that the higher values indicated more frequent contact. Relations with the relatives variable was computed by summing up all frequency of contact scores across the relatives' variables. The relations with the parents-in-laws were not available for Norway. Likewise, relations with God-parents were optional; hence it was not available for a series of countries. As a result, these relations were not included in computation of this variable. Its values changed between 0 and 12.

Civil Society Participation: As it is noted, civil society activism was frequently examined as a positive determinant of generalized trust.⁷ ISSP asked the respondents' frequency of participation in a series of civil society organizations. A 1 to 4 scale was used to indicate participation in each of the given organizations. The scale was re-coded between 0 and 3 whereby the higher values indicated more frequent participation. Civil society participation variable was the sum frequency of participation across all types of groups and organizations. The charitable groups were not included in the computation because this data lacked for Germany. The values of this variable changed between 0 and 18.

Olson type participation / Putnam type participation: A series of analyses questioned whether all types of civil society organizations exerted similar influence on generalized trust. Knack and Keefer (1997, s. 1271-1274), for instance, differentiated between

6 All contacts indicated in ISSP survey which were neither the kinship nor the non-kinship relations were accepted as the institutional contacts.

7 A series of scholars mentioned the possibility of reverse causality between civil society involvement and generalized trust. In her comparative study, Stolle underlined the possibility that people who already trust others tend to become members of civil society institutions. See Dietlind Stolle (2001), "Getting to trust: an analysis of the importance of institutions, families, personal experiences and group membership," Paul Dekker and Eric M. Uslaner (Der.,) *Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life* (London and New York: Routledge): 118-134. In her study, Paxton also acknowledged the possible reciprocal relationship between generalized trust and associational membership. However counting on a series of research conducted on the question, she underlined that the causality is more likely to run from associational membership to generalized trust. See Pamela Paxton (2007), "Association Memberships and Generalized Trust: A Multi-level Model Across 31 Countries," *Social Forces* 86 (1): 54.

the Olson and the Putnam type of organizations. In his 1982 study, Olson wrote on collective action and argued that a series of civil society organizations such as professional organizations, trade unions, and political parties were more likely to display rent-seeking behavior. Knack and Keefer (1997) defined these types of hierarchically organized modern institutions as Olson type civil society organizations. They contrasted these with networks of civic engagement mentioned by Putnam et.al. (1993, s. 92-93). The latter were more horizontally organized and had post-modern concerns such as the community work, recreational, and rights-based activism. Being so, the likelihood of Putnam type organizations entering into distributional coalitions was found low.

The differentiation made between Olson and Putnam type organizations was directly related to generalized trust. Due to their rent-seeking tendency, Olson type organizations were regarded as exclusionary. Hence, they were hypothesized to influence generalized trust negatively. In the empirical model, Olson type participation was the sum frequency of contact for political parties and clubs as well as trade unions and professional organizations. Its values changed between 0 and 6. Alternatively, Putnam type organizations were induced mostly by provision of public goods; hence they were argued to influence generalized trust positively

(Knack ve Keefer, 1997, s. 1271). In the empirical model, Putnam type participation was the sum score for sports and leisure clubs and neighborhood associations and its values changed between 0 and 6.

Subjective Happiness: Another variable of interest was subjective happiness, which was found to be a significant individual level variable for generalized trust (Uslaner, 2002, s. 94-100). It was included in the analysis because happier people were, on the whole, found to be optimistic towards life in general, and other people in particular. The latter, in turn, was likely to positively influence individual's regard of the fellow citizens. ISSP asked this question along a 1- 4 scale. It was re-coded so that 1 corresponded to "not happy at all" and 4 corresponded to "very happy".

Cross-country macro-structural differences: Though social capital literature emphasized the significance of both the formal and the informal social relations for generalized trust, a series of studies also underlined the relevance of macro-structural determinants of generalized trust such as the historical heritage, economic inequalities, and ethnic divisions (Bjornskov, 2007, s. 1-21; Delhey ve Newton, 2005, s. 311-327). It was expected that even when the relational foundations of generalized trust were controlled for, significant cross-country differences would persist due to the mentioned macro-structural differences. Country level dummy variables were used to control for these differences.

University attendance: This was a dummy variable, which took the value of one for the cases of university attendance.⁸

Employment: This was also a dummy variable, which accounted for the cases of full time and part time employment as well as self-employment.

⁸ In ISSP, data was available for those who still attended to university. Since higher education is hypothesized to influence generalized trust, those attending to university are also accepted as part of the better educated respondents.

Sex: The sex variable took the value of one for the male respondents.

Age: The age variable was a continuous variable.

Empirical Analysis and Results

As it is noted, present analysis used the ISSP agreement scores to the following statement as the generalized trust variable: "If you are not careful, other people will take advantage of you". This statement was asked along an ordinal scale and its values changed between 1 and 5. Because most of the variables of interest violated the parallel regression assumption, a multinomial logit model (MNL) is used to compute the cross-country relational underpinnings of generalized trust (Long ve Freese, 2006, s. 197-200). For this purpose, the five point ordinal scale was re-coded into three outcomes. Those who strongly agreed or agreed with the above statement were coded as "No Trust"; those who neither agreed nor disagreed were labeled as "Neutral"; and those who strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement were named as "Trust". In all analyses, "No Trust" was used as the base category and its comparison with "Trust" reported. Hence, the ensuing models showed the effect of each independent variable on trust in comparison with its influence on lack of trust.

Table.1 on the next page presented two models and they were only different in terms of civil society participation variables. Variables which were significant at five percent or lower are shown in shaded cells. Table.1 also presented the marginal effect each unit of independent variable made on the probability to trust. Model II of Table.1 was used for the computation of the marginal effect scores. Lastly, Model I and Model II did not report the country coefficients. In both models, the base country was Finland and the country coefficients were found significant except for Denmark.

The analysis showed that everyday, informal relations were relevant for generalized trust, yet their content rather than structure seemed to matter more for trust relations. Table.1 showed negative and significant influence of the size of the adult kinship ties on generalized trust, yet both its coefficient and marginal effect were low. Also both the size of the non-kinship ties and the weight of the kinship ties proved insignificant in the analysis. Their coefficients and marginal effects came close to zero. Alternatively, variables which dealt with ties for different purposes of action yielded significant and interesting results. They also seemed to exert more pronounced influence on generalized trust.

Table 1. Multinomial analyses of Trust versus No-trust					
	Model I		Model II		Marginal effect (Model II)
	Coeff.	P> z 	Coeff.	P> z 	
<i>Tie-based variables</i>					
<i>Size of adult kinship ties</i>	-0,02	0,02	-0,02	0,02	0,00
<i>Size of non-kinship ties</i>	0,00	0,14	0,00	0,16	0,00
<i>Weight of adult kinship ties</i>	0,00	0,87	0,00	0,86	0,00
<i>Kinship ties: Expressive</i>	0,04	0,22	0,04	0,22	0,00
<i>Kinship ties: Instrumental</i>	0,09	0,00	0,09	0,00	0,02
<i>Non-kinship ties: Expressive</i>	0,11	0,00	0,10	0,00	0,01
<i>Non-kinship ties: Instrumental</i>	-0,08	0,03	-0,08	0,03	0,02
<i>Other variables</i>					
<i>Relations with the relatives</i>	-0,01	0,32	-0,01	0,31	0,00
<i>Total civil society participation</i>	0,05	0,00			
<i>Olson type participation</i>			0,02	0,12	0,00
<i>Putnam type participation</i>			0,06	0,00	0,01
<i>Church or other religious org.</i>			0,06	0,00	0,01
<i>Other associations or org.</i>			0,04	0,03	0,01

<i>Employment</i>	0,14	0,00	0,14	0,00	0,03
<i>University attendance</i>	0,41	0,00	0,42	0,00	0,06
<i>Institutional contact: Expressive</i>	-0,12	0,05	-0,12	0,05	-0,02
<i>Institutional contact: Instrumental</i>	-0,04	0,29	-0,03	0,31	0,00
<i>Subjective happiness</i>	0,27	0,00	0,27	0,00	0,05
<i>Sex</i>	-0,40	0,00	-0,30	0,00	-0,08
<i>Age</i>	0,02	0,00	0,02	0,00	0,00
<i>Constant</i>	-1,47	0,00	-1,47	0,00	

The analysis showed the positive and significant influence of kinship relations for instrumental action and the non-kinship relations for expressive action. Hence it showed us the relevance of kinship relations for strategic and utilitarian calculations. Likewise, it emphasized the emotional side of the non-kinship relations for trust relations. Social capital literature hardly acknowledged these possibilities. In general, bridging social capital was associated with non-kinship types of relations and their significance lied in their potential for strategic use. Likewise, more often, kinship relations were conceptualized as exclusionary and their utilitarian use was not considered. Yet the present analysis showed that individual's informal relations could not be conceptualized only as means to strategic relations. This may indeed reflect one side of the story, yet Table 1. revealed the other side too, which was about people' need for the fellow friends. Individuals seemed to become more trusting of unknown others through emotional connections to their friends. Hence friends were likely to matter more for trust relations than the utilitarian count.

Alternatively, the analysis designated the kinship ties rather than the non-kinship ties as strategic for trust relations. This finding also underlined a much-neglected aspect in the operational definition of trust. The analysis showed that generalized trust was also about being willing to embrace risks about the unknown others, as it was about familiarity with the variable human conditions and behaviors. This willingness, in turn, boiled down to an ability to deal with possible disappointment as a result of one's decision to trust. The safety net kinship ties provide emerged as significant to ease the risk-taking tendency. Once individuals felt that they could act on their close kinship ties for instrumental action, they were likely to become more pro-active in social life as well.

These findings became more interesting when we focused on civil society variables

and a series of demographic variables. Model I of Table 1. showed the positive and significant influence of civil society activism on generalized trust. Yet once this activism was disaggregated into two different types of organizations in Model II, less hierarchical community level Putnam type civil society organizations proved as the positive and the significant determinant of generalized trust. Also, being employed and having attended the university were found significant. These findings underscored the importance of participation in a series of modern structures such as the workplace, the education system and the civil society for trust relations.

What do the findings so far tell us? They tell us the prominence of an active community life for extending trust to fellow citizens. It can well be claimed that those people who are social and participating in their communities, who have friends to rely on for emotional well-being, and who possess family ties to mobilize for power and wealth are also the ones who are more likely to trust people at large. These findings also invite for a re-consideration of the conceptual linkage between everyday, informal relations and generalized trust. People's informal relations matter not only because they make us familiar with different human conditions and behaviors, but also because people embrace the risks inherent in trust relations easier with the safety nets and the emotional support these relations provide. The analysis also shows that institutional channels are no substitutes for either the emotional or the strategic support the informal relations provide to build trust relations.

In line with the prior research, subjective happiness also emerged as a significant determinant of generalized trust. Among the demographic control variables, women proved more likely to trust than men, and old age emerged as a positive and significant determinant of trust.

What about the influence of the cross-country differences on generalized trust? As noted, all country dummy variables, except for Denmark, proved significantly different from the base category of Finland. Hence, as it was expected, cross-country differences were significant determinants of generalized trust as well.

The discrepancy of trust levels across countries can be better illustrated by presenting the predicted probabilities to trust in a series of selected countries. The probability calculations were computed for the employed man who did not attend university. The rest of the variables were set to their mean scores. Hence once all tie-based variables were held constant at their mean values, the probability to trust in Finland (0,38), Denmark (0,36), Switzerland (0,29), and France (0,25) emerged as the highest among all countries. Alternatively, the probability to trust in Poland (0,04), Hungary (0,04), Slovenia (0,05), Brazil (0,05) and South Africa (0,05) were found as the lowest.

These figures showed us the persistence of cross-country differences in generalized trust levels even when the influence of the relational variables were controlled for. This finding underscored the significance of macro-structural determinants of generalized trust such as the culture, economy and the ethnic make-up along with the micro-relational determinants. In other words, though individual's informal relations and relational ties influenced generalized trust, they did not come into existence in a vacuum; they were bound to the given socio-political environment. Hence the interactions between the macro- and the micro-foundations of generalized trust can well be designated as a

promising venue of future research.

Conclusion

The findings of the present study invited for a re-consideration of the conceptual relationship established between daily, informal social relations and generalized trust. It also calls for a re-examination of the measurement and analysis of these relations.

In general, social capital literature emphasized the need for individual's diverse contacts with different others and such contacts were hypothesized to induce more trusting citizens. Establishing diverse contacts, in turn, was related to bridging social capital; hence to weak ties which were different than one's primordial relations. Present research showed that non-kinship relations were relevant for trust relations, but not because higher numbers of such relations fostered trust. Indeed the size of close friends proved insignificant in the analysis. The relevance of non-kinship ties seem to lie in the emotional support they provided. This finding is important because it underlined the importance of the content of the relationship, which is an under-researched area in social capital literature. The differentiation among the ties on the basis of the purpose of action, then, proved relevant for trust relations.

The emphasis on the purpose of action further shed light to conceptual discussion on the relationship between the everyday, informal relations and generalized trust. The analysis showed the significant influence of the kinship relations which were used for instrumental action. Hence besides the contact with different others who provided emotional support, the decision to trust the fellow citizens seemed related to one's ability to discount the risks involved in trust relations. It was likely that kinship ties which may be mobilized for power and wealth purposes acted as the safety net that eased the risk-taking tendency. In sum, the focus on ties and their purpose of action showed that generalized trust is also about being willing to embrace risks about unknown others as it is about familiarity with different human conditions and behaviors.

The relevance of tie-level data also invited for further questioning about the measurement of the informal relationships. Thus far the social capital literature relied more heavily on group level relations such as the family, close friends, colleagues and the neighbors. Present study showed that the size, the weight and the properties of the given ties influenced generalized trust in different ways; hence measurement at the individual tie-level seemed a relevant venue of further investigation.

Lastly, the cross-country differences in generalized trust level persisted even when relational foundations of generalized trust were controlled for. This finding affirmed the fact that social relations did not come into existence in vacuum; rather they were bound to socio-political structure. Hence future research should delve more into details of the interactions between the macro-structural and the micro-relational determinants of generalized trust.

References

- Alesina, A. ve Giuliano, P. (2007). The Power of the Family. (NBER Working Paper 13051) URL: <http://www.nber.org/papers/w13051.pdf>
- Almond, G. ve Verba, S. (1963). *The Civic Culture*. California: Sage Publications.
- Banfield, E. C. (1958). *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bjornskov, C. (2007). Determinants of Generalized trust: A Cross-Country Comparison. *Public Choice*, 130 (1), 1-21.
- Dekker, P. (2005). Social Capital of Individuals: Relational Assets or Personal Quality? (Der. Prakash, S. and Selle , P.), *Investigating Social Capital içinde* (s. 88-110) New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Delhey, J. ve Newton, K. (2005). Predicting Cross-National Levels of Social Trust: Global Pattern or Nordic Exceptionalism? *European Sociological Review*, 21 (4), 311-327.
- Farole, T. Rodriguez-Pose, A. ve Storper, M. (2007) *Social Capital, Rules, and Institutions: A Cross-Country Investigation* (Working Paper No.12) Instituto Madrileño de Estudios Avanzados (IMDEA) Ciencias Sociales.
- Gambetta, D. (1988). Mafia: The price of Distrust. (Der. Gambetta, D.,) *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations içinde* (s. 158-175) New York, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Gambetta, D. (1993). *The Sicilian Mafia: The Business of Private Protection* Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Granovetter, M. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78 (6), 1360-1380.
- Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and Post-modernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R. ve Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ISSP Research Group (2003). *International Social Survey Programme: Social Relations and Support Systems / Social Networks II - ISSP 2001*. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA3680 Data file Version 1.0.0, doi:10.4232/1.3680
- Knack, S. ve Keefer, P. (1997). "Does Social Capital Have an Economic Pay-off? A Cross-Country Investigation. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112 (4), 1271-1274.
- Knack, S. (2003). Groups, Growth, and Trust: Cross-country Evidence for Olson and Putnam Hypotheses. *Public Choice*, 117 (3-4), 341-355.
- Lin, Nan. (2007). *Building a Network Theory of Social Capital*. (Der. Lin, N. Cook, K. ve Burt, R. S.,) *Social Capital içinde* (s. 3-31) New Jersey: Transaction Publications.

- Long, S. J. ve Freese, J. (2006). *Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables Using Stata*. Texas: Stata Press Publication.
- Luhmann, N. (1979). *Trust and Power*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Luhmann, N. (1988). Familiarity, Confidence, Trust: Problems and Alternatives. (Der. D. Gambetta), *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations içinde* (s. 94-109) New York, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Narayan, D. (1999). *Bonds and Bridges: Social Capital and Poverty*. (The World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 2167).
- URL: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/989601468766526606/pdf/multi-page.pdf>
- Norris, P. (1999). *Critical Citizens*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Paxton, P. (2007). Association Memberships and Generalized Trust: A Multi-level Model Across 31 Countries. *Social Forces*, 86 (1), 47-76.
- Pichler, F ve Wallace, C. (2007). Patterns of Formal and Informal Social Capital in Europe. *European Sociological Review*, 23 (4), 423-435.
- Putnam, R. Nanetti, R. ve Leonardi, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.
- Putnam, R. (2007). E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30 (2), 137-174.
- Scott, J. (1991). *Social Network Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Seligman, A. (1997). *The Problem of Trust*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Simmel, G. (1955). *The Web of Group Affiliations*. R. Bendix (Çev.). Illinois: The Free Press. (İlk baskı. 1922).
- Stolle, D. ve Rochon, T. R. (1988). Are All Associations Alike? Member Diversity, Associational Type, and the Creation of Social Capital. *The American Behavioral Scientist*. 42 (1), 47-65.
- Stolle, D. (2001). *Getting To Trust: An Analysis of the Importance of Institutions, Families, Personal Experiences And Group Membership*. (Der. Dekker, P. ve Uslaner, E.), *Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life içinde* (s. 118-134). London and New York: Routledge.
- Van der Gaag, M. ve Snijders, T. (2005) The Resource Generator: Social Capital Quantification with Concrete Items. *Social Networks*, 27 (1), 1-29.
- Uslaner, E. (2002). *Moral Foundations of Trust*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

PB | How Do Our Relations In Everyday Life Influence Our Trust In Strangers?
Theory And Evidence From Twenty-Seven Democracies

Woolcock, M. ve Narayan, D. (2000). Social Capital: Implications for Development Theory, Research and Policy. World Bank Research Observer, 15 (2), 225-249.