Public Services and Government

The Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

Exploring Dimensions of Social Capital in Scotland Findings from The Scottish Social Attitudes Survey and Scottish Household Survey

social research

EXPLORING DIMENSIONS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN SCOTLAND
FINDINGS FROM THE SCOTTISH SOCIAL ATTITUDES SURVEY AND SCOTTISH HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

Rachel Ormston and Susan Reid
ScotCen Social Research

Scottish Government Social Research
2012

The views expressed in this report are those of the researcher and do not necessarily represent those of the Scottish Government or Scottish Ministers.

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The purpose of this report is to explore whether different groups in society experience different levels of social capital. Does where you live affect the strength of your social networks? Are older or younger people more likely to benefit from having strong links with other people in their community? And are people who are already socio-economically disadvantaged further disadvantaged by having lower levels of social capital and therefore fewer resources to draw upon? It draws on data from the Scottish Social Attitudes survey (SSA) 2009[1] and the Scottish Household survey (SHS) 2010.

What is 'social capital'?

1.2 The concept of 'social capital' provides a framework for exploring a variety of individual and community-based assets which researchers and activists have argued can improve people's lives through creating resilience, building trust and improving physical and mental wellbeing.[2] Indeed, research evidence shows that high levels of social capital are associated with a range of positive outcomes for individuals and/or communities including better health and wellbeing, lower crime rates and higher educational achievement.[3] Although there are many different definitions of social capital, and different theoretical approaches underpinning these definitions, all of them centre around the importance of networks. For example, Robert Putnam (1996 and 2000) defines social capital as 'networks, norms, and trust that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives' and describes some of its benefits as 'mutual support, cooperation, trust, institutional effectiveness'.[4] The Office of National Statistics (ONS) has adopted the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) definition for their work on social capital. This definition is similar to Putnam's and again highlights the role of networks as well as the importance of shared values and understandings:

> *"Networks together with shared norms, values and understandings that facilitate co-operation within or among groups"* (Cote and Healy, 2001:41)

1.3 For some, such as Lin and Bourdieu, informal personal social networks are central to social capital, while others (for example, Putnam's early work) focus more on the role of formal networks.[5] A further refinement of this definition makes a distinction between bonding, bridging and linking social capital. Woolcock describes bonding social capital as relationships or networks

[1] The report uses SSA 2009 rather than later years because the 2009 survey included a wider range of measures of social capital.
[2] For evidence of the benefits of social capital on health and wellbeing see: Mackinnon J, Reid, M. & Kearns, A. (2006). Communities and health improvement: A review of evidence and approaches http://www.healthscotland.com/uploads/documents/2876-Communities%20and%20Health%20Improvement.pdf
[3] See for example ONS (2001) and OECD (2001).
[4] Note that trust may be both an indicator of social capital and an outcome of it – those who are more connected to their community may become more trusting as a result.
[5] As discussed in Li, Y., Pickles, A. & Savage, M. (2005).

between people in similar situations (for example, between family and close friends). In contrast, bridging social capital is formed between people with relatively more distant ties, such as work colleagues. Finally, linking social capital describes links formed with people outwith your own communities, or between people at different levels of a power hierarchy (for example, between an individual and a service provider – see Field, 2003 and Harper, 2002).

Why does social capital matter?

1.4 Policy makers in the UK have become increasingly interested in social capital and how it might be enhanced in recent years. In Scotland, strong, resilient communities are central to many of the Scottish Government's key strategic objectives and national outcomes. For example, the strategic objective to 'Help local communities to flourish, becoming stronger, safer places to live, offering improved opportunities and a better quality of life' (Safer and Stronger) reflects assumptions from social capital theory that if individuals and communities are supported to build their own capacities and networks this will lead to improvements in wellbeing.

1.5 In relation to health policy in particular, there has been growing interest in understanding how an 'assets-based' approach might help address some of Scotland's long-standing health problems and inequalities. The Chief Medical Officer's most recent annual report (2011) describes the assets-based approach as involving 'helping people to be in control of their lives by developing the capacities and capabilities of individuals and communities'. It highlights the 'recognition of social capital (the connections within and between social networks) and its importance as an asset' in discussing Area Based Community Development as an approach that could be applied to improve health and wellbeing.

1.6 Meanwhile, the Christie Commission report on the future delivery of public services (2011) has also argued that 'building personal and community capacity, resilience and autonomy' should be a key objective of future public service reform. Engaging individuals and communities in decisions about services is seen in the Scottish Government's response to that report - *Renewing Scotland's Public Services* - as key if public services are to become both more efficient and more effective at meeting people's needs. And arguably such 'co-production' of services can only be achieved if individuals and communities engage both with each other and with service providers – in other words, it relies on social capital.

1.7 This paper is an attempt to provide a greater empirical understanding of the social capital assets of different groups in Scottish society. Understanding the distribution of social capital may help policy makers develop further strategies to support the development of strong, resilient communities and individuals.

Social capital – an attribute of individuals, groups or places?

1.8 While social capital is usually discussed within the context of communities, as something that relies on the existence of links, networks and trust *between* people, it is arguably the case that some kinds of social capital – like a

willingness to trust other people or perceptions of the local area – are also attributes of *individuals*. In practice, attributes associated with individuals, groups of people and places may all contribute to forming social capital. This report uses individual level data from a survey to explore social capital, though the questions used may be tapping a combination of group, place and individual attributes. The precise ways in which these interact are not always obvious – for example, a person's perception of how often they regularly stop and speak to people in their area may be influenced by how often other people speak to them, by physical features of their local area, and by their own personal willingness or need to stop and speak to others. In interpreting the findings in this report, it is important to bear these potential interactions in mind – work to increase social capital may require a clearer understanding of the interactions between individuals, groups and places in supporting or maintaining particular kinds of asset.

2 ANALYTICAL APPROACH

2.1 The analysis in this paper is based on data from the Scottish Social Attitudes (SSA) survey (2009) and the Scottish Household Survey (SHS) (2010). The Scottish Social Attitudes survey is an annual survey exploring social and political attitudes. In 2009, it included a number of measures of social capital for modules funded by the Scottish Government and as part of its unfunded and background sections. The Scottish Household Survey is a continuous survey funded by the Scottish Government measuring the characteristics of households and individuals in Scotland. It includes a number of measures of social capital each year (2010 was the most recent year for which data was available at the time of writing).

2.2 The ten measures included in the analysis were selected in the light of a framework for measuring social capital in the UK, developed by ONS (Harper, 2002). This framework comprises the five different dimensions of social capital set out in table 1. In developing these dimensions, Harper (2002) takes a deliberately broad view of social capital, including aspects that may be important correlates of social capital (like views of the local area) as well as those (like social networks) that are more obviously a source or component of social capital.

2.3 Although this paper focuses primarily on data from SSA 2009, a smaller number of questions from SHS 2010 were also included to ensure that there was a suitable range of measures relating to all five dimensions. These questions are not the only ways in which these dimensions could be measured - it is of course possible that had we included a different set of questions, we would have found different results. The measures included are intended to cover at least one aspect of each dimension, but are not comprehensive. For example, questions around communities focus on geographical communities, rather than communities of interest, while questions about views of the local area focus on perceptions of anti-social behaviour.[6] Again, it is important to note that if other questions had been included – for example, focusing on more positive aspects of people's neighbourhoods – the results may have differed from those presented here.

[6] Decisions about which questions to include in were based on discussions with the Scottish Government and on pragmatic considerations about data availability and the extent to which questions had already been analysed and reported elsewhere. For example, variations on various additional questions about perceptions of the local area in SSA 2009 had already been analysed in a report on attitudes to sustainable places and greenspace (Reid and Curtice, 2010).

Table 1 – Summary of questions included in analyses

Aspect of social capital (ONS classification)	SSA 2009 questions	SHS 2010 questions
Social networks and social support	How strongly do you agree or disagree that: I regularly stop and speak to people in my area If my home was empty, I could count on one of my neighbours to keep an eye on it I feel that there are people in this area I could turn to for advice or support Agree strongly Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Disagree strongly	
Reciprocity and trust	Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?	
Civic participation	In the last few years, have you ever done any of the things on this card as a way of registering what you personally thought about an issues? If yes: Which ones[1]? Thinking about improving your local area, how much would you agree or disagree with this statement: 'It is just too difficult for someone like me to do much about improving my local area'?	I am going to read out a list of phrases which might be used to describe things a local council does. For each of these, please tell me to what extent you agree or disagree that it applies to your local council: I can influence decisions affecting my local area I would like to be more involved in the decisions my council makes that affect my local area
Views of local area	The next few questions are about anti-social behaviour in general. By this we mean behaviour like vandalism, drunken and rowdy behaviour, revving car engines or other behaviour that might be a nuisance or annoyance to others. How much of a problem do you think such behaviour is in your local area? A very big problem Quite a big problem Not a very big problem Not a problem at all	
Social participation		Whether respondent has volunteered, or not, in the last 12 months. (A derived variable from two questions asking about volunteering activity.)

1- List of possible answers which respondents selected all that applied were: No, have not done any of these, Contacted an MP or MSP; Contacted a government department directly; Contacted my local council; Responded to a consultation document; Attended a public meeting; Contacted radio, TV or a newspaper; Signed a petition (including online petitions); Raised the issue in an organisation I already belong to; Gone on a protest or demonstration; Attended an event organised as part of a consultation exercise; Spoken to an influential person; Formed a group of like-minded people; Joined an existing organisation; Actively took part in a campaign (e.g. leafleting, stuffing envelopes etc); Given money to a campaign or organisation.

2.4 The analysis conducted for this paper used logistic regression to explore which of a range of key demographic factors are independently associated with various aspects of social capital. Logistic regression is a statistical technique that allows you to examine the relationship between a dependent variable (in this case, various measures of social capital), and various independent variables (like gender, age, income, etc.). The analysis identifies which of these independent variables are significantly and independently related to the dependent variable, after controlling for the inter-relationships between variables.

2.5 Logistic regression models were created for each of ten measures based on questions from SSA 2009 and SHS 2010 that explored different elements of social capital. Each of these regression models looked at the relationship between the specific aspect of social capital – for example whether people feel they have people in their area to turn to for advice and support – and various demographic, socio-economic and area-based variables that might be associated with different levels of social capital. The socio-demographic and area-based variables included in the analyses were:

- Gender
- Age[7]
- Education
- Household income
- Socio-economic class (as measured by the National Statistics Socio-Economic Classification[8])
- Marital status
- Tenure (owner-occupier, private renter, or social renter)
- Whether or not the respondent has a disability
- Whether or not there are school-aged children in the household
- Urban-rural (based on the Scottish Government urban-rural classification[9])
- Deprivation (as measured by the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation[10]).

[7] Respondents were divided into four age categories – 18-29, 30-39, 40-64 and 65+. It is perhaps worth noting that different sub-groups may have been associated with somewhat different findings. For example, it is possible that there may be differences between relatively younger and older people within the oldest age category (65+).

[8] SSA uses the National Statistics Socio-Economic Classification (NS-SEC). *SSA* respondents were classified according to their own occupation, rather than that of the 'head of household'. Each respondent was asked about their current or last job, so that all respondents, with the exception of those who had never worked, were classified. The seven NS-SEC categories are: Employers in large organisations, higher managerial and professional; Lower professional and managerial; Higher technical and supervisory; Intermediate occupations; Small employers and own account workers; Lower supervisory and technical occupations; Semi-routine occupations; Routine occupations. The remaining respondents were grouped as 'never had a job' or 'not classifiable'.

[9] See http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2008/07/29152642/7 for details of the Scottish Government urban-rural classification.

[10] The Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) 2009 measures the level of deprivation across Scotland – from the least deprived to the most deprived areas, based on 38 indicators in seven domains of: income, employment, health, education skills and training, housing, geographic access and crime. For more details about SIMD, see http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/SIMD/.

2.6 These variables were chosen partly based on evidence from previous work on social capital, and partly on the basis of hypotheses about additional factors that might affect social capital. For example previous analysis of SSA data has shown variations in levels of 'community-connectedness' by gender, age, income and area deprivation (Anderson and Dobbie, 2008), while analysis of Understanding Society data (a longitudinal study of households in the UK) shows that people with higher incomes tend to score more highly than those with lower incomes on various measures of social participation[11] (Ferragina et al, 2011). Research by Li et al (2005) on three dimensions of social capital (neighbourhood attachment, social networks and civic participation) suggests that class, education, income, gender, age and social deprivation are all significantly associated with differing levels of social capital.

2.7 Meanwhile, other research has suggested that being in a relationship is positively associated with higher levels of wellbeing,[12] which might in part be explained by the impact of relationships on widening (or deepening) people's networks and social capital. Similarly, having children may broaden people's social networks and may therefore have an impact on levels of social capital. Being disabled could impact on people's social capital in different ways. For example, barriers relating to the accessibility of public spaces and buildings might have a negative impact on people's social networks. On the other hand, experiences of such barriers might encourage disabled people to get more involved in trying to change and influence their communities. Finally, given the diverse geography of Scotland, the Scottish Government had a particular interest in exploring whether or not living in an urban or rural area is associated with higher or lower levels of social capital.

2.8 Differences in social capital by ethnicity and religion could not be robustly explored due to small sample sizes for key sub-groups. Data on sexual orientation was not available in the data used for this study.

Limits of the analysis

2.9 Logistic regression is a useful technique for exploring the relationship between multiple 'independent' variables and a given outcome. However, it can only tell us if a statistically significant and independent relationship exists between each variable and the outcome. It cannot tell us whether or not these 'independent' variables cause this outcome – such conclusions can only be made on the basis of experimental research. In the context of this paper, this means that we cannot conclusively say that, for example, having a higher level of education leads directly to higher levels of social capital. All we can say is whether or not a relationship between the two appears to exist. Assumptions about the

[11] Specifically, neighbouring (as measured by an 8 item version of Buckner's Neighbourhood Cohesion Instrument, which covers things like feeling of belonging to a neighbourhood, willingness to seek advice from someone in the neighbourhood, and willingness to work together to improve the neighbourhood), general trust (based on two questions, one about the extent to which most people can be trusted or not and another about willingness to take risks with strangers) and interest in politics (as measured on a 4 point scale from 'Very interested' to 'Not at all interested).

[12] Galloway, S., Bell, D., Hamilton, C. and Scullion, A (2006) *Quality of Life and Wellbeing: Measuring the Benefits of Culture and Sport: A Literature Review and Thinkpiece*, Scottish Executive Social Research.

direction and nature of this relationship rely on hypotheses on the part of those interpreting the data.[13]

2.10 Other limits relate to the possibility of drilling down to very specific sub-groups. As noted above, differences by ethnicity or religion could not be explored due to the small numbers of people falling into particular sub-groups. It is also worth noting that while this report looks at variations by deprivation and by urban-rural, it does not compare patterns of social capital in deprived urban areas with those in deprived rural areas. Given that rural deprivation is often relatively dispersed, there may be differences in the relationship between deprivation and social capital between rural and urban areas. However, this analysis is beyond the scope of this report.

[13] It is also worth noting that some of the independent variables included in the regressions differed slightly for SHS and SSA, reflecting differences in the way the data for that variable was collected or processed. However, variables in each dataset were recoded for analysis so that categories were as consistent as possible across analyses.

3 KEY FINDINGS

- Overall the findings show that social capital varies significantly across different socio-economic and demographic groups.
- Different factors appear significant for different dimensions of social capital. For example, whether or not people had regular contact with people in their local area varied significantly by age, while feeling you could rely on a neighbour to keep an eye on your home varied by tenure.
- However, three key factors emerge as significantly associated with differing levels of social capital across at least four of the five dimensions.
    - People living in rural areas (particularly remote rural areas) consistently indicated higher levels of social capital compared with those in large urban areas.
    - People living in the least deprived areas of Scotland had higher levels of social capital than those in the most deprived areas.
    - People who are educated to degree level generally had higher levels of social capital, particularly in comparison with those with no educational qualifications.
- Age was significantly associated with three aspects of social capital in particular – social networks, civic participation and views of the local area. However, the pattern by age was not uniform and varied depending on the particular aspect of social capital in question. While for example, older people appear to have better 'bridging' social capital – those aged over 65 were more likely than those under 30 to say they regularly stop and speak to people in their area. However, they were significantly *less* likely than younger people to want to be more involved in decisions their council makes that affect their local area. Younger people, aged 18-29, were the age group most likely to feel that anti-social behaviour was a problem in their area.
- Other factors that were significantly and independently related to particular measures of social capital but not to others were:
    - social class (employers managers and professionals were the socio-economic group most likely to have volunteered and least likely to feel it was too difficult for them to do anything to improve their local area)
    - income (those on high incomes were less likely than those on low incomes to feel anti-social behaviour was a problem in their area)
    - gender (women were less trusting than men of people in general, but more likely to have volunteered in the last 12 months)
    - tenure (owner occupiers were more likely than social or private renters to agree that they have a neighbour they could count on to keep an eye on their home), and
    - disability (people with a long-standing illness or disability were slightly more likely than those without a disability to have done something active to register their views).
- The only factors that were not significantly related to any of the social capital measures included in this paper were whether there are school-aged children in the household and marital status.

4 DETAILED FINDINGS

4.1 The findings discussed here are based on the regression analyses described above. Where a factor is described as significantly associated with one of the measures of social capital, this indicates (unless otherwise specified in text or footnotes) that it is independently statistically significant, even after its relationship with other variables is taken into account in a regression model.[14] Full output from the regression analyses conducted for this paper are included in Annex A. In the following discussion, simple percentages are used (based on bivariate cross-tabulations) to illustrate key points.

Social networks and support

4.2 As discussed above, networks are central to definitions of social capital. The relationships people have with others are both a source of support to them as individuals and key to enabling mutual cooperation towards shared outcomes. This section explores findings from three questions from SSA 2009 relating to access to social networks and social support.

4.3 The first two questions relate to networks that could be characterised as bridging, since they describe relationships with neighbours and others in the local area. Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed that:

- 'I regularly stop and speak to people in my area' and
- 'If my home was empty, I could count on one of my neighbours to keep an eye on it'.

4.4 Having regular contact with others in the local area varies significantly with whether one lives in an urban or rural area, age and, to a lesser extent, education and gender[15] (Table 2):

- 51% of those in remote rural areas agreed strongly that they regularly stop and speak to people in their area compared with only 20% of people living in large urban areas.
- 37% of those aged 65 or over agreed strongly that they regularly stop and speak to people in their area compared with 17% of 18-29 year olds.

[14] As a general rule, if something is marginally significant (p = >0.05 but >=0.10) in a multivariate regression model, but the bivariate relationship with the dependent variable is highly significant (p >=0.05), the bivariate relationship is reported in the text and tables, with the qualification that this relationship does not hold once other factors are taken into account. If a variable is only marginally significant in both multivariate and bivariate analyses, differences are not generally reported in the text and tables.

[15] Differences by gender are only only marginally significant in the regression model (p = 0.093). However, differences in the proportion of men and women strongly agreeing that they regularly stop and speak to people in their area are significant at the bivariate level (p = 0.049). In contrast, having school-aged children in the household was marginally significant in the regression analysis but differences were not significant at the bivariate level (regardless of whether agree and strongly agree were banded together or not). Given that it was only marginally significant in the regression model and not significant at all at the bivariate level, whether or not there were school-aged children in the household is not included in Table 2, above.

- People with degrees were somewhat less likely than other groups to agree that they regularly stop and speak to people in their local area (67% compared with 74-78% of those with lower levels of qualification).[16] This perhaps reflects graduates belonging to more geographically dispersed social networks, rather than networks defined by their local area.
- Women were more likely to agree strongly that they regularly stop and speak to people in their area.

Table 2 – Agree/disagree that 'I regularly stop and speak to people in my area' by age, education, urban-rural (SSA 2009)

	Agree strongly	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree/ Strongly disagree	Sample size
	%	%	%	%	N
Age					
18-29	17	43	11	30	179
30-39	19	48	12	21	223
40-64	27	48	9	15	677
65+	37	49	5	9	402
Urban-rural					
Large urban	20	48	9	23	437
Other urban	21	48	11	20	375
Accessible small town	34	45	10	11	123
Remote small town	34	54	5	7	105
Accessible rural	33	46	7	13	264
Remote rural	51	42	4	3	178
Education					
Degree/HE	27	40	12	21	490
Highers/A-levels	24	52	8	17	231
Standard Grades/GCSEs	25	53	8	14	427
None	28	46	7	20	324
Gender					
Female	28	47	7	18	826
Male	23	47	12	18	656

4.5 Table 3 shows that tenure was the only factor significantly associated with agreeing or strongly agreeing that 'if my home was empty, I could count on one of my neighbours to look after it'. Owner-occupiers were most likely to strongly agree or agree that they have a neighbour they could count on to keep an eye on their home (92% of owner-occupiers agreed with this statement, compared with 75% of social renters and 66% of private renters – Table 3).[17] One

[16] Education was significant in the regression analysis. However, none of the individual categories were significantly different from the reference category (no qualifications). This probably reflects the fact that the pattern of response by education was not linear – rather, graduates simply stand out from other groups on this measure.

[17] Note that combined figures (for example, 'agree' plus 'strongly agree') are combined in SPSS, to avoid rounding errors. As such, they may vary by a percentage point from the sum of the (rounded) individual figures.

explanation for why only tenure was significant in the regression is that the regression analysis combines those who strongly agree and agree together. At the bivariate level people in the least deprived areas, rural areas and older people are all more likely to agree strongly that they can count on their neighbours.

Table 3 – Agree/disagree that 'If my home was empty, I could count on one of my neighbours to keep an eye on it' by tenure (SSA 2009)

	Agree strongly	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree/ Strongly disagree	Sample size
	%	%	%	%	N
Tenure					
Owner	43	48	4	4	979
Social renter	29	47	6	17	152
Private renter	25	40	4	30	331

4.6 The third question asked people how much they agreed or disagreed that: 'I feel that there are people in this area I could turn to for advice and support'. This could be characterised as measuring the existence of closer networks, or bonding social capital. Here, whether people lived in urban or rural areas and area deprivation were particularly significant (Table 4).

- People in remote rural areas were significantly more likely than those in urban areas to feel they had people locally they could turn to for advice (90% of those in remote rural areas agreed with this statement, compared with 67% in large urban areas).
- People in the most deprived areas were less likely to have someone to turn to locally (65% of those in the most deprived areas agreed with this statement, compared with 82% of those in the least deprived areas).

Table 4 – Agree/disagree that 'I feel that there are people in this area I could turn to for advice and support' by age, urban-rural, area deprivation and tenure (SSA 2009)

	Agree strongly	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree/ Strongly disagree	Sample size
	%	%	%	%	N
Urban-rural					
Large urban	20	47	13	20	437
Other urban	18	51	13	17	375
Accessible small town	29	43	12	15	123
Remote small town	34	49	8	9	105
Accessible rural	29	49	7	15	264
Remote rural	42	48	4	6	178
Area deprivation					
1st Least deprived	28	53	7	11	288
2nd	32	42	12	14	346
3rd	20	51	11	17	317
4th	20	47	14	19	278
5th Most deprived	15	49	12	23	253
Age					
18-29	13	53	13	21	179
30-39	21	47	15	16	223
40-64	25	46	11	17	677
65+	32	49	7	12	402
Tenure					
Owner	27	48	11	13	979
Private renter	15	45	12	27	152
Social renter	17	51	11	21	331

4.7 It would appear from Table 4 that the proportion who strongly agree that they have someone they can turn to increases with age, from 13% of those aged 18-29 to 32% of those over 65. However, although age was also significant in the regression analysis (model 3), once other factors are taken into account the relationship between the different age categories and agreeing that you have people locally you can turn to for advice was less clear: while age as a whole was significant, the 30-39, 40-64 and 65+ categories were not significantly different from the reference category (18-29). Similarly, at the bivariate level owner-occupiers were significantly more likely than both social and private renters to agree strongly that they had people locally they could turn to for advice and support, perhaps because they are a less transient population and are more likely to have lived in their home for longer than those who are renting. However, tenure is only marginally significant in the regression analysis.[18]

Social trust

4.8 Trust is a core element of social capital and features strongly in the theoretical and research literature. Strongly correlated to social participation (for example,

[18] P = 0.089. Note that gender is also marginally significant in both the regression analysis and marginally significant at the bivariate level.

taking part in groups or clubs, or volunteering),[19] trust is viewed as an essential part of building the relationships which sit at the heart of the concept of social capital. SSA has included a question on 'general' social trust on a regular basis since 2000. Respondents are asked 'Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?' Regression analysis shows that men, people living in less deprived areas and people living in remote rural areas and remote small towns were all relatively more likely to think most people can be trusted (Table 5):

- 58% of men compared with 45% of women said most people can be trusted. This finding reflects recent analysis of Understanding Society (the UK's household longitudinal study) which showed that men were more likely than women to exhibit higher levels of trust (Ferragina et al, 2011).
- People living in the least deprived areas of Scotland were more than twice as likely to say that most people can be trusted compared with those in the most deprived areas: 65% compared with 31%.
- 68% of those living in remote rural areas and 62% of those living in remote small towns felt that most can be trusted, compared with 46-48% of those in large or other urban areas.

4.9 Education was also statistically significantly related to trust, although the pattern was not completely linear. Sixty-two per cent of those with degrees, compared with 40% of those with standard grade-level qualifications and 45% of those with no qualifications felt most could be trusted. Again, this reflects similar findings from Understanding Society. Finally, although only marginally significant in multivariate analysis, at the bivariate level tenure was significant – 58% of owner-occupiers, compared with 32% of social renters said most can be trusted.

[19] For evidence of the link between trust and volunteering, see Brown and Ferris (2004).

Table 5 – 'Most people can be trusted or can't be too careful in dealing with people' by gender, education, urban-rural and area deprivation (SSA 2009)

	Most people can be trusted	Can't be too careful dealing with people	Sample size
	%	%	N
Gender			
Female	45	51	826
Male	58	41	656
Area deprivation			
1st Least deprived	65	33	288
2nd	62	36	346
3rd	54	45	317
4th	43	54	278
5th Most deprived	31	65	253
Urban-rural			
Large urban	48	49	437
Other urban	46	52	375
Accessible small town	52	47	123
Remote small town	62	35	105
Accessible rural	61	37	264
Remote rural	68	29	178
Education			
Degree/HE	62	35	490
Highers/A-levels	56	40	231
Standard Grades/GCSEs	40	58	427
None	45	52	324
Tenure			
Owner	58	40	979
Private renter	51	65	152
Social renter	32	45	331

Involvement in community and civic life (participation)

4.10 Social and civic participation are included as two separate dimensions of social capital in the ONS measurement framework. Social participation concerns involvement in groups around leisure, social activities or voluntary organisations whereas civic participation is about having your voice heard in society. Measures of the former could include participation in volunteering, or in social clubs and groups. Measures of the latter include voting behaviour, contact with elected officials, involvement in campaigns, confidence in institutions and people's perceptions of their ability to influence political decisions.

Social participation

4.11 This report looks at just one measure of social participation – volunteering. Education, whether people lived in an urban or rural area, class, gender and area deprivation were all significantly associated with participation in volunteering in the last 12 months, as measured by SHS 2010.

4.12 The direction of the relationships with urban-rural and area deprivation is similar to that seen above for social networks and social trust – that is, higher levels of volunteering are seen among those living in rural areas and those in the least deprived areas of Scotland. People in remote rural areas are particularly likely to have volunteered – 47%, compared with 28% of people living in large urban areas and 29% in other urban areas. Other studies have often noted issues around availability of services in rural areas (e.g. Scottish Government, 2011). It is possible that higher rates of volunteering in remote areas reflect perceptions of rural services – that people volunteer in part to fill perceived gaps in service availability.

4.13 Meanwhile, just 17% of those in the most deprived areas have volunteered, compared with 39% of people living in the least deprived areas of Scotland (Table 6). Participation in volunteering also increased with level of educational qualification – from 15% among those with no qualifications to 43% among graduates.

Table 6 – Whether volunteered in past 12 months by gender, education, class, income, urban-rural and area deprivation (SHS 2010)

	Yes – have volunteered in past 12 mths	No – have not volunteered in past 12 mths	Sample size
	%	%	N
Education			
Degree/HE	43	57	2065
Highers/A-levels	36	64	761
Standard Grades/GCSEs	28	72	952
None	15	85	1810
Class			
Employers/mgrs & professional	46	54	1288
Intermediate occupations	31	69	410
Small employers/ own account workers	37	63	304
Lower supervisory & technical	22	78	385
Semi-routine & routine occupations	25	75	1046
Urban-rural			
Large urban	28	72	1602
Other urban	29	71	1822
Accessible small town	32	68	523
Remote small town	34	66	363
Accessible rural	38	62	785
Remote rural	47	53	540
Gender			
Female	34	66	3184
Male	29	71	2452
Area deprivation			
1st Least deprived	39	61	1083
2nd	38	62	1259
3rd	32	68	1217
4th	27	73	1161
5th Most deprived	17	83	914
Income			
£11,999 or less	23	77	1434
£12k-£22,999	26	74	1815
£23K-£37,999	36	64	1319
£38K+	42	58	887

4.14 Although women were less likely to think most people could be trusted (and trust has been linked with higher levels of volunteering – see for example Brown and Ferris, 2004), they were more likely to have participated in volunteering (34% compared with 29% of men). Social class was also significant – employers and managers were most likely to have volunteered (46% compared with 22-37% of other socio-economic class groups). Meanwhile, at the bivariate level those earning over £23,000 were more likely to have volunteered (36-42%, compared with 23-26% of those earning under £23,000). However, the relationship between volunteering and income was

only marginally significant when other factors are controlled for in multivariate regression analysis.

4.15 Thus overall the picture that emerges in relation to social participation is that it is those who are already in a more privileged socio-economic position in society who are most likely to spend time volunteering. Employers, managers or professionals, people earning more than £23,000 per annum, those with more formal qualifications and people living in the least deprived areas were all more likely to volunteer. In addition women and those living in rural areas were more likely to be involved in volunteering. These findings are consistent with those reported in the 2009 SHS annual report (Scottish Government, 2011), which showed lower levels of volunteering among those in the most deprived areas of Scotland and those earning less than £15,000.

Civic participation

4.16 Four questions (two from SSA 2009 and two from SHS 2010) were used to explore levels of civic participation. The questions cover two aspects of civic participation: active involvement (both actual, and whether people would like to be more involved), and how empowered people feel to influence decisions locally. Respondents were asked:

- Whether or not they had done anything to register their views on an issue in the last few years (SSA 2009) – analysis focused on those who had done something 'active' to make their views known (that is, something beyond simply signing a petition or giving money to a charity or campaign)
- Whether they agreed or disagreed that 'It is just too difficult for someone like me to do much about improving my local area' (SSA 2009)
- Whether they agreed or disagreed that 'I can influence decisions affecting my local area' (SHS 2010), and
- Whether they agreed or disagreed that 'I would like to be more involved in the decisions my council makes that affect my local area' (SHS 2010).

4.17 Education was significantly associated with all four of these measures of civic participation (Tables 7-10). People with higher levels of educational qualification were more likely than those with lower or no qualifications to have already done something active to register their views, to feel more empowered to influence decisions affecting their area, and to want to be more involved in the decision making process. For example, Table 7 shows that 56% of people with degrees compared with only 33% of those with no recognised qualification had done something active to register their views in the past few years, while Table 9 shows that 26% of graduates compared with 17% of those with no qualifications strongly agreed or tended to agree that they could influence decisions affecting their local area.

4.18 Age was significant for three of the four measures. However, the pattern by age varied between different measures (Tables 7, 8 &10):

- People aged 40-64 were the age group most likely to have done something active to register their views (48% compared with 36-39% of those aged under 40).

- Those aged under 65 years, and especially those aged 30-39 years-old were more likely than those in the oldest age group to say they would like to be more involved in council decisions affecting the local area (46% of those aged 30-39 years old strongly agreed or tended to agree that they would like to be more involved, compared with 18% of those aged 65 or above).
- Meanwhile, people in both the oldest (65 plus) and youngest (18-29) age groups appear to be relatively more likely than those in the middle-age groups to feel that it is too difficult for them to do much about improving their local area (Table 8).[20]

4.19 In summary then, 40-64 year-olds were most likely to already be active in terms of civic participation, 30-39 year-olds were most likely to want to be more active in future, while both 18-29 year-olds and those aged 65 or older were more likely to feel disempowered with respect to their ability to influence decisions about their area. Further research could explore some of the reasons for these differences by age – for example, do older people feel disempowered because they are limited by mobility problems in terms of attending meetings? Or does the perceived lack of efficacy among older and younger people reflect a lack of knowledge about how to influence decisions, or a feeling that their views will not be listened to?

[20] This pattern is apparent at the bivariate level. However, multivariate analysis only shows that those aged 30 and over a more likely than those aged 18-29 to *disagree* that it is too difficult for them to do much about improving their area.

Table 7 – Whether participated to make views known by age, education and whether have a disability (SSA 2009)

	Done nothing to register views	Done something active to register views	Done something passive to register views	Sample size
	%	%	%	N
Education				
Degree/HE	31	56	12	490
Highers/A-levels	51	39	10	231
Standard Grades/GCSEs	51	40	9	427
No recognised qualification	56	33	11	324
Age				
18-29	53	36	12	179
30-39	46	39	15	223
40-64	41	48	10	677
65+	46	45	8	402
Whether has a disability				
Yes	43	49	8	457
No	46	42	12	1025
Income[2]				
£11,999 or less	51	42	6	321
£12k-£22,999	41	47	11	288
£23K-£37,999	49	42	9	259
£38K+	56	33	10	331

1 – Participants were asked to say which, if any, of a list of things they had done as a way of registering what they thought about an issue in the last few years. Those who only mentioned giving money or signing a petition were classed as having done something 'passive' to make their views known, on the basis that neither action requires significant time or engagement with others. Those who had taken one of the other actions listed (including contacting an MP, MSP or local council, attending meetings, going on protests, etc.) were classed as having done something more 'active' to make their views known.

2 – Income was marginally significant in the regression model, p=0.10.

Table 8 – Agreeing/ disagreeing 'It is just too difficult for someone like me to do much about improving my local area' by age, education, class, urban-rural and area deprivation (SSA 2009)

	Agree strongly	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree/ Strongly disagree	Sample size
	%	%	%	%	N
Age					
18-29	14	38	31	16	161
30-39	5	32	30	32	205
40-64	6	26	29	35	611
65+	13	32	25	22	339
Education					
Degree/HE	5	23	27	43	451
Highers/A-levels	9	31	30	27	208
Standard Grades/GCSEs	11	37	29	19	381
None	13	33	32	16	271
Class					
Employers/mgrs & professional	5	26	24	42	482
Intermediate occupations	9	30	39	19	147
Small employers/ own account workers	8	26	31	30	122
Lower supervisory & technical	11	27	42	17	155
Semi-routine & routine occupations	12	38	26	19	386
Urban-rural					
Large urban	10	32	28	27	382
Other urban	9	34	30	24	337
Accessible small town	8	26	33	31	105
Remote small town	6	24	37	22	87
Accessible rural	8	28	29	30	244
Remote rural	8	17	23	46	162
Area deprivation					
1st Least deprived	3	27	29	38	261
2nd	7	27	27	35	313
3rd	8	29	38	22	285
4th	11	35	25	24	243
5th Most deprived	16	35	26	19	215

Table 9 – Agree/disagree 'I can influence decisions affecting my local area' by education and urban-rural (SHS 2010)

	Strong agree/ tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Sample size
	%	%	%	%	%	N
Education						
Degree/HE	26	17	30	21	7	3191
Highers/A-levels	22	17	30	23	8	1254
Standard Grades/GCSEs	18	15	29	28	10	1521
None	17	14	28	31	10	2972
Urban-rural						
Large urban	22	15	28	27	9	2971
Other urban	19	18	30	24	10	2732
Accessible small town	21	16	31	25	6	822
Remote small town	16	15	36	23	10	536
Accessible rural	23	15	29	26	8	1165
Remote rural	31	12	29	22	6	793

Table 10 – Agree/disagree 'I would like to be more involved in the decisions my council makes that affect my local area' by education and urban-rural (SHS 2010)

	Strong agree/ tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Sample size
	%	%	%	%	%	N
Age						
16-29[1]	37	17	19	17	10	1249
30-39	46	15	17	16	6	1297
40-64	40	16	20	19	5	3878
65+	18	12	29	34	6	2594
Education						
Degree/HE	46	17	19	13	5	3191
Highers/A-levels	38	17	21	18	6	1254
Standard Grades/GCSEs	37	14	20	22	7	1521
None	22	13	24	34	8	2927
Urban-rural						
Large urban	39	14	19	21	7	2971
Other urban	34	16	21	21	7	2732
Accessible small town	31	16	26	22	5	822
Remote small town	36	15	21	21	7	536
Accessible rural	36	16	21	21	6	1165
Remote rural	38	11	23	23	5	793

1-SHS collects data from individuals aged 16 and above, so all respondents to the survey are included in the analysis from aged 16. SSA, however, only includes respondents from age 18.

4.20 Other significant variations with respect to questions on civic participation included:

- People living in remote rural areas, compared with people in all other types of areas, were more likely to feel empowered to influence local decisions and able to improve their local area. 31% of people in remote rural areas compared with 22% of people living in large urban areas strongly agreed or tended to agree that they could influence decisions affecting their local area.[21]
- Social class was significantly associated with feeling able to improve the local area – 42% of employers, managers and professionals compared with 19% of those in routine or semi-routine occupations disagreed that it was too difficult for them to do anything about this.

[21] Whether people live in a rural or urban setting was also significantly associated with wanting to be more involved in council decision making in the multivariate analysis (those living in other urban areas, accessible small towns and accessible rural areas were all *less* likely than those in large urban areas to want to be more involved). However, there was no clear pattern at the bivariate level.

- Deprivation was also associated with feeling able to improve the local area. Although the pattern was less clear in the multivariate model, at the bivariate level, those in less deprived areas were less likely than those in the most deprived areas to feel it was too difficult for them to improve their local areas.[22]
- People with a long-standing illness or disability were more likely than those without a disability to have done something active to register their views (49% compared with 42% respectively). This might in part reflect the older age profile of those with a disability, since older people are relatively more likely to have done something active to register their views. However, regression analysis suggests that disability is significant even once age is taken into account. An alternative interpretation would be that perhaps some disabled people see a greater need for change in society and are therefore more vocal about their views.[23]

Views of local area

4.21 The fifth and final dimension in the ONS social capital framework relates to people's views of their local area. As discussed above, although Harper (2002) acknowledges that positive views of the local area may not be a direct indicator or outcome of high social capital, it is an important correlate of it, and is therefore included in the ONS framework. Harper suggests that views of the local area can include views of the physical environment, facilities, enjoyment of living in the area and fear of crime or anti-social behaviour. This report focuses on one specific more negative aspect of views of local area – perceptions of how problematic anti-social behaviour is believed to be in the local area (based on data from SSA 2009). Anti-social behaviour (ASB) was described to respondents as 'behaviour like vandalism, drunken and rowdy behaviour, revving car engines or other behaviour that might be a nuisance or annoyance to others' and respondents were asked to say whether such behaviour was a very big problem, quite a big problem, not a very big problem, or not a problem at all.

4.22 Whether people live in an urban or rural area and especially area deprivation were both strongly related to perceptions of antisocial behaviour, with those living in rural areas and in less deprived areas less likely to say that ASB is a problem. For example, 35% of people in the least deprived areas of Scotland said that ASB is not a problem at all in their area, compared with only 11% of people in the most deprived areas (Table 11). Meanwhile, 47% of those in remote rural areas compared with between 18% and 22% of those in urban areas or accessible small towns reported that anti-social behaviour was not a problem at all locally. Those on higher incomes were also less likely to feel that

[22] Area deprivation was also marginally significantly associated with agreeing 'I would like to be more involved in the decisions my council makes that affect my local area' in the regression analysis (Annex A, Model 9, p = 0.080). However, variations at the bivariate level did not follow a clear pattern, so deprivation is not included in Table 10, above.

[23] Income was only marginally significantly related to having something active to register ones views in the regression analysis. However, it was not significant at the bivariate level, so is not reported here.

anti-social behaviour was a problem locally (28% of those with household incomes of £38,000 or more said anti-social behaviour was not a problem, compared with 19-21% of those on lower incomes).

4.23 Age and social class were also significantly associated with thinking anti-social behaviour was a problem at a bivariate level, though each was only marginally significant when other factors were taken into account in multivariate analysis. While the bivariate pattern by social class was not linear, older people were less likely than younger people to say that ASB was a problem (80% of those aged 65 or older compared with 59% of 18-29 year-olds said ASB was not a big problem or not a problem at all).

Table 11 – How big a problem anti-social behaviour is in your local area by income, urban-rural and area deprivation (SSA 2009)

	A very big problem	Quite a big problem	Not a very big problem	Not a problem at all	Sample size
	%	%	%	%	N
Area deprivation					
1st Least deprived	*	12	53	35	295
2nd	3	12	53	33	319
3rd	7	21	45	26	287
4th	8	27	49	16	295
5th Most deprived	18	31	40	11	286
Urban-rural					
Large urban	10	20	47	22	437
Other urban	6	22	53	18	375
Accessible small town	8	28	46	18	123
Remote small town	4	21	47	27	105
Accessible rural	3	14	46	37	264
Remote rural	2	12	40	47	178
Income					
£11,999 or less	10	29	42	19	321
£12k-£22,999	12	19	48	20	288
£23K-£37,999	8	22	49	21	259
£38K+	4	16	52	28	331
Income unknown	3	18	48	31	283
Social class					
Employers/mgrs & professional (reference)	5	16	52	26	532
Intermediate occupations	7	22	48	23	169
Small employers/ own account workers	8	21	33	38	139
Lower supervisory & technical	6	17	57	20	166
Semi-routine & routine occupations	8	26	45	21	442
Age					
18-29	15	26	45	14	179
30-39	7	22	45	25	233
40-64	5	19	51	25	677
65+	4	16	46	34	402

4.24 As noted in section 2, above, perceptions of ASB is only one (negative) indicator of people's views of the local area. It is possible that responses to questions that tap more positive aspects of the local area would be associated with different patterns. However, it is worth noting that analysis of questions exploring people's general rating of their area as a place to live in both SSA and SHS show broadly similar patterns to those described above. For example, Reid and Curtice (2010) found those on lower incomes and those in deprived areas were more likely than those on higher incomes and in less deprived areas to rate their areas *below* average as places to live. Meanwhile, the Scottish Household Survey (Scottish Government, 2011) has consistently found that those in rural areas of Scotland are more likely than their urban counterparts to rate their area as a 'very good' place to live.

5 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 As discussed in the introduction to this report, policy makers in Scotland and elsewhere are increasingly recognising the importance of social capital. Involving communities in the 'co-production' of public services and adopting an 'assets-based' approach to health improvement both rely on using and enhancing the networks and resources individuals and communities have at their disposal. There is a growing body of evidence to suggest that having high levels of social capital can have positive benefits, providing resilience to physical and mental health issues, as well as representing a valuable resource to draw upon in difficult times.

5.2 This paper shows that people who are already socio-economically disadvantaged in society, by living in the most deprived areas of Scotland and having the lowest levels of education, are also less likely to have high levels of social capital assets to draw upon, including having particularly low levels of trust in other people in general. In contrast, people in remote rural areas stand out as having particularly high levels of social capital.[24] Life stage also appears as a significant factor in relation to three dimensions of social capital: social networks, civic participation and views of local area.

5.3 Policy initiatives that seek to engage with communities and to utilise social capital need to take account of this variation in its distribution between different groups in Scottish society. Policy makers should look to better understand variations in social capital between different groups, how different kinds of social capital are established, and what the role for policy intervention or support may be. Finally, as discussed in the introduction to this report, any work to increase social capital may require further understanding of the interactions between individuals, groups and places in supporting or maintaining particular kinds of assets.

[24] The 5 dimensions of social capital as defined by ONS are: social networks and support; social trust; civic participation; social participation and views of local area.

REFERENCES

Anderson, S. & Dobbie, F. (2008) Attitudes to youth crime and willingness to intervene, Scottish Government Social Research

Brown, E. and Ferris, J. (2004) Social capital and philanthropy, Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy, California

Chief Medical Officer (2011) Health in Scotland 2010: assets for health, The Scottish Government

Christie Commission (2011) Commission on the Future Delivery of Public Services, APS Group, Scotland

Ferragina E., Tomlinson, M. & Walker, R. (2011) Determinants of participation in the United Kingdom: a Preliminary Analysis, ISER, University of Essex

Field, J. (2003) Social Capital, Abingdon: Routledge.

Galloway, S., Bell, D., Hamilton, C. and Scullion, A (2006) Quality of Life and Wellbeing: Measuring the Benefits of Culture and Sport: A Literature Review and Thinkpiece, Scottish Executive Social Research.

Harper, R. (2002) The measurement of social capital in the United Kingdom, ONS.

Li, Y., Pickles, A. & Savage, M. (2005) Social Capital and Social Trust In Britain. European Sociological Review: Vol 21:2, 109-123.

Mackinnon J., Reid, M. & Kearns, A. (2006). Communities and health improvement: A review of evidence and approaches. http://www.healthscotland.com/uploads/documents/2876-Communities%20and%20Health%20Improvement.pdf

OECD (2001) *The wellbeing of nations: the role of human and social capital.* http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/48/22/1870573.pdf

ONS (2001) *Social Capital: a review of the literature*, UK: ONS. Available from: http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/user-guidance/social-capital-guide/the-social-capital-project/index.html

Putnam, R. (1996) Who killed civic America. Prospect, March: 66-72.

Putnam, R. (2000) Bowling alone, New York: Simon & Schuster.

Reid, S and Curtice, J (2010) *SSA 2009: Sustainable places and greenspace*, Scottish Government

Scottish Government (2011) *Scotland's People: Annual report: results from 2009/2010, Scottish Household Survey*, Scottish Government, Edinburgh.

ANNEX A – REGRESSION MODELS

1. Regression analysis aims to summarise the relationship between a 'dependent' variable and one or more 'independent' explanatory variables. It shows how well we can estimate a respondent's score on the dependent variable from knowledge of their scores on the independent variables. This technique takes into account relationships between the different independent variables (for example, between education and income, or social class and housing tenure). Regression is often undertaken to support a claim that the phenomena measured by the independent variables cause the phenomenon measured by the dependent variable. However, the causal ordering, if any, between the variables cannot be verified or falsified by the technique. Causality can only be inferred through special experimental designs or through assumptions made by the analyst.

2. All regression analysis assumes that the relationship between the dependent and each of the independent variables takes a particular form. This report was informed by logistic regression analysis – a method that summarises the relationship between a binary 'dependent' variable (one that takes the values '0' or '1') and one or more 'independent' explanatory variables. The tables in this annex show how the odds ratios for each category in significant explanatory variables compares to the odds ratio for the reference category (always taken to be 1.00).

3. Taking Model 1 (below) as an example, the dependent variable is whether people agree they regularly stop and speak to people in their area. If the respondent strongly agreed or agreed that they regularly stop and speak to people in their area, the dependent variable takes a value of 1. If they neither agreed nor disagreed, disagreed or disagreed strongly, it takes a value of 0. An odds ratio of above 1 means that, compared with respondents in the reference category, respondents in that category have higher odds of strongly agreeing or agreeing that they regularly stop and speak to people in their local area. Conversely, an odds ratio of below 1 means they have lower odds of saying this than respondents in the reference category. The 95% confidence intervals for these odds ratios are also important. Where the confidence interval does not include 1, this category is significantly different from the reference category. If we look at age in Model 1, we can see that those aged 65 or over an odds ratio of 3.62, indicating that they have higher odds of strongly agreeing or agreeing that they regularly stop and speak to people in their area compared with 18-29 year-olds (who are the reference category). The 95% confidence interval for this age group (2.08-6.28) does *not* include 1, indicating this difference is significant.

4. The significance of each independent variable is indicated by 'P'. A p-value of 0.05 or less indicates that there is less than a 5% chance we would have found these differences between the categories just by chance if in fact no such difference exists, while a p-value of 0.01 or less indicates that there is a less than 1% chance. P-values of 0.05 or less are generally considered to indicate that the difference is highly statistically significant, while a p-value of 0.06 to 0.10 may be considered marginally significant. The models below show the odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals for those variables with P-values of less than or equal to 0.10 only; other variables are simply listed with their P-values.

5. The models below were produced using the Complex Survey command (CS Logistic) in PASW. Unlike forward stepwise models, CS Logistic models can account for complex sample designs (in particular, the effects of clustering and associated weighting) when calculating odds ratios and determining significance.

Model 1: Factors associated with strongly agreeing or agreeing 'I regularly stop and speak to people in my area' (SSA 2009)

Dependent variable encoding **1 = Strongly agree/agree** **0 = Neither/disagree/strongly disagree**	**Odds ratio**	**95% confidence interval**
Age (p = 0.000)		
18-29 (reference)	1.00	
30-39	1.06	0.59-1.89
40-64	1.66	1.06-2.60
65+	3.62	2.08-6.30
Urban-rural (p=0.000)		
Large urban	1.00	
Other urban	0.93	0.66-1.31
Accessible small town	1.52	0.77-3.01
Remote small town	2.63	1.50-4.61
Accessible rural	1.59	1.08-2.36
Remote rural	5.43	2.98-9.88
Highest educational qualification (p = 0.039)		
No qualification (reference)	1.00	
Degree or higher education	1.07	0.62-1.86
Highers or equivalent	1.82	0.94-3.52
Standard grade or other school level qualification	1.43	0.85-2.43
Whether school age children in household (p=0.057)		
Yes (reference)	1.00	
No	0.64	0.41-1.01
Gender (p=0.093)		
Male (reference)	1.00	
Female	1.31	0.95-1.79
Tenure (p=0.138)		
NS-SEC socio-economic group (p = 0.148)		
Whether has disability (p=0.518)		
Income (p=0.542)		
Area deprivation (p = 0.544)		
Marital status (p = 0.762)		

Nagelkerke R2 = 14.1%

Model 2: Factors associated with strongly agreeing or agreeing 'If my home was empty, I could count on one of my neighbours to keep an eye on it' (SSA 2009)

Dependent variable encoding **1 = Strongly agree/agree** **0 = Neither/disagree/strongly disagree**	**Odds ratio**	**95% confidence interval**
Tenure (p = 0.000)		
Social renter (reference)	1.00	
Owner	2.90	1.67-5.03
Private renter	0.56	0.29-1.07
Age (p=0.104)		
Urban-rural (p=0.155)		
Whether school age children in household (p=0.165)		
Sex (p = 0.212)		
Highest educational qualification (p=0.244)		
Whether has disability (p=0.450)		
Area deprivation (p = 0.627)		
Marital status (p = 0.735)		
NS-SEC socio-economic group (p = 0.868)		
Income (p=0.975)		

Nagelkerke R2 = 15.8%

Model 3: Factors associated with strongly agreeing or agreeing 'I feel that there are people in this area I could turn to for advice and support' (SSA 2009)

Dependent variable encoding **1 = Strongly agree/agree** **0 = Neither/disagree/strongly disagree**	**Odds ratio**	**95% confidence interval**
Urban-rural (p=0.001)		
Large urban	1.00	
Other urban	0.97	0.67-1.36
Accessible small town	1.21	0.74-1.98
Remote small town	2.04	1.21-3.43
Accessible rural	1.70	1.06-2.70
Remote rural	4.24	2.10-8.56
Area deprivation (p=0.007)		
5th - Most deprived	1.00	
4th	1.07	0.64-1.80
3rd	1.19	0.70-2.06
2nd	1.36	0.78-2.38
1st – Least deprived	2.25	1.28-3.96
Age (p = 0.029)		
18-29 (reference)	1.00	
30-39	0.77	0.45-1.32
40-64	0.93	0.55-1.58
65+	1.76	0.85-3.63
Gender (p=0.085)		
Male (reference)	1.00	
Female	1.28	0.97-1.70
Tenure (p=0.089)		
Social renter (reference)	1.00	
Owner	1.18	0.65-2.13
Private renter	0.67	0.36-1.23
Whether school age children in household (p=0.182)		
Whether has disability (p=0.216)		
NS-SEC socio-economic group (p = 0.266)		
Highest educational qualification (p=0.383)		
Income (p=0.515)		
Marital status (p = 0.981)		

Nagelkerke R2 = 10.2%

Model 4: Factors associated with saying that 'most people can be trusted' rather than saying 'you can't be too careful in dealing with people' (SSA 2009)

Dependent variable encoding **1 = Most people can be trusted** **0 = You can't bee too careful dealing with people/Don't know/Not answered**	**Odds ratio**	**95% confidence interval**
Gender (p = 0.000)		
Male (reference)	1.00	
Female	0.61	0.47-0.79
Area deprivation (p=0.003)		
5th - Most deprived	1.00	
4th	1.20	0.75-1.94
3rd	1.61	1.00-2.61
2nd	2.00	1.21-3.32
1st – Least deprived	2.60	1.55-4.36
Urban-rural (p=0.006)		
Large urban	1.00	
Other urban	0.84	0.58-1.30
Accessible small town	1.36	0.62-3.00
Remote small town	1.78	1.18-2.68
Accessible rural	1.43	0.89-2.31
Remote rural	2.23	1.23-4.02
Highest educational qualification (p = 0.012)		
No qualification (reference)	1.00	
Degree or higher education	1.34	0.90-1.99
Highers or equivalent	1.30	0.82-2.07
Standard grade or other school level qualification	0.72	0.47-1.10
Tenure (p=0.079)		
Social renter (reference)	1.00	
Owner	1.56	1.06-2.30
Private renter	1.27	0.75-2.16
NS-SEC socio-economic group (p = 0.277)		
Income (p=0.450)		
Age (p = 0.475)		
Whether school age children in household (p=0.669)		
Whether has disability (p=0.963)		
Marital status (p = 0.963)		

Nagelkerke R2 = 16.3%

Model 5: Factors associated with having volunteered in the last 12 months (SHS 2010)

Dependent variable encoding **1 = Volunteered in last 12 months** **0 = NOT volunteered in last 12 months**	**Odds ratio**	**95% confidence interval**
Highest educational qualification (p = 0.000)		
No qualification (reference)	1.00	
Degree or higher education	2.98	2.17-4.08
Highers or equivalent	2.57	1.82-3.63
Standard grade or other school level qualification	1.82	1.30-2.55
Class (p=0.000)		
Employers/mgrs & professional (reference)	1.00	
Intermediate occupations	0.65	0.49-0.86
Small employers/ own account workers	0.87	0.63-1.21
Lower supervisory & technical	0.54	0.38-0.75
Semi-routine & routine occupations	0.61	0.47-0.79
Urban-rural (p=0.000)		
Large urban (reference)	1.00	
Other urban	1.17	0.93-1.46
Accessible small town	1.18	0.86-1.61
Remote small town	1.43	0.95-2.14
Accessible rural	1.61	1.21-2.14
Remote rural	2.68	1.86-3.87
Gender (p = 0.003)		
Male (reference)	1.00	
Female	1.32	1.10-1.58
Area deprivation (p=0.004)		
5th – Most deprived (reference)	1.00	
4th	1.57	1.13-2.18
3rd	1.38	0.99-1.93
2nd	1.71	1.22-2.39
1st – Least deprived	1.87	1.34-2.62
Income (p=0.067)		
£11,999 or less (reference)	1.00	
£12k-£22,999	0.74	0.55-1.01
£23K-£37,999	0.94	0.68-1.30
£38K+	1.00	0.70-1.43
Age (p = 0.101)		
Tenure (p=0.151)		
Marital status (p = 0.375)		
Whether has disability (p=0.643)		

Nagelkerke R2 = 12.5%

Model 6: Factors associated with having done something active to register views rather than having done something passive or nothing at all to register views' (SSA 2009)

Dependent variable encoding **1 = Done something active to register views** **0 = NOT done something active to register views**	**Odds ratio**	**95% confidence interval**
Highest educational qualification (p = 0.000)		
No qualification (reference)	1.00	
Degree or higher education	2.98	1.95-4.56
Highers or equivalent	1.56	1.02-2.39
Standard grade or other school level qualification	1.41	0.95-2.08
Age (p = 0.007)		
18-29 (reference)	1.00	
30-39	0.71	0.42-1.20
40-64	1.32	0.80-2.19
65+	1.57	0.81-3.04
Whether has disability (p=0.009)		
Yes (reference)	1.00	
No	0.70	0.54-0.91
Income (p=0.100)		
£11,999 or less (reference)	1.00	
£12k-£22,999	1.03	0.71-1.49
£23K-£37,999	0.75	0.47-1.20
£38K+	0.88	0.51-1.50
Whether school age children in household (p=0.166)		
Marital status (p = 0.277)		
Area deprivation (p=0.325)		
Urban-rural (p=0.449)		
NS-SEC socio-economic group (p = 0.602)		
Tenure (p=0.693)		

Nagelkerke R2 = 11.2%

Model 7: Factors associated with strongly disagreeing or disagreeing that 'It is just too difficult for someone like me to do much about improving my local area' (SSA 2009)

Dependent variable encoding **1 = Strongly disagree/disagree** **0 = Neither/agree/strongly agree**	**Odds ratio**	**95% confidence interval**
Age (p = 0.000)		
18-29 (reference)	1.00	
30-39	2.47	1.44-4.22
40-64	4.05	2.48-6.63
65+	3.13	1.70-5.76
Highest educational qualification (p = 0.000)		
No qualification (reference)	1.00	
Degree or higher education	2.50	1.39-4.50
Highers or equivalent	1.72	0.68-3.45
Standard grade or other school level qualification	1.00	0.53-1.90
Class (p=0.004)		
Employers/mgrs & professional (reference)	1.00	
Intermediate occupations	0.45	0.26-0.76
Small employers/ own account workers	0.58	0.33-1.01
Lower supervisory & technical	0.45	0.22-0.94
Semi-routine & routine occupations	0.66	0.43-1.00
Urban-rural (p=0.009)		
Large urban	1.00	
Other urban	0.98	0.67-1.44
Accessible small town	1.28	0.75-2.19
Remote small town	0.80	0.34-1.89
Accessible rural	1.04	0.62-1.75
Remote rural	3.05	1.65-5.66
Area deprivation (p=0.011)		
5th - Most deprived	1.00	
4th	1.12	0.34-1.98
3rd	0.72	0.40-1.28
2nd	1.38	0.72-2.66
1st – Least deprived	1.26	0.67-2.35
Marital status (p = 0.122)		
Income (p=0.146)		
Gender (p = 0.252)		
Whether school age children in household (p=0.735)		
Whether has disability (p=0.775)		
Tenure (p=0.790)		

Nagelkerke R2 = 21.4%

Model 8: Factors associated with strongly agree or tend to agree that 'I can influence decisions affecting my local area' (SHS 2010)

Dependent variable encoding **1 = Strongly agree/tend to agree** **0 = Neither/tend to disagree/strongly disagree**	**Odds ratio**	**95% confidence interval**
Highest educational qualification (p = 0.000)		
No qualification (reference)	1.00	
Degree or higher education	1.48	1.15-1.91
Highers or equivalent	1.29	0.97-1.70
Standard grade or other school level qualification	0.85	0.64-1.12
Urban-rural (p=0.001)		
Large urban	1.00	
Other urban	0.78	0.64-0.94
Accessible small town	0.95	0.72-1.25
Remote small town	0.67	0.46-0.96
Accessible rural	0.96	0.75-1.23
Remote rural	1.38	1.02-1.87
Age (p=0.203)		
Whether has disability (p=0.278)		
Tenure (p=0.416)		
Gender (p = 0.425)		
Income (p=0.591)		
Area deprivation (p=0.686)		
Class (p=0.737)		
Marital status (p = 0.947)		

Nagelkerke R2 = 2.9%

Model 9: Factors associated with strongly agreeing or tending to agree that 'I would like to be more involved in the decisions my council makes that affect my local area' (SHS 2010)

Dependent variable encoding **1 = Strongly agree/tend to agree** **0 = Neither/tend to disagree/strongly disagree**	**Odds ratio**	**95% confidence interval**
Age (p = 0.000)		
18-29 (reference)	1.00	
30-39	1.40	1.22-1.75
40-64	1.18	0.95-1.46
65+	0.70	0.49-1.01
Highest educational qualification (p = 0.000)		
No qualification (reference)	1.00	
Degree or higher education	2.26	1.81-2.82
Highers or equivalent	1.71	1.34-2.18
Standard grade or other school level qualification	1.59	1.26-1.99
Urban-rural (p=0.007		
Large urban	1.00	
Other urban	0.78	0.66-0.92
Accessible small town	0.66	0.52-0.84
Remote small town	0.81	0.60-1.09
Accessible rural	0.78	0.63-0.97
Remote rural	0.84	0.63-1.11
Area deprivation (p=0.080)		
5th - Most deprived	1.00	
4th	1.03	0.82-1.29
3rd	1.10	0.87-1.39
2nd	0.87	0.69-1.11
1st – Least deprived	0.85	0.67-1.09
Whether has disability (p=0.314)		
Tenure (p=0.353)		
Marital status (p = 0.373)		
Class (p=0.624)		
Gender (p = 0.643)		
Income (p=0.938)		

Nagelkerke R2 = 4.9%

Model 10: Factors associated with anti-social behaviour being not a very big, or not a problem at all in local area (SSA 2009)

Dependent variable encoding **1 = Not a very big problem/not a problem at all** **0 = Very big/quite a big problem**	**Odds ratio**	**95% confidence interval**
Area deprivation (p=0.000)		
5th - Most deprived	1.00	
4th	1.70	1.06-2.74
3rd	2.21	1.26-3.86
2nd	4.58	2.71-7.75
1st – Least deprived	6.54	3.38-12.64
Urban-rural (p=0.001)		
Large urban	1.00	
Other urban	1.00	0.63-1.59
Accessible small town	0.62	0.41-0.95
Remote small town	0.99	0.53-1.85
Accessible rural	1.46	0.80-2.66
Remote rural	2.23	1.20-4.13
Income (p=0.014)		
£11,999 or less (reference)	1.00	
£12,000-22,999	1.34	0.84-2.14
£23,000-£37,999	1.34	0.82-2.20
£38,000+	1.83	1.13-2.97
Class (p=0.061)		
Employers/mgrs & professional (reference)	1.00	
Intermediate occupations	0.86	0.52-1.41
Small employers/ own account workers	0.65	0.36-1.20
Lower supervisory & technical	1.45	0.81-2.59
Semi-routine & routine occupations	0.84	0.56-1.27
Age (p = 0.072)		
18-29 (reference)	1.00	
30-39	1.48	0.90-2.42
40-64	2.12	1.16-3.87
65+	2.65	1.25-5.63
Marital status (p = 0.283)		
Whether has disability (p=0.325)		
Whether school age children in household (p=0.469)		
Gender (p = 0.501)		
Tenure (p=0.720)		
Highest educational qualification (p=0.817)		

Nagelkerke R2 = 20.1%

Social Research series
ISSN 2045-6964
ISBN 978-1-78256-095-1
web only publication

www.scotland.gov.uk/socialresearch

APS Group Scotland
DPPAS13400 (10/12)

GSR
GOVERNMENT SOCIAL RESEARCH
Social Science in Government