

2006

## An analysis of the relationship between social capital and subjective well-being in four regions of Spain in the mid-1990s

Maria Puerta Francos  
*Edith Cowan University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses>



Part of the [Civic and Community Engagement Commons](#), and the [Place and Environment Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Puerta Francos, M. (2006). *An analysis of the relationship between social capital and subjective well-being in four regions of Spain in the mid-1990s*. Edith Cowan University. Retrieved from <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses/93>

This Thesis is posted at Research Online.  
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses/93>

# Edith Cowan University

## Copyright Warning

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study.

The University does not authorize you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site.

You are reminded of the following:

- Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright.
- A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. Where the reproduction of such material is done without attribution of authorship, with false attribution of authorship or the authorship is treated in a derogatory manner, this may be a breach of the author's moral rights contained in Part IX of the Copyright Act 1968 (Cth).
- Courts have the power to impose a wide range of civil and criminal sanctions for infringement of copyright, infringement of moral rights and other offences under the Copyright Act 1968 (Cth). Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CAPITAL AND  
SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING IN FOUR REGIONS OF SPAIN IN THE MID-1990S**

**María del Pilar Puerta Francos**

**Bachelor degree in Political Sciences and Sociology**

**This thesis is presented in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts (Sociology and Anthropology)**

**Faculty of Community Services, Education and Social Sciences,  
Edith Cowan University, (Joondalup Campus).**

**Year of submission: 2006**

## USE OF THESIS

The Use of Thesis statement is not included in this version of the thesis.



## ABSTRACT

This research offers an analysis of two concepts: subjective well-being and social capital. I examine each concept separately, looking at their underlying determinants and characteristics, and I also look at the links between these two notions, as there is theoretical support for their interdependent relationship.

I have conducted data analysis of five samples, all part of the World Values Survey 1995-1996. The WVS 1995-1996 offers vast data for Spain and for four autonomous regions – Basque Country, Andalusia, Galicia and Valencia. For the national sample N= 1211. Regional sampling is as follows: Basque Country (N=2205), Andalusia (N=1803), Galicia (N=1200), and Valencia (N=501). The subjects of all the surveys are citizens of both sexes, aged 18 and older.

This research is based on data already gathered for purposes other than my study. Therefore, I have not been involved in the design of the questionnaire, nor in the data-gathering and coding procedures. The analysis presented here is the result of manipulating the data in a way that has allowed me to work with them using various forms of statistical analysis. In analysing the data, it has been very important to consider also the specific historical, economic, social and cultural characteristics of each region studied.

Through the analysis of social features, such as the relationships among people and between the citizens and the public institutions, and the social trust that is created under the umbrella of civic engagement and connectedness, this study suggests that it is possible to obtain interesting and valuable information about human well-being. In this context, the concept of social capital appears to be useful to explore the way social features are connected to subjective well-being and quality of life. Nevertheless, some of the hypothesised relationships are, at best, relatively weak.

## DECLARATION

I certify that this thesis does not, to the best of my knowledge and belief:

- (i) incorporate without acknowledgment any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any institution of higher education;
- (ii) contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text; or
- (iii) contain any defamatory material.

I also grant permission for the Library at Edith Cowan University to make duplicate copies of my thesis as required.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date 10<sup>th</sup> July 2006

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<b>USE OF THESIS</b>	2
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	3
<b>DECLARATION</b>	4
<b>PART 1 INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH</b>	8
1.1 Background of the study	8
1.2 Significance of the study	9
1.3 Purpose of the study	10
1.4 Research questions	10
<b>PART 2 SPAIN AND REGIONS: SOCIOPOLITICAL BACKGROUND</b>	11
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 The role of the Catholic Church	12
2.3 Spanish autonomous governments and nationalisms	13
2.3.1 The Basque Country (Euskalerrria)	16
2.3.2 Catalonia (Catalunya)	18
2.3.3 Galicia	19
2.3.4 Andalusia	19
2.3.5 Valencia (Valencian Autonomous Community)	20
2.4 Civil society and civic engagement in Spain	20
2.5 Spain 1995-1996	21
2.6 Conclusion	23
<b>PART 3 SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING</b>	24
3.1 Introduction	24
3.2 The concept of subjective well-being: Life satisfaction, happiness, positive affect and negative affect	25
3.3 Subjective well-being and materialism	28
3.4 Satisfaction of human needs	29
3.5 Subjective well-being and economic development	30
3.6 Measures of subjective well-being	31
3.7 Conclusion	35
<b>PART 4 SOCIAL CAPITAL</b>	36
4.1 Introduction	36
4.2 The concept of social capital	37
4.3 Forms of social capital	40

	Page
4.4 Elements of social capital	44
4.4.1 Trust	44
4.4.2 Reciprocity	50
4.4.3 Tolerance	51
4.4.4 Social networks	52
4.4.4.1 Family and friends	53
4.4.4.2 Voluntary associations	53
4.4.4.2.1 Levels/degrees of participation	55
4.4.4.2.2 Participation and social capital	55
4.4.4.2.3 Participation and economic development	57
4.4.4.2.4 Factors influencing participation	59
4.4.4.2.5 Measures of participation	62
4.5 Community and social capital	63
4.6 Social capital, civil society and democracy	65
4.6.1 Civil society and nationalism	67
4.7 Measures of social capital	68
4.8 Threats to social capital	69
4.9 Negative aspects of social capital	71
4.10 Conclusion	72
<b>PART 5 SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING AND SOCIAL CAPITAL</b>	<b>73</b>
5.1 Introduction	73
5.2 Social bonds and subjective well-being	73
5.3 Self-determination, goal achievement and satisfaction of needs through social capital	76
5.4 Subjective well-being, human capital and social capability	77
5.5 Conclusion	81
<b>PART 6 METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>82</b>
6.1 Introduction	82
6.2 Subjects	83
6.3 Data Analysis	85
6.4 Conclusion	92
<b>PART 7 DATA ANALYSIS</b>	<b>93</b>
7.1 Introduction	93
7.2 Subjective well-being: analysis of happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole	93
7.2.1 Happiness	93
7.2.2 Satisfaction with life as a whole	104
7.2.3 Subjective Well-Being Index	115

	Page
7.3 Social capital: the analysis of its elements	129
7.3.1 Tolerance	129
7.3.2 Trust	142
7.3.2.1 Interpersonal or general trust	142
7.3.2.2 Trust in institutions	155
7.3.3 Participation in voluntary associations	171
7.3.4 Social bonds	188
7.3.4.1 Informal networks: family	188
7.3.4.2 Informal networks: friends	198
7.3.4.3 Importance of Social Bonds Index	207
7.4 Conclusion	216
<b>PART 8 LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH</b>	219
<b>PART 9 CONCLUSION</b>	221
<b>REFERENCES</b>	225
<b>APPENDICES</b>	239
A. List of tables	240
B. List of acronyms and abbreviations	245
C. Electoral results Spanish general elections.	246
D. Happiness, life satisfaction and Individual Subjective Well-Being Index. Tables of correlations	254
E. Elements of social capital: Tolerance Index, general trust, Levels of Trust in Institutions Index, Total Association Index, importance of family, importance of friends and Importance of Social Bonds Index. Tables of correlations.	272
F. Complete questionnaire for World Values Survey 1995-1996. Spain, Basque Country, Andalusia, Galicia and Valencia	322

# PART 1

## INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH

### 1.1 Background of the Study

Human beings are social creatures. Thousands of years ago, our ancestors gathered together to find solutions to the difficult task of surviving in an often hostile environment. As individuals started to live together, they developed sets of beliefs, social norms and mutual obligations. As a result, rewards and sanctions were established to reinforce socially acceptable behaviour among individuals, groups and communities (Pérez-Díaz, 1998). From those early beginnings, societies have been integrated by people who have developed interdependent relationships within the specific group or groups to which they belong, and also outside those groups. Institutions emerged both as carriers of human beliefs, norms and values, and as guardians of a diversity of cultural traditions.

An interest in understanding human action in its social context has driven me to study well-being and quality of life from a "society-individual relationship" approach. At the same time that the individual's potential develops and shapes within social experiences, the social environment may also change. In other words, there are interactive and dynamic processes of building society and social beings.

Present measures of subjective well-being tend to be based on psychological components. In the last thirty years, numerous investigations have systematically considered the measurement and evaluation of what people have on their minds when they are asked to make an assessment of their lives (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Bradburn, 1969; Campbell, 1981; Campbell, Converse & Rodgers, 1976; Diener, 1984; Headey & Wearing, 1992). In this line, several studies suggest that life satisfaction, happiness, negative affect and positive affect are some of the dimensions of subjective well-being (Lawton, 1983; Lawton, Kleban & Di Carlo, 1984). These studies are based on models of affective evaluations, which might include global evaluations (evaluation of satisfaction with life as a whole) and domain-specific evaluations (evaluation of satisfaction with specific life-domains).

Representing the psychological tradition, Andrews and Withey (1976) suggest that people organise their perceptions mainly through affective evaluations, and therefore, those evaluations are of major importance in the analysis of the structures of perceptions about life concerns. Those variables representing such dimensions have frequently shown correlations with subjective well-being, which suggests that there may be some linkage between them (Lawrence & Liang, 1988). However, these psychological and affective models say little about the way social features influence individuals' evaluations of the quality of their lives. There is certainly a place for assessments of "life-as-a-whole" in the analysis of perceived well-being and quality of life (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Inglehart, 1997). Nevertheless, the approach toward affective evaluations of life (using, for

example, Bradburn's [1969] measures of Positive Affect, Negative Affect and Affect Balance) limits the analysis to the individual and to psychological assessments, and ignores the relationships between people and the social dimension of subjective well-being, and as Cox (1998) points out, social relationships are crucial to the individual's perception of well-being. I believe that psychological elements are not the only influence in subjective well-being and that future research on this topic should consider the analysis of social and cultural determinants. The analysis of society and its different social processes can help us to understand the many dimensions of human behaviour, without directly using a psychological approach. When measuring subjective well-being, or individuals' evaluations of the quality of their lives, it is possible to combine psychological and social measurements (Kaplan & Anderson, 1988). Measures of social and community health are valid instruments to help us achieve an understanding of the social components of subjective well-being. Under a sociological approach it is possible to talk of psychosocial factors (Larson, 1993), and psychosocial well-being (Larson, 1996).

## **1.2 Significance of the Study**

The measurement of issues such as the interactions among people, the quality of those relationships, the expectations people put on their relationships, and the social processes that establish identities and functions in society, may give us an extended picture of social connections which may be intrinsic to quality of life and subjective well-being (Cox, 1998). Therefore, this study advocates that the measurement of subjective well-being under a societal approach is of great relevance. In this line, the Roper Institute (1993) stresses the importance of individual and community capacities to pursue and achieve goals towards the greater reward of securing high levels of well-being. Salvaris (1998, p. 16) also points out the relevance of "measures of social and community health", such as social relations, citizens' participation and social capital in assessing national well-being. Miranda and Villanueva (1983) assert the social content of quality of life as a collective claim. Latham (1998) also considers social factors and communal problems as closely related to quality of life and personal well-being:

Perceptions of personal well-being now rely more on communal issues – the way in which the actions of others might impact adversely on one's life – than concerns about the generation and distribution of economic resources ( Latham, 1998, p. xxxiii).

### **1.3 Purpose of the Study**

The broad aims of this research are to offer an analysis of the concepts of subjective well-being and social capital, and also to empirically test some of the theoretical associations between these phenomena, as suggested by the literature, in the context of regional Spain.

Firstly, this dissertation intends to work with the concept of subjective well-being, its elements and its measurement. Due to the nature of the data analysed, the main focus will be on the psychological elements that make up the structure of subjective well-being: happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole. However, the study will also look at the social factors that, theoretically, have been associated with subjective well-being.

Secondly, the study will discuss the concept of social capital, exploring how social relationships generate civic engagement, social trust, tolerance and cooperation, which derive from collective action toward the achievement of progress and satisfaction. High levels of social capital – collective governance, public mutuality and social connectedness – are essential for the effective functioning of democratic institutions, and crucial for collective well-being and progress. A healthy democratic system offers the freedom and guarantees that can help people to act individually and collectively in the pursuit of their goals, hopefully enabling them to achieve desired levels of public and private well-being.

Finally, the research will test the theoretical links between subjective well-being and social capital. Social capital, as a measure of social and community health, may prove to be a useful tool to understand the social components of subjective well-being.

This research will look at Spain and at four Spanish autonomous communities, or regions, which are very different, from any perspective, one from another. I do expect that sociopolitical and cultural factors will have an effect on the results of the analysis for the different regions.

### **1.4 Research Questions**

This study intends to address the following research questions:

- How do levels of subjective well-being differ between regions in Spain?
- How do levels of social capital differ between regions in Spain?
- To what extent are social capital and subjective well-being linked within those regions in Spain?



## **PART 2**

### **SPAIN: SOCIOPOLITICAL BACKGROUND**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

The Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) was a historical event that had tragic consequences for Spain. Thousands of people died, and many more went into exile. The Civil War divided the country and ended up with the state organised on a dictatorial model. Francisco Franco, an Army man without political experience, governed Spain as a dictator for almost forty years – from the end of the Civil War in 1939 until his death in 1975 – with the support of the Catholic Church, the Army, and some influential sectors of the economy (Pérez-Díaz, 1996a). However, the Spanish Civil War has also been a reference point to help the return of democracy and civil society to Spain. The collective memory of fratricide and guilt has been a moral trauma for many for over forty years, but it has also driven the country into a common will for reconciliation, tolerance and peace.

Constitutional monarchy was reestablished after the death of Francisco Franco in 1975. Juan Carlos I became King of Spain, leading the country into democracy. The new King, and Adolfo Suárez, Presidente del Gobierno (President), guided the political reform, known as the "transition", and persuaded the whole society of the importance of following democratic norms (Pérez-Díaz, 1998). Pérez-Díaz (1996a) points out that the success of the transition and the consolidation of democracy in Spain was supported by the already existent civil society. In the mid-seventies, Spain went through the process of building a European identity. The country was already exposed to those institutions and ways of life of Europe from the mid-fifties (Pérez-Díaz, 1996a; Pérez-Díaz, 1998; Vidal-Beneyto, 2004), through migration, foreign investment, tourism, mass media, and also the influence of European universities in the Spanish democratic students' organisations, very active through the sixties. As Pérez-Díaz points out:

... by the mid-seventies the economic, social, and cultural institutions of Spain were already quite close to those of western Europe, and the cultural beliefs, normative orientations, and attitudes of the people that accompanied the workings of these institutions had become fairly similar to those of other Europeans. This was one of the main reasons why the political change to democracy took place so swiftly and, apparently, so thoroughly, in spite of the enormous problems to be overcome ... (Pérez-Díaz, 1998, p. 17)

The Spanish democratic Constitution was approved in a referendum in 1978. It was a product of the dialogue between all the political parties, including the Communist Party in exile, and the consensus reached among them. The Army and the Catholic Church also gave their approval to the constitutional text, and therefore to the democratic election of government. Further the members of the society in general showed a large amount of confidence in the new political system, in its institutions and in themselves as a national community, which together made possible the emergence of a democratic state in Spain (Pérez-Díaz, 1998).

Spanish democracy is strong today, but it was quite frail and had enormous problems to overcome in the first ten years of its development. Terrorism, from groups such as ETA (Euskadi Ta Askatasuna = Basque Country and Freedom) and GRAPO (Grupo Revolucionario Antifascista Primero de Octubre = Antifascist Revolutionary Group First of October), and the threat of army intervention, were the most serious threats during the sociopolitical transition (Aguilar, 1998). The Armed Forces attempted a coup in 1982 against the young democracy and its representatives. Those involved, and their supporters, justified their actions on the grounds of guarding the country from further moral breakdown and disintegration caused by nationalist/separatist demands and by terrorist actions targeting the Armed Forces and the National Police. The coup was unsuccessful and a few months later the Spanish voters supported a socialist government.

As result of its more recent political history, Spain has a very heterogeneous range of political parties today. Voters have shown from the first democratic national election in 1977 their preference for those political parties that are based on democratic principles. Since 1977, Spain has had governments of centre, moderate-left and moderate-right parties, all of whom have supported a market economy and a welfare state, civil freedoms, tolerance and pluralism (Pérez-Díaz, 1996a). Herri Batasuna<sup>1</sup> (People United), a nationalist/separatist party in the Basque Country, is the only political group that both supports openly the terrorist acts of ETA and has representation in a Spanish parliament. Detailed information on results of general elections in Spain from 1977 until 2000 can be found in Appendix C.

## **2.2 The Role of the Catholic Church**

Spain is a traditionally Catholic country that has gone through a process of increasing secularisation. The last twenty-five years have witnessed an important lessening of the influence of the Catholic Church in the public and private spheres. However, secularisation is not a new phenomenon in recent Spanish history. The Spanish Second Republic (1931-1939) supported the

---

<sup>1</sup> Herri Batasuna is not a legal political party since 2003. The Constitutional Tribunal of Spain declared Herri Batasuna illegal on the grounds of being a political organisation with proven links with a terrorist group.

establishment of a secular state, where the Catholic Church did not have a prominent sociopolitical role at that time. Actually, during the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), the Catholic Church suffered persecution from those who supported the Republic and its anticlerical ideology. The National (right wing) victory in 1939 gave the Catholic Church an extraordinary triumph, with the creation of a "... denominational state fully consistent with the church ..." (Pérez-Díaz, 1998, p. 132), and restored the power, resources and influence that have been lost during the period of the Second Republic. From 1939 until almost the end of the dictatorship, the Catholic Church enjoyed a status of extraordinary control over many aspects of society's life, backed up by the state's authority.

Interestingly, the Catholic Church distanced itself from the political regime throughout the seventies. Prior to this, some sectors of society, like the students' organisations, had increasingly been demanding new messages and solutions from the Church. Changes inside Spain (such as serious internal divisions of the regime and the emergence of a new political class), and outside Spain (such as an increase of the pressure from the Vatican and the European Community [the current European Union] over the Spanish government), influenced the Catholic Church's positioning towards the political regime, and its new attitude towards social, moral and political problems (Pérez-Díaz, 1998).

The Catholic Church thus became involved in exchanges with the new democratic political class, a process which continued throughout the political transition in the mid-seventies, and by the late seventies the Catholic Church played an extraordinary role in the peaceful emergence of the democratic state. But at the same time, Spanish society started a moderate process of secularisation, and the Catholic Church saw its sphere of influence over society extraordinarily limited with the arrival of democracy, especially after the Socialist Party won the 1982 national elections. Although according to the Spanish Constitution Spain became a nondenominational state in 1978, it was not until 1982, with the socialist victory in the national elections, that the Catholic Church had to come to terms with its loss of power and influence on the masses.

### **2.3 Spanish Autonomous Governments and Nationalisms**

Spain had become a unified state under the Catholic Kings in 1469. Before that, Spain was not a single nation but a number of crowns, kingdoms, principalities and provinces, some of them linked by royal marriages, others annexed by military conquest. Under the Catholic Kings' dynasty, the constituent territories maintained some level of autonomy.

During the 19<sup>th</sup> century nationalist<sup>2</sup> political movements developed in Catalonia and the Basque Country (Pallarés & Keating, 2003), two regions making claims for self-government. The Spanish

---

<sup>2</sup> While national refers to Spain and anything Spanish, nationalist refers to ethnoterritorialism and it is, in the Spanish context, associated with those regions that have distinctive language and culture.

Second Republic (1931-1939) allowed some degree of regional autonomy within Spain, thus providing answers to the ethnoterritorial question. At that time, Catalonia, Galicia and the Basque Country gained their Statutes of Autonomy, which are the bases of today's statutes. By the time the Spanish Civil War started in 1936, Spain was developing an incipient autonomous process (Moreno, 1998).

Franco's dictatorship (1939-1975), with its policies to build a strong and united national identity, tried to deny nationalist culture, regionalist feelings, and federalist claims, especially those emanating from Catalonia and the Basque Country. During the period of Francoism numerous nationalist tensions emerged, as the regime would not tolerate the use of their distinctive language and symbols. As a result, nationalist feelings and aspirations were hidden in many Catalan and Basque hearts, but at the same time they grew stronger. From the late 1960s, much of the democratic opposition to the regime supported future political programmes where regionalism and decentralisation were fundamental in the restoration of democracy.

Since democracy was restored in 1977 and a new Constitution approved in 1978, Spain has provided a complex example of decentralisation within the framework of a democratic state. In 1979, four years after Franco's death and one after the new Constitution had been approved in a national referendum, the Basques and the Catalans regained the Statutes of Autonomy that they had previously attained during the Second Republic (1931-1939). In 1980 both regions elected their parliaments and thus those people who would form their autonomous governments. After almost forty years of repressive government, Basques and Catalans achieved important levels of autonomy in such fundamental matters as taxation and finances, security, planning, education and health.

Spain has fifty provinces administratively and politically organised into seventeen autonomous regions<sup>3</sup>. Each of them has its own parliament (based on proportional representation and unicameral regime), elected every four years (paralleling the national system), together with institutional apparatus and government. Powers transferred from the central government or shared with it vary from one region to another. Of these regions, Catalonia and the Basque Country are the ones that, from the early days of the democracy in 1975, have sought more powers and autonomy from the central government. Currently they have almost complete legislative power to control and manage their own policies. The other fifteen Spanish regions enjoy important levels of administrative decentralisation, but they share policy-making powers with the central government in many areas (Rico, Fraile & González, 1998).

By the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Catalonia, the Basque Country and Madrid were the only industrialised regions of Spain, and all attracted large numbers of immigrants from the poorer regions that based their economies on old fashioned agriculture practices. A minority of Catalan and

---

<sup>3</sup> Ceuta and Melilla (North African territories) are the only Spanish cities that are not administratively classified as part of an autonomous community.

Basque natives saw their identity threatened by this wave of people, and their reaction was the development of the nationalist movements and the demands of self-government in both regions (Pérez-Díaz, 1996a). By the mid-1990s, Catalonia and the Basque Country had obtained more legislative and administrative responsibilities, and had done it so much faster than any other region in Spain. One reason for this special treatment was the pressure both autonomous governments and people had put on the central government in Madrid, based in their own ethnic identities and their claims – sometimes backed by violence – of independence from Spain.

The concept of ethnoterritoriality may help explain some of the political and social movements in Spain. Moreno (1997; 1998) refers to ethnoterritoriality as a dimension where ethnic, cultural and geographic references are reflected in conflicts and political mobilisations. Spanish territorial and political unity has been put under pressure for decades by the action of ethnoterritorial and linguistic diversity. At least five very distinct languages coexist today in Spain: "castellano" (Castilian, the state's official language), "catalán" (Catalan), "euskera" or "vasco" (Basque), "valenciano" or "valencià" (Valencian) and "gallego" or "galego" (Galician)<sup>4</sup>. Many Spanish citizens today express a dual identity, incorporating ethnoterritorial (local) and national (state) identities (Moreno, 1998). Such duality is also manifested in some autonomous governments' calls for self-government:

... the more the primordial ethnoterritorial identity prevails upon modern state identity, the higher the demands for political autonomy. Conversely, the more characterised the state-national identity is, the less likely it would be for ethnoterritorial conflicts to appear. At the extreme, complete absence of one of the two elements of dual identity would lead to a socio-political fracture in the pluriethnic state, and demands for self-government would probably take the form of independence (Moreno, 1998, p. 2).

Non-statewide parties (NSWPs) are numerous, and many of them have representation, not only in the autonomous parliaments, but also in the national and in the European parliaments (Pallarés & Keating, 2003). These parties base their political projects on their defense of territorial, nationalist or not nationalist, interests. However, their influence trespasses their territory, affecting the political programmes of the Spanish national parties (Pallarés & Keating, 2003). The presence of representatives of regional and nationalist parties in the Spanish Parliament, especially those from the Basque Country and Catalonia, has been very important in helping consolidate the autonomous process and its politics (Moreno, 1998).

There are three "historic nationalities" in Spain – Catalonia, Basque Country and Galicia – which have maintained through centuries a separate cultural identity from the Castilian heritage. As Pallarés and Keating (2003) suggest, those elements of national identity (language, culture and

---

<sup>4</sup> Three of the four regions analysed in this study have distinct languages: Basque Country, Galicia and Valencia.

ethnic background) that characterise these regions may well support the success of nationalist parties in these autonomous communities. That is clearly the case of Catalonia and the Basque Country, where nationalist parties are very strong and influential. Galicia has seen a much weaker development of nationalist parties (Hamann, 1999), although the Bloque Nacionalista Galego (BNG = Galician Nationalist Bloc) has gained strength since the 1990s (Pallarés & Keating, 2003).

However, Spain's ethnoterritorial diversity and strong regionalist parties go further than the best known cases of the Basque Country, Catalonia and Galicia. In some other Spanish Autonomous Communities self-government claims came, in many cases, stimulated by what the Catalans and Basques started decades ago, although some of them – Andalusia, Asturias, and Valencia – asked for regional recognition from as far as the times of the First Republic, in 1873 (Moreno, 1998). During the transitional years (1975-1982) support for the development of autonomous governments in Andalusia, the Canary Islands, and Valencia was very strong. In other regions, the autonomous process came not as an ethnoterritorial claim, but more as result of local political parties' encouragement (Moreno, 1998). Of all these non-historic regions, the Canary Islands is the only region with a strong and influential non-statewide party, CC (Coalición Canaria = Canary Coalition).

### ***2.3.1 The Basque Country (Euskalerrria)***

Early Basque nationalism was based in conservative religious (catholic) elements and racist ethnocentric claims (Moreno, 1998). Basque nationalist aspirations, in the words of those who seek complete independence from the Spanish state, derive from historic rights. Those rights, in their view, are older than the Spanish state as we know it today. Navarre and the Basque Country kept their "fueros" (autonomous medieval laws), their culture and their idiom (Euskera) for centuries. Since democracy was restored in 1975, self-determination has been a permanent claim from the Basques nationalist/separatists (including the moderates, non-violent) to the central government in Madrid.

The Basque Country obtained its Statute of Autonomy in 1979. From that date, the government in Madrid has transferred powers to the autonomous government through dialogue and negotiations. However, there is a significant rejection of the Spanish Constitution by political and social sectors in the Basque Country. This attitude has contributed to the creation of three differentiated and antagonistic blocks: those Spanish-wide parties in favour of the Constitution and against the independence of the Basque Country; the "democratic" Basque nationalists, in favour of the independence of the Basque Country and against the Spanish Constitution; and the Basque separatists against any form of relationship with the Spanish state, supporting terrorist acts to achieve independence from Spain (Colomer, 1998).

Terrorism has been troubling the Basque region and the whole Spanish state since long before Franco's death. ETA (Euskadi Ta Askatasuna = Basque Country and Freedom) was founded in 1959, with self-determination and total independence from Spain and France as its main goals. ETA has since killed over 800 people. Kidnappings and revolutionary tax, or blackmail, are part of its ways to obtain funds to support their armed struggle. ETA refuses to recognise the Spanish state and fights against it to obtain self-determination and total independence for the Basque Country and Navarre<sup>5</sup>, and the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist state there. Although the last aim might seem out of place today, ETA has important local support and it has been politically represented in the Basque, Spanish and European Parliaments by its political wing HB (Herri Batasuna = People United).

ETA's terrorist actions have a huge impact in the economy of the region. Investors – Basques, Spanish and foreigners – have taken their money and business to safer areas of Spain or overseas. ETA has bombed Spanish and French interests, and also keeps carrying out a terror policy of kidnappings and revolutionary tax to fund its violent actions.

Violence is a very stressing issue, not just in the Basque Country, but also between the Basques and the rest of the Spanish nation. But it is important to emphasise the crucial role that civil society is playing to solve the problem of the violence and its consequences. In the last ten years, the Basque Country has witnessed the emergence of pacifist groups as a reaction against violence. Citizens are getting organised in collective action to put pressure, not only on the terrorist band ETA but also on those autonomous and national institutions that might become abusive of their power (e.g, the police in its treatment of terrorists), and those citizens who show apathy about the whole terrorism/Basque problem (Funes, 1998). The common aim of these groups is to stop any kind of violence and to find a peaceful solution to the conflict in the Basque Country.

These organised groups see the solution to the problem of violence in the Basque Country within themselves, the Basques. In the past, numerous Basques supported an ideological movement that ended up in ETA and its spiral of violence. This support was considerable during the democratic transition and in the 1980s. Through the 1990s, an important sector of the Basque society felt responsible for the emergence and support of the terrorist band, and therefore considers itself also partly responsible for the past and current indiscriminate violence (Funes, 1998).

Gesto por la Paz (Gesture Towards Peace) is one of the groups looking for support from Basque society to stop violence. It is a pluralistic movement, as it represents all democratic political positions. Their members and supporters reject all kinds of violence, basically on ethical and moral grounds (Funes, 1998). This movement holds demonstrations always after a violent act occurs (from ETA or from security forces), or after a kidnapping, as a peaceful response to that violence.

---

<sup>5</sup> Radical Basque nationalists consider Navarre and other regions in the South of France integral parts of the Basque Country.

Elkarri (Among All of Us) is another well-known group aiming to end the armed struggle in the Basque Country. Its members and supporters are clearly left nationalists-separatists, whose ideas are closer to those of ETA (many were members, or close to the sphere of action of the terrorist band). They are critical of the Spanish political system, although they see terrorism as a political problem between the Basque Country and Spain that requires a political solution. Violence as ethically unacceptable is not part of their discourse (Funes, 1998).

The choice of belonging to or supporting one group or another is determined by ideology. The first one, Gesto por la Paz, is clearly closer to the majority, not just of the Basque people, but also of the Spanish people. The second group, Elkarri, supports separatists' ideas (those also supported by the terrorist band ETA), which are popular within a minority.

### ***2.3.2 Catalonia (Catalunya)<sup>6</sup>***

Catalonia is comparatively richer and more advanced than any other autonomous region in Spain. Geographically blessed by a privileged location on the Mediterranean and in Europe, Catalonia is an example of how openness to overseas markets and trading relationships can build up a confident and growing economy, the engine and the envy of the rest of the Spanish state. The 1978 Spanish Constitution declares that the Spanish state has the obligation to establish economic balance between the different regions of Spain, so all Spaniards can enjoy similar standards of living. This principle is expounded in what is known as the principle of inter-territorial solidarity: the wealthier regions will provide more funds to the central government to distribute to the less well-off regions (Agranoff & Ramos Gallarín, 1997; Moreno, 1998). Today, Catalans feel that their financial contribution towards the national economic balance is much greater than what they receive from the central administration, and they feel discriminated against. Catalans have used this matter to pressure the central government with claims of an independent fiscal system (Moreno, 1998).

Moreno (1998) argues that Catalonia's social structure had a crucial class-wide supportive role in the rise of Catalan nationalism. Catalan bourgeois industrial society produced a strong nationalist movement more intellectual than secessionist, open to people from other places (Keating, 2001), and offering an alternative view of the Spanish nation. Catalonia had autonomous governments well before Franco's regime. Catalan politics tend to moderation, with two dominant parties: *Convergència i Unió* (Convergence and Union, nationalist conservative) and the Socialist Party (moderate left). It has its own culture and language, which is widely spread, even within those born in other regions.

---

<sup>6</sup> Catalonia has not been included in the data analysis as there was no data available for this region in the World Values Survey 1995-1996.



### ***2.3.3 Galicia***

Homeland of Franco, Galicia has been a region neglected throughout centuries. Subsistence agriculture and fishing were not enough to keep people in such a peripheral location, and massive waves of emigrants left decade after decade to richer regions of Spain (Catalonia, Madrid, and the Basque Country), Europe and South America. Today, Galicia still has poorly developed infrastructure, and its traditional ways of life, such as fishing and agriculture, are finding tough competition and legislation from Europe.

Galicia has a very strong Celtic heritage and its own language, Galician, widely spoken by its population. Although Galician nationalism goes back to the late 1800s, it is much weaker than Catalan or Basque nationalisms. This has traditionally been translated in poor nationalist representation in the autonomous parliament (Pallarés & Keating, 2003). The conservatives (Alianza Popular/Partido Popular = People's Allianz/People's Party) have dominated every regional election since Galicia obtained its Statute of Autonomy. The dominant role that the Catholic Church has played through history in this region and the total control of the dictatorship over all aspects of Galician life may have contributed to the strength of a conservative national party in a regional setting.

### ***2.3.4 Andalusia***

Andalusia is the second largest region of Spain, after Castilla-León, and the most densely populated. Historically, Andalusia has been a land of profound social unrest and underdevelopment (Entrena & Gómez-Mateos, 2000). A traditionally agricultural region, Andalusia did not benefit of the Industrial Revolution in the same way that other regions of Spain, such as Madrid, Catalonia and the Basque Country, did. Instead, it developed a weak and poorly managed industrial sector, and kept a feudalistic distribution of land ownership, based on large estates owned by the upper class. Both elements would have a profound effect in the social, political and economic future of the region. As Entrena and Gómez-Mateos (2000) point out, such socioeconomic structure could not support strong employment, and therefore many Andalusians (like people from other regions in the same socioeconomic circumstances, such as Galicia and Extremadura) migrated to more industrialised regions, like the Basque Country, Madrid and Catalonia, and to other parts of Europe or to South America.

### ***2.3.5 Valencia (Valencian Autonomous Community)***

Like Catalonia, the region of Valencia is geographically blessed by a privileged location in the Mediterranean region and in Europe. This has helped develop trading relationships, although in a smaller scale compared to those developed by Catalonia. The region of Valencia has also been blessed by a temperate climate and very fertile soil that made of it one of the most important fruit and vegetable producers in Europe. The 1960s brought a spectacular increase of the population in the region due to the arrival of people from other parts of Spain to work, not only in the agriculture sector but also in the increasingly growing industries of shoe and textile manufacturing, and tourism. The region of Valencia became the Autonomous Community of Valencia in 1983, after approval of its Statute of Autonomy and holding its first autonomous elections. Nationalist political parties have not done all that well in autonomous elections in Valencia compared to national parties because nationalist parties (particularly left wing parties) were too fragmented while national parties, such as the Socialist Party (PSOE), were better organised (Santacreu Soler & García Andreu, 2002). However, national parties have increasingly developed strategies and policies that embrace the history and the culture that characterise the region and its people, including the defense of the use of their own language (Valencià).

## **2.4 Civil Society and Civic Engagement in Spain**

Pérez-Díaz (2003, p.438) argues that the Spanish Civil war and the years that followed were the antithesis of any civil society, characterised by distrust, broken communities and the disappearance of social solidarity. From the 1950s to the 1970s Spain went through economic and sociopolitical transformations that allowed the development of norms, associations and goodwill feelings that proved very important in later years.

López de Aguilera (1990) emphasises the changes from a relatively active civil society in the 1960s and 1970s to a clearly depoliticised and unengaged society during and after the democratic transition. Encarnación (2001) also points out that Spain went through a very successful democratic transition with a civil society very poor in civic engagement and organised collective action. The last years of the dictatorship witnessed significant social mobilisation, such as industrial strikes and students' demonstrations. However, the number of people who were members of organised groups was very low, and many social movements had a very short life. After Franco's death, Spain's new parliament approved a Law of Associations that would guarantee the right of the citizens to decide freely to whether or not they wished to join any particular association. However, this law had little impact on the attitude of most Spaniards, as levels of associationism have declined throughout the democratic years (Encarnación, 2001; McDonough et al, 1998; Pérez-Díaz, 1986). These arguments

clearly challenge the view that a strong civil society where its members participate actively in collective action groups is essential for the creation and support of a democratic system. However, organised trade unions and political parties, especially the Socialist and Communist parties, were essential in the development of a civil society before and after the transition to democracy (Encarnación, 2001).

## **2.5 Spain 1995-1996**

From 1982 until 1993, the Spanish Socialist Workers Party (Partido Socialista Obrero Español, PSOE) was in office with a majority in the parliament. For more than a decade, Felipe González and his party controlled the country at national, regional and local levels (Amodia, 1996). From 1990, however, the socialist government started to decline, and in 1993, after the national elections, the socialists lost their parliamentary majority and formed government depending on the support of CIU (Convergència i Unió = Convergence and Union) and PNV (Partido Nacionalista Vasco = Nationalist Basque Party), the main nationalist parties in Catalonia and the Basque Country. In 1994, the PP (Partido Popular = People's Party, right-wing party) defeated the socialists at the European elections. In the spring of 1995, the conservatives won in the regional and municipal elections. By 1996, the PSOE was forced to call a new national election, as it lost the nationalist support. From May 1996 Spain had a new President, José María Aznar, leader of the conservative People's Party (Partido Popular, PP), who needed the support of three nationalist parties (PNV from the Basque Country, CiU from Catalonia, and CC from the Canary Islands) to form government. Table 2.1 shows the distribution of votes in the general elections of 1996<sup>7</sup>. The Socialist Party regained national office in March 2004 (details in Appendix C).

The outgoing socialist government and the President Felipe González were cleared in 1996 of the claims of conducting "dirty war" (running of death squads) against ETA during the mid-1980s. The government was suspected of using tax-payers funds and the cover of the national security system to murder several people presumably linked to the terrorist band. The Socialist Party has also been affected by a series of political and financial scandals, involving illegal party funding (Amodia, 1996; Lancaster, 1994). Both cases clearly influenced the decline of levels of credibility that the Socialist Party had experienced since 1982.

---

<sup>7</sup> The reason behind reporting electoral results from 1996 is that this research analyses data from 1995-1996. I have included electoral results from other years in Appendix C only as general background information.

Table 2.1

*Distribution of Votes and Seats in the Congress (Lower House). General Elections, 3rd of March 1996*

<b>Party or Coalition of Parties</b>	<b>Votes</b>	<b>(%)*</b>	<b>Seats</b>	<b>(%)</b>
Partido Popular (PP)	9,224,696	37.19	146	41.71
Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE)	7,894,535	31.83	122	34.86
Izquierda Unida (IU)	2,342,789	9.45	19	5.43
Partit dels Socialistes de Catalunya (PSC-PSOE)	1,531,143	6.17	19	5.43
Convergència i Unió (CIU)	1,151,633	4.64	16	4.57
Partido Popular - Partido Aragonés (PP-PAR)	370,975	1.50	8	2.29
Eusko Alderdi Jetzalea-Partido Nacionalista Vasco (EAJ-PNV)	318,951	1.29	5	1.43
Iniciativa per Catalunya - Els Verds (IC-EV)	296,985	1.20	2	0.57
Coalición Canaria (CC)	220,418	0.89	4	1.14
Bloque Nacionalista Galego (BNG)	220,147	0.89	2	0.57
Herri Batasuna (HB)	181,304	0.73	2	0.57
Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya (ERC)	167,641	0.68	1	0.29
Unión del Pueblo Navarro - Partido Popular (UPN-PP)	120,335	0.49	2	0.57
Eusko Alkartasuna (EA)	115,861	0.47	1	0.29
Unió Valenciana (UV)	91,575	0.37	1	0.29
Total	24,248,988		350	
Other parties**	553,943	2.23		
Total votes to candidatures	24,802,931			

\* Based on votes obtained by all candidatures.

\*\* Candidatures that have obtained votes but not seats.

Source: Junta Electoral Central. Ministerio del Interior, 2002.

## **2.6 Conclusion**

The Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) and the dictatorship that followed (1939-1975) defined very critical years of Spain's history. During that period, the most conservative and influential elements of the Spanish society, namely the Catholic Church and the Army, fostered a social, economic and political model of government based on a strong centralisation of the state's apparatus, suppression of any regionalist/nationalist identities, and profound international isolation. However, some foreign elements made it through, and by the mid 1970s Spain was on the way to building a European identity. After Franco's death in 1975, Spain became a constitutional monarchy. The democratic political reform that followed, known as the "transition", was an example of successful compromise between all the political parties and of confidence from the public in the democratic process.

Spain is today a nation with a diverse political party system. Voters have shown repeatedly their preference for a two-party system, based on moderate-left and moderate-right options. However, ethnoterritorial and linguistic diversity has helped consolidate territorial and nationalist parties, some of them, like in the cases of Catalonia and the Basque Country, very powerful in the national context.

## **PART 3**

### **SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter is concerned with the concept of subjective well-being, its elements (especially those that may be connected to the concept of social capital), and its measurement. I must note that most of the literature available on subjective well-being and therefore reviewed in this section emphasises the role of psychological factors over social factors.

I start this section of the study by defining the term "subjective well-being" (numerous authors also refer to the same concept with the term "subjective quality of life"), clearly separating the "objective" dimension from the "subjective" dimension of the concept. As the main focus of this research is on the subjective dimension of well-being, this section will explore the various psychological elements that make up the structure of subjective well-being, and how, although partly independent, they are interrelated. Most literature reviewed in this study supports the multidimensionality of subjective well-being, one important distinction being between cognitive (rational) and affective (emotional) components of subjective well-being. The chapter then passes to review some of the critics who suggest that one of the elements of subjective well-being – happiness – is affected by survey response bias. When people are asked about their happiness, they tend to answer in positive rather than in negative terms. The explanations for such behaviour are varied. Numerous studies suggest that people think that it may be socially desirable to report that you are happier than you really are, while others argue that there is a tendency to adapt very easily to unpleasant circumstances and therefore to downplay them.

The next section of this chapter addresses the issue of the relationship between materialism and subjective well-being, with special attention to the modernisation/postmodernisation theory, and to the conflictive values theory. While there is empirical evidence of a positive association between subjective well-being and postmaterialist values, materialist values appear to be associated with correspondingly lower levels of subjective well-being.

I will continue with a discussion on the role of needs' satisfaction in the achievement of desired levels of quality of life, and its connection with socioeconomic and political variables. In brief, satisfaction of human needs, together with favourable living conditions, tends to be associated with high levels of subjective well-being, while inequalities (socioeconomic and gender based) and poor life conditions produce generalised dissatisfaction. The chapter will also review those studies that support a link between quality of life and economic development. The underlying argument is that an above average financial/income status is associated with greater levels of happiness.

Finally, I review some of the more prominent indicators and measures of subjective well-being. Most of them are based on individuals' self reports, and vary from single item scales to multi-item scales. Two of them – the satisfaction with life as a whole scale and the happiness scale – will be used in this research to analyse subjective well-being in the context of Spain and four of its regions.

### **3.2 The Concept of Subjective Well-Being: Life Satisfaction, Happiness, Positive Affect and Negative Affect**

Miranda and Villanueva (1983), and Veenhoven (1996) argue that when defining quality of life, or well-being, it is necessary to consider it in both objective and subjective terms. Under Veenhoven's view:

'Objective' quality of life is the degree to which living-conditions meet observable criteria of the good life, such as: income security for everybody, safety in the street, good health care, education, etc. In this context, the prefix 'objective' refers to the way of measurement. Measurement is based on explicit criteria of success that can be applied by impartial outsiders.

'Subjective' quality of life is how people appreciate their life personally. For example, how secure they think their income is, how safe they feel in the street, how satisfied they are with their health and education, etc. Here the prefix 'subjective' means that criteria for judgement may vary from person to person. In this case, standards are not explicit, and external judgement is not possible. (Veenhoven, 1996, p. 1)

However, "quality of life" appears to be a concept that may have been overused and/or badly used (Miranda & Villanueva, 1983), and therefore has ended up being confusing. Miranda and Villanueva (1983) believe that quality of life results from numerous interrelated factors. In this line, Lawton (1997, p. 45) considers quality of life as a "...collection of dimensions", such as a psychological or subjective dimension (personal appreciation of own quality of life), and an objective or social dimension. Lawton (1997) argues that both dimensions influence individuals' evaluations of their own lives.

Eckersley (1997) considers "quality of life" as a broad term that refers to total well-being, which includes physical, mental, social and spiritual well-being. Veenhoven (1984) defines subjective well-being as the individual's judgement of overall personal quality of life in a positive way, and satisfaction as a very important concept in its measurement (Veenhoven, 1996). Diener, Suh and Oishi (1997, p.1) refer to subjective well-being as the way "...people evaluate their lives". It is a "meaningful construct" (Diener, 1994, p. 105) of global judgements based in individual

experiences. Christopher (1999) suggests that the predominant approach to explore well-being uses the term "subjective well-being".

Especially since the 1960s, social psychology has been an important source of literature referring to subjective well-being or perceived quality of life. Andrews and Withey (1976), Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965), and Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976) all based their findings in survey technique, using subjective well-being or quality of life as dependent variables, and analysing their relationship with people's levels of satisfaction in various life domains. Andrews and Withey (1976) designed the "Life as a Whole Index", which has been widely used as a measure of subjective well-being. This index is designed to reflect affective – positive and/or negative – and cognitive components of subjective well-being. Andrews and Withey (1976) also distinguished between assessments of life as a whole and assessments of specific life domains and concerns, such as health, work, marriage, religion, political issues, leisure or financial situation. In their view, some people may achieve positive changes in their subjective well-being by changing the way they judge the various domains or the life as a whole, while others will only achieve desired levels of subjective well-being by accomplishing specific goals related to life domains or to life as a whole.

Those specific life domains and the evaluations the individuals make of them form the structure of subjective well-being (Andrews & Inglehart, 1979). However, Veenhoven (1996) points out that although satisfaction with life as a whole is correlated with the individual's evaluations of specific life domains, this does not necessarily mean that those domain appraisals actually cause overall life satisfaction. Andrews and Withey (1976), Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976), Diener (1994), and Veenhoven (1994a, 1996) suggest that individuals continually make subjective cognitive appraisals of events, life circumstances and themselves within their own experiences. Living conditions and major socioeconomic changes may produce variations in our appreciation of life, as a whole or in some of its components or domains (Veenhoven, 1996). By definition, the more positive the appraisals of one's life and circumstances the higher one's subjective well-being; the more negative the appraisals the lower one's subjective well-being (Diener, 1994).

Subjective well-being is a multidimensional concept (Diener, 1984; George, 1981; Lawton, 1983). Life satisfaction, happiness, negative affect (transitory distressing feelings) and positive affect (transitory feelings of pleasure as an emotional state) are some of the dimensions that make up the structure of subjective well-being under a psychological approach (Lawton, 1983; Lawton, Kleban & Di Carlo, 1984). The variables representing such dimensions have frequently shown correlations with one another and with overall assessments of subjective well-being (Lawrence & Liang, 1988). Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976) suggest that satisfaction and happiness are not exactly the same. On one hand, *satisfaction* is based in a cognitive experience (Cummins & Nistico, 2002), and implies positive relationships between what the individual desires and what he/she achieves. Life satisfaction can be subdivided into numerous categories or domains – family, work, friends, leisure,



health, finances, etc. On the other hand, people assess their levels of *happiness* on the basis of experiences of positive affect, counterbalanced by experiences of negative affect. Myers and Diener (1997) also agree that satisfaction and happiness are not the same thing, although they have many traits in common.

Andrews and Robinson (1991) consider subjective well-being an individual's attitude that has both cognitive (rational) and affective (emotional) components. Like numerous researchers with a psychological approach to the study of subjective well-being, Andrews and Robinson (1991) also suggest that the two components of the affective dimension of subjective well-being are positive affect and negative affect. Argyle (1987) points out that positive and negative affect, although part of the affective dimension of subjective well-being, are independent. Baker, Cesa, Gatz and Mellins (1992) also support the view that positive and negative affects are independent of each other; in these writers' opinion, positive affect originates in the environment, while negative affect originates within the individual and may be affected or influenced by genetic factors. Emmons and Diener (1985) suggest a strong influence of temperament in subjective well-being, pointing out that such well-being tends to be positively associated with extraversion and negatively associated with neuroticism. Costa and McCrae (1980; 1984) also note the influence of personality characteristics (extraversion and neuroticism) on happiness. However, personality is not the only influence on subjective well-being. Environmental factors (Veenhoven, 1994b) and recent life events (Myers and Diener, 1995) may also account for some variations in subjective well-being levels. As Diener et al. (1999) point out, there is not just one cause of happiness. Numerous factors (personal circumstances, personality characteristics, goals and expectations, personal ability to cope with life events, etc.) have an effect on people's levels of happiness. In this line, Headey and Wearing (1989) developed the "dynamic equilibrium model", which suggests that subjective well-being stays stable if life events do not suffer any changes. However, any deviations from the normal pattern of life events will produce changes in the individual's subjective well-being, although those changes may only be temporary.

Nevertheless, Christopher (1999) argues that the predominant approach to researching subjective well-being lacks the analysis of particular cultural values and norms, and is greatly influenced by Western cultural values, such as individualism. Christopher (1999) also suggests that measures of affective balance, such as happiness, are affected by response bias. In this line of argument, Hagedorn (1996) asks whether people are really deceiving themselves and researchers by responding mainly towards the positive end of the scale in answer to the question "How happy are you?", while Jacobs and Willits (1994) show their concern about the appropriateness of using a measure that may inadequately assess happiness because people tend to answer in very positive terms. Eckersley (1997) contends that some people may not reveal their unhappiness because to do so could label that person as a loser. Argyle (1987) and Veenhoven (1984) suggest that some people

may report exaggerated levels of happiness because it may be socially desirable to say that you are happy, even if you are not. Argyle (1987) also points out that some people may get used to many unpleasant circumstances, and therefore they may not report them as unsatisfactory, especially when they compare their situation with others' or with past situations. Myers and Diener (1995) follow that argument, asserting that people adapt very easily to most kinds of situations, positive or negative, and when they are asked to make an evaluation of their lives, those situations may not have a lasting effect in their memory unless they are or have been really unforgettable. Muldoon, Barger, Flory and Manuck (1998) also examine the effect of psychological adaptation to specific life circumstances, such as illness, misfortune, etc, on individuals' reports of subjective well-being. In this context, Pusey (1998) has found evidence that self-reported happiness appears to be a normal situation in industrialised countries, that people also adapt very quickly to most circumstances, and that attitude has an important effect in subjective appraisals of well-being. Veenhoven (1996, p.19) likewise follows this argument, suggesting that "...happiness seems to be the normal condition" of human nature under tolerable living conditions. When asked to make an assessment of personal well-being, a majority of people tend to report in a moderate positive way (Cummins & Nistico, 2002). According to Cummins and Nistico (2002, p. 41), people do so because "...life satisfaction is held under homeostatic control"; there is a link between subjective well-being and "Positive Cognitive Biases" (PCBs). PCBs are adaptive mechanisms that ensure the homeostatic maintenance of people's sense of positive well-being through the fulfillment, partial or total, of their needs.

### **3.3 Subjective Well-Being and Materialism**

Inglehart (1997) contends that happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole are excellent indicators of overall subjective well-being. His research on values in various societies includes items on happiness and on satisfaction with life as a whole, which he uses to test the theory of cultural shift, and specifically the shift from materialist values (those that give top priority to physical sustenance and safety) to postmaterialist values (those that put more emphasis on quality of life). Inglehart (1997) supports the idea that there is a link between high levels of subjective well-being and postmaterialism. According to Inglehart's theory, the achievement of high levels of economic growth, industrialisation and sociopolitical stability are conducive to – but not necessarily a cause of – high levels of physical security and subjective well-being; nevertheless, societies that have achieved an advanced industrial status and material security are showing a gradual intergenerational shift towards what are known as postmaterialist values: more people today emphasise quality of life and individual self-expression rather than ever-increasing material wealth as a basis for higher levels of subjective well-being. Hence, Inglehart maintains that although levels of subjective well-being tend to rise with processes of industrial development, industrialised nations

eventually "reach a point of diminishing marginal utility at which maximizing economic gains ...or economic growth... no longer results in higher levels of subjective well-being" (Inglehart, 1997, p.87). Thus, in nations which have been wealthy for a long period of time income has, if any, very modest impact on subjective well-being.

Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) have also explored the effect that materialist values may have in subjective well-being, but with an approach different to Inglehart's. They have tested the theory that high levels of materialism are negatively associated with subjective well-being – although individuals with strong materialist values may believe that they will achieve desired levels of well-being by consuming and possessing more things – and positively correlated with depression and neuroticism. Richins and Dawson (1992, p.308) define the concept of materialism as a "... set of centrally held beliefs about the importance of possessions in one's life". Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) use the "values theory" to support their view that materialist values are opposed to collective-oriented values, such as family values. Family values and family support have shown strong effects on well-being (Headey, 1993; Moreno 1999). As a consequence, those individuals who hold high materialist values and high collective values will manifest a serious value conflict in the form of psychological stress. This tension may lead to a reduced sense of happiness and of satisfaction with life as a whole. The way materialist values may reduce subjective well-being is conditional on the rest of the core values of the individual. Richins and Dawson (1992) follow this line of argument and point out that those individuals who manifest high levels of consumism also experience reduced levels of life satisfaction. Belk (1985) also suggests an association between materialism and low levels of happiness. However, Eckersley (2001) points out that consumism, as a cultural trend characteristic of Western societies, may present, in a way, some benefits to the quality of life of individuals. In his opinion, the fact that goods and services are out there, available to anybody with money to pay the price, has made people's lives safer and more comfortable.

### **3.4 Satisfaction of Human Needs**

Veenhoven (1992; 1994b; 1996) explores the role that needs' satisfaction has in the achievement of desired levels of happiness under what he calls a "naturalistic point of view" (1996, p. 39). He points out that people become happier as they satisfy more of their needs. Veenhoven (1992, p.14) uses the term "livability" to refer to the "...degree to which the provisions and requirements of society fit with the needs and capacities of its members." Satisfaction, somehow, reflects a successful fit between human needs gratification and physical, social and mental living conditions. According to Veenhoven (1992), better living conditions, in any sense, will translate in higher levels of subjective well-being. He points out that those countries where life conditions are very miserable show higher levels of dissatisfaction than those countries where living conditions are

better. Living conditions affect levels of physical and mental health, which are linked to happiness and levels of satisfaction with life as a whole (Argyle, 1987; Veenhoven, 1996). Socioeconomic inequalities and a lack of political freedom also have an effect on the extent of satisfaction (Veenhoven, 1992). Under this approach, objective life conditions have an effect on happiness. Maslow (1970) also supports the view that satisfaction of needs has an effect on levels of life satisfaction. Maslow states that people living in poor countries base their happiness evaluations in the satisfaction of basic needs (such as access to food and water), while those living in wealthy nations base their happiness assessments in higher needs (such as love and freedom). Maslow also suggests that once the basic needs are met, life satisfaction will be associated with the satisfaction of higher needs. Since self-reports of life satisfaction are influenced by the satisfaction of needs and expectations, a crucial issue is the gap between perceived needs and the level of fulfillment of those needs. This issue will be discussed further under subsequent headings.

### **3.5 Subjective Well-Being and Economic Development**

Inkeles and Diamond (1980), and Veenhoven (1996) argue that there is significant empirical evidence of the relationship between a nation's level of economic development and the subjective well-being of its citizens. People living in highly developed countries tend to have a greater sense of personal worth and satisfaction with their lives than do those who live in developing or underdeveloped countries. In the more developed countries people are, on average, also more trustful, tolerant and self confident, and these are attitudes that have a great impact in the political, social and economic stability of the country. Eckersley (1997) agrees that people in richer countries may report higher levels of happiness than do people in developing countries, but he contends that the differences are not substantial and that there is no evidence of wealth being the cause of greater happiness. Social and economic inequalities also have an effect on levels of subjective well-being (Veenhoven, 1996), as they may be a source of adversity, personal frustration, cultural intolerance and poor allocation of human resources.

Davis (1984) suggests an association, at the individual level, of above average financial/income situation with greater levels of happiness. In a way, he follows the traditional welfare economics assumption that money can buy goods and services that can make people happy. Hosen, Solovey-Honsen and Stern (2003) also support the view that those individuals with higher incomes, therefore able to consume more, and involved in economically productive and challenging activities, tend to show higher levels of subjective well-being. Requena Santos (1994) has explored the relationship between happiness and a number of socioeconomic features, coming to the conclusion that happiness increases with socioeconomic status, with income and education as major influences, ahead of occupation. Argyle (1987) and Saunders (1996) argue that health status and income are

especially of concern as we grow older, and both have an effect in subjective happiness assessments. Pusey (1998) has evidence of the impact of shifts in income on subjective well-being. Saunders (1996) suggests that the relationship between income and perceived well-being is complex and may be a non-symmetrical one, meaning that once people have enough money to live comfortably, increases of income might have little effect on perceived happiness. On the other hand, a decline in income may produce a rise in unhappiness. In this line, Cummins (2000) and Cummins and Nistico (2002) have developed a model where subjective well-being is explored using the principle of homeostasis. Briefly, the Homeostatic Theory of Subjective Well-Being suggests that subjective well-being "... is held under homeostatic control" (Cummins, 2000, p. 136) and that there are theoretical and empirical associations between low levels of personal wealth and low levels of subjective well-being. In Cummins' opinion:

... provided that people have sufficient money to purchase the resources required for adaptation to their life circumstances, the level of SWB will be largely set by the balance of extroversion and neuroticism. This changes, however, when the financial resources become insufficient to support adaptation (Cummins, 2000, p. 151)

Radcliff (2001) provides an approach that combines economics, culture and politics in the analysis of subjective well-being. He states that governments' ideologies have an impact on welfare policies and, therefore, an effect on levels of perceived well-being. Leftist policies, traditionally associated with the nurture of the welfare state, are conducive to life satisfaction as they mitigate the effects that market orientated policies have in people's lives. Radcliff also acknowledges that politics may have an effect, positive or negative, on overall economic performance, and by extension on people's happiness.

### **3.6 Measures of Subjective Well-Being**

Measuring subjective well-being may help understand societies better and may also inform social policy makers of those issues that produce dissatisfaction and that can be improved by sociopolitical reform. Andrews and Withey (1976), Campbell et al. (1976), Headey (1993) and Michalos (1980) argue that assessments of life concerns, or life domains, are very powerful predictors of general happiness and satisfaction with life. Andrews and Withey (1976) emphasise the importance of measuring how satisfied people are, how satisfactions and dissatisfactions change through time, how they are distributed in society and within its sub-groups, and how the satisfaction with different domains of life correlate with each other. Exploring the components of subjective well-being will provide some knowledge in this matter, but the researcher will also obtain valuable information

through the analysis of those factors that influence personal assessments of well-being, and the social and psychological effects/outcomes of variations in subjective well-being (Andrews & Withey, 1976).

Assessment of subjective well-being is affected by its multidimensionality (Diener, 1984; George, 1981; Lawton, 1983) and by the influence of life circumstances in people's assessments of their lives (Diener, 1994). Standards for life satisfaction evaluations are also influenced by cultural values (Oishi et al, 1999). Indicators of quality of life rely to some extent in people's own subjective perception and evaluation of their lives at a given time and under given circumstances, but they may also include objective measures of life conditions in terms of goods and services (Blisshen & Atkinson, 1980; Szalai, 1980). Szalai (1980) suggests that indicators of quality of life can be categorised as social indicators because they measure the well-being of groups of people. Some quality of life measurements are based in traditional indicators of objective social conditions, such as: socioeconomic indices, like infant mortality or life expectancy; and financial accounts; family status measurements, like divorce rates or proportion of single parent households; measures of environmental quality, as indicated by the extent of air, water and noise pollution; or indirect indicators of psychological well-being, as measured by suicide, homicide and crime rates (Jacobs & Willits, 1994, p. 162). Therefore, individuals' evaluations of life and of different issues plus objective indicators of conditions related to those issues may provide a very useful tool for social researchers and policy makers (Andrews & Withey, 1976). However, assessments of community services, local and national governments make a very small contribution to explaining well-being (Andrews & Robinson, 1991). There is one economic indicator that is used widely as a measure of individual and national progress, the Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Eckersley (1997) argues that the GDP cannot be taken as a general measure of socioeconomic welfare, as it ignores, for example, the value of national assets, and income distribution. Miranda and Villanueva (1983) also point out that objective indicators of quality of life have limitations, as they do not evaluate people's concerns nor provide information on such valuable issues as, for example, collective satisfaction with life and work conditions.

Social indicators may influence community attitudes and policy making by identifying issues that are of common interest and that may be addressed through policy reform, thus it is very important that they are accurate, valid and comprehensive (Eckersley, 1997). Andrews and Withey (1976) considered that specific indicators of subjective well-being should be: broad in coverage of the population's concerns, relevant to any sub-group of that population, and statistically and economically efficient and accurate.

There are a large number of scales that have been used to measure subjective well-being. Choosing one scale or another depends on the theoretical purpose of the study and its methodology. Some items in a scale may only be appropriate for a specific set of respondents. So to choose the

appropriate scale we have to clearly establish which concept or concepts we want to measure and if we will be comparing the results with any others (Andrews & Robinson, 1991).

Most measures of subjective well-being are based on individuals' self-reports, and although relying exclusively in self-report measures has limitations, they have shown satisfactory levels of validity and reliability (Diener, 1994). Some of the more useful measurement scales are based on one single item, although multi-items scales may offer higher levels of validity and reliability. They may also offer more information about the different components of subjective well-being (Andrews & Robinson, 1991). In any case, people's self-reported assessments of well-being have been measured and tested for a number of years now, and it can be said that those measures have shown quite remarkable consistency (Myers & Diener, 1997).

Bradburn (1969) developed the "Three Affect Scale" (Positive Affect Score [PAS], Negative Affect Score [NAS], and Affect Balance Score [ABS]). This scale is widely used in the measurement of psychological well-being. Positive affect refers to the dimension of positive emotions, while negative affect refers to the dimension of negative emotions. Affect balance is the difference between positive affect and negative affect. Campbell et al. (1976) produced the "Index of General Affect", based on eight items. They also produced the "Index of Well-Being", which is a measurement of self-reported well-being. This index combines the "Index of General Affect" and a single item evaluation of life satisfaction. Although highly reliable and consistent, measures of subjective well-being may change in response to changing circumstances and life events (Diener, 1994).

Cantril (1965) developed the "Self-Anchoring Ladder", a scale that looks like a ten (0 to 9) step ladder, with the phrase "best possible life for you " at one end, and the phrase "worst possible life for you" at the other. After naming the specific index (e.g. life satisfaction or happiness), the question would be: "At the present moment in time, where would you place yourself in the ladder?"

A better known scale is the "Satisfaction with Life as a Whole Index", also known as the "Delighted-Terrible" response scale – "How do you feel about your life as a whole?" – created by Andrews and Withey (1976). Andrews and Withey argue that it is a very appropriate measure of subjective well-being because:

Its wording refers directly to a concept of immediate and obvious relevance from a social indicator standpoint...is one of the most sensitive of a whole set of alternative measures...that can be used to attain a global assessment of the respondent's own current life-as-a-whole, using the full range of a very general evaluative dimension...[the measure] shows meaningful and reasonable relationships to a variety of more specific life qualities; it relates substantially to feelings of life being happy, satisfying, interesting, rewarding, ideal, enjoyable, and the respondent's sense of his or her own capability...The scaling...is transparently straightforward, a simple mean. (Andrews & Withey, 1976, p.108).

Andrews and McKennell (1980) also consider the "Delighted-Terrible Scale" as a very balanced measure of subjective well-being because, although it has had some design changes over time, it still reflects both affective and cognitive assessments of subjective well-being in equal amounts, and equal amounts of positive and negative affect. Diener and Larsen (1984) point out that the concept of life satisfaction itself, which has been used in different scales, appears to be very stable and consistent. Inglehart (1997) has used the "Satisfaction with Life as a Whole Index", with ten categories, as one of the items to test the theory of cultural shift, and specifically the shift from materialist values to postmaterialist values. Cummins (2003) considers that scales of 10 or 11 points are the more sensitive and, therefore, superior measurement of peoples' levels of life satisfaction.

Another broadly used concept to measure subjective well-being, specifically its affective dimension, is that of happiness (Davis, 1984; Jacobs & Willits, 1994; Smith, 1979). Smith (1979) points out that one of the advantages of the happiness measure is that it is clearly understood and meaningful to respondents. However, many authors have shown some concerns about the use of happiness measures as the only tools to measure and evaluate subjective well-being. Argyle (1987) and Hagedorn (1996) suggest that self-reports of happiness may be biased by people's perception that being happy is generally regarded as more desirable than being unhappy. Argyle (1987) also argues that people may not report unhappy feelings because they may have got used to them.

In addition, there are some concerns that the utilitarian assumption of individual happiness and satisfaction as measures of subjective well-being in society may result in ignoring the variety of interdependencies existing between individuals, who are very different one from each other (The Roher Institute, 1993). Factors such as threats to personal safety, rising economic insecurity, threats to health, environmental degradation and growing inequalities in the society, may affect people's perception of their quality of life, and therefore need to be taken into account in any assessment of subjective well-being (The Roher Institute, 1993).

Veenhoven (1984) supports the distinction between cognitive and affective components when measuring subjective well-being. This distinction may help to understand why some individuals or groups show high levels of satisfaction and low levels of happiness, or vice versa, in the same study. For example, as people get older, more educated and professionally successful, they may feel more satisfied with their lives because they have reached the point where they have achieved their aspirations, but they may also feel emotionally unhappy as their lives unfold and their states of health decline. The influence of aspirations in the measurement of subjective well-being has shown some interesting outcomes. Argyle (1987) and Michalos (1980) argue that when evaluating subjective well-being we have to consider the "gap" between what people desire and what people perceive they have achieved. They apply the gap/ratio theory, which deals with the relationship between what people aspire for and what they perceive they have achieved. The greater the gap between aspirations and perceived achievements, the lower the subjective well-being. Following



this line of argument, rich people may show lower levels of subjective well-being because their aspirations are far too great compared to those of not so rich people. Therefore, aspirations, perceived achievements and subjective well-being are all very important factors that need to be explored and measured separately to test the gap/ratio theory.

### **3.7 Conclusion**

The aim of this chapter has been to offer a conceptual framework to explore subjective well-being as a multidimensional concept. Life satisfaction, happiness, positive affect (feeling of pleasure as an emotional state) and negative affect (distressing psychological states) are some of the dimensions that integrate the structure of subjective well-being under a psychological approach. Individuals continually make subjective cognitive appraisals of events, life circumstances and themselves within their own experiences.

There is not a single measurement of subjective well-being. There are many studies on subjective well-being; numerous scales have been designed to measure it. Choice of scales depends on the theoretical purpose of the research and the researcher's methodological preferences. The best known single item scale is the Satisfaction with Life as a Whole Index – "How satisfied are you with your life as a whole?" It is one of the most widely used and reliable measures of subjective well-being. Another reasonably adequate and broadly used concept to measure subjective well-being, specifically its affective dimension, is happiness. However, there are limitations in the use of satisfaction and happiness indexes as only tools to measure and evaluate subjective well-being. There is the concern that people may get used to many unpleasant circumstances, and therefore they may not report them as unsatisfactory, especially when they compare their situation with others' or with past situations. Another criticism is that a measure of happiness may be subject to a response bias. There are questions as to whether people tend to answer in very positive terms or if they tend to report exaggerated levels of happiness because it may be considered socially desirable to say that you are happy, even if you are not.

## **PART 4**

### **SOCIAL CAPITAL**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter intends to explore the concept of social capital, its forms and the conditions under which is created and nurtured, emphasising the importance of the development of social capital in any society. It looks especially at the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of social capital and its components.

The first part of this chapter provides a general discussion of the concept of social capital and its influence in political, social, and economic life from different perspectives. It follows with a review of some of the authors that have had relevant theoretical roles in the development of the concept and measures of social capital, with a special focus in the works of Bourdieu, Coleman and Putnam.

The chapter follows with a look at the different categories of social capital. It is widely accepted that there is not just one form of social capital, but many, and most authors draw on the characteristics of the different elements of social capital to categorise it. In this context, the types of networks, their norms and obligations, the relationships that develop within those networks and the trust derived from those relationships have helped to draw differences between, for example, bonding social capital and bridging social capital, or horizontal from vertical social capital.

The next section provides a detailed exploration of the core elements that comprise social capital. This part of the study focuses on the role that trust, reciprocity, tolerance and social networks have in the creation of social capital in communities. Social networks will be extensively explored as they constitute, in the opinion of numerous authors, the essential structural element of social capital.

Community, civil society and democracy are concepts associated with the development of social capital. This study offers a theoretical analysis of the different views on the relationship between the functioning of communities, civil society and social capital. I have made a special emphasis in the role that nationalism may have in the creation of civil society, as it is a phenomenon affecting Spanish society.

The chapter follows with an exploration of the methodological issues surrounding the measures of social capital, and a review of those indicators more widely used to measure the elements of social capital. Methodological issues of the study are further analysed in Part 6 (Methodology). This section identifies those indicators that measure specifically the elements of social capital reviewed here. The study emphasises the view that social capital is a multidimensional concept, and therefore it needs to be addressed element by element and measured as such.

Finally, I review those threats that affect the elements of social capital and, as a consequence, may make social capital a vulnerable asset. I conclude pointing out those aspects of social capital that may have negative effects on community relationships and on society in general.

## **4.2 The Concept of Social Capital**

Social capital is a concept that has been extensively explored during the last two decades under the umbrella of such different disciplines as education, sociology, economy, political sciences and anthropology. In a broad sense, social capital embodies a wide range of concepts that may help explain the linkages between economic, political, social, historical and cultural factors, making it an especially appealing, but difficult to define, object of research. In words of Portes (1998, p. 2): "...social capital comes to be applied to so many events and in so many different contexts as to lose any distinct meaning."

It was Hanifan (1916, p.130) who first used the expression "social capital", in order to describe those elements from daily life, such as good will and social interaction, that will have a positive impact towards the satisfaction of individual and collective needs.

Defined simply, social capital refers to how individuals and organisations are interrelated with each other by norms, values, sanctions, trust, social networks (formal and informal), obligations and expectations. Those relationships enable both individuals and organisations to gain access to resources that will help them achieve shared goals and find solutions to collective problems more effectively than if they were to pursue those goals and solutions individually. From a sociological perspective, social capital can only be created and nurtured by people functioning as a group or network, not just as individuals (Grootaert, 1998; Onyx & Bullen, 2000), as those who are socially associated with an individual are the real source of his/her social capital (Portes, 1998). However, its effects can be assessed at the individual level (Hyppä & Mäki, 2003).

The concept of social capital lies at the core of the understanding of the role of social features (such as social cohesion, integration, and collective problem solving) in the pursuit of desired levels of personal and collective well-being. In this context, social capital provides a framework to explore collective action, particularly why some communities succeed in reaching shared goals and in finding solutions to collective problems that affect the well-being of their members, while others cannot find the necessary collective effort to achieve those common goals (Coleman, 1988; Putnam et al., 1993). Stone (2000) suggests that because social capital has a clear role in the design, development, and implementation of public policy, researchers need to address the issues of how social capital is generated, how it is distributed and how it functions at different levels and in different circumstances. In this regard, Edwards and Foley (1998) point out that most research in

social capital has ignored the role of the political, economic, social and cultural contexts in the variations on the characteristics of social capital.

In brief, social capital

...refers to the processes between people which establish networks, norms and social trust and facilitate co-ordination and co-operation for mutual benefit (Cox, 1995, p. 15).

Three of the seminal proponents of the concept of social capital are Bourdieu (1977a, 1977b, 1986), Coleman (1973, 1986a, 1986b, 1988) and Putnam (1993, 1995, 1996). Bourdieu (1986) argues that social relations are fundamental resources that place the individual in a hierarchical and complex social structure. Social networks allow their members access to valuable collective resources, and may play a role in the individual's social and economic status. Bourdieu points out that economic and material conditions are fundamental components of the development of social processes, and therefore they must be taken into account in any measurement of social capital.

Coleman (1988) also sees social capital as a resource result of human relationships in the context of social structures. However, individuals do not create social capital constrained by economic or material circumstances but because they believe that by creating social groups and networks they will facilitate collective action, and therefore they will maximise their individual potentialities and opportunities. Coleman (1988) emphasises the role of norms and values, mutual trust, mutual obligations and expectations, social networks and social organisations in the creation of social capital. He has shown a special interest in the study of social capital as a resource essential in the acquisition and development of human capital, in particular in the context of children's education and development within the family and the community. Coleman (1988) argues that those relationships developed within the family structure constitute the social capital of the family. In this context, social capital will vary, depending on several structural factors. According to this view, variables such as the physical presence or absence of the parents in the household, the quantity and quality of the attention the child or children receive from the parents and/or other adults within the family circle, and the strength of the relationships between the child or children and the parents, will determine the nature of social capital at the family level. Portela Maseda and Neira Gómez (2003) support Coleman's theory of social capital within the family, and suggest that human capital will only pass from one generation to the next if the social capital within the family is strong. Smith, Beaulieu and Seraphine (1995) have also done some work in this line, and suggest an association between social capital (as social interaction) at the family level, and human capital (as educational achievement). The concept of human capital and its association with social capital is further explored in Part 5 of the study.

The most influential argument that Putnam puts forward is the role of social capital in shaping democratic societies. Putnam (1993) and Putnam et al. (1993) point out that social capital is a resource that operates in the context of a civil society, referring to significant horizontally organised interrelations between people leading to the creation of efficient political institutions that will aid the functioning of democratic societies. Democracy thrives on those communities where trust, civic engagement, reciprocity, solidarity and integrity are valued concepts. Putnam et al. (1993) have worked extensively in the specific case of government structure, economic performance, and regional divisions in Italy. They suggest that political and administrative decentralisation (and the various degrees of power transferred to each region by the central government) widen the inequalities and differences between regions, and reduce the efficiency and the equity standards of public policy. In this line, the World Bank Group (2002) also emphasises the crucial role that healthy sociopolitical and economic environments, together with the historical and cultural contexts, play in the development of social capital

Rico, Fraile and González (1998) offer a different point of view, suggesting that, in the case of regional Spain, the association between regional economic development and social capital is not significant. Their research confirms, however, that social capital is an essential determinant of regional government effectiveness, and that its positive effects may be influenced by public resources allocation. In the context of decentralisation, they argue that degree of autonomy (political decentralisation) and self-government experience have a positive influence on legislative performance. In regional Spain, political decentralisation is associated with legislative effectiveness and accountable government performance

Is social capital just another type of capital, like economic, human or political capital? Portela Maseda and Neira Gómez (2003) suggest that, although social capital has some of the characteristics of any other type of capital, it also presents some important differences. On one hand, social capital is an asset that produces benefits, it may substitute and complement other forms of capital, may be transformed into other forms of capital, and it requires constant investment to grow, just like the other forms of capital. On the other hand, social capital is difficult to create outside social structures and it is also complicated to clearly define it and measure it. Over all, Portela Maseda and Neira Gómez (2003) support the view of social capital as another form of capital, and that, although all capitals are somehow linked, the strongest association of social capital is with human capital.

Grootaert and Van Bastelaer (2001, p.8) also consider social capital a form of capital, and as such social capital is "...an accumulated stock..." or asset that produces benefits, in this case diverse collective benefits based in collective action and information exchange. It is an asset that is not distributed homogeneously, that grows as it is used, and that diminishes as its use decreases. In words of Weiss (1996, p. 22), "The more one gives, the more one receives or has the potential to

receive", and in this context Weiss suggests that the benefit or the potential for benefit really depends on levels of participation and social trust. In a way, social capital may be considered as an indicator of the social health of communities, societies and nations. Stone and Hughes (2002, p.1) refer to social capital as a multidimensional concept that acts as "...the glue that holds communities together". Coleman (1988) also views social capital as not one but as several entities or dimensions, which have two common elements: the social structure, and the action within that social structure. Under Coleman's approach, social capital allows the individual to identify the specific characteristics of the social structure that may be useful as resources to achieve collective endeavours. Eastis (1998) also supports the multidimensionality of social capital, and argues that social capital is affected essentially by the characteristics of the networks, organisations and agents involved in its creation. The complexity of the concept of social capital itself and of its various dimensions points out the need to explore those elements individually. Portela Maseda and Neira Gómez (2003) argue that social capital is composed by different types of assets (social, psychological, cultural, cognitive, etc.), and those assets will help achieve collective action towards mutual benefit.

Stone (2000) suggests that because social capital has a clear role in the design, development, and implementation of public policy, researchers need to address the issues of how social capital is generated, how it is distributed and how it functions at different levels and in different circumstances. In this regard, Edwards and Foley (1998) point out that most research in social capital has ignored the role of the political, economic, social and cultural contexts in the variations on the characteristics of social capital ( participation, tolerance and trust).

Weiss (1996) emphasises the part played by social capital in social exchange based on mutually beneficial relationships supported by mutual expectations and obligations. People engage in social interactions at different levels (levels of participation, common values and trust vary from person to person and from group to group) to satisfy specific needs. Based on levels of need and levels of engagement people will receive different levels of benefits.

### **4.3 Forms of Social Capital**

As it has been said before, social capital refers to the networks of relationships, norms and values in and among social actors (individuals and organisations) that contribute towards cooperation to achieve mutual benefit. Pérez-Díaz (2003) argues that while it is widely accepted that social capital is essential to any form of micro or macro societies, the problem is to clearly define the different types of social capital.

We can identify different forms of social capital, generally based in the characteristics of the different types of networks, their norms and obligations, the relationships that develop within those networks and the trust derived from those relationships. Effective and socially supported norms of obligations and expectations, such as those that encourage working towards a common goal, are themselves a powerful form of structural social capital (Coleman, 1988). Also different social structures demand different social actions and, therefore, may have different forms of social capital (Coleman, 1988). Trust, norms, expectations and obligations are defined within the social structures, based on factors such as individual or group needs, and resources available to provide satisfaction of those needs. In this line of argument, the term "consensus" emphasises the importance of some sort of agreement among expectations held by different people. Role theory (Biddle, 1986) suggests that in those situations where norms are supported by sanctions – such as in voluntary associations – normative consensus may help to facilitate social relationships and social integration in that setting.

Family life, paid work and public life all form part of the human condition (Arendt, 1958). To achieve a successful balance between all these aspects of life it is necessary to allocate time and other resources to each of these spheres. The loss of such balance – by people's choices of one sphere over the others – would bring poor social action or none. Both public and private spheres involve the development of social relationships and experiences among people (Cox, 1998; Valenzuela & Dorsbuch, 1994), and as result they will help create some forms of social capital. Pérez-Díaz (1998) sees the public sphere as:

... the locus of a debate among individuals and social participants who are required to advance the pursuit of their goals within the framework of an argument about the public good (p. 281).

Both public and private spheres interact and function together. As people have experiences in both "arenas", when they perceive and evaluate specific issues they will use both types of experiences to give an assessment of their particular circumstances (Cox, 1998). Stolle and Rochon (1998) use the terms "public civicness", to refer to social capital at the collective and public levels, and "private civicness" for more intimate and immediate forms of social capital. Portela Maseda and Neira Gómez (2003) also distinguish between the social capital that involves individuals, more related to personal goals and benefits, and communitarian social capital, also involving individuals, but in this case working together as a collective towards the achievement of common goals.

Several authors have made very similar categorisations of social capital. On one hand, Putnam et al. (1993) and Wallis (1998) distinguish between "localised social capital" (also known as bonding social capital), based on informal social exchanges within family and close community members,

and characterized by strong trust; and "generalised social capital" (or bridging social capital), which helps establish links between individuals and organizations (such as voluntary organizations) that are not necessarily in the same or adjacent communities. Wallis, Crocker and Schechter (1998) point out that both types of social capital are linked by the norm of civic engagement, suggesting that:

The strength of bridging capital seems to rest on the strength of the local social capital being bridged. In turn, the strength of local social capital rests on the quality and frequency of informal social interactions (pp. 258-259).

Putnam and Goss (2003) emphasise the importance of the strength of the social bonds in order to define social capital. On one hand, there is a social capital based on strong bonds – where the contacts are very frequent and between very close people. On the other hand, social capital can also be based on weak bonds – where contacts are infrequent and between people who are not necessarily close. Both strong and weak bonds are important in the formation of social capital.

Stone and Hughes (2002) also categorise the concept of social capital based on the nature of the social networks, and in very similar terms to the ones described before. They argue that overall, stocks of social capital and its outcomes will vary depending on the characteristics – such as size and capacity – of the networks and on the combination of those characteristics. Closed and dense networks, such as family, friends, and neighbours, will develop "bonding social capital", or the social capital that helps to meet specific needs. Extensive networks, such as work relations and informal ties, sometimes with strangers, will provide a flow of resources and opportunities that may produce large stocks of social capital, enhancing the "bridging social capital". Those relationships that involve ties to power, between authorities or formal institutions on the one hand, and individuals or communities on the other, will reflect in "linking social capital". Finally, heterogeneous networks may influence levels of trust of strangers, by promoting relationships with diverse groups, or by inhibiting relationships based in differences. Putnam and Goss (2003) argue that while linking social capital may have positive effects on those who belong to the networks, it can also have negative effects on those outside those networks. Stone and Hughes (2002) also suggest that networks and the norms of trust and mutuality that they are based on are essential elements of social capital. In this regard, they distinguish three different forms of trust and three categories of social relationships according to different sorts of networks: "informal realm/informal relations", "generalised realm/generalised relations", and "institutional realm/institutional relations". The first category corresponds to the established relationships and the social ties within family and close friends. The second category identifies those ties between acquaintances or strangers within the community, where shared values and participation may have an important role in the



development of trust and reciprocity. The last category describes the relationships between members of the community and its institutions. Pérez-Díaz (2003) suggests that "soft" (relatively informal) forms of sociability, such as friends, acquaintances and families, are as relevant to the concept of social capital as more formal forms of associations. Pérez-Díaz (2003, p.473) also points out that in order to analyse feelings of trust (in institutions or in general), researchers must consider not only the verbal response of individuals to survey questionnaires (which, in many cases may just reflect generalised opinions), but also people's deep attitudes towards trust obtained through observation of people's behaviour, their values and norms.

Social capital is also categorised as vertical and horizontal. The former is related to individuals' attitudes towards authority and dependency, based on formally structured relations of hierarchy, inequality, and force, as it is represented in judges, teachers, police, etc. This sort of social capital, also known as non-communitarian, does not necessarily involve social participation, mutuality or reciprocity. In words of Putnam et al. (1993, p. 170): "[a vertical network]... cannot sustain trust and cooperation". However, Latham (2000) argues that the analysis of social capital should include an examination of vertically structured relations such as levels of trust towards individuals and organisations in positions of authority.

On the other hand, horizontal or communitarian social capital is the form of social capital based on freely created reciprocity and cooperation. The types of relationships that give rise to this sort of social capital are those with family, friends, neighbours, etc. This form of social capital supports social trust, equality, reciprocity, widespread participation and cooperation. Horizontal social capital is also basic for the successful functioning of community life and for a good government (civil society and democracy). Success of many of society's institutions depends on this type of social capital, as it provides the support for cooperation and collective action (Latham, 1998; Putnam et al., 1993). Nevertheless, Champlin (1997) argues that although governments may foster cooperation, they cannot create social capital, as any government involvement in a horizontal network can transform it into a vertical network and stop any further development of social capital.

Pérez-Díaz (2003) also suggests that there are numerous types of social capital and that all societies have combinations of diverse types and levels of social capital. Thus, in order to measure social capital the researcher must clearly identify it first. Pérez-Díaz proposes a categorisation of social capital based on diverse forms of solidarity within civil society. Pérez-Díaz explores "civil" social capital and an "uncivil" social capital using the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) to illustrate his theory. He suggests that during the Spanish Civil War social capital was high, but it was uncivil social capital, based on intense solidarity developed within corporative and highly hierarchical structures (such as the Catholic Church, the Armed Forces, or the prewar political parties), complete lack of social solidarity and high levels of distrust. On the other hand, postwar Spain's social capital went from uncivil in the first years after the war to civil towards the 1950s-1970s, a period

characterised by fast economic growth and slow but significant sociopolitical transformation towards the integration in Europe. This civil social capital would be essential in the democratic transition taken place in Spain in the mid 1970s.

## **4.4 Elements of Social Capital**

Social capital is a multidimensional concept that is not easily observable or tangible (Coleman, 1988, Portela Maseda & Neira Gómez, 2003; Stone, 2001; Stone & Huges, 2002). The understanding of the different elements and outcomes of social capital, and how they interrelate, are crucial steps towards the development of strong theoretical research and useful measurement tools.

Cox (1995) suggests the following essential elements of social capital, necessary not just to achieve a certain level of social capital, but to keep it growing:

- Trust. Self-trust, interpersonal trust, trust in government and institutions.
- Reciprocity.
- Tolerance and diversity.
- Participation and cooperation.
- Belonging.
- Debate and questioning.
- Enhancement of self-value and value of others.
- Social capability, opportunities.

Other authors emphasise that trust, social capability, cooperation, recognition and approval are integral components of social capital, and are directly linked to participation, civic engagement and stable democracy (Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Muller & Seligson, 1994; Stolle & Rochon, 1998). Stone (2001) suggests that social networks constitute the structural element of social capital. Within these networks are found norms of reciprocity and trust, all of them key dimensions of social capital.

### **4.4.1 Trust**

Fukuyama (1995, p. 26) defines trust as "the expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest and cooperative behavior, based on commonly shared norms, on the part of other members of that community", and notes that social life would not be possible without a community value such as trust. Freitag (2003) supports the view that social trust, as a set of norms and values involving attitudes towards others, and the willingness to trust others are essential components of

social capital. Trust stimulates an environment of reciprocity and collective action that encourages individuals to create social bonds, which are another key element of social capital. Keating (2001, p. 219) points out that trust "...allows people to overcome the problem of non-simultaneous reciprocity". Cox (1995; 1998) also sees the creation and reinforcement of trust as a crucial part of the development of social capital. Cox uses the term "trust" as a collective expression for those ties that bind human beings, based on personal experiences and influenced by also personal expectations. The development and accumulation of trust is quite a delicate matter, considering that trust depends of the outcomes of our active relationships with others (individuals, institutions or governments). The just created trust will help to establish new relationships, which will reinforce it or destroy it. On the other hand, the lack of positive social relationships will be reflected in a lack of social trust, which may drive people to act individualistically and to avoid any collective action (Latham, 1998). Locke (1663/1954) accounted for trust as a set of morals which make human beings trustworthy when they act under its guidance. Hollis (1998) also highlights the importance of the normative aspect of trust:

Normative expectations have what could be called a moral flavour, in that they hover uneasily between moral obligations and the local requirements of a particular society. What is expected of you is, morally, that you be trustworthy and, socially, that you abide by the relevant norms (p.11).

Hollis (1998) argues that social beings exercise that trust everyday of their lives, in their dealings with friends and family, and with strangers; in the privacy of their homes and in the more public arena of the civil society. Hollis also acknowledges three key elements to solve the problem of trust: identification of what makes society bond together; definition of those elements that make that bond stronger or weaker; finally, the ability to shape public policies and institutions accordingly.

Trust itself derives from consensus and mutual agreement, making easier the understanding of the surrender of personal choice to favour collective action and common benefit. At this stage it is difficult, if not impossible, to establish which causes which. Fukuyama (1995) points out that the existence of cultural capital is crucial for the development of trust. Societies rich in cultural capital secure high level of trust by exercising solidarity, and are based on sets of moral habits and reciprocal obligations followed by all the members of that group. On the other hand, societies poor in cultural capital suffer from low social cohesion. Weiss (1996) also emphasises the role that a shared culture ("... common language, belief system, social behavior, and socio-economic class" [Weiss, 1996, p. 100]), together with responsibility and participation within the community, has in the creation of social trust. It is important to keep in mind the influence that moral traditions (as culture) and institutions have over "individual motivational orientations" (Pérez-Díaz, 1998, p. 53),

defining acceptable social behaviour. By culture here I mean "... a set of shared habits of action, those that enable members of a single human community to get along with one another and with the surrounding environment..." (Rorty, 1998, p. 188). Grew (1999) also suggests that the concept of cultural capital, which is based in public behaviour and shared values, should be included in the study of social capital.

Brehm and Rahn (1997), Cox (1998), and Putnam et al. (1993) support the idea of a reciprocal relationship between "civic engagement", or participation, and "interpersonal trust". Stone (2001) also agrees that trust, understood as a dimension of social capital, is inherent within social networks (by social networks Stone understands not only professional or voluntary forms of associations, but also family, neighbours and friends), and it is closely associated with norms of reciprocity. In this context, Stone (2001) argues that as networks vary in types, norms of trust and reciprocity are also likely to vary. Following this line of argument, Cox (1995) states that:

The more we work together with others in environments which encourage cooperation, the more likely we are to trust others, and the occasional failures of trust will be less damaging. Social capital is therefore increased by use (p. 19).

At this point we should ask ourselves about the possibilities our society offers to create, experience, and develop social trust. Trust is an attitudinal phenomenon and therefore it is difficult to measure accurately those possibilities. We can take a "trust indicator", such as "general trust", or "trust in institutions", use it to measure trust in different societies, and compare results. Different levels of trust may be caused by different possibilities to experience social trust, although one cannot be sure of the specific nature of those possibilities (Cox, 1995). The individual's personality and his/her social baggage are two sources of individual trust (Pye, 1999). Brehm and Rahn (1997) suggest that a child's early experiences may have a great impact in the development of beliefs about trustworthiness. Parents' divorce and below average household financial situation are two exogenous elements that may have a negative influence in the development of individual levels of interpersonal trust. In this line, Uslaner (1999) argues that moral principles acquired also in childhood are likely to have an effect in the creation of social trust. Later in life, education, income and employment status have been associated with the development of trust in others. Putnam (1996) suggests that educational level is significantly associated with social capital. His argument is that those individuals who have achieved higher levels of education also show higher levels of trust, tolerance and participation in voluntary and formal associations. As Weiss (1996) states, the relationship between the development of human capital (e.g. through education) and the development of social capital is of mutual dependency. On the one hand, human capital needs the encouragement and the resources only available through community interaction to grow

successfully. On the other hand, social capital relies somewhat on human capital because communities need educated individuals to support and to teach others those values (such as trust) and norms which are essential to the creation and development of social capital. In this context, unemployment and lack of material resources tend to be translated into mistrust towards others (Brehm & Rahn, 1997). Experiences with the media and the public institutions also have an effect on the levels of individuals' trust, in particular in the case of sociopolitical institutions and of the democratic system (Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Inglehart, 1990; 1997), which are the basis of civil society and self-government of community life. Finally, Freitag (2003) suggests that socioeconomic status (based on income and education) has a strong association with levels of social trust and, therefore, with social capital.

Trust can be categorised in terms of its components. Cox (1998) distinguishes between "social trust" – closer to the individual and his/her relationships with strangers –, and "civic trust" – more related to norms and formal institutions. Cox (1998) considers both types of trust as good measurements of the quality of social relationships, people's satisfaction and the state of the social system:

Trust in this context is the sum of the expectations that people have and the way this is 'spent' and renewed through experiences of relationships. Trust leads to engagement and commitment and therefore to social bonds (p. 162).

Brehm and Rahn (1997), Stolle and Rochon (1998), and Yamagishi and Yamagishi (1994) use the term "generalized interpersonal trust" to refer to trust that goes beyond familiar relationships, making possible the incorporation of new people into our circle of trust. Generalised interpersonal trust depends a great deal on the commitment to the social rules and on the expectations derived from following those rules, and may have a powerful effect in the creation of collective action. Brunstein (1993) suggests that high levels of commitment – involving relationships based on trust – contribute to subjective well-being. Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) use the concept of "enforceable trust", which is related to individuals' motivation to pursue collective goals over individual goals.

To measure generalised interpersonal trust, questions on whether people can be trusted and are likely to be helpful are of interest (Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Stolle & Rochon, 1998; Stone & Hughes, 2002). Related to the development of trust and commitment to common causes are those questions about how we mix, how often and why (Cox, 1998). Participation is interrelated with trust: "The more that citizens participate in their communities, the more that they learn to trust others; the greater trust that citizens hold for others, the more likely they are to participate" (Brehm & Rahn, 1997, pp. 1001-1002). The social system allows the development of trust through creating

opportunities towards the experience of positive relationships with others, familiar or strangers. In this line, Eckersley (1997) suggests that measures of interpersonal and institutional trust are valid tools to explore people's perceptions of life improvement.

Degrees of trust and social capital are affected by political power. Trust in the political system and in the institutions they represent is connected to the idea of the government system as a problem-solver. Putnam et al. (1993) point out that citizens of democratic societies believe they have the right to ask their representative government to help them achieve individual as well as social goals. People expect their government to be receptive to their demands, but most important, to do something effective about them. Putnam states that "*Social capital is not a substitute for effective public policy but rather a prerequisite for it and, in part, a consequence of it. Social capital...works through and with states and markets, not in place of them*" (Putnam, 1993, pp. 7-8, emphasis in original). Cox (1995) argues that faith in government, and the provision of public funding and public services, is linked to collective well-being and to social and institutional trust. On the other hand, features such as crime, drug-addiction and unemployment can affect the levels of interpersonal trust as well as levels of trust towards governments and other social institutions (Latham, 1998).

Paramio (1998; 2000) points out that from the 1970s, democratic life in Western countries has changed. Most people do not identify anymore with political parties, not as result only of the influential role of the mass media, but as result also of their increasing dissatisfaction with the governments' policies and the lack of positive results, especially in the economic and employment areas. Paramio suggests that the role that the family had in defining its members' political identification has diminished in the last twenty five years, especially with the arrival of television. Democratic societies are heterogeneous, with very diverse individual and collective interests. Social and cultural diversification also has a very important effect in recent changes in political identification, especially among young people.

An increasing number of people respond in polls that they not longer trust political parties and the government. The discontent and the distrust of the political system are factors that may stand behind the increase of absentee votes in elections, or the numerous manifestations of very critical views, frustration and cynicism about political parties and their leaders (Paramio, 1998). Many people accuse political parties of trying to monopolise organisational life in democratic societies, and the government of having a centralist and authoritarian attitude towards civil society (Arato, 1996, p. 14). Inglehart (1997) points out that industrialised nations are seeing a growing support from their citizens for individual autonomy as oppose to hierarchical authority, and that such behaviour may foster a view of the government as a threat to the individual. The credibility of the political system involves accountability and transparency, reinforced by reliable information. But political corruption and scandals – in numerous occasions related to parties' finances and/or public servants –

and leadership failures have become reiterated issues in modern democracies. These trends may enhance the anti-political attitude of many citizens, and therefore diminish public trust and social capital. Under these circumstances, many citizens associate politics and even democracy with corrupt behaviour and lies (Guerra, 1996). In words of Pérez-Díaz (1998), the problem is that there are:

... tendencies of the political parties to become increasingly oligarchic; to articulate a public discourse which does not accord with their actual behavior; to insulate themselves from public opinion while obscuring their dealings with certain powerful interest groups (and particularly with the economic establishment); and to engage in some policies regarding the lower classes that foster patterns of dualism, clientelism, and deferential politics (p. 43).

On the other hand, Weil (1989) argues that people are capable of separating state's functioning from democracy's functioning. Poor state's performance – particularly political and economic performance – may lead to a decline of political trust, but has little effect on support for democracy. For that to happen, in Weil's view, people have to perceive that democracy is not functioning as they would expect. Weil (1989) illustrates his argument with the case of Spain in the period 1975-1985. Despite very high unemployment, slow economic growth, and increasing threat of army intervention and terrorism, Spaniards showed a strong support for their new democracy. On the other hand, poor state performance led to a decline in political trust.

Partisan control has become a cancer in many fields of public administration. From economic institutions to cultural and educational departments, the political party or parties in power (national, regional, local administrations) tend to position their supporters and members in public posts.

Weisberg (1996) suggests that it is necessary to analyse peoples' expectations about government performance, and the positive or negative results of that performance. The government as a problem-solver, even of those problems that are not within its competence or are well beyond its control, is an idea in many citizens' minds. Today's global economic dynamics restrict considerably what governments can do in terms of economic priorities and policies (The Roher Institute, 1993). Nevertheless, as this happens, people's demands escalate, and calls for government officials to solve problems rise, even with the contradictory attitude of not wanting to contribute to the economic and social costs of such government activity (Weisberg, 1996).

Paramio (2000) suggests that economic and social changes in the last two decades have produced an important fragmentation of societies. An increasing number of people do not have any job security and they feel that the future is uncertain. Governments appear to be very limited in solving economic and employment problems, and this issue has influenced people's opinion on what to expect from the politicians. Citizens' political motivation, therefore, has practically disappeared in

favour of an increase in their interest about local issues or common goals that do not depend entirely of the general policies of the governments.

People are very sensitive to inequalities in terms of equal access to democratic rights. Together with distrust of government, institutions, and/or public figures – by reduction or total loss of public services –, inequalities affect the levels of communal trust and well-being, and might also impair social capital (Cox, 1995; 1998). The state may not be in a face-to-face relationship with the citizens and their problems, and this gap may affect the levels of confidence in bureaucracy to resolve successfully matters of social conflict. This lack of trust in government and public institutions is directly related to people engaging in community associations to resolve their problems (Cox, 1998).

The state can be perceived as a service provider, but also as a coercive apparatus (Hayek, 1960). Overprotection of public spaces and institutions may result in feelings of insecurity and, therefore, distrust of others (individuals, groups or institutions). People scared of using public transport, walking the streets or talking to strangers may be influenced by an unreal sense of increased crime (Cox, 1995).

Weisberg (1996) offers a critical approach to the citizens' view of government:

When we want something accomplished, we view government as 'us', a cooperative mechanism for getting the job done. When it comes time to pay the bill, however, we view it as 'them', a malevolent, external force (p. 68).

Measuring trust in institutions and in political leaders, together with the analysis of those events that may affect people's trust towards governments, institutions and public officials, is of great interest in the context of social capital. Stone (2001) nevertheless argues that, although indicators of institutional trust may provide valuable information on citizens' confidence in public institutions, that information will be incomplete and will not help to understand the concept of social capital unless we find the empirical connections between civic or institutional trust and generalised trust.

#### ***4.4.2 Reciprocity***

Stone (2001) refers to reciprocity as:

...the process of exchange within a social relationship whereby 'goods and services' (meaning exchange of any kind) given by one party are repaid to that party by the party who received the original 'goods and services'. Reciprocal relations are governed by norms, such that parties to the exchange understand the social contract they have entered into (p.30).



As they are interrelated, network type will affect the attributes of the norms of reciprocity (Stone, 2001). Putnam et al. (1993) point out that norms of generalised reciprocity affecting community members and social networks have a role in the creation of social trust, and therefore are an important component of social capital. In this line, Putnam et al. (1993) suggest that people may be more likely to engage in collective action if they are assured that their contribution will be rewarded at some point. Selznick (1998) points out that interdependency and reciprocity are essential for communities to exist, as both help develop voluntary cooperation towards a common purpose, mutual benefits and trust. Bellah (1998) argues that, under a democratic communitarism point of view, relationships that involve norms of reciprocity, loyalty and mutual commitment towards the pursuit of the common good, are essential for both individual and social well-being.

The identification of common expectations and goals is essential to creating cooperation and feelings of reciprocity. It affects levels of personal and collective efficacy, levels of control (over personal circumstances and over collective circumstances), and trust in social processes conducing to those goals (Cox, 1998).

Measures of reciprocity may include indicators of reciprocal exchanges within networks, which may vary depending on the type of network they develop from. Another approach to explore norms of reciprocity is to measure non-reciprocal behaviour and the sanctions involved to punish actions such as cheating on taxes or avoiding paying transport fares (Stone, 2001). These indicators may provide valuable information if they are analysed in conjunction with trust indicators across networks.

#### ***4.4.3 Tolerance***

Tolerance is an attitude that has been widely associated with generalised trust, cooperative behaviour, reciprocity, and social capital (Cox, 1995; 1998; Stolle & Rochon, 1998). Inkeles and Diamond (1980), who also support these associations, point out that tolerance plays an essential role in the achievement of high levels of national economic development.

Societies with high levels of social capital are open to diversity and differences. Growing levels of trust allow individuals and groups to develop the tolerance needed to accept differences and dissent (Cox, 1995; 1998), and accept unknown people into an already existent network of interactions (Stolle & Rochon, 1998). People may, more than likely, have different views on public issues; but in a society with strong social capital, such differences in opinion go hand by hand with tolerance of the opponent or the person who thinks differently (Putnam et al., 1993).

In other situations, by contrast, people might show fears of other citizens' attitudes towards the law or the community rules, and how that behaviour might affect them. This feeling of fear can cause damage in levels of community trust, reflected in lower levels of social participation (Latham, 1998), in racism or in other forms of group phobia (Cox, 1995; 1998).

Sometimes relatively high levels of at least some forms of social capital *within* a group may be accompanied by prejudice or hostility towards outsiders. When this happens one can speak of a dark side to social capital. In Spain, one example of this phenomenon is what happens between some Basques and Spain as a country. Nationalist Basques do not consider themselves Spanish, and see those who are not Basques as a threat to the achievement of their ideal of independence. Increasing distrust, fear and anxiety have grown around those who are Basques and those who are not. Some see violence as a weapon to keep the nationalist spirit alive and achieve the ultimate goal of the creation of an independent Basque state.

#### ***4.4.4 Social Networks***

Stone (2001, p.6) suggests that social networks "... characterised by norms of trust and reciprocity" are the essential structural element of social capital. There are numerous types of social networks, varying in size, capacity, location, structure and nature of the relationships they involve. Network characteristics will affect levels, capabilities and outcomes of social capital (Stone & Hughes, 2002). Stone (2001) and Stone and Hughes (2002) advise that in order to use a social network as a way to measure social capital, the norms and characteristics of that specific social network must be considered. Within this approach, social networks can be classified as informal – networks based on relationships within family, friends and neighbours – and formal – networks based on non-group and group based relationships, such as voluntary associations and institutions. On this distinction, Memmott and Meltzer (2003, p.109) argue that:

Formal versus informal networks should be seen not as a binary model but as a series of gradations involving multiple properties of formality within such networks.

This paper will focus in the categories of family and friends and, in particular, voluntary associations, in relation with the development and growth of social capital.

#### ***4.4.4.1 Family and Friends***

Coleman (1988) suggests that individuals create social capital because they believe that by creating social groups and networks they will facilitate collective action and therefore they will maximise their individual potentialities and opportunities. In this context, Coleman explored the role of social capital as a resource for children's education and development within the family and the community. He argues that those relationships developed within the family constitute the social capital of the family. The physical presence of the parents in the household, the quantity and quality of the attention the child receives from the parents, and the strength of the relationships between the child and the parents, will determine the nature of social capital at the family level.

Stone and Hughes (2002) also argue that one locus of social capital is within the family. Stone (2001) suggests that the relationships between the children, and the different array of relationships brought up when parents are absent from the household can be used as additional measures of social capital within the family. In this line, Weiss (1996) argues that within the family may exist different levels of connectedness (referring to number and quality of relationships). This connectedness depends upon the structure – single parent versus two parent family –, the strength – close versus detached – of family bonds, and the levels of civic engagement of the family members. In Weiss's view, family relationships have traditionally helped develop high levels of trust and social capital in the broader community.

Those relationships created and nurtured within the family have a significant role in the creation of trust towards outsiders, norms of reciprocity and exchange, and therefore in the growth of social capital (The World Bank Group, 2002).

Neighbourhood networks are another of the various types of social networks likely to contribute to social capital (Hall, 2003; Putnam, 1995). Baum et al. (2000) have explored networks of friends and neighbours as indicators of social capital. Measures of frequency of contact with friends/neighbours, visits to public places such as cafes, cinemas, social clubs, etc., and frequency of engagement in some kind of group activity provide valuable information on such networks.

#### ***4.4.4.2 Voluntary Associations***

Voluntary associations and civic engagement are important forms of social pluralism, and as argued by deTocqueville (1835-1840/1985), they are conducive to democracy. Casado (1990, p. 173) refers to voluntary action as an "expression of social freedom". Etzioni (1995) considers that voluntary associations are just one of many ways available to communities to organise themselves. Voluntary associations represent, whatever their reasons and objectives, a collective identity, and contribute to the building of a cooperative and tolerant spirit, and as Hall (2003) points out, belonging to any type of voluntary association is essential for the development of social capital.

Bellah (1998) argues that participation is a right but also a duty. González Sánchez and Mena Merchán (1990) affirm that citizens in democratic societies should accept their civic responsibilities by engaging in collective activities oriented towards social progress. As a result, actively engaged individuals would provide diverse experiences to their society and, at the same time, they would also receive diverse benefits from the community. However, current democratic systems may not be giving sufficient stimulus to such voluntary participation (Guerra, 1996). In this line of argument, López de Aguilera (1990) points out that although formal democracies allow participation, they also limit that participation. He has analysed the structure of political parties with realistic expectations winning an election, and he has come to the conclusion that many of those political parties are diminishing internal debate so as to give citizens a more united image of the party. This image may improve their chances of winning new votes, and therefore the elections. There is also a tendency in industrialised societies to the privatisation of almost every service or activity. That trend involves a strong separation between the political sphere and everyday life, with a clear reduction of the role of the citizen in political decisions. Formal democracies involve elections, where citizens choose those people who will represent them in the political arena. Once the ritual of the election is over, the citizens become mere passive actors in the political scene. López de Aguilera (1990) suggests that this depoliticisation has a reflection in other aspects of daily life, such as an increase in individualistic attitudes, a decrease in the use of public spaces, and a rise in levels of mistrust towards those we do not know well.

Other threats to social engagement are linked to the crisis of the welfare state system, basically reflected in a declining quality of life for many citizens. Crisis episodes may not encourage people to act collectively towards social changes, but may increase individualistic and conservative attitudes.

Voluntary organisations themselves have the key to their successful functioning by clearly defining their objectives. Mena Merchán (1990) argues that setting unrealistic goals and inadequate priorities, together with a lack of human and financial resources, will prevent successful cooperation. On the other hand, motivation, capabilities, knowledge and channels of action are major factors of success of collective action. Mena Merchán (1990) also suggests that any process of collective participation must be open to the social reality of the community. By the term "community" he refers to those people that, organised as a group, form a social unit. Its members have in common traits, interests and geography, all of those elements enhancing a feeling of belonging. In this context, social actors are encouraged to observe, understand and interpret the social circumstances surrounding them. Participation also involves communication within the community, and the development of supporting dialogues among the different actors. Sociopolitical elements, such as democracy, decentralisation, progress and human development, solidarity and equality are also very important components of a number of collective action groups.

Walzer (1995) questions the "voluntary" nature of current patterns of participation in Western democracies. He argues that any individual born in any society has a baggage, from gender to social class and religious belief that influences, without a doubt, the types of associations he/she will be part of.

Eastis (1998) suggests that voluntary organisations are varied and, therefore, differ in their characteristics (such as members' background, goals, skills of those involved, etc) and in their structures, and both features may affect social interactions and the production of social capital. Rodríguez Villasante (1995) also suggests that voluntary associations and their horizontal networks are very diverse, and it is that diversity what opens possibilities not only for progress towards multiple collective goals, but also for the exploration of alternative economic, political and cultural experiences.

#### ***4.4.4.2.1 Levels/degrees of participation.***

Mena Merchán (1990) proposes three levels of participation. The more basic level is that where people use services already available. Mena Merchán regards this stage not as proper participation, but as a fundamental condition to real participation, as it may help understand the importance of cooperation to satisfy common needs, and it may also help define common interests. The next level, according to Mena Merchán (1990), involves cooperation within an organisation, to the point that people get information about the organisation itself, its goals, and its ways of action. At this stage, people may show their interest in being part of the collective action. Finally, the third level of participation is evident when individuals, as part of an organised group, have taken planning, management and evaluation roles, and manifest a greater commitment towards the organisation and its goals.

#### ***4.4.4.2.2 Participation and social capital.***

Putnam has used the concept of social capital to explore the functioning of society through the study of participation in voluntary associations (civic engagement), and the analysis of institutional performance and democratic outcomes. Putnam (1993) and Putnam et al. (1993) suggest that active participation in public affairs is a distinctive characteristic of any civil society. He argues that social capital is a resource closely related to individuals' collective capacities to work together and accomplish shared goals. People have to show common interests and will to pursue mutual benefit to enable the creation and accumulation of social capital. A way to achieve these goals is by creating and sustaining voluntary associations and other forms of civic engagement. Putnam (1995) also points out the links between civic engagement, reciprocity and social trust. By engaging in

associations, people encourage others to do the same, based in norms of generalised reciprocity; this also facilitates mutual trust by allowing a flow of communication and collaboration.

Associational membership is a valuable indicator of social capital (Stolle & Rochon, 1998; Weiss, 1996). Coleman (1988) also sees social capital as a resource based on individual and group interrelations that facilitate action to achieve specific goals and benefits. On this line, The World Bank Group (2002) emphasises the role that high levels of participation have in the development of social capital, and more specifically in the achievement of collective goals. Those communities where their members work together – by applying norms of reciprocity, by sharing information relevant to collective problem-solving, and overall, by developing successful cooperative strategies – will see problems such as violence, free-riding, lack of business opportunities and poor quality of education and health services, reduced.

According to the Rømer Institute (1993), people and groups are keen today to pursue diverse but at the same time mutual goals, in many instances by participating in democratic decision-making processes to achieve desired levels of well-being. Social phenomena such as the welfare state, the labour market, environmental policies and management, urban planning and development, training and education, have a very important impact on people's lives, and drive many of them to act together to achieve specific goals.

Brehm and Rahn (1997, pp. 1001-1002) argue that social capital itself refers to:

...a tight reciprocal relationship between civic engagement and interpersonal trust. The more that citizens participate in their communities, the more that they can learn to trust others; the greater trust that citizens hold for others, the more likely they are to participate.

Cox (1995; 1998) argues that people who voluntarily put time and effort into some sort of collective participation are helping to build and increase social capital. It is a complex process: we build mutually rewarding relationships with others through our and their free involvement in social activities. Those relationships are based on trust (which also helps to develop tolerance and solidarity, very important in the process of conflict solving), and on public debate about differences of interest. This phenomenon is more likely to happen in egalitarian communities. The identification of common goals and the evaluation of the possibilities for reaching those goals are fundamental to the creation of cooperation and of a feeling of reciprocity. Both actions will give some indication of the levels of personal and community efficacy (i.e. people's levels of control over their personal and collective situations), and of the extent to which sufficient trust is present to facilitate the achievement of common goals. Gregory (1999) argues that "cooperative trust" has a relevant role in the specific case of public institutions and their pursuit of the public good.

Almond and Verba (1963), who emphasised the need of "subject orientation" (or the will to achieve common goals through participation following the rule of law) also support the view that it is all up to the people acting beyond purely individual choices to obtain collective benefits. Brehm and Rahn (1997) argue that societies where individuals get together to achieve common goals are able to resolve collective problems. Foley and Edwards (1998) agree that participation in voluntary associations has an impact on interpersonal trust, cooperation, and the creation of social networks. However, they argue that different types of associations and different contexts may produce different outcomes. Martínez Navarro (1990) also agrees that in order to explore participation and cooperation in any modern society it is necessary to better define the different types of associations, who participate in them and their functions.

Lappe and Du Bois (1997), and Youniss, McLellan and Yates (1997) suggest the importance of the concept of agency within the social capital theory. Agency refers to the power of human action, at an individual or at a collective level. Through intention, choice and capacity, humans are able to use their social agency to create opportunities for engagement in social activities, develop civic behaviours, and sustain collective well-being.

#### ***4.4.4.2.3 Participation and economic development.***

Social capital is a concept that may help explain the possible association between economic, social and cultural factors, although causal relationships between social capital and economic outcomes are difficult to determine. Portela Maseda and Neira Gómez (2003) suggest that social capital may be a variable of interest, together with financial, human and natural capitals, in the analysis of economic development, at the regional or at the national levels. Their view is that none of these forms of capital would have an impact on economic development by themselves, and that by effectively combining all of them sustainable development is possible. In this context, Putnam et al. (1993) examined regional divisions in Italy in a longitudinal study, and analysed the ways in which political and administrative decentralisation – and the various degrees of power transferred to each region by the central government – widened inequalities and differences between regions. Putnam (1993) and Putnam et al. (1993) found close associations between civic engagement and socioeconomic factors. The argument is that cooperation, civic engagement and interpersonal trust are essential to achieve economic progress, prosperity and social wellbeing, and to make public institutions more effective and democracy more stable. "In summary, economics does not predict civics, but civics does predict economics, better indeed than economics itself" (Putnam et al. 1993, p. 157).

The Social Capital Initiative (SCI) has been involved now for several years in research towards the operationalisation of the concept of social capital, and its influence on economic growth. Under its umbrella, researchers have developed projects which vary in locations (most projects involve developing countries) and approaches, but they share a common feature: there is agreement on the association between social capital and economic development. Grootaert (1998), who is involved in the Social Capital Initiative, suggests that certain forms of social capital can have a positive impact on sustainable development and economic growth, and are therefore a valuable resource to reduce poverty. Pye (1999) suggests that economic, social and political progress depend greatly on trust and reciprocity, while Grootaert and Van Bastelaer (2001) emphasise the role that social capital plays in improving income levels, information-sharing, and service delivery systems, indeed in any form of collective action. Natural, physical and human capitals are traditional components of economic growth. However, Grootaert (1998) argues that social capital should be included also as a relevant contributor to sustainability, microeconomic (markets) and macroeconomic performances. Another valuable outcome of social capital is that combined with the other forms of capital, such as human and physical capital, it may substantially enhance their performance. Coleman (1988), and Cox (1995) also believe there is a link between the accumulation of social capital, the increase of quality of life, and the "...development of financial and human capital" (Cox, 1995, p.11). Cox supports the importance of interpersonal trust and self-trust for the achievement of high levels of prosperity and economic growth. In her view (Cox, 1995, p.26), high levels of social capital may be a "... prerequisite for economic growth". However, there is not a clear causal relationship between social capital and economic growth. If, as Grootaert (1998) points out, social capital can drive the economy to success, economic outcomes may also affect levels of social capital. In this line of argument, North (1990) and Olson (1982) emphasise the impact that sociopolitical institutions have on economic outcomes. On the other hand, Inglehart (1997, p. 7) has found evidence of a link between industrialisation and increasing levels of mass political participation. Those societies that have achieved an advanced industrial status and material security are showing a rise of postmaterialist values, with a decline on respect for political and religious authority and a growing interest in active participation and self-expression.

Cooperation based on civic norms and trust may foster expectations and reciprocity, which themselves may result in higher economic efficiency, reducing costs (Grootaert, 1998), opportunism and cheating (Putnam et al., 1993). Fukuyama (1995) and Granovetter (1985) share similar thoughts, arguing that norms, expectations, and trust resulting from social interactions and social networks have a great effect in the economic system's success. In this line of argument, Grootaert (1998) emphasises the role that information-sharing and collective decision making have in economic development. Champlin (1997) and Swank (1996) also support the value of cooperative structures, trust and reciprocity in achieving shared financial and economic solutions, and in



promoting economic success. Groups that have achieved certain levels of trust among their members will be more productive than those groups without interpersonal trust (Coleman, 1988). Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) see social capital as made up of:

... those expectations for action within a collectivity that affect economic goals and goal-seeking of its members, even if these expectations are not oriented to the economic sphere. (p. 1322)

On the other hand, Kenworthy (1997) argues that economic cooperation and national economic performance are not correlated with indicators of trust or of civic engagement. His view is that trust may play a role in cooperative economic relationships, but it is not a key player in the creation of successful economic cooperative behaviour; there are many other factors conducive to economic progress which do not require trust. Institutions, businesses, organisations, governments, all may encourage arrangements towards cooperative behaviour, which might result in progress and well-being achievements. But, according to Kenworthy (1997), there is not enough evidence to say that trust has a major role in the creation and development of successful cooperative economic behaviour. Kenworthy points out furthermore that there are no links between voluntary participation and cooperative economic behaviour, and using data from the 1991 World Values Survey, he also suggests that associations between civic engagement and successful economic performance at the national level are weak.

O'Connell (2003) supports the view that the key to civic engagement and therefore to social capital, is economic equality, not economic development. He argues that those societies with high levels of economic equality also show relatively high levels of political transparency and participation in diverse associations.

#### ***4.4.4.2.4 Factors influencing participation.***

Why do people engage in participation and cooperation in social activities? What does motivate individuals to act collectively? Mena Merchán (1990) suggests a number of social, economic and political factors that may have an effect in the emergence of voluntary participation. He points out that the natural dynamic of society drives its actors to explore various avenues of change and improvement. In this context, periods of structural crisis bring out on many occasions the cooperative spirit of people. Improved quality of life, freedom of speech and of ideas, and democratic values also drive people to participate collectively. Linz (1988) argues that the creation and articulation of organisations such as pressure groups require prolonged periods of political stability, so that those groups can consolidate their organisations and legitimate their activities.

Putnam (1995; 1996) points out that education is the most important predictor of group membership. He found evidence of the relationship between education level and participation in voluntary associations and also between education and interpersonal trust.

Rodríguez Villasante (1990) argues that people do not participate in voluntary associations unless they have a reason. To take part in any type of participation, people need adequate time, space, and positive motivation towards social action. Rodríguez Villasante suggests that to participate, people need to find available time outside the necessary time put towards remunerated work. He also argues that metropolitan areas are highly exposed to segregation and social anomy, where social contacts outside family and close friends are limited. In this sort of environment, those spaces that could allow interpersonal relationships exist, but are difficult to find. Urban redevelopment may also result in structural changes in communities that may affect existing social networks (Bush & Baum, 2001). The relocation of industries, for example, may require large numbers of people to change their place of residence, thereby having an impact on the strength of social networks. Rodríguez Villasante (1990) points out that the concepts of city/town and citizen, village/neighbourhood and neighbour are crucial supports in the development of cooperative social groups. Finally, different people find different motives to be part of a coordinated group. Rodríguez Villasante differentiates between formal groups, or those organisations based on ideological, religious, professional or economic interests, and informal sectors, closer to the local subculture. Very rarely both formal and informal groups connect. Voluntary associations belong to the formal group category, and independently of their structure and motives, they reflect solidarity and the need for social change.

Participation in organisations and groups is determined by the existence of norms, shared responsibilities, and moral commitment between the citizens to fulfill shared goals and obtain some kind of benefit. Therefore, voluntary associations reflect at least two different needs: the need to be part of a group or groups (people can be members of several associations at the same time), and the need to act to achieve a goal or goals (Martín, 1990). Individuals who engage freely in social activities are expected to pursue those goals that are congruent with their values and norms. The achievement of high levels of well-being and quality of life are clearly related to the development of, and respect for, shared values towards the satisfaction of common goals. Bernscheid and Lopes (1997) suggest that there is a link between satisfactory social interaction and stability. They argue, based on social exchange theories, that people's exchange of rewards and punishments is essential for the creation and growth of social interaction. Those relationships that were rewarding and satisfactory are most likely to be maintained and strengthened, while the ones that did not produce the desired satisfaction will disappear.

Lappe and Du Bois (1997) argue that the individual's problem solving capacity is an essential element of social capital. All what people need are real opportunities, the motivation, and the skills to go from the individual to the collective level of problem solving successfully.

Youniss, McLellan, and Yates (1997) suggest that adolescent participatory behaviour has a great impact on their later civic orientation as adults. These authors argue that those individuals who participate in voluntary organised groups and social movements during their youth will build up a civic identity. They will also develop the basic skills – such as recognition and acceptance of responsibilities within society, discipline towards common goals and benefits, and negotiation of differences to produce solutions – needed to engage in civic activities later on. In this line, Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995) suggest that youth participation will help to create, later in adult life, tolerance towards other people's opinions.

Moxley and Proctor (1995) have done some research on the way social solidarity may affect successful collective action involvement and, therefore, help achieve community goals. In this line of argument, Mena Merchán (1990) also emphasises the fact that many voluntary associations are created with the purpose of building up solidarity among their members and within society in general. The creation and nurture of egalitarian attitudes, and the encouragement of collective action as a way to achieve social improvements are other motivations that may make people act together (Mena Merchán, 1990).

Fukuyama (1995) suggests, under the influence of Bourdieu, that human behaviour (and cooperation is one form of human behaviour) is influenced by a need for recognition. Some people have no access to socioeconomic resources as result of their individual reputation or their belonging to a specific group. Thus, participation and civic engagement, both forms of human contribution, are often motivated by that search for recognition, creating value and purpose in people's lives, and therefore satisfaction, well-being and self-esteem. Non-participation in social life activities can create insecurity and lack of self-esteem, which are results of non-recognition, while satisfaction with one's social life will generally depend on social interaction. An important way in which people receive recognition is by mutual trust.

Self-regarding motives, or self-interest, can also act against social recognition. Blau (1964) argues that although people seem to be keen on being part of associations and acting in a reciprocal way to obtain common benefits, they may actually be quite egoistic. People involved in associations may do so because they are basically seeking social approval. If they are seeking only to get something from others but they are not willing to reciprocate, this may result in a failure to achieve the recognition they are seeking.

Contrary to Putnam's (1995) idea of not including social movement organisations as fundamental elements of civil society, several authors have demonstrated that organised social movements have an influential role in civil society through their interaction with government institutions. Tilly (1984) suggests that social movements are, in some form, determinant in the shaping and development of specific institutions and government policies. Supporting this view, Smith (1998) points out that social movements play an essential role in the functioning of communities by providing links between the different social actors and generating pressure for some form of collective benefit. In this line of argument, Etzioni (1998) emphasises the effect that collective action has in the solution of community problems – by people working together and by the pressure they can exert on governments and institutions to meet their responsibilities – and in the achievement of common goals.

#### ***4.4.4.2.5 Measures of participation.***

Associational membership – at the political level or at the community level – appears to be a useful way to measure participative and cooperative attitudes. Knoke (1986) considers most associations as based on the principles of equality and voluntarism, both of which have significant collective importance. Voluntary associations encourage social integration, and economic and political activity. They also help to broaden the individual's interests, through interaction with others; and they provide the basis for acquiring information and abilities to control and influence the surrounding environment. Putnam et al. (1993) assert that associationism creates attitudes towards cooperation and trust, develops organisational citizenship skills, and builds the attitudes needed to motivate individuals to use those skills. All these functions are of great importance for active citizenship and democracy. Putnam (1995) also argues that, as result of the use of television, there has been a decline in the number of people involved in voluntary associations; people watch more television these days, and therefore they do not have the time they used to have to participate in community activities and organisations. Bennett (1998) disagrees with this argument, pointing out that voluntary associations are, like other components of society, influenced by economic cycles. In times of hardship, women participate less in voluntary activities because they have less free time to do so after working and doing the house duties. In Bennett's view, numbers of women involved in voluntary associations would increase again once the general economic situation improves, at which time women could more readily make a choice between paid work and various voluntary activities. The same may also be true of at least some men

Belonging to an association creates generalised interpersonal trust, and that trust affects the individuals' social interactions and cooperation (Stolle & Rochon, 1998; Yamagishi & Yamagishi, 1994). It also builds up a common identity, stimulates public debate, and puts pressure on government to act on behalf of the common interests (Foley & Edwards, 1998). Some associations of interest for the measurement of social capital may be those encouraging cooperative spirit, norms of reciprocity and collective thinking beyond the group itself (Stolle & Rochon, 1998).

Grootaert (1998) argues that measuring civic engagement as a form of social capital is more complex than just counting the number of voluntary associations and their members. By definition, such social capital refers to civic associations as a collective tool to achieve common goals. If this is so, measurement of civic engagement would imply exploring what are those goals and the extent to which they have been achieved. Stone (2001) points out the need to address not only the frequency of engagement in formally constituted social groups, but also the quality of the relationships developed within those groups, in order to measure social capital.

Several authors suggest that measuring newspaper exposure will give us some important information about participation (Brehn & Rahn, 1997; de Tocqueville, 1835-1840/1985). Relevant here are indicators of attention to, and interest in what is happening at the community, the country and the world levels. Measurement of knowledge about community issues and discussion about social topics are also of interest in the context of participation. However, we must keep in mind that people with better access to information sources are more favoured socially than those who are poor in knowledge and information. The amount and quality of the information that individuals have strongly determines their social opportunities and values. Those individuals with access to information networks and resources are more capable of creating opportunities towards the achievement of their interests. By contrast, individuals who lack such knowledge and information are limited in the opportunities to reach their goals (Latham, 1998).

A more general assessment of social capital measures is later explored in this chapter.

## **4.5 Community and Social Capital**

Onyx and Bullen (2000) point out that social capital requires participation by members of communities in order to generate and grow. They emphasise the influence that communitarian theories have in the conceptual development of social capital:

The combined effect of trust, networks, norms and reciprocity creates a strong community, with shared ownership over resources known as the commons ... The commons refers to the creation of a pooled community resource, owned by no one, used by all (Onyx & Bullen, 2000, p.25).

Several authors have used the concept of community to explain the relationships between social attachments and shared values. Etzioni (1998) argues that to understand what makes a society better or worse, we first have to find out who we are, as a community, what our aspirations are, which are our more serious collective problems, and how to solve those problems for the benefit of the whole community. Communities are not necessarily a geographical concept, they also refer to those groups that, although dispersed, still maintain their social bonds around organisations such as schools, churches, sports clubs, etc. However, Waltzer (1995) suggests that those communities based in a permanent location are more likely to succeed. For Etzioni (1998, p. xiii), communities "...are webs of social relations that encompass shared meanings and above all shared values". People need to build social attachments and to follow norms that, in many cases, may be part of one or more communities, such as family, neighbourhoods, voluntary associations and work (Etzioni, 1995).

Similar to Etzioni, Weiss (1996) emphasises the impact that a community (as the relationships within the family, neighbourhood and friends) and its shared values have in its members' social interactions and, therefore, in the creation of social capital. He suggests that levels of social capital will vary greatly from one community to another, based on the "connectedness" or the quantity and quality of the social interactions of their members.

Bellah (1998) supports the view of societies not solely based in individuals, but in communities, following the "democratic communitarianism" theory. This theory suggests that the individual depends on the community, which strength comes from its shared values and goals, and from the challenges derived from the search for the common good. In this line, Spragens (1995) argues that under a communitarian version of liberalism, sources of social attachments such as families, voluntary associations and civic organisations, have an essential role in the creation of happiness and human progress. In the context of a healthy civil society, Spragens (1995) points out that active citizen participation in the public affairs of the community and responsible behaviour towards the achievement of the common good may contribute to stronger democracies. This research will explore the concept of civil society and its links with social capital later in this chapter.

On the other hand, social capital also has a role in community building. As Wallis, Crocker and Schechter (1998) suggest, communities, and therefore individuals, benefit from public and private enterprises that involve cooperation and association within communities, and most importantly, the empowerment of those communities. In this context, the Reference Group on Welfare Reform (2000, p. 45) emphasises the importance of "building community capacity", especially of those communities that are disadvantaged, to increase levels of financial, human and social capital at the local level. In order to do so, it is essential the partnership of governments, business, non profit associations and community organisations, in the development of strategies that will enable social participation and access to economic opportunities.

Freitag (2003) proposes, also in the context of the role of community in the development of social capital, a different view. He argues that identification with a broad sense of community, and not with the immediate community, is associated with strong social trust, tolerance and open to cultural and social diversity.

#### **4.6 Social Capital, Civil Society and Democracy**

The concept of civil society is of great interest to understand the interaction between society, its different social actors and the state. It is also of help to explore the various sociopolitical mechanisms that affect the social structure. Foley and Edwards (1998), López de Aguilera (1990), and Vallespín (1996) believe that the concept of civil society is ambiguous, depending on the context in which we place it, its actors and its roles. In the contexts of socialisation and association, civil society is an idea linked to the notion of social capital. Cox (1995) and Putnam et al. (1993) suggest that civil society is built on social capital, although the causal relationship between these two entities is not clear. Smith (1998) argues that civil society creates and promotes social capital, which in turn has a great influence over the functioning of democratic political systems. Dahrendorf (1998) claims that civil society is actually supported by diverse networks of associations – such as sports clubs, political parties, the churches and the family. Youniss, McLellan and Yates (1997, p.620) support this view, arguing that "... civic engagement helps to sustain, reform, or transform civil society." As it has been mentioned before, social capital refers to those networks of relationships (social exchange), and those norms and values shared by the social actors (individuals and organisations) that contribute towards the achievement of cooperation for mutual benefit. Therefore, social capital is an essential element in the smooth functioning of civil society. Keane (1998) views civil society as

... an ideal-typical category ... that both describes and envisages a complex and dynamic ensemble of legally protected non-governmental institutions that tend to be non-violent, self-organizing, self-reflexive, and permanently in tension with each other and with the state institutions that 'frame', construct and enable their activities (p.6).

Civil society emerges as result of a well-governed sociopolitical system, respect for diversity and democratic collective involvement in decision-making processes. Genuine cooperation between individuals and between organisations has to be understood as a process of mutual learning more than as a loss of personal choice (Wallis, 1998). In a way, civil society may encourage cooperation and solidarity between individuals and between groups (Guerra, 1996). Social capital is therefore essential to achieve and strengthen civil society. In addition, the sociopolitical environment

influences the way social capital is used and nurtured, by providing or denying the essential mechanisms to support participation and collective conflict solving (Grootaert, 1998). Dahrendorf (1998) argues that an environment of inequalities relating, for example, to differences of income, ethnicity, religion, or sexual orientation may exclude some people from the broader community, causing severe social disadvantages, and even violence, that are not compatible with a well developed civil society. The biggest enemies of modern civil societies, in Dahrendorf's opinion, are poverty and unemployment. He argues that both lack of income and work limit seriously the opportunities of civic engagement, which is essential for the existence of a civil society. Freedom and confidence (in oneself and in the community) are other fundamental ingredients of a civil society, and both may also be threatened by socioeconomic inequalities.

Arato (1996) points out that the concept of civil society is particularly relevant in the analysis of transitions from authoritarian regimes to democratic systems, as it occurred in Spain in the mid 1970s, and also in the identification of new elements to improve existing democracies. He suggests that in order to understand civil society, it is necessary to distinguish civil society as social movement and civil society as institution. The primacy of action and communicative coordination in the context of the institutions are the uniting elements of the general concept of civil society (Arato, 1996).

Pérez-Díaz (1996b, pp.20-21) understands civil society as formed by five institutional components, all linked mutually. The first element of a civil society is a public authority (government), with limited powers but responsible towards the citizens. The rule of law is the second element, with the public authority (government) and the citizens under the same universal law, independently of particular circumstances. The third element is a public space, where the citizens debate their common concerns. The fourth element is a market economy, supported by a variety of agents and resources. Finally, the fifth element is composed by multiple voluntary associations, with various functions and interests, in which free citizens participate under a collective identity. The system represented by the civil society will function with the support of public institutions and cooperative free individuals, both under the same rule of law. In this context, Oaks (1998) emphasises the importance of civic responsibilities. In order to preserve the rule of law and to protect individuals' and groups' rights (and therefore civil society), people must show their commitment towards the common good. Oaks (1998) suggests that values such as tolerance, trust, benevolence, patriotism, respect for human and civil rights, and participation in the democratic system are some of those civic responsibilities. In Oaks' opinion, voluntary participation has a fundamental role in the achievement of social goals.



Pérez-Díaz (1998) suggests that a successful transition to democracy will be based in the existence or emergence of a civil society. Keane (1998) also supports the view of civil society as a fundamental condition of democracy. However, the World Bank Group (2002) argues that civil society, and the social capital that it engenders, may also have a crucial role in the promotion of socioeconomic development even in those societies that do not enjoy a democratic regime.

The capacity of a civil society to develop its values and its interests in a coherent, integrated and therefore successful way (through pluralism and public debate), away from individualistic and purely partisan orientations, is also essential to the achievement of collective well-being and high levels of democracy. Civil disobedience (which is not the same as incivility), associated to social movements, appears to be the last resort of collective action in the context of civil society (Arato, 1996).

#### ***4.6.1 Civil Society and Nationalism***

National identity, taken as a form of collective identity, may have a part in the creation and survival of a strong civil society (Keane, 1998). It is important to distinguish between national identity and nationalism. National identity integrates people with common characteristics, such as language, territory and culture (Keane, 1998). It may give those who share the same nationhood "... a sense of purposefulness, confidence and dignity..." (Keane, 1998, p.88). National identity does not necessarily exclude those who think differently. On the other hand, nationalism is an ideology with a fanatical core, what Keane (1998, p.95) calls "... a pathological form of national identity". Nationalism does not allow differences within the nation. Those, from within or from outside the nation, who do not follow the nationalist views are seen as its enemies and therefore are kept apart. Nationalism has been historically a cause for discrimination and violence between groups. Pérez-Díaz (1995) points out that there is a challenge in finding the way to make compatible nationalism and the development of plural societies.

Violence and incivility exist in all civil societies. As they nurture plurality within individuals and organisations, civil societies also provide the opportunities to raise uncivilised behaviours (Keane, 1998). What varies from one society to another is the degree and origin of violence. Civil societies with nationalist tensions will develop some kind of violent behaviour involving those who support the nationalist ideology to its extremes and those who oppose it (civilians and armed forces/police).

## 4.7 Measures of Social Capital

Social capital is a multidimensional concept widely used in social, economic and anthropological research, as well as in public policy design and implementation. Such a variety of disciplines have come out with different definitions of the term and, consequently, an array of measures and levels of analysis based on its different components. Stone (2001) argues that social capital is, in fact, a concept that, although widely used, is ambiguous and confusing in part because the links between what it is and how to measure it are not clear. Portela Maseda and Neira Gómez (2003) also argue that the multidimensionality of the concept of social capital makes difficult to agree on a universal and invariable indicator.

Therefore, multidimensionality is a circumstance that makes measuring social capital (not only its quantity but also its quality) a very difficult challenge. In words of Patulny (2004, p.1), "Its great weakness is in its measurement". However, the identification of specific indicators – based on the diverse dimensions of social capital – and their impact is possible, and it will depend on contextual factors, such as the geographical setting (Grootaert & Van Bastelaer, 2001), the theoretical purpose of the research, and its conceptual and methodological frameworks. It is essential to be cautious when we measure a concept such as social capital, because as I have already said, there are numerous definitions that involve different components, and the measure chosen for our purpose will only measure those aspects of social capital reflected in its items. In order to choose the appropriate measure we have then to clearly establish which concept or concepts we want to measure within the social capital framework. Stone (2001, p. 6) suggests three criteria to design indicators of social capital:

... first, recognise that social capital is a multidimensional concept comprising social networks, norms of trust, and norms of reciprocity; second, understand social capital properly as a resource to action; and third, empirically distinguish between social capital and its outcomes.

Grootaert (1998) also suggests some criteria to follow when designing and applying indicators of social capital. First, they must be developed under a conceptual and operational framework. Second, indicators of social capital must be clearly defined. Third, those indicators need to be suitable to measure social phenomena at household, community and national levels. Finally, they must be objective. Grootaert (1998) points out that there are two essential paths to follow in selecting social capital indicators and outcomes. The first approach would draw from the characteristics of the different social relationships and agents involved, their impact and their effectiveness. Type and size (membership) of local associations and networks, internal homogeneity of the association/network, and levels of trust (interpersonal/institutional) and adherence to norms are

some indicators of social capital under this perspective. The second approach would involve those outcomes and effects that social capital may have on a specific dimension (e.g. economic growth). Indicators such as political stability, civil liberties, levels of political corruption and government inefficiency, voter turnout, discrimination and social disintegration may allow some estimation of the effect of social capital on a number of dimensions.

As it has been said before, Stone (2001), Stone and Hughes (2002), and Wall, Ferrazzi and Schryer (1998) argue that it is important to measure separately social capital, its determinants and its outcomes. Nevertheless, some outcomes of social capital – cooperation, tolerance, democracy, and prosperity – may act also as determinants. Stone and Hughes (2002, p. 6) describe this conceptual model as a "cumulative causal circle".

When measuring social capital we also need to remember that aggregated measures of social capital are only valid in the contexts of the specific populations they represent, but they are not reliable indicators of social capital elsewhere. Therefore, social analysts should not assume that aggregated measures of social capital are the ultimate measure of societies' resources (Edwards & Foley, 1998). A combination of research methodologies, such as qualitative, quantitative and comparative analyses, may provide the key to a more complete measure of social capital

Numerous authors consider interpersonal trust, social networks and collective action as the key components of social capital (Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Fukuyama, 1995; Portela Maseda & Neira Gómez, 2003; Putnam, 1995; Putnam et al, 1993). The three dimensions are closely interrelated – voluntary participation and formal group membership are frequently used as indicators of collective action and interpersonal trust – although as it has been said before, it is important that each component is explored and measured separately. Cox (1998) also suggests several measures of social capital, related to the social networks' dimension of the concept of social capital. For example, any indicator of interest in collective issues, such as newspaper, radio and television exposure, knowledge of local problems and community policies, may be associated with civic engagement and therefore pertinent to the assessment of social capital. Expressed measures of attitudes towards other people, institutions, activities, etc are also of interest in this context.

## **4.8 Threats to Social Capital**

Social capital is an asset easy to diminish and difficult to rebuild (Grootaert & Van Bastelaer, 2001). Putnam (1995) suggests that heavy television watching is a threat to the creation and nurture of civic engagement and social trust and, therefore, to social capital. While people watch television they do not take part in social activities outside the home; in other words, television consumption may be inimical to participation in voluntary associations, thus inhibiting the creation of social capital in the wider community. Putnam and Goss (2003) also argue that technological advances –

such as telephone, email, etc. – have ambiguous effects on social capital: they may help increase the number of contacts some people have, but they may also have the opposite effect. Bennett (1998) and Norris (1996) argue that it is not television, but socioeconomic changes, such as economic hardship or increase of time at work, what causes people, particularly women, to cut down their time participating in civic or voluntary activities. Bennett (1998) points out that in times of economic crisis, women tend to participate less in voluntary activities because they have less free time to do so after work and house duties. This would suggest that numbers of women involved in voluntary associations would increase again once the general economic situation improves, and women have the choice of paid work or more free time. Paramio (2000) follows this line of argument, and argues that mass media, particularly television, are only one element in the fragmentation caused by socioeconomic changes, which has resulted in low political identification and lack of trust in the political system.

Rivera (1996) argues that an increase in the gap between the rich and the poor in a given community is a threat to collective values, and to direct and multilateral interpersonal relationships. It also weakens spontaneous reciprocity causing severe damage to the community as a whole.

Cox (1995) suggests that isolation, lack of social interaction and/or difficulty in developing trusted relationships, and lack of time and space for social contact are threats to the creation and nurture of social capital. In her view, family and intimate social relationships are not, by themselves, sources of social capital. On the contrary, they might limit voluntary and free contacts with others outside their close and exclusive sphere, and therefore limit the development of the individual's social skills, thus jeopardising the creation of social capital within the wider community.

Mobility, especially from rural to urban areas, can cause thinning of existing rural associations. On the other hand, urban environments may not provide the necessary conditions to recreate these associations (Grootaert, 1998).

Hollis (1998) argues that trust itself may, in the long term, be a threat to social capital. He points out that high levels of trust may drive a society to achieve also higher levels of progress and development. Progress itself may be responsible for people becoming more rational, and consequently, their relationships may turn to be more instrumental. The long-term effect of this may be for people to become less trusting of others and perhaps less trustworthy themselves.

## 4.9 Negative Aspects of Social Capital

As it has been pointed out before in this chapter, social capital is not one but many different entities. Some of those entities can foster social inequalities. Portes (1998, p. 2) argues that "... the concept [of social capital] focuses attention on the positive consequences of sociability while putting aside its less attractive features". While norms and networks within a collectivity may foster beneficial actions, they can also constrain actions that could benefit everyone and may even have deleterious effects (Coleman, 1988; Grootaert, 1998; Portes, 1998; Putnam, 1993). Mistrust, and as result prejudice, discrimination and segregation, can derive from rigid and strict social ties that impose barriers to integration, especially from vertically structured collective associations. The norms and the social connections that enable members to cooperate and obtain the benefits of their actions are the same ones that may exclude outsiders from those benefits (Portes, 1998; Portes & Landolt, 1996), constraining potentially productive interactions, and even causing serious conflicts (Grootaert & Van Bastelaer, 2001; Olson, 1982). In the case of organised crime and street gangs, violent and criminal behaviours are highly valued and even rewarded by criminal associates who have a high degree of loyalty to one another – a somewhat perverse form of social capital (Weiss, 1996). Social capital will produce equity when it becomes a universal resource and not only an asset for a few privileged or exclusive groups (Grootaert, 1998).

In some instances, apathy towards the wider community may be a norm within a close-knit group or network, in which case one form of social capital may impede the formation of another (Weiss, 1996).

Social ties provide a vehicle for social control over anti-social behaviour (Portes, 1998). However, they can also limit individual freedoms to the point that they may produce an imbalance between individual liberties and collective action (Putnam, 1993). To obtain the benefits of cooperation, organisations' members will have to surrender, or at least share, some personal power (Coleman, 1973; Pérez-Díaz, 1998; Wallis, 1998) in favour of the organisation's defined goals and rules:

These rules require people not only to be ready to submit to external sanctions if they break them but, above all, to have the inner conviction that such rules, and the corresponding inner space, are ... sacred, and that these rules, and their own attachment to them, constitute the signs of identity of their membership to civilized society (Pérez-Díaz, 1998, p. 51).

"Free-ride" can be a product of some forms of social capital. When analysing participation in organisations, we have to keep in mind the fact that members may not be the only ones who obtain benefits from that engagement. Free-riders are those individuals that use or consume public goods and its benefits, available to everybody, but do not contribute to the production and/or provision of those public goods (Rivera, 1996). For example, not everybody belongs to what is known as "neighbourhood watching", a community-based resource to fight against crime, specifically home invasions. But some people do, and their commitment is to report any suspicious happening around their area. Therefore, those not involved in neighbourhood watching might expect their "watching" neighbours to also include their houses in their protective action, even if there is not expressed commitment to do so. But the "watching" neighbours might feel unhappy towards those who do not produce a collective good as they do. As result of this unfair and uncooperative behaviour, those individuals who practise the "free-riding" could be marginalised within a community (Oliver, 1984). Another outcome of "free-riding" may be the reduction in the number of people engaging in forms of collective action, and as a consequence of both, a significant damage to the already vulnerable trust. Rivera (1996) suggests that, to some extent, reducing the size of reciprocal cooperative groups may help identify those individuals who do not cooperate; the individuals excluded from "free-riding" may thus be penalised for their uncooperative behaviour.

#### **4.10 Conclusion**

In this chapter I have attempted to explore the major theoretical aspects of social capital and its importance for the understanding of various social features, such as social cohesion, integration, and social problem solving, in the pursuit of desired levels of personal and collective well-being. Social capital, briefly, refers to how individuals are interrelated with each other by norms, values, sanctions, social networks, obligations and expectations, which enable them to achieve shared goals and to find solutions to collective problems more effectively than if they were to pursue those goals and solutions individually. This section has identified the elements of social capital, such as trust, tolerance, reciprocity and social networks. It has also outlined the important conceptual and measurement issues relating to social capital.

In a way, social capital may be considered as an indicator of the social health and strength of communities, societies and nations. The achievement of high levels of well-being and quality of life are theoretically related to the respect and development of those elements that help build social capital, such as trust, social capability, tolerance and social participation. This view will be further explored in Part 5, and empirically tested in Part 7.

## **PART 5**

### **SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING AND SOCIAL CAPITAL**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

Parts 3 and 4 of this study have explored, independently, the concepts of subjective well-being and social capital. Part 5 of the study will focus on the theoretical relationship between both concepts.

The first section of this chapter examines the relationship between elements of subjective well-being – satisfaction with life and happiness – and an element of social capital – social bonds. Participation in some kind of voluntary association, the social support received from friends and family, and marriage appear to have an impact on increasing levels of subjective well-being.

The chapter then follows with a discussion of the view that subjective well-being may result from social capital. In other words, subjective well-being may be an outcome of social capital, and, at the same time, it may help produce more social capital. The chapter then moves on to assess the importance of goal setting and goal achievement – as social capital is a resource that may help to achieve collective goals – as processes towards the achievement of desired levels of well-being. This line of argument will continue as I explore the links between quality of life, human capital and social capability. Social capability theory suggests that the individual's capacity to use personal freedom, personal skills and assets, as well as his/her access to resources (such as information and primary goods) are of great importance to achieve personal well-being.

#### **5.2 Social Bonds and Subjective Well-Being**

Individuals are social beings, and as such, they have a public life within the social structures. Headey (1993) suggests that people develop a feeling of well-being by having somebody (family, friends, etc.) to trust and depend on when in need. Supporting this view, Larson (1993; 1996) explores the contribution of social adjustment and social support to what he calls "psychosocial well-being", which in few words is a combination of social and psychological well-being. On the one hand, social adjustment refers to "...satisfaction with relationships, performance in social roles and adjustment to one's environment" (Larson, 1993, p. 294). On the other hand, social support refers to the size and quality of the relationships within the individual's social network, such as friendship and kinship. Larson (1993; 1996) suggests that higher levels of social interaction are positively correlated with happiness and negatively with depression. Hyypä and Mäki (2003) also agree that there is an association, at the individual level, between social participation, well-being and health-related behaviour. In this line of argument, Kawachi et al. (1997), and McMichael and

Manderson (2004) suggest that social capital – in the form of social interactions in any type of social structure – may contribute to people's well-being.

Participation in voluntary associations, as discussed in Part 4 of this study, is one of various types of social bonds and a fundamental element of social capital. Numerous authors have suggested that civic engagement may play an important role in the pursuit of desire levels of subjective well-being. In Mena Merchán's (1990) view, people can achieve common goals by acting collectively, and by doing so they may also improve the community's quality of life. Weiss (1996, p. 19), who defines social capital as "...the social infrastructure that contributes or detracts from the quality of life", suggests that the increase of social capital, seen as community networks, relationships and values, may contribute to a better quality of life. Also in this line of argument, Cox (1998), Kasser and Ryan (1993; 1996), and Sullivan (1995) suggest that there is a positive association between people's participation in civic associations and their levels of subjective well-being and quality of life. Social isolation affects people's quality of life, and as Bell (1998) points out, voluntary associations help to break down that isolation by connecting individuals with common interests, values, and goals.

Argyle (1987) and Davis (1984) also point out the relationship between an element of well-being – happiness – and social ties. Argyle (1987) suggests that quality relationships in the family, social and work environments, are the main sources of satisfaction for the individual, and that friendship and trust in others are fundamental contributors to overall happiness. He also emphasises the role that affection, intimacy, confidence, reassurance of self-worth, and social support play in the production of positive affect or happiness. On the other hand, Davis (1984, p. 329) argues that "Sociological theory predicted higher levels of subjective welfare among the married, those not living alone, the joiners, and the more sociable". Numerous authors have found empirical evidence of a positive association between close relationships, such as supportive and committed marriage, and subjective well-being (Eckersley, 1997; Myers and Diener, 1997; Stack and Eshleman, 1998; Veenhoven, 1996). Marriage also tends to be positively correlated with financial satisfaction and perceived health, both significant determinants of happiness. Stack and Eshleman (1998) have also explored the relationship between cohabitation and subjective well-being, coming to the conclusion that although people who live together – not married – report higher levels of happiness than single persons, the association between cohabitation and happiness is substantially weaker than the association between marriage and happiness.

Similarly to involvement in any community organisation, religious activism may provide an opportunity to meet people who share similar values and look at achieving similar goals. Ellison (1991) has explored the positive influence of organised religious participation in individual perceptions of well-being. He argues that any type of religious organisation provides opportunities for people to meet and build social ties. Religious communities may also offer information and support to those in need, and promote norms of health, personal and social behaviour that may



enhance subjective well-being. Finally, in Ellison's (1991) view, participation in collective worship may help reinforce personal beliefs and cognitive evaluations of quality of life.

Veenhoven (1996) also supports the view of an association between participation in voluntary associations and subjective life satisfaction. He argues that people who are members of any sort of organisation, such as churches, political parties and clubs, generally report higher levels of satisfaction with life as a whole than those people who do not belong to any kind of association or do not participate in any organisational activity. In the same line of argument, Headey, Holmstrom and Wearing (1985) support the association between subjective well-being and a rich and well-developed social network. Their study shows that satisfaction with domains closely related to social networks, such as leisure, marriage and friendship, are strongly correlated with overall subjective well-being, and that participation in some kind of organisation increases people's chances of developing social networks conducive to well-being. Requena Santos (1994) points out that there is a significant association between levels of happiness and the size, strength and quality of social networks in which the individual is involved. Superficial relationships may produce higher levels of happiness than those more intimate and, therefore, more complex, as the former do not require much commitment. In the same line, Larson (1993; 1996) suggests that there is a close relationship between the support one obtains from social relationships and social well-being: "... the larger one's network and the more satisfaction with contacts in the network, the higher the level of social support and social well-being" (Larson, 1996, p. 185). Headey (1993), Larson (1993) and Requena Santos (1994) also support the strong effects that social networks and social ties, such as intimate attachments, friendships and reliable alliances, have on well-being and happiness. Ryff (1989) considers that having positive and trusting interpersonal relations may have an effect in increasing levels of subjective well-being. Freitag (2003) also supports the relationship between social trust and life satisfaction, although he develops the argument from the effect that happiness and life satisfaction have in the creation of trusting attitudes towards others. According to this view, happy and satisfied people are more likely to trust others and therefore build social capital, than are unhappy and unsatisfied people.

### **5.3 Self-Determination, Goal Achievement and Satisfaction of Needs through Social Capital**

Stone and Hughes (2002) have done extensive research in the field of social capital, and have come out with an interesting point that links social capital with well-being. Their argument is that social capital is a resource that may help to achieve collective goals, and as such, it may produce a variety of outcomes. Many of these outcomes are classified as well-being – individual/family well-being, public well-being, neighbourhood well-being, political well-being, and economic well-being. More interestingly, these outcomes may also be determinants by helping to produce social capital. This line of research basically argues that well-being, in its many kinds, may result from social capital and, at the same time, it may help produce more social capital. It is what Stone and Hughes (2002, p. 6) call a "cumulative causal cycle".

Weiss (1996) suggests that social capital, combined with physical capital and human capital, plays a crucial role in the satisfaction of people's needs. Hosen, Solovey-Hosen and Stern (2003) also support the view that different types of capital, included social capital, may enhance human happiness and, therefore, subjective well-being, by helping achieve goals. Herbert and Milsum (1990) suggest that people can achieve desired levels of well-being when they can reach goals by themselves. These goals may be, in some cases, individual goals, but they can also include community and society's goals. Argyle (1987), Herbert and Milsum (1990) and Michalos (1980) also support the gap/ratio theory, which states that the smaller the gap between the goals and the degree of achievement, the greater the subjective well-being. This theory also suggests that any assessment of subjective well-being should consider the gap between what people desire and what people perceive as achieved. The greater the gap, the lower the subjective well-being.

Campbell et al. (1976), Diener (1994), Eckersley (1997), and Myers and Diener (1995) also point out the importance of individual goal aspiration and goal achievement as factors that may enhance subjective well-being. Supporting this view, Doyal and Gough (1991) argue that people need opportunities, resources and capacities to exercise self-determination and, therefore, to have the possibility to achieve the levels of well-being desired. Self-determination means: "... that choices are made autonomously and free of coercion and that people consent in an informed way to their rule by others or by government" (Roher Institute, 1993, p.30). People acting as individuals, as communities and/or as governments exercise self-determination by articulating aspirations and by planning towards making decisions that will help them to achieve those goals (Beauchamp & Childress, 1989; Rawls, 1971). Hamburg, Elliot and Parron (1982) and Ryff (1989) suggest that self-determination and independence can contribute to the well-being of individuals and societies. They may help to promote good health by showing the effect that people's lifestyle choices – such as exercise, smoking, diet, alcohol and drugs use, etc. – have on individual and community health.

Support from close relationships, such as family and friends, and from organisations and institutions – in the form of information and resources – are essential in the process of creating and developing the capacity to exercise self-determination (Roher Institute, 1993). Carver and Scheier (1990) and Ryan, Sheldon, Kasser and Deci (1996) have found evidence that significant progress toward achievement of intrinsic goals is positively related to positive affect, and therefore, to subjective well-being. Hankiss (1980) also notes the great impact that the life-goal variable has in people's assessment of their quality of life. In this line, Ryff (1989) suggests that having a purpose in life and clear goals to achieve are central elements of positive well-being.

Those societies that have reached a point where essential needs have been satisfied (postmodern societies) develop a sense of security that is essential in the shift towards values that emphasise subjective well-being and quality of life (Inglehart, 1997). Linked to this view is the association between that sense of security, subjective well-being, tolerance and trust. Inglehart (1997) suggests that nations that are high in well-being values are also more tolerant, and they show higher levels of interpersonal trust and active participation than those nations that are high in survival values.

## **5.4 Subjective Well-Being, Human Capital and Social Capability**

The concepts of social capability and human capital are of great importance in the analysis of quality of life, as personal well-being depends heavily on the individual's capacity to effectively use material and social resources (Sen, 1992). Human capital, as any other form of capital, is an asset that provides satisfaction of a specific need, in this case the need for knowledge obtained through formal and informal types of education, training and experience (Weiss, 1996). It is an asset greatly dependent on public and private financial investment, as Weiss has found evidence of a positive association between human capital and material resources invested in education. On the other hand, low levels of human capital, translated in lack of skills and knowledge, may limit economic development (Schultz, 1977). Human and social capitals, like any of the other forms of capital, are unequally distributed in society. The social structure itself may be an obstacle to the pursue of personal well-being, as it creates social and economic inequalities that may restrict the access of specific groups or individuals to valuable material and social resources such as education and skills' development, and as a consequence, to life opportunities. In this line of argument, Eckersley (2001) suggests that socioeconomic inequalities reduce social capital levels and increase social isolation.

Sen (1992) has explored the concepts of social capability and human capital in the context of the analysis of quality of life. He also has developed some theoretical links between social capability, well-being and social capital, arguing that personal well-being is greatly affected by the individual's capacity to use material and social resources in an effective way. In this context, Sen (1992) refers to social capability as the outcome of the sum of the use of personal freedom, access to primary

goods, and the individuals' valuable skills and knowledge (human capital) enhanced by their participation in social life. Sen (1992) conceives freedom as an essential capability of the individual to achieve personal goals and thus to pursue personal levels of well-being by allowing the individual to use personal abilities, skills and assets – which have been reinforced by the individual's life in society – to achieve personal goals and desired levels of quality of life. Strong relations of mutual trust and cooperation play an important role in the pursuit of social capability, as they help to reinforce the sense of social participation, together with mutual respect and recognition by other citizens (Latham, 1998).

Human capital and social capital have a mutual effect (as determinants and as outcomes) on each other (Weiss, 1996). On one hand, human capital provides the values and abilities needed for the growth of social capital. On the other hand, social capital in the family and in the community can facilitate successful education of new generations. Kilpatrick (2002, pp. 454-455) argues that social capital allows individuals and communities to develop their learning processes. She identifies two elements – "knowledge resources" and "identity resources"– both of which are necessary if social capital is to be mobilised.

People with better access to information sources are more favoured socially than those who are poor in knowledge and information. In other words, the amount of information individuals have is a major determinant of their social opportunities: those with access to information networks are more capable of creating opportunities that might help them to achieve their individual and collective interests, while those who lack knowledge and information are limited in the ways in which they can respond to the challenge of new opportunities (Latham, 1998), and in the ways they may use mass media resources – such as the television, the press or the internet – to inform themselves about public life, participate in it, or influence the government (Paramio, 2000). Civic engagement fosters communication, and therefore, information becomes a more available resource to those involved in one form or another of cooperative action. In this context, Coleman (1988, p. S100) suggests that social capital makes possible human capital, which "is created by changes in persons that bring about skills and capabilities that make them able to act in new ways", and human capital may be measured by the level of education achieved. Portela Maseda and Neira Gómez (2003) also support the influence of social capital on the creation of future human capital, suggesting that the strength of the social capital at the family level has an effect on the educational results of the children, and therefore their quality of life.

Putnam (1996) also suggests that those better educated tend to have higher levels of participation and trust, mainly due to the skills, abilities, and inclinations gained through education. Following that line of argument, Veenhoven (1996) found very strong correlations between personal capability and perceived quality of life. Argyle (1987) and Veenhoven (1998) agree that there is a significant relationship between access to opportunities in life, freedom of choice, and levels of satisfaction.

Veenhoven (1998) suggests that individualism has a positive effect on happiness. To assess individualism Veenhoven uses indicators such as freedom of choice, personal capability, perceived freedom and control over own life, and adherence of individualistic values. Myers and Diener (1997) have also found extensive evidence of the association between happiness and sense of control over one's life.

Coleman (1988) makes a different analysis of the relationship between social capital and information networks. He approaches the matter from the social relations themselves, as the ones that produce channels of information. In his view, the acquisition of information is a vital step towards social action.

Inkeles and Diamond (1980) explore the concepts of "personal effectiveness" and "sense of personal competence", to analyse the individual's capacity to cope, control and influence his/her personal emotions, and his/her interpersonal relations, and to evaluate how the individual uses those skills to achieve personal and social development. The assessment of personal effectiveness may include personal attributes that have an effect on the individual's capacity to influence and control not just his/her own emotions but also the surrounding world (Inkeles & Diamond, 1980). Kobasa (1979) also follows that line of argument, pointing out the association between the capacity to control specific life situations and the achievement of desired levels of subjective well-being. Lawton (1983) suggests that the combination of the evaluation of the individual's health, the ability to acquire knowledge and skills, the use of time and social behaviour, provides the fundamental elements of the "good life".

To reach equality among individuals it is necessary to acknowledge those differences and disadvantages existing within individuals and groups, and to recognise their different needs (Roher Institute, 1993). Central to the notion of equality at the societal level are the concepts of respect and tolerance of diversity:

When individuals and communities express their aspirations and develop capacities to pursue and achieve them, their well-being is well on the way to being secured. When a society makes it possible for its members and communities to contribute to the well-being of that society, the society is closer to social well-being. Ultimately, when nations, as well as international institutions, provide the conditions for this to happen, in a context of mutual recognition and equality among nations, it can be truly said that they have achieved well-being (Roher Institute, 1993, p. 42).

Latham (1998), following the neo-Tocquevillean paradigm, emphasises the major role that government and institutions play helping individuals achieve social capability, guaranteeing social and economic participation, and helping citizens create opportunities and use their freedom to achieve personal and collective goals. The state has the obligation of strengthening the relationships among citizens (Latham, 1998), by creating social opportunities and also by enforcing responsibilities and obligations. Provision of certain services might help society to achieve "...economic prosperity, social integration, and a sense of collective identity" (Pérez-Díaz, 1998, p.59). Accordingly, Latham (1998) argues that the government should be responsible for encouraging public debate and removing blockages that may affect the public's commitment to civic engagement. Governments can also provide the reforms needed to obtain high levels of self-governance, and in that way receive back the public trust and recognition of its management performance.

The Rother Institute (1993) emphasises the importance of democratisation at all levels of society in the achievement of social well-being. Participation in decision-making processes that have an effect in personal as well as in community lives appears to be essential to reach high levels of democratisation. Those nations that support freedom (political and individual freedom) also show higher levels of life satisfaction, in part because of the effect freedom has on people's opportunities and choices (Veenhoven, 1996).

Inglehart (1997) has also found evidence of an association between subjective well-being and a number of traits that are conducive to stable democracy. He argues that level of satisfaction with life as a whole can predict political legitimacy. His point is that overall life satisfaction "...provides more stable basis of support for a given regime than does political satisfaction" (Inglehart, 1997, pp. 177). Thus, societies high in subjective well-being are more likely to be stable democracies than those with low subjective well-being. Those societies high in well-being values, in Inglehart's view, also show high levels of interpersonal trust and active participation attitudes, which are of great importance in a democratic system.

Transparency in the dealings between politicians, and within institutions and the public administration, is vital, so that citizens can have a clear vision of those on whom to put their trust and expectations. On the other hand, government's policies towards privatisations might create anxiety in people, as their sense of belonging decreases with the feeling of loss of ownership (Cox, 1995).

## **5.5 Conclusion**

There is much theoretical support for the positive association between the development of trusting relationships, active participation and subjective well-being. On the one hand, individuals are able to achieve not only personal but also collective well-being by developing strong social ties based on trust and tolerance. On the other hand, when people's well-being is high, there is also an increased sense of security that helps develop more social capital in the form of tolerance, trust and participation.

There are also theoretical links between social capability, well-being and social capital. Subjective well-being may be greatly influenced by the individual's capacity to use physical and social resources in an effective way. Social capability is the sum of the use of personal freedom, access to primary goods, and the individuals' valuable skills and knowledge (human capital) enhanced by their participation in social life. Strong and trusting interrelations are essential in the pursuit of social capability, as they reinforce social participation, mutual respect and recognition by others.

Finally, it is of great significance the theoretical association between human capital, social capital, and subjective well-being. While human capital provides the values and abilities needed for the growth of social capital, civic engagement can also facilitate access to knowledge and information, and therefore create opportunities that might help them to achieve individual and collective well-being.

## **PART 6**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **6.1 Introduction**

As noted earlier in Part 1, this study intends to address the following research questions:

1. How do levels of subjective well-being differ between regions in Spain?
2. How do forms and levels of social capital differ between regions in Spain?
3. To what extent are social capital and subjective well-being linked within those regions in Spain?

In order to answer those questions empirically, I will analyse data from the World Values Survey (WVS) 1995-1996. This chapter aims to explain the processes involved in the gathering and in the analysis of that data. First of all, I will provide general details regarding the WVS 1995-1996, and more specific information on the data for Spain and the four autonomous regions analysed in this study.

Then I will address the steps to be undertaken in the statistical analysis of the data. As the WVS was designed as a general survey on values, many of its variables are not appropriate to answer our research questions. However, some existing measures in the WVS will be manipulated and new variables will be computed to make the analysis possible.

To measure levels of subjective well-being in Spain and its regions I will use the happiness and the satisfaction with life as a whole scales. Following Inglehart (1997), I will combine both items to create a Subjective Well-Being Index, and this way answer our first research question.

The second research question refers to levels of social capital in Spain and in the four regions involved in this study. I will identify those variables in the WVS 1995-1996 that reflect proximal components of social capital, such as tolerance, trust, participation in voluntary associations, importance of family and importance of friends.

The final step is to explore to what extent social capital and subjective well-being are linked. To do so I will use the items used to measure subjective well-being and social capital.



## 6.2 Subjects

The World Values Survey (WVS) 1995-96 was designed under the umbrella of intergenerational value change theory (Inglehart, 1997) to explore changes in mass belief systems in a multinational context and in a very broad sense. The WVS includes questions on happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole. Inglehart (1997) believes they are excellent indicators of overall subjective well-being and quality of life, and Veenhoven (1996, p.14) considers the WVS Program as fundamental for the creation of "international statistics of satisfaction". The subject of social capital is not featured as such in the WVS. However, there are several items that, once manipulated, may be reasonably relevant to the conceptual framework of this study. Those "social capital indicators" are analysed in more detail throughout this chapter.

The WVS 1995-96 offers data for Spain and for four autonomous regions (Andalusia, Basque Country, Galicia and Valencia), based in independent samples (Inglehart, 1997). The main sources of regional data are the regional samples themselves. However, in those cases where results for specific variables are not available in the regional samples, I will use the Spanish national sample to draw regional data. The national Spanish sample contains 1211 cases. The separate regional samples are as follows: Andalusia (N=1803), Basque Country (N=2205), Galicia (N=1200), and Valencia (N=501). Data collection occurred between May 1995 and March 1996 (Fieldwork dates: Spain, 2<sup>nd</sup> - 8<sup>th</sup> October 1995; Andalusia, March 1996; Basque Country, May-June 1995; Galicia, November 1995; Valencia, October 1995). In the case of the Spanish study, surveys were based on face-to-face interviews conducted at the respondent's home. Stratified multistage sampling was used, built from 1986 census data. The distribution of the sample was proportional by autonomous communities and size of town: all towns with more than 500,000 inhabitants were included in the sample, smaller towns were randomly selected. The first step was to make a selection within towns by a random selection of census sections. The second step was to select the houses by random route method. Finally, individuals were sampled following sex and age quotas. Subjects were individuals of both sexes, aged 18 and older. Average interview duration was 45 minutes. Details other than sample size and fieldwork dates are unavailable regarding the 1995-96 data sampling procedures for Andalusia, the Basque Country, Galicia and Valencia. In short, this analysis is based on interview data, although the interviewing process is not part of this study.

Preparation for the data analysis developed in section 7 of this study brought up several methodological issues. Briefly, two of the samples used in this study present irregularities in their sampling procedure, as shown in Table 6.1. First, the sample for Valencia (N=501) included respondents under 18 years of age (8.2% of the sample), when the subjects should have been individuals aged 18 and older. Second, the sample for Galicia (N=1200) presents a clear age skewness: a very high percentage of respondents (43.9%) were 18 to 29 years of age. There was

thus an overrepresentation of this age group, as those who were 18 to 28 years of age made up only 24.4% of the Galicians interviewed in the Spanish national sample. Conversely, in the Galician sample there was an underrepresentation of most other age groups. Males, who made up only 44.8% of the Galician sample, were also underrepresented here. In order to explore how irregularities such as these might affect the results, I used the weight variable included in all data sets involved in this study and compared results not using the weight variable. The results were generally very similar. For this reason, and because it is inappropriate to use weighted data in some forms of analysis, no weight variable has been used in any of the statistical analyses in this research.

Table 6.1  
*Age and Gender distribution in Galicia and Valencia*

<b>Age</b>	<b>Galicia%</b>		<b>Valencia%</b>	
	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>
14-17			8.2	
18-29	43.9	24.4	22.9	26.3
30-39	19.5	22.1	20.1	19.7
40-49	14.7	17.4	15.2	14.7
50-59	8.4	12.8	11.6	13.1
60-69	8.2	16.3	13.0	16.4
70 +	5.3	7.0	9.0	9.8
<b>Gender</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>
Male	44.8	50.0	48.3	49.2
Female	55.2	50.0	51.7	50.8
<b>Total N</b>	1,200	86	501	122

(1) From regional sample

(2) From national sample.

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

### 6.3 Data Analysis

Because the WVS was designed for a more general purpose than this particular research, many of its variables are inadequate to answer the present research questions or fail to capture important information relevant to the conceptual framework of this study. In some cases, available measures will be applied directly from the WVS, but in most cases existing measures will be manipulated or new ones will be created to make analysis possible. For example, old values will be recoded into new ones to create dummy variables, and new variables will be computed to measure those concepts linked to our research questions, like social capital. The multidimensionality of both subjective well-being and social capital adds complexity to the development of adequate measurement tools.

This study will test the internal reliability of multiple item scales, using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. An Alpha score of .7 or more will indicate that the scale is reliable.

To answer the first research question of this study (How do levels of subjective well-being differ between regions in Spain?) I have chosen two single item scales to measure subjective well-being: the satisfaction with life as a whole and the happiness scales. The scale used to measure life satisfaction in the WVS (Inglehart, 1997) has ten response points, which is considered an appropriate range for a question of this type (Andrews & Robinson, 1991).

V65. All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?

Please use this card to help with your answer.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Dissatisfied					Satisfied				

The second scale, measuring happiness, is a single item scale with four fixed response categories:

V10. Taking all things together, would you say you are:

1. Very happy
2. Quite happy
3. Not very happy
4. Not at all happy

For the purpose of analysis, variable 10 has been reverse-coded so that responses run in the same directions as those for variable 65; that is, the responses range from 1 (not at all happy) to 4 (very happy)<sup>1</sup>.

Although it presents the problems of single-item measures, the happiness scale is a good instrument to measure such a concept (Andrews & Robinson, 1991; Davis, 1984; Jacobs & Willits, 1994; Smith, 1979), and as it has been used in many studies, it allows comparisons (Stack and Eshleman, 1998). Smith (1979) points out that one of the advantages of the happiness measure is that it is clearly understood and meaningful to respondents. However, and as I pointed out in part 3 of this study, many authors have shown some concerns about the use of happiness measures. Hagedorn (1996) argues that some people may be unconsciously deceiving themselves and researchers by responding mainly towards the positive end of the scale. Argyle (1987) suggests that many people may tend to report exaggerated levels of happiness because it may be socially desirable to say that you are happy, even if you are not. Argyle (1987) also argues that people may get used to many unpleasant circumstances, and therefore they may not report them as unsatisfactory, especially when they compare their situation with others' or with past situations. Thus, there are various limitations inherent in the use of satisfaction and happiness indices as the only tools to assess well-being.

Inglehart (1997) has combined the satisfaction with life as a whole and the happiness scales to create a Subjective Well-Being Index for each sample. I will calculate Inglehart's Subjective Well-Being Index following his steps (1997, p. 391):

1. Calculate the percentage scoring high on V10, minus the percentage scoring low in V10 ("Taking all things together, would you say you are ...") Codes 1–2 define low, and Codes 3–4 define high.
2. Calculate the percentage scoring high on V65 minus the percentage scoring low on V65 ("All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?"). Codes 1–4 define low, and codes 7–10 define high.
3. Sum figures (1) and (2).
4. Divide this result by 2.

I will also calculate an Individual Subjective Well-Being Index in a way that can be subjected to statistical analysis using SPSS. It is based in the same two variables used by Inglehart (1997) – level of happiness and level of satisfaction with life as a whole – but I will recode their values differently. The steps to calculate this Individual Subjective Well-Being Index are as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup>For the purpose of analysis, numerous variables from the WVS 1995-1996 have been reverse-coded following this model, so that responses run in the same directions as those for variable 65.

A.

V10. Taking all things together, would you say you are:

- 9. Very happy
- 6. Quite happy
- 3. Not very happy
- 0. Not at all happy

B.

V65. All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?

Please use this card to help with your answer.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  
Dissatisfied Satisfied

Then I will calculate, for each person, an Individual Subjective Well-Being Index, based on the following formula: Sum of A and B, then divide the result by 2.

Variables 10 (happiness) and 65 (satisfaction with life as a whole) from the WVS will be also used in correlation and regression analysis, to help find and explain relationships with other variables from the WVS. Apart from levels of subjective well-being in Spain and its regions, I am also interested in the connections between subjective well-being and other elements of social life.

In order to measure social capital and address the second research question of this study (How do levels of social capital differ between regions in Spain?) I have identified in the WVS 1995-1996 several separate variables that would reflect proximal components of social capital: tolerance, trust (interpersonal or general trust, and trust in institutions), participation in voluntary associations, importance of family, and importance of friends. Once manipulated, these variables may be reasonably relevant to the theoretical framework of this study.

The WVS 1995-1996 provides a group of variables that, once manipulated, are appropriate to measure the degree of tolerance in the community. We can obtain information about tolerance by measuring attitudes toward neighbours who do not represent the majority of the population (V51 to V60). For unknown reasons, there is no data for variable 53 in the Basque Country data set. It is possible that variable 53 was omitted from the Basque Country questionnaire because of the complex sociopolitical situation in the region. To enable comparison between relatively large samples from each of the four regions, variable 53 has been excluded from the Tolerance Index.

However, at one point I will make regional analysis of tolerance that includes data from variable 53, using the Spanish data set. The variables that will be used to measure tolerance are as follows:

On this list are various groups of people. Could you please sort out any that you would not like to have as neighbours? **(CODE AN ANSWER FOR EACH)**

	<u>Mentioned</u>	<u>Not mentioned</u>
V51. People with a criminal record	1	2
V52. People of a different race	1	2
V53. Political extremists	1	2
V54. Heavy drinkers	1	2
V55. Emotionally unstable people	1	2
V56. Muslims	1	2
V57. Immigrants/foreign workers	1	2
V58. People who have AIDS	1	2
V59. Drug addicts	1	2
V60. Homosexuals	1	2

For the analysis, I have recoded "mentioned" as 0, and "not mentioned" as 1. Then, I have computed a new variable named Tolerance Count, which is the sum of variables 51 to 60, excluding variable 53. I have also computed a Tolerance Index as follows:

$$\text{Tolerance Index} = (\text{ABS (Tolerance Count)} / 9) * 100$$

To measure generalised interpersonal trust, questions on whether people can be trusted are of interest (Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Stolle & Rochon, 1998). However, Stone (2001) points out that the WVS item to measure generalised interpersonal trust presents the limitations of any single, unidimensional indicator used to measure a multidimensional concept. The item speaks about trusting "most people", but it does not ask about levels of trust towards specific categories of people. However, it is widely used in research on trust and social capital and it is the item used in the present study to measure general trust.

V27. Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?

1. Most people can be trusted
0. Can't be too careful [TRANSLATION: = "have to be very careful"]

This variable has been reverse-coded from the original, where "most people can be trusted" was code 1 and "can't be too careful" was code 2.

Measuring trust in institutions and in political leaders, together with the analysis of those events that may affect people's trust towards governments, institutions and public officials, is of great interest in the study of social capital. The WVS has sixteen items to measure level of confidence in institutions (variables 135 to 150). This research will combine all sixteen items to create an overall Levels of Trust in Institutions Index. The original coding was as follows:

I am going to name a number of organisations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all?

	<u>A great deal</u>	<u>Quite a lot</u>	<u>Not very much</u>	<u>None at all</u>
V135. The churches	1	2	3	4
V136. The armed forces	1	2	3	4
V137. The legal system	1	2	3	4
V138. The press	1	2	3	4
V139. Television	1	2	3	4
V140. Labor unions	1	2	3	4
V141. The police	1	2	3	4
V142. The government in Madrid	1	2	3	4
V143. Political parties	1	2	3	4
V144. Parliament	1	2	3	4
V145. The civil service	1	2	3	4
V146. Major companies	1	2	3	4
V147. The Green/Ecology movement	1	2	3	4
V148. The Women's movement	1	2	3	4
V149. The European Union	1	2	3	4
V150. The United Nations	1	2	3	4

In order to measure institutional trust as a whole I will manipulate variables 135 to 150. Firstly, I will recode the existing variables (code 1 becomes 3, code 2 stays as 2, code 3 becomes 1, code 4 becomes 0). Secondly, I will compute a new variable called Level of Trust in Institutions Index. This new variable comprises variables 135 to 150:

$$\text{Levels of Trust in Institutions Index} = (\text{ABS}(\text{MEAN}(\text{V135 to V150})) / 3) * 100$$

As it has been argued in Part 4 of this study, civic engagement is a fundamental element of social capital. Unfortunately, it is not possible to measure the quality of the relationships between people in this research. The WVS 1995-1996 does not provide detailed information about involvement in both formal and informal associations other than active or passive membership. Considering the limitations, I still believe, based on the existing literature on this matter, that associational membership appears to be a good way to measure participation, civic engagement and social capital. In the 1995-1996 WVS there are items (variables 28 to 36) related to membership in voluntary organisations, so it is possible to measure the participation of individuals in a number of organisations. The original coding for this question in the WVS 1995-1996 was as follows:

Now I am going to read off a list of voluntary organisations; for each one, could you tell me whether you are an active member, an inactive member or not a member of that type of organisation?

	<u>Active member</u>	<u>Inactive member</u>	<u>Do not belong</u>
V28. Church or religious organisation	1	2	3
V29. Sport or recreation organisation	1	2	3
V30. Art, music or educational organisation	1	2	3
V31. Labor union	1	2	3
V32. Political party	1	2	3
V33. Environmental organisation	1	2	3
V34. Professional organisation	1	2	3
V35. Charitable organisation	1	2	3
V36. Any other voluntary organisation	1	2	3



These variables will be recoded to create a Total Association Index:

- Active member 2
- Inactive member 1
- Do not belong 0

The next step will be to compute the new index:

$$\text{Total Association Index} = (\text{SUM (V28 to V36)/18}) * 100^2$$

In order to measure social capital at the family and friends levels it is necessary to look at those relationships that develop within the family structure and within the friends' networks. The WVS only allows measuring the importance that the family and the friends have for the respondent. The original coding for these questions was as follows:

Please say, for each of the following, how important it is in your life. Would you say...

	Very <u>important</u>	Rather <u>important</u>	Not very <u>important</u>	Not at all <u>important</u>
V4. Family	1	2	3	4
V5. Friends	1	2	3	4

In the present analysis, the above coding will be reversed so that the responses range from 0 (not at all important) to 3 (very important). Then, an Importance of Social Bonds Index will be created.

$$\text{Importance of Social Bonds Index} = \text{Mean (Sum (v 4, v5) * 33.33)/2}$$

To answer the third research question (To what extent are social capital and subjective well-being linked within those regions in Spain?), I will use the index (Subjective Well-Being Index) created to answer the first research question (How do levels of subjective well-being differ between regions in Spain?), and the variables and indices that represent core elements of social capital. Correlation and multivariate analysis will be used to see if there is any significant association between them.

---

<sup>2</sup> 18 corresponds to total results: the 9 variables analysed here multiplied by 2.

## **6.4 Conclusion**

This section of the study has outlined the methodological approach to addressing the research questions (How do levels of subjective well-being differ between regions in Spain? How do levels of social capital differ between regions in Spain? And to what extent are social capital and subjective well-being linked within those regions in Spain?). Applying this approach, I will explore five data sets from the World Values Survey 1995-1996. The Spanish sample will give us results at the national level, while Andalusia, Basque Country, Galicia and Valencia will provide data at the regional levels. The aggregate sample (national plus regional samples) will be used to obtain results at the individual level.

Items about happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole will be used to measure levels of subjective well-being and, following Inglehart (1997), I will combine both items to create a Subjective Well-Being Index. To measure levels of social capital I will use measures of tolerance, trust, participation in voluntary associations, and importance of social bonds (family and friends). Finally, I will use correlational and regression analyses on the core elements of subjective well-being and social capital to explore the empirical relationship between these two phenomena.

## **PART 7**

### **DATA ANALYSIS**

#### **7.1 Introduction**

This section of the study will present results based on the analytic procedures outlined in the previous section. I will start with those items that have been identified in the conceptual framework as core elements of subjective well-being: happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole. I will follow with the measurement of Individual Subjective Well-Being using an index created with that purpose.

The next step will be to analyse those variables in the WVS 1995-1996 that reflect proximal components of social capital: tolerance, trust (general trust and trust in institutions), participation in voluntary associations, importance of family, and importance of friends.

The final step will be to assess to what extent subjective well-being and social capital are linked, by looking at the relationship between the core elements of each concept.

#### **7.2 Subjective Well-Being: Analysis of Happiness and Satisfaction with Life as a Whole**

##### ***7.2.1 Happiness***

This section will treat "happiness" as the dependent variable. I will measure levels of happiness at the individual level, and I will compute mean scores for Spain, the Basque Country, Andalusia, Galicia and Valencia. For each of the samples I will then identify which other variables are associated with happiness, looking at what the literature and previous empirical studies suggest being important determinants of happiness.

Table 7.1 shows the frequencies by age group for the different levels of happiness for all the samples analysed in this study. These results suggest that in Spain and in its regions most people are quite happy or very happy. There appear to be some differences between regions, but overall the patterns are fairly similar.

Table 7.1  
*Levels of Happiness (% by age)*

Age	Total cases				Spain				Basque Country				Andalusia				Galicia				Valencia			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
<b>Levels of Happiness: 1 Not at all happy. 2 Not very happy. 3 Quite happy. 4 Very happy</b>																								
15-24	0.9	8.7	67.3	23.1	0.5	9.7	62.2	27.6	1.5	7.9	72.7	17.9	0.6	6.0	64.5	28.9	0.6	11.1	66.9	21.4	0.9	10.3	66.4	22.4
25-34	0.5	9.1	70.8	19.6	0.4	9.9	70.4	19.3	0.4	8.7	73.5	17.4	0.5	9.3	66.4	23.8	0.3	9.4	76.0	14.3	1.0	7.1	61.6	30.3
35-44	0.9	9.1	70.9	19.1	2.0	9.3	72.0	16.7	1.1	8.0	74.6	16.3	0.0	9.9	66.0	24.1	1.4	9.5	72.3	16.8	0.0	9.8	62.0	28.2
45-54	0.5	9.8	66.5	23.2	0.0	13.1	68.6	18.3	0.6	7.0	67.4	25.0	0.4	8.8	65.3	25.5	0.7	11.1	71.3	16.9	1.3	16.5	54.4	27.8
55-64	1.3	14.4	63.7	20.6	0.6	15.7	70.2	13.5	1.8	12.4	62.2	23.6	1.2	16.8	61.6	20.4	2.2	8.9	70.0	18.9	0.0	18.4	46.9	34.7
65-98	1.9	13.7	63.5	20.9	1.8	16.3	64.7	17.2	0.6	9.9	65.4	24.1	3.7	15.8	59.0	21.5	2.8	14.3	68.6	14.3	0.0	13.8	62.1	24.1
<b>All</b>	1.0	10.5	67.5	21.0	0.9	12.3	68.0	18.8	1.0	8.8	70.0	20.3	1.1	10.9	63.9	24.1	1.0	10.6	70.9	17.5	0.6	12.0	60.3	27.1

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

Table 7.2 shows the means of level of happiness for the samples of Spain, Basque Country, Andalusia, Galicia and Valencia, as well as an aggregation of all the samples. To summarise the results, Valencia has the highest mean (3.14), while Spain and Galicia have the lowest means (both 3.05). Results in Table 7.2 support the view that, when asked to make a self-assessment of their happiness, most people respond in very positive terms (Argyle, 1987; Hagedorn, 1996; Jacobs & Willits, 1994).

Table 7.2  
*Happiness (Means)*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
Valencia	3.14	.63	501
Andalusia	3.11	.62	1797
Basque Country	3.09	.57	2185
Total cases	3.09	.59	6881
Galicia	3.05	.56	1191
Spain	3.05	.59	1207

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

In order to determine whether the differences between the means for the unaggregated samples are statistically significant I have conducted a series of t-tests. All t-tests conducted in this study adopt a 95% confidence interval. Table 7.3 shows the results of the t-test comparing the means of all the samples. Differences comparing the means from Spain and Basque Country, Spain and Andalusia, Spain and Valencia, Basque Country and Galicia, Andalusia and Galicia, and Galicia and Valencia are all statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). The differences between the means from Spain and Galicia, Basque Country and Andalusia, Basque Country and Valencia, and Andalusia and Valencia are not statistically significant ( $p > .05$ ).

Table 7.3

*T-Tests Comparing Means for Levels of Happiness in Each Sample*

	<b>Spain</b> Mean 3.05	<b>Basque Country</b> Mean 3.09	<b>Andalusia</b> Mean 3.11	<b>Galicia</b> Mean 3.05	<b>Valencia</b> Mean 3.14
Spain	-	p=.019	p=.004	p=.950	p=.005
Basque Country	-	-	p=.425	p=.021	p=.151
Andalusia	-	-	-	p=.005	p=.355
Galicia	-	-	-	-	p=.005

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

Inglehart (1997) created a Subjective Well-Being Index, based on overall percentages of happiness and life satisfaction. Table 7.4 follows Inglehart's method, showing the percentage scoring high on V10, minus the percentage scoring low in V10. Codes 1- 2 define low, and codes 3-4 define high. These results indicate that, first of all, most people in Spain and in the four surveyed regions, are quite or very happy, and second, that there are some differences between Spain and the regions in relation to levels of happiness, although the magnitude of those differences varies.

Table 7.4

*Happiness Index: High Happiness % Minus Low Happiness %*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Index</b>
Basque Country	80.5
Total cases	77.0
Galicia	76.8
Andalusia	76.0
Valencia	75.1
Spain	73.6

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

I have conducted a series of calculations – correlation coefficients and multivariate regression models – to find those variables in the World Values Survey 1995-1996 that may explain or predict happiness. Based on the correlations presented in Appendix D (Table D.1), the following generalisations in the next six paragraphs can be made.

Satisfaction with life as a whole is the variable that has the strongest (positive) association with happiness. State of health, satisfaction with financial situation and freedom of choice and control over one's life follow in this order, also with positive associations. Satisfaction with life as a whole and happiness are two of the dimensions that form the structure of subjective well-being (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Davis, 1984; Lawton, 1983; Lawton, Keblan & Di Carlo, 1984), so it is not surprising that both show a significant association. Physical and mental health status is another variable that has shown correlations with happiness in previous researches (Argyle, 1987; Veenhoven, 1996). The association between happiness and satisfaction with financial situation has also been suggested before. Davis (1984) points out that under an economic approach, income and consumption levels are major determinants of happiness: the more money people have, the more they can buy, and the happier they are. In this context, household income and family attitude towards saving are also associated positively with happiness.

The association between happiness and freedom of choice and control over one's life is of great interest. A feeling of personal control over one's life is a strong determinant of subjective well-being (Rapley & Hopgood, 1997) and, although the correlations are weak, the results indicate an empirical association between subjective well-being (happiness) and such control. In a broad way, freedom and sense of control over one's life have a positive influence on people's opportunities and choices in life, and that affects levels of happiness (Inkeles & Diamond, 1980; Kobasa, 1979; Myers & Diener, 1997; Veenhoven, 1996). This internal locus of control is also one of the core elements of social capability, a concept that has been used to develop theoretical links between subjective well-being and social capital (Sen, 1992). Briefly, social capability greatly influences personal well-being, and social capital (in the form of trust and cooperation) helps to create social capability. These results do not prove a direct link between subjective well-being and social capital, but they suggest an association between one element of subjective well-being (happiness) and one concept that is theoretically associated with social capital (freedom of choice and control over one's life).

Looking at those variables that are measures of social capital in this study, happiness is weakly associated with the two indicators of trust. On one hand, the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index is positively associated with happiness in all samples except in the case of Valencia. Taking each of the composites of the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index, confidence in the churches and confidence in the United Nations have produced the strongest (positive) associations with happiness in this group of variables. It is worth to point out here the negative association between happiness and corruption in Spain. On the other hand, general trust is positively associated with happiness.

Although this association is also very weak, it can be said that there is some empirical support for Freitag's (2003) view that happy people are more likely to trust others. Of the other elements of social capital, participation in voluntary associations is also weakly associated with happiness. Variables 28, 29, 30, 32, 35 and 36 measure levels of participation in several voluntary organisations, and all correlations between them and happiness are positive, except in the case of variable 32 (membership in political party). The association between the Total Association Index (it comprises variables 28 to 36) and happiness only exists in the case of Andalusia (it is a positive association).

In relation with other types of social bonds, happiness is positively associated with importance of family and importance of friends. The Importance of Social Bonds Index confirms these positive associations. Also in the family context, happiness is positively associated with the goal of making one's parents proud, respect for parents, marital status, emphasis on family life, an emphasis on parents' responsibilities towards children, importance attributed to children's having a two-parent home, and ideal size of family. On the other hand, happiness is negatively associated with number of children and with the view that marriage is outdated.

The element of tolerance did not correlate at all with happiness in its index form. However, some of the variables that form that index did correlate negatively: attitude towards homosexual neighbours, attitude towards neighbours with criminal record, and attitude towards neighbours who are heavy drinkers. Finally, there is an association between happiness and those variables that measure "non civic" attitudes, such as cheating on taxes (negative association), claiming benefits one is not entitled to (positive association), buying something knowing that it is stolen (negative association), and avoiding a fare on public transport (negative association).

Overall, these results show that there are differences between samples, but as with the previous results, they are not very substantial. The associations between happiness and most of the independent variables are fairly weak, so I do not expect the multivariate regression model to produce high scores either.

The next five tables provide results of the multivariate regression model at the individual, national and regional levels. Table 7.5 shows those variables that have a predictive relationship with happiness within the aggregated sample. The variables that fulfilled the confidence level criteria ( $\text{sig.T} < .05$ ) were only three: state of health, satisfaction with life as a whole and freedom of choice/control over one's life, together producing an Adjusted R Square of .17. In this model satisfaction with life as a whole holds most of the weight in the prediction of happiness.



Table 7.5 Happiness.

*The Influence of Expected Predictors. Model I Total Cases*

		<b>Dependent variable: Happiness</b>				
<b>Independent Variables</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V65	Satisfaction with life as a whole	.104479	.003711	.346956	.28.153	.0000
V11	State of health	.104758	.008493	.141908	12.335	.0000
V66	Freedom of choice/ control over one's life	.008270	.003340	.029950	2.476	.0133
R Square				.17213		
Adjusted R Square				.17175		
Multiple R				.41488		
Standard Error				.53496		
Significant F				.0000		
F				456.71319		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Interestingly, satisfaction with financial situation did not make it into this equation. However, I have calculated a second regression model that includes financial situation, state of health and freedom of choice/control over one's life (Table 7.6). This group of variables has a much smaller Adjusted R Square (.09). In this case, by a relatively small margin, state of health holds the highest weight in the prediction of happiness.

Table 7.6

*Happiness. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Model II Total Cases*

		<b>Dependent variable: Happiness</b>				
<b>Independent Variables</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V11	State of health	.137027	.008814	.185688	15.546	.0000
V64	Satisfaction with financial situation	.039571	.003306	.146886	11.971	.0000
V66	Freedom of choice/ control over one's life	.032052	.003367	.116062	9.520	.0000
R Square				.09198		
Adjusted R Square				.09157		
Multiple R				.30328		
Standard Error				.56008		
Significant F				.0000		
F				221.97807		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

When one examines the separate samples, there are some differences in the combinations of independent variables that produce the highest Adjusted R Square. In the case of the general Spanish sample (Table 7.7), satisfaction with life as a whole, state of health and satisfaction with financial situation produced an Adjusted R Square of .17. Satisfaction with life as a whole is the strongest predictor of happiness in this equation.

Table 7.7

*Happiness. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Spain*

		<b>Dependent variable: Happiness</b>				
<b>Independent Variables</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V65	Satisfaction with life as a whole	.085132	.009208	.285266	9.246	.0000
V11	State of health	.130089	.019122	.184152	6.803	.0000
V64	Satisfaction with financial situation	.022713	.009752	.079309	2.595	.0096
R Square				.17106		
Adjusted R Square				.16897		
Multiple R				.41360		
Standard Error				.53411		
Significant F				.0000		
F				81.78898		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.8 shows the results of the regression model for the Basque Country, where satisfaction with life as a whole and state of health resulted, as in the case of Spain (Table 7.7), in an Adjusted R Square of .17. Again, life satisfaction is the strongest predictor of happiness in this model.

Table 7.8

*Happiness. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Basque Country*

		<b>Dependent variable: Happiness</b>				
<b>Independent Variables</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V65	Satisfaction with life as a whole	.114605	.006133	.373076	.18.687	.0000
V11	State of health	.085931	.015282	.112261	5.623	.0000
R Square				.16830		
Adjusted R Square				.16754		
Multiple R				.41025		
Standard Error				.51596		
Significant F				.0000		
F				219.66320		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.9 shows the results of the multiple regression equation for Andalusia, which are very similar to those from the Basque Country. In this case, satisfaction with life as a whole and state of health have produced an Adjusted R Square of .16 in the prediction of happiness.

Table 7.9

*Happiness. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Andalusia*

		<b>Dependent variable: Happiness</b>				
<b>Independent Variables</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V65	Satisfaction with life as a whole	.099700	.006760	.329906	14.750	.0000
V11	State of health	.112677	.015903	.158479	7.085	.0000
R Square				.15910		
Adjusted R Square				.15816		
Multiple R				.39887		
Standard Error				.56566		
Significant F				.0000		
F				168.76952		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Galicia (Table 7.10) offers the highest Adjusted R Square (.21) of all samples, with only two independent variables in the regression equation: satisfaction with life as a whole and state of health. The relative weight of these two predictors of happiness is fairly similar to that reported above for Andalusia and the Basque Country.

Table 7.10

*Happiness. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Galicia*

		<b>Dependent variable: Happiness</b>				
<b>Independent Variables</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V65	Satisfaction with life as a whole	.110507	.007493	.391877	14.749	.0000
V11	State of health	.118875	.019152	.164921	6.207	.0000
R Square				.21124		
Adjusted R Square				.20991		
Multiple R				.45961		
Standard Error				.50220		
Significant F				.0000		
F				158.41539		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Finally, Table 7.11 shows the results for the region of Valencia. Satisfaction with life as a whole, state of health and freedom of choice/control over one's life are, as in the case of the total sample, the main predictors of happiness from the WVS 1995-1996 (Adjusted R Square of .20).

Table 7.11

*Happiness. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Valencia*

<b>Dependent variable: Happiness</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V65 Satisfaction with life as a whole	.124885	.015287	.372608	8.169	.0000
V11 State of health	.076558	.033703	.095741	2.272	.0236
V66 Freedom of choice/ control over one's life	.026658	.012635	.094769	2.110	.0354
R Square			.20886		
Adjusted R Square			.20393		
Multiple R			.45701		
Standard Error			.56021		
Significant F			.0000		
F			42.41460		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The first conclusion that can be drawn from these results is that there are some differences in the levels of happiness in Spain and its regions, although these differences are not generally very large. The second conclusion is that there are also some differences in the predictors of happiness in Spain and its regions. Overall, satisfaction with life as a whole and state of health are the main and shared predictors of happiness within all samples analysed, a conclusion that is consistent with the theoretical framework of this research.

### ***7.2.2 Satisfaction with Life as a Whole***

This section will follow the same approach as the previous section on happiness. In this case, "satisfaction with life as a whole" is the dependent variable. I will measure levels of life satisfaction at the individual level within the aggregated sample and also using the separated samples for Spain, the Basque Country, Andalusia, Galicia and Valencia. For each of the samples I will then identify those variables that have correlated with life satisfaction. This will be followed by an examination of the models that are the best predictors of life satisfaction.

Table 7.12 shows the frequencies by age group for the different levels of satisfaction with life as a whole for all the samples analysed in this study. These results indicate that most people in Spain and in the regions analysed in this research have reported high levels of satisfaction with life as a whole. Overall, although there are some differences between regions, the patterns are fairly similar.

Table 7.12

*Levels of Satisfaction with Life as a Whole (% by age)*

Age	Total cases			Spain			Basque Country			Andalusia			Galicia			Valencia		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
15-24	7.9	23.9	68.2	9.2	25.6	65.2	6.6	25.2	68.2	7.6	25.9	66.5	9.7	22.3	68.0	6.0	16.4	77.6
25-34	8.5	27.6	63.9	9.5	31.0	59.5	7.5	26.0	66.5	9.1	29.0	61.9	8.7	30.1	61.2	8.1	14.1	77.8
35-44	7.4	28.3	64.3	11.3	34.0	54.7	5.3	28.5	66.2	7.4	29.1	63.5	8.5	23.9	67.6	4.3	21.4	74.3
45-54	7.7	28.6	63.7	13.2	34.7	52.1	5.5	24.6	69.9	6.8	31.1	62.1	7.4	31.6	61.0	8.9	20.2	70.9
55-64	10.0	31.8	58.2	10.7	45.5	43.8	6.5	31.5	62.0	13.0	25.7	61.3	11.1	30.0	58.9	10.2	14.3	75.5
65-98	11.1	27.0	61.9	14.6	34.7	50.7	7.7	25.7	66.6	11.8	29.1	59.1	13.2	17.0	69.8	9.3	17.4	73.3
<b>All</b>	8.7	27.5	63.8	11.4	34.2	54.4	6.5	26.7	66.8	9.3	28.36	62.4	9.5	25.6	64.9	7.6	17.2	75.2

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

Table 7.13 shows the means of level of satisfaction with life as a whole for the samples of Spain, Basque Country, Andalusia, Galicia and Valencia, plus the combination of all the samples used in this study. Valencia has the highest mean (7.35), while Spain has the lowest mean (6.61).

Table 7.13  
*Satisfaction with Life as a Whole (Means)*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
Valencia	7.35	1.90	499
Basque Country	7.12	1.85	2195
Andalusia	6.99	2.04	1794
Total cases	6.99	1.96	6885
Galicia	6.98	2.00	1194
Spain	6.61	1.97	1203

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

As I did in the section exploring happiness, I have conducted a series of t-tests to determine whether the differences between the means of the five sets of samples are statistically significant. Table 7.14 shows the results of these t-tests. All means appeared to be significantly different, with the exception of the means from Andalusia and Galicia ( $p > .05$ ).

Table 7.14  
*T-Tests Comparing Means for Levels of Satisfaction with Life as a Whole in Each Sample*

	<b>Spain</b> Mean 6.61	<b>Basque Country</b> Mean 7.12	<b>Andalusia</b> Mean 6.99	<b>Galicia</b> Mean 6.98	<b>Valencia</b> Mean 7.35
Spain	-	p=.000	p=.000	p=.000	p=.000
Basque Country	-	-	p=.034	p=.045	p=.012
Andalusia	-	-	-	p=.906	p=.000
Galicia	-	-	-	-	p=.000

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data



Following Inglehart (1997), I have calculated "high satisfaction minus low satisfaction". Table 7.15 shows the percentage scoring high on V65 minus the percentage scoring low on V65. Codes 1–4 define low, and codes 7–10 define high. Note that, as suggested by Inglehart (1997), this analysis does not count those cases coded 5 and 6, while results in Tables 7.12 and 7.13 are based on the analysis of all cases. This is the reason for the rank order differences between Tables 7.13 and 7.15. Valencia (67.3%) has the highest score, while Spain has the lowest (42.8%). As with the analysis of levels of happiness, Spain comes last in levels of satisfaction with life as a whole.

Table 7.15  
*Life Satisfaction Index: High Life Satisfaction %*  
*Minus Low Life Satisfaction %*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>%</b>
Valencia	67.6
Basque Country	60.3
Galicia	55.4
Total cases	55.1
Andalusia	53.1
Spain	43.0

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

Following are those variables in the World Values Survey 1995-1996 relevant to the research's conceptual framework and which have an association with satisfaction with life as a whole (Full results in Appendix D, Table D.2). Satisfaction with life as a whole is positively associated with satisfaction with financial situation. This result supports the view that socioeconomic status has an effect on subjective well-being (Davis, 1984; Hosen, Solovey-Honsen & Stern, 2003; Requena Santos, 1994). In this context, household income and family attitude towards saving are also positively associated with satisfaction with life as a whole. Satisfaction with life as a whole has also shown a moderate positive association with freedom of choice and control over one's life. As pointed out in the correlational analysis of happiness, personal well-being is affected by the individual's capability to use a variety of resources effectively. Freedom of choice and control over one's life is an essential asset, as it allows the individual to use personal abilities and knowledge (acquired through socialisation) to achieve desired levels of well-being. Argyle (1987) and Veenhoven (1998) also suggest the existence of a link between freedom of choice and satisfaction.

Inkeles and Diamond (1980), and Kobasa (1979) have found evidence of an association between the individual's capacity to control and influence specific life situations, and the achievement of desired levels of development and personal well-being. As mentioned earlier in the section exploring the correlates of happiness, control over one's life is one of the core elements of social capability, a concept that has been used to develop theoretical links between subjective well-being and social capital (Sen, 1992). Again, these results only suggest an association between one element of subjective well-being (satisfaction with life as a whole) and one concept that is theoretically associated with social capital (freedom of choice and control over one's life).

The correlation is also positive with level of happiness, and with state of health. As mentioned in the section exploring happiness, life satisfaction and happiness are two of the core elements of subjective well-being (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Davis, 1984; Lawton, 1983; Lawton, Keblan & Di Carlo, 1984), and therefore it makes sense that both show a significant association with each other. On the other hand, health status is another variable that has shown an association with satisfaction with life as a whole in previous researches (Argyle, 1987; Veenhoven, 1996).

In order to establish if there is any association between satisfaction with life as a whole and social capital, it is of interest to look at those variables that are measures of social capital in this study. The Levels of Trust in Institutions Index has shown a positive weak association with satisfaction with life as a whole. Most of the variables that form the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index have also produced positive associations with satisfaction with life as a whole: confidence in the churches, confidence in the armed forces, confidence in the legal system, confidence in the press, confidence in the television (negative association in the case of the Basque Country), confidence in the police, confidence in the government in Madrid, confidence in the political parties, confidence in the parliament, confidence in the civil service, confidence in the major companies, confidence in the ecology movement, confidence in the European Union, and confidence in the United Nations. As in the previous analysis taking happiness as the dependent variable, it is of interest to highlight here the negative association between life satisfaction and perception of corruption in Spain. In the Basque Country, satisfaction with life as a whole has a weak positive correlation with satisfaction with national government. The fact that such association only occurs in the case of the Basque Country makes it quite interesting. Of all regions analysed in this study, the Basque Country is the only one where nationalist parties and ideas are very strong (since 1979 all autonomous elections in the Basque Country have been won by a Basque nationalist party). This result may reflect a criticism of the way the national government has been handling the Basque situation. On the other hand, general trust is also positively associated with satisfaction with life as a whole. The results presented in Table D.2 (Appendix D) provide a fairly weak support for Freitag's (2003) hypothesis of a relationship between satisfaction with life as a whole and social trust.

Turning to another aspect of social capital, the results in Table D.2 (Appendix D) suggest that satisfaction with life as a whole is also weakly associated with participation in voluntary associations. Variables 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35 and 36 measure levels of participation in several voluntary organisations. All correlations between these variables and satisfaction with life as a whole are positive, except in the cases of variable 30 (member of art organisation), variable 31 (member of labour union), and variable 33 (member of environmental organisation). There is no association between the Total Association Index (it comprises variables 28 to 36) and satisfaction with life as a whole.

In relation with other types of social bonds, satisfaction with life as a whole is positively associated with importance of family and importance of friends. The importance of Social Bonds Index confirms these associations. Looking at those variables that also refer to family matters, satisfaction with life as a whole is positively associated with the goal of making one's parents proud, respect for parents, marital status, importance attributed to children's having a two-parent home, more emphasis on family life, an emphasis on parents' responsibilities towards children, and ideal size of family. Number of children and the view that marriage is outdated have negative associations with life satisfaction. The element of tolerance did not correlate at all with satisfaction with life as a whole in its index form. Only one of the variables that form that index did correlate negatively with life satisfaction: attitude towards people with AIDS as neighbours. Finally, there are negative associations between life satisfaction and those variables that measure "non civic" attitudes, such as cheating on taxes, claiming benefits one is not entitled to, buying something knowing that it is stolen, and avoiding a fare on public transport.

The next six tables present results for the multivariate regression models that have produced the highest Adjusted R Squares in explaining or predicting satisfaction with life as a whole for the combined sample and for each of the separate samples.

Satisfaction with financial situation, happiness, freedom and control over one's life, state of health and marital status have resulted in an Adjusted R Square of .38 for the combined sample (Table 7.16). Satisfaction with financial situation, happiness and freedom and control over one's life hold, in that order, most of the weight in the prediction of satisfaction with life as a whole.

Table 7.16

*Satisfaction with Life as a Whole. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Total Cases*

<b>Dependent variable: Satisfaction with life as a whole</b>						
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>	
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.321161	.009176	.359878	34.999	.0000	
V10 Happiness	.822534	.034123	.248421	24.105	.0000	
V66 Freedom/control over one's life	.210295	.009297	.229973	22.620	.0000	
V11 State of health	.219487	.024904	.089742	8.813	.0000	
V89 Marital status	.058636	.008167	.071162	7.180	.0000	
R Square			.37929			
Adjusted R Square			.37882			
Multiple R			.61587			
Standard Error			1.53333			
Significant F			.0000			
F			800.86774			

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

In the case of Spain (Table 7.17), the independent variables that have an explanatory relationship with satisfaction with life as a whole are very similar to those in Table 7.16. Satisfaction with financial situation, freedom and control over one's life, happiness, state of health, living up to what friends expect (this variable did not have a highly significant correlation with life satisfaction, but it did appear in the regression equation), and marital status have produced an Adjusted R Square of .39. Satisfaction with financial situation, freedom and control over one's life, and happiness hold, in that order, most of the weight in the prediction of satisfaction with life as a whole.

Table 7.17

*Satisfaction with Life as a Whole. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Spain*

<b>Dependent variable: Satisfaction with life as a whole</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.331677	.024148	.347201	13.735	.0000
V66 Freedom/control over one's life	.264874	.022882	.285476	11.576	.0000
V10 Happiness	.663778	.084251	.197341	7.879	.0000
V11 State of health	.188800	.058362	.079884	3.235	.0013
V71 Living up to what friends expect	-.181620	.057692	-.073357	-3.148	.0017
V89 Marital status	.050786	.020625	.058637	2.462	.0140
R Square			.39522		
Adjusted R Square			.39198		
Multiple R			.62867		
Standard Error			1.52704		
Significant F			.0000		
F			121.76941		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The Basque Country (Table 7.18) has very similar results to those from the aggregated sample (Table 7.16). The group of independent variables formed by satisfaction with financial situation, level of happiness, freedom of choice and control over one's life, marital status and state of health have produced an Adjusted R Square of .35. Satisfaction with financial situation, happiness, and freedom and control over one's life hold, in that order, most of the weight in the prediction of satisfaction with life as a whole.

Table 7.18

*Satisfaction with Life as a Whole. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Basque Country*

		<b>Dependent variable: Satisfaction with life as a whole</b>				
<b>Independent Variables</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V64	Satisfaction with financial situation	.329295	.016069	.382498	20.493	.0000
V10	Happiness	.901312	.059934	.279207	15.038	.0000
V66	Freedom/control over one's life	.127893	.016929	.139283	7.555	.0000
V89	Marital status	.065148	.013886	.084481	4.692	.0000
V11	State of health	.192492	.046206	.076231	4.166	.0000
R Square				.35420		
Adjusted R Square				.35262		
Multiple R				.59514		
Standard Error				1.47329		
Significant F				.0000		
F				224.75911		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The following results (Table 7.19 and Table 7.20) correspond to Andalusia and Galicia. In the case of Andalusia (Table 7.19), the group of independent variables formed by happiness, state of health, satisfaction with financial situation, freedom and control over one's life, marital status and, surprisingly, rating of political system in ten years, have produced an Adjusted R Square of .39. Satisfaction with financial situation, freedom and control over one's life, and happiness hold, in that order, most of the weight in the prediction of satisfaction with life as a whole. In the case of Galicia (Table 7.20), the group of independent variables formed by happiness, state of health, satisfaction with financial situation, freedom and control over one's life, marital status and, surprisingly, level of confidence in the police, have an Adjusted R Square of .36. Satisfaction with financial situation, happiness, and freedom and control over one's life hold, in that order, most of the weight in the prediction of satisfaction with life as a whole.

Table 7.19

*Satisfaction with Life as a Whole. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Andalusia*

<b>Dependent variable: Satisfaction with life as a whole</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.289310	.020565	.328231	14.068	.0000
V66 Freedom/control over one's life	.272754	.020991	.298987	12.994	.0000
V10 Happiness	.601735	.073831	.188736	8.150	.0000
V11 State of health	.270309	.052579	.117175	5.141	.0000
V89 Marital status	.047905	.018292	.058480	2.619	.0089
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	.045193	.018292	.054190	2.452	.0143
R Square			.39054		
Adjusted R Square			.38770		
Multiple R			.62493		
Standard Error			1.50702		
Significant F			.0000		
F			137.23856		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.20

*Satisfaction with Life as a Whole. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Galicia*

<b>Dependent variable: Satisfaction with life as a whole</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.308489	.022875	.332104	13.486	.0000
V10 Happiness	1.083739	.090366	.302121	11.993	.0000
V66 Freedom/control over one's life	.175722	.022708	.189583	7.738	.0000
V89 Marital status	.066574	.020044	.080321	3.321	.0009
V11 State of health	.204299	.065100	.078826	3.138	.0017
V141 Confidence in the police	.178479	.056378	.076079	3.166	.0016
R Square			.36634		
Adjusted R Square			.36297		
Multiple R			.60526		
Standard Error			1.60031		
Significant F			.0000		
F			108.78418		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Finally, the sample of Valencia has produced a multivariate regression model with four independent variables in the equation (Table 7.21). The independent variables included in the equation are level of happiness, satisfaction with financial situation, freedom and control over life, and problem if wife earns more than husband. Together they have the highest Adjusted R Square of all samples analysed (.43). Satisfaction with financial situation, happiness and freedom of choice are, in this order, the strongest predictors of satisfaction with life as a whole in Valencia. All the other regression models included marital status as part of their equations, with the exception of the Valencian case. Interestingly, there is a variable in this model (variable 102. Problem if wife earns more than husband) that reflects an issue linked to marital status.

Table 7.21

*Satisfaction with Life as a Whole. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Valencia*

<b>Dependent variable: Satisfaction with life as a whole</b>						
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>	
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.307960	.031870	.371620	9.663	.0000	
V10 Happiness	.838822	.109415	.284779	7.666	.0000	
V66 Freedom/control over one's life	.177676	.032926	.211861	5.396	.0000	
V102 Problem if wife earns more than husband	-.242654	.078398	-.111834	-3.095	.0021	
R Square			.43852			
Adjusted R Square			.43350			
Multiple R			.66221			
Standard Error			1.40770			
Significant F			.0000			
F			87.47218			

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

To summarise the results, I have found that satisfaction with life as a whole is predicted, in all samples analysed, by satisfaction with financial situation, level of happiness and freedom of choice and control over one's life. State of health and marital status are also part of the group of predictors of life satisfaction at the individual level, in the Basque Country, Andalusia, Galicia and the national Spanish sample. Other weak determinants of satisfaction with life as a whole are: living up to what friends expect (Spain), rating of political system in ten years (Andalusia), confidence in the police (Galicia), and problem if wife earns more than husband (negative beta in Valencia).



### ***7.2.3 Subjective Well-Being***

This section looks at answering the first research question of the study (How do levels of subjective well-being differ between regions in Spain?). In the previous sections I have explored two of the core components of subjective well-being: happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole. With the results from Table 7.4 (High happiness minus low happiness) and from Table 7.15 (high life satisfaction minus low life satisfaction) I have calculated Inglehart's Subjective Well-Being Index, following Inglehart's steps (1997, p. 391), at national and regional levels (this index cannot be created at the individual level). The steps to calculate this index are:

1. Calculate the percentage scoring high on V10, minus the percentage scoring low in V10. Codes 1- 2 define low, and codes 3–4 define high. Results are shown in Table 7.4
2. Calculate the percentage scoring high on V65 minus the percentage scoring low on V65. Codes 1–4 define low, and codes 7–10 define high. Results are shown in Table 7.15.
3. Sum figures (1) and (2).
4. Divide this result by 2. Results are shown in Table 7.22.

In this index a score of 0 indicates that the same number of people consider themselves unhappy or not satisfied with their lives as a whole as consider themselves happy or satisfied with their lives. If everyone is happy and satisfied, then a score of +100 would result. If everyone considered themselves unhappy and dissatisfied, then we would obtain a score of -100. Thus the scores may vary between -100 and +100.

Table 7.22 shows that many more people report high levels of happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole than report high levels of unhappiness and dissatisfaction with life as a whole. On the other hand, these results suggest that there are some regional differences within Spain in overall levels of subjective well-being. The score for the national sample is the lowest of them all (58.3). Andalusia (64.5) and Galicia (66.1) produced close results, both above the national index. Basque Country (70.4) and Valencia (71.3) are the samples with the highest scores.

Table 7.22

*Inglehart's Subjective Well-Being Index for National and Regional Samples*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>SWB</b>	<b>N</b>
Valencia	71.3	501
Basque Country	70.4	2205
Galicia	66.1	1200
Total cases	66.0	6920
Andalusia	64.5	1803
Spain	58.3	1211

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

The results in Table 7.23 are also from the World Values Survey 1995-1996, although in this case data are from the Spanish national sample (N= 1211), which also offers data for all its regions. The steps to calculate this index are the same as those used in Table 7.22. Because the regional samples drawn from the national sample may be too small, we must view these results with caution. Nevertheless, I have included them in this analysis with the only purpose of highlighting possible regional differences in terms of levels of subjective well-being. Navarra offers the highest score (90.5), but this is based on a sample of only 16 people. The next highest scores are well below, with Aragon scoring 79.0, Extremadura 76.7 and Castilla-Leon 72.0. The result for the Basque Country from the Spanish sample is 70.9, a score very close to the 70.4 obtained in the analysis of its own sample. Andalusia (62.2 in the Spanish sample, and 64.5 in its own sample) has also produced fairly close results in both analyses. The lowest of all scores from the regions in the Spanish national sample came from Cantabria (47.1), Baleares (43.7), La Rioja (43.6) and, finally, Murcia (37.3). Given the sizes of these sub-samples, the potential for error could be quite high. Inconsistent results within a region for which we have two sets of data are those for Galicia (54.1 in the Spanish sample, and 66.1 in its own sample) and Valencia (49.3 in the Spanish sample, and 71.3 in its own sample).

Table 7.23

*Inglehart's Subjective Well-Being Index for Regional Sub-Samples within the National Sample*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>SWB</b>	<b>N</b>
Navarre	90.5	16
Aragon	79.0	37
Extremadura	76.7	33
Castilla - Leon	72.0	16
Basque Country	70.9	64
Catalonia	67.1	46
Castilla - La Mancha	65.9	77
Asturias	65.8	34
Canarias	62.5	191
Andalusia	62.2	214
Madrid	57.4	160
Galicia	54.1	86
Valencia	49.3	122
Cantabria	47.1	51
Baleares	43.7	23
La Rioja	43.6	8
Murcia	37.3	33

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

I have used another formula to calculate an Individual Subjective Well-Being Index in a way that can be subjected to statistical analysis using SPSS. It is based in the same two variables used by Inglehart (1997) – level of happiness and level of satisfaction with life as a whole – but I have recoded their values differently (details in the Methodology chapter). Results in Table 7.24 are quite close to those obtained following Inglehart's model (Inglehart, 1997), and showed in Table 7.22. In the analysis of the Individual Subjective Well-being Index Spain has the lowest mean of all (5.87), followed closely by Galicia (6.06), total cases (6.13), Andalusia (6.16) and the Basque Country (6.21). Valencia has again the highest score of all (6.38).

Table 7.24

*Individual Subjective Well-Being Index (Means)*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
Valencia	6.38	1.6	499
Basque Country	6.21	1.5	2177
Andalusia	6.16	1.6	1788
Galicia	6.06	1.6	1186
Total cases	6.13	1.5	6849
Spain	5.87	1.5	1199

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

As I did in the sections exploring happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole, I have conducted a series of t-tests to determine whether the differences between the means of the five sets of samples from Table 7.24 are statistically significant. Table 7.25 shows the results of the t-test comparing the means of all the samples. All means appeared to be significantly different, with the exception of the means from Basque Country and Andalusia ( $p > .05$ ), and Andalusia and Galicia ( $p > .05$ ).

Table 7.25

*T-Tests Comparing Means of Individual Subjective Well-Being Index in Each Sample*

	<b>Spain</b> Mean 5.87	<b>Basque Country</b> Mean 6.21	<b>Andalusia</b> Mean 6.16	<b>Galicia</b> Mean 6.06	<b>Valencia</b> Mean 6.38
Spain	-	p=.000	p=.000	p=.004	P=.000
Basque Country	-	-	p=.307	p=.007	p=.025
Andalusia	-	-	-	p=.102	p=.006
Galicia	-	-	-	-	p=.000

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

Looking again at the core elements of subjective well-being, Veenhoven (1996) suggests that dispersion of satisfaction may be caused by social inequality. His argument is that the more unequal people's chances in life are the more they differ in their level of satisfaction with life. Income inequality (at the household and at the individual levels) is one of the many dimensions of social inequality. The empirical analysis of satisfaction with life as a whole has revealed that, indeed, household income is significantly correlated with this element of subjective well-being at the

individual, national and regional levels, with the exception of Valencia (Table D.2 in Appendix D). Satisfaction with life as a whole is also quite highly correlated with financial situation in all samples analysed (Table D.2 in Appendix D). All regression models exploring the predictors of satisfaction with life as a whole have satisfaction with financial situation as the strongest predictor (Tables 7.16, 7.17, 7.18, 7.19, 7.20 and 7.21). Finally, happiness is also associated with satisfaction with financial situation at the individual, national and regional levels (Table D.1 in Appendix D). To illustrate the possible relationship between income inequality and subjective well-being, we present data that shows the average earnings, in industry and services, per worker and per month, in 1995 (Table 7.26). It is important to note that these data have not been subjected to a purchasing power parity adjustment. Between the highest earnings (Basque Country, 273,384 pesetas, or AU\$ 2733) and the lowest earnings (Extremadura, 176,223 pesetas, or AU\$ 1762) there is a difference of 97,161 pesetas (AU\$ 971) per person, per month. Murcia, the Canary Islands, Galicia (with the lowest year to year change, only 1.6), Castilla-La Mancha and Valencia are regions which average wage, per person and per month, is under 200,000 pesetas (AU\$ 2000). In order to see if those regions that have higher average earnings are also the happiest and more satisfied with their lives, we need to look at Tables 7.22, 7.23 and 7.24. Tables 7.22 and 7.24 offer results from the independent samples from Spain, Basque Country, Andalusia, Galicia and Valencia. As we have pointed out before, Valencia is the region with the highest Subjective Well-Being Indices (71.3 in Table 7.22 and a mean of 6.38 in Table 7.24). In terms of average earnings, Table 7.26 shows that Valencia is behind the Basque Country, Spain and Andalusia in average earnings per worker per month in industry and services. These results do not suggest that a region where levels of subjective well-being reached 71 in a scale of 0-100 is necessarily at the top of the average earnings per person per month. Furthermore, the Spanish sample only obtained 58.3 in Inglehart's Subjective Well-Being Index (Table 7.22) and a mean of 5.87 in the Individual Subjective Well-being Index (Table 7.24), placed well behind the other samples. However, average earnings in Spain are higher than in Andalusia, Valencia and Galicia (Table 7.26).

As it has been mentioned earlier, Table 7.23 shows Inglehart's Subjective Well-Being Index for all the regions of Spain, based on results from the Spanish national sample. From these results we can argue that the region with a highest Inglehart's Subjective Well-Being Index (Navarre) ranks third on average earnings in Table 7.26, while the region with the lowest Inglehart's Subjective Well-Being Index (Murcia) ranks second last on average earnings in Table 7.26. These results may support the view that more income brings more happiness, but the case of Extremadura, third happiest of all regions but last on average income, contradicts such a view.

Table 7.26

*Average Earnings per Worker and Month, (4<sup>th</sup> Quarter of 1995) in Industry and Services in Spain and Regions*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Both sexes</b>		<b>Men</b>	<b>Women</b>
	<b>Pesetas</b>	<b>Year to year change</b>	<b>Pesetas</b>	<b>Pesetas</b>
Basque Country	273,384	4.3	285,219	223,733
Madrid	247,061	2.5	258,169	207,490
Navarre	244,846	9.0	257,701	194,144
Cantabria	231,829	8.6	242,812	174,955
Asturias	229,166	2.5	240,185	171,822
Aragon	227,984	3.1	246,204	160,725
Catalonia	224,671	5.0	240,863	178,227
Spain	219,078	4.5	233,206	170,481
Baleares	214,279	6.0	224,629	176,263
Castilla -Leon	212,116	3.1	220,867	167,141
La Rioja	203,844	6.7	220,246	150,283
Andalusia	203,069	4.2	218,091	148,056
Valencia	196,267	6.1	216,089	139,911
Castilla - La Mancha	187,671	8.8	202,321	135,736
Galicia	185,194	1.6	195,117	146,543
Canary Islands	182,110	4.4	191,464	154,022
Murcia	178,738	6.7	197,490	125,297
Extremadura	176,223	3.2	187,526	131,489

Source: Spain in Figures, 1996. INE 1996

To bring a broader understanding of these results I have conducted a series of tests – correlations and multiple regressions – to find those variables in the World Values Survey 1995-1996 that may have an effect on subjective well-being. Table D.3 (Appendix D) shows those variables that have correlated significantly with the Individual Subjective Well-Being Index (as calculated in table 7.24) and that are relevant to the theoretical framework of the study. These results are in line with those obtained for the variables 10 (happiness) and 65 (satisfaction with life as a whole), as both are components of the Individual Subjective Well-Being Index used in this analysis. The variables that have shown the strongest associations with subjective well-being are as follows: Satisfaction with

financial situation, freedom of choice and control over one's life, and state of health (all positive associations). Satisfaction with financial situation is clearly the variable that has the strongest association with the Individual Subjective Well-Being Index in all samples. This result supports the view that there is an association of above average financial and income situation and greater levels of subjective well-being (Cummins, 2000; Davis, 1984; Hosen, Solovey-Honsen & Stern, 2003). In the family finances' context, household income, and family attitude towards saving are also associated positively with subjective well-being. It is important to take into account that subjective variables, such as self-assessed well-being and satisfaction with financial situation, tend to produce more significant correlations with each other than with objective variables such as family income (Cummins, 2000). A very interesting outcome of this analysis is the positive association between subjective well-being and freedom of choice and feeling of control over one's life. Freedom of choice is a variable that has been theoretically linked to the concept of social capability, which in turn tends to enhance subjective well-being. Health status also shows significant correlations with the subjective well-being for all samples. Argyle (1987) and Saunders (1996) argue that state of health and income are especially of concern as we grow older, and both have an effect in subjective happiness assessments.

Looking at those variables that are measures of social capital in this study, subjective well-being is weakly associated with the two indicators of trust. On one hand, the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index is positively associated with subjective well-being in all samples except in the case of Valencia. Taking each of the composites of the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index, confidence in the churches, confidence in the European Union, and confidence in the United Nations have produced the strongest associations with subjective well-being in this group of variables. It is of special interest to point out here the negative association between subjective well-being and perception of corruption in Spain. On the other hand, general trust is positively associated with subjective well-being in Galicia and in the Basque Country, as well as in the aggregated sample.

Of the other elements of social capital, participation in voluntary associations is also weakly associated with subjective well-being. Variables 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35 and 36 measure levels of participation in several voluntary organisations. All correlations between subjective well-being and these variables are positive, except in the case of variable 31. The association between the Total Association Index (it comprises variables 28 to 36) and subjective well-being only exists in the case of Andalusia (positive association). In relation with other types of social bonds, subjective well-being is positively associated with importance of family and importance of friends. The Importance of Social Bonds Index confirms these associations. Furthermore, subjective well-being is positively associated with the goal of making one's parents proud, respect for parents, marital status, more

emphasis on family life, an emphasis on parents' responsibilities towards children, and importance attributed to of children's having a two-parent home. Number of children and the view that marriage is outdated have negative associations with subjective well-being.

The element of tolerance did not correlate at all with subjective well-being in its index form. However, two of the variables that form the Tolerance Index did correlate negatively with subjective well-being: attitude towards neighbours with criminal record and attitude towards neighbours who are heavy drinkers. Finally, there is a negative association between subjective well-being and those variables that measure "non civic" attitudes, such as cheating on taxes, claiming benefits one is not entitled to, buying something knowing that it is stolen, and avoiding a fare on public transport.

Overall, correlation analysis results in Table D.3 (Appendix D) show that there are differences between samples, but as with the previous results (happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole), they are not very substantial. The associations between subjective well-being and most of the independent variables are fairly weak, therefore the multivariate regression models that follow will not produce high scores either.



Based on multivariate regression analysis for all individuals included in this study (the sum of the national and regional samples), Table 7.27 shows those explanatory variables that are important determinants of subjective well-being for the total of cases analysed in this study. As the results on Table D.3 (Appendix D) also suggested, subjective well-being is predicted by financial situation, control over one's life, state of health, marital status and, interestingly, levels of trust in institutions. Although the weight of the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index in this regression model is very weak, it offers a link between an element of social capital and subjective well-being. This cluster of variables has produced an Adjusted R Square of .29.

Table 7.27

*Subjective Well-Being. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Total Cases*

<b>Dependent variable: Individual Subjective Well-Being Index</b>						
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>	
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.236481	.007750	.333166	30.514	.0000	
V66 Freedom/control over one's life	.166348	.007871	.228805	21.133	.0000	
V11 State of health	.403758	.020875	.207585	19.342	.0000	
V89 Marital status	.087578	.006920	.133683	12.656	.0000	
Levels of Trust in Institutions Index	.007776	.001416	.057794	5.492	.0000	
R Square			.28730			
Adjusted R Square			.28675			
Multiple R			.53600			
Standard Error			1.30633			
Significant F			.0000			
F			527.59307			

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.28 shows those variables from the World Values Survey that predict subjective well-being in the Spanish national sample. In this case, subjective well-being is predicted by financial situation, control over one's life, state of health and marital status, and together these variables produce an Adjusted R Square of .32. Levels of Trust in Institutions Index did not make it into this equation.

Table 7.28

*Subjective Well-Being. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Spain*

<b>Dependent Variable: Individual Subjective Well-Being Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.260725	.019342	.348089	13.479	.0000
V66 Freedom/control over one's life	.180686	.018534	.249980	9.749	.0000
V11 State of health	.398145	.046084	.215138	8.640	.0000
V89 Marital status	.081063	.016664	.119448	4.865	.0000
R Square			.32330		
Adjusted R Square			.32094		
Multiple R			.56859		
Standard Error			1.26485		
Significant F			.0000		
F			137.23584		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.29 shows the regression model results for the Basque Country. In this case, these combined predictors only account for an Adjusted R Square of .24. Overall, the results are very similar to those obtained from the total sample (Table 7.27). In this case, subjective well-being is also predicted by financial situation, health status, control over one's life, marital status and Levels of Trust in Institutions Index.

Table 7.29

*Subjective Well-Being. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Basque Country*

<b>Dependent Variable: Individual Subjective Well-Being Index</b>						
<b>Independent Variables</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V64	Satisfaction with financial situation	.235681	.013972	.339330	16.869	.0000
V11	State of health	.347443	.039963	.170476	8.694	.0000
V66	Freedom/control over one's life	.120624	.014751	.162901	8.177	.0000
V89	Marital status	.093131	.012059	.149812	7.723	.0000
	Levels of Trust in Institutions Index	.007629	.002691	.054860	2.835	.0046
R Square				.23950		
Adjusted R Square				.23764		
Multiple R				.48939		
Standard Error				1.28881		
Significant F				.0000		
F				128.80406		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.30 shows the results for Andalusia. The cluster of predictors accounts, in this case, for an Adjusted R Square of .32. In this case, subjective well-being is predicted by financial situation, control over one's life, state of health, marital status and Levels of Trust in Institutions Index.

Table 7.30

*Subjective Well-Being. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Andalusia*

<b>Dependent Variable: Individual Subjective Well-Being Index</b>						
<b>Independent Variables</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V64	Satisfaction with financial situation	.232119	.014857	.325065	15.623	.0000
V66	Freedom/control over one's life	.207564	.015156	.282867	13.695	.0000
V11	State of health	.430973	.038065	.232731	11.322	.0000
V89	Marital status	.073011	.013928	.105900	5.242	.0000
	Levels of Trust in Institutions Index	.007339	.002681	.055420	2.738	.0063
R Square				.32524		
Adjusted R Square				.32326		
Multiple R				.57030		
Standard Error				1,31160		
Significant F				.0000		
F				164.36448		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.31 shows the results of the regression model for Galicia. The combined predictors, in this case, account for an Adjusted R Square of .26. Overall, the results are very similar to those obtained from the Basque Country and Andalusia samples. In the case of Galicia, subjective well-being is also predicted by financial situation, health status, control over one's life, marital status and Levels of Trust in Institutions Index.

Table 7.31

*Subjective Well-Being. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Galicia*

<b>Dependent Variable: Individual Subjective Well-Being Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.221791	.018905	.307040	11.732	.0000
V11 State of health	.456026	.052745	.226813	8.646	.0000
V66 Freedom/control over one's life	.138039	.018803	.191250	7.341	.0000
V89 Marital status	.088054	.016446	.136700	5.354	.0000
Levels of Trust in Institutions Index	.016538	.003561	.119634	4.644	.0000
R Square			.26403		
Adjusted R Square			.26082		
Multiple R			.51384		
Standard Error			1.33973		
Significant F			.0000		
F			82.29820		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Finally, Table 7.32 presents the regression model results for Valencia. The combined predictors account for an Adjusted R Square of .30. In this case, subjective well-being, similarly to the case of Spain, is predicted by financial situation, control over one's life, state of health and marital status.

Table 7.32

*Subjective Well-Being. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Valencia*

<b>Dependent Variable: Individual Subjective Well-Being Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.214222	.029443	.299948	7.276	.0000
V66 Freedom/control over one's life	.199860	.029184	.280173	6.848	.0000
V11 State of health	.375119	.081231	.184327	4.618	.0000
V89 Marital status	.113018	.026524	.165159	4.261	.0000
R Square			.30669		
Adjusted R Square			.30090		
Multiple R			.55380		
Standard Error			1.33362		
Significant F			.0000		
F			52.97201		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The first conclusion that can be drawn from the analyses in this section is that levels of subjective well-being differ from one sample to another, although the differences are not very large. The people from Valencia are the most happy and satisfied with their lives, while Spanish in general are the least happy and satisfied. Second, the Individual Subjective Well-Being Index I have created (also based on happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole, but with some changes in the original coding from Inglehart [1997]) supports the previous analyses and the view that levels of subjective well-being vary lightly within Spain.

In respect to exploring the associations between subjective well-being and other variables from the WVS related to this study's conceptual framework, I have found that subjective well-being is predicted by financial situation, health status, control over one's life, and marital status in all samples analysed. In the cases of the aggregated sample, the Basque Country, Andalusia and Galicia the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index also meets the conditions for inclusion in the regression equations. Although the weight of the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index in the

prediction of subjective well-being is very small, it is an interesting result towards the analysis of the possible associations between subjective well-being and social capital.

### **7.3 Social Capital: the Analysis of its Elements**

The literature suggests that social capital is a multidimensional concept that comprises many elements, social networks, trust and tolerance being identified as some of the most important ones. Within that framework, I have identified in the World Values Survey 1995-1996 those variables that reflect proximal components of social capital: tolerance, trust (social trust and trust in institutions), participation in voluntary associations, and social bonds (importance of family and friends). These indicators will allow me to measure social capital and address the second research question of this study (How do levels of social capital differ between regions in Spain?). Those social capital indicators are analysed in detail throughout this chapter.

#### **7.3.1 Tolerance**

This section will treat "tolerance" as the dependent variable in the statistical equations. The World Values Survey 1995-1996 provides a group of variables that, once manipulated, are appropriate to measure tolerance. As reported in the Methodology chapter, data for variable 53 have not been recorded in the Basque Country, using data from the Spanish data set, and therefore this variable has been removed from the general analyses of the Tolerance Index. However, I have made a regional analysis that includes variable 53 (including the Basque Country from the Spanish data set), shown in Table 7.35

As the Tolerance Index is a composite measure, it has been tested for scale reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha for the overall scale (variables 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59 and 60) is .7629 (.7822 standardised alpha). The Cronbach's Alpha for the scale used in the regional analysis from the Spanish national data set (variables 51 to 60) is .7347 (.7572 standardised alpha), indicating that the items in both scales combine together well and thus form reliable scales.

In a scale from 0 (low tolerance) to 100 (high tolerance), all the samples analysed produced scores above the value of 70, which can be interpreted as high tolerance. Table 7.33 shows the means for all the samples and for the total number of cases analysed. The sample with the highest mean is Andalusia (77.33), and the one with the lowest mean is Valencia (72.28).

Table 7.33

*Tolerance Index (Means)\**

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
Andalusia	77.33	23.21	1803
Basque Country	77.03	24.81	2205
Total cases	76.13	23.67	6920
Galicia	75.62	21.45	1200
Spain	74.83	23.92	1211
Valencia	72.28	24.09	501

\*Variable 53 excluded from this analysis

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

In order to determine whether the differences between the means in Table 7.33 are statistically significant I have conducted a series of t-tests. Table 7.34 shows the results of the t-test comparing the means of the five samples. All means appeared to be significantly different, with the exception of the means from Spain and Galicia, Basque Country and Andalusia, and Basque Country and Galicia (all  $p > .05$ ).

Table 7.34

*T-tests Comparing Means for Levels of Tolerance in Each Sample\**

	<b>Spain</b> Mean 74.83	<b>Basque Country</b> Mean 77.03	<b>Andalusia</b> Mean 77.33	<b>Galicia</b> Mean 75.62	<b>Valencia</b> Mean 72.28
Spain	-	P=.012	P=.004	P=.395	P=.045
Basque Country	-	-	P=.694	P=.084	P=.000
Andalusia	-	-	-	P=.039	P=.000
Galicia	-	-	-	-	P=.007

\*Variable 53 excluded from this analysis

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

Table 7.35 shows also the regional means for the Tolerance Index, in this case the data used is from the WVS 1995-1996 Spanish national sample (N= 1211). This table shows results using variables 51 to 60 and also results excluding variable 53. Here are represented all the Spanish regions. As in the case of the analysis of subjective well-being, we must take these results with caution, as the regional samples drawn from the national sample may be too small. In a scale from 0 (low tolerance) to 100 (high tolerance), the highest score corresponds to Navarre (86.25 using variables 51 to 60, and 88.89 excluding variable 53), and the lowest to La Rioja (31.25 using



variables 51 to 60, and 29.17 excluding variable 53). As mentioned previously, I would take both results with caution as the sample sizes of both Navarre and La Rioja are very small and the results appeared very far from the other regions'. On the other hand, Andalusia (76.31 using variables 51 to 60, and 76.43 excluding variable 53 in the Spanish sample; and 77.33 in its own sample), Galicia (71.28 using variables 51 to 60, and 72.48 excluding variable 53 in the Spanish sample; and 75.62 in its own sample), Basque Country (79.69 using variables 51 to 60, and 81.77 excluding variable 53 in the Spanish sample; and 77.03 in its own sample) and Valencia (71.72 using variables 51 to 60, and 73.22 excluding variable 53 in the Spanish sample; and 72.28 in its own sample) have produced close results in both analyses. Overall, the results from tables 7.33 and 7.35 suggest that people in Spain are very tolerant and that, although there are some differences in levels of tolerance in Spain and the regions analysed in this study, these differences are not very large.

Table 7.35

*Regional Tolerance Index (Means) from Spanish National Sample*

<b>Region</b>	<b>Variables 51 - 60</b>		<b>Variables 51, 52, 54 - 60*</b>		<b>N</b>
	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	
Andalusia	76.31	21.18	76.43	21.92	214
Aragon	64.86	26.31	66.67	26.45	37
Asturias	75.88	17.25	78.10	18.45	34
Baleares	69.57	15.51	74.88	14.69	23
Basque Country	79.69	21.96	81.77	21.90	64
Canarias	71.10	26.06	73.24	26.25	191
Cantabria	70.00	23.41	71.02	23.32	51
Castilla - La Mancha	76.75	25.00	78.50	25.38	77
Castilla - Leon	72.50	25.95	70.83	26.87	16
Catalonia	66.52	24.42	67.87	25.79	46
Extremadura	73.03	20.08	73.74	18.80	33
Galicia	71.28	24.34	72.48	25.32	86
La Rioja	31.25	25.88	29.17	24.44	8
Madrid	77.56	20.79	79.51	21.13	160
Murcia	69.09	30.86	69.70	31.34	33
Navarre	86.25	16.68	88.89	15.71	16
Valencia	71.72	21.11	73.22	21.98	122

\*Variable 53 excluded from this analysis

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Following is the correlation analysis between the Tolerance Index and those variables from the World Values Survey 1995-1996 that are relevant to the research's conceptual framework (see Appendix E, Table E.1). The Tolerance Index has a moderately strong positive association with those variables that measure attitudes towards issues such as justification of homosexuality, justification of prostitution, justification of abortion, justification of divorce, justification of euthanasia, and justification of suicide.

Educational level (positive correlation), age, marital status, and number of children (all negatively correlated) also appear to be relevant towards attitudes of tolerance in all the samples analysed. An interesting association (positive) is that of tolerance and postmaterialist values, in particular in the regional samples. One of the claims of the postmaterialist theory (Inglehart, 1997) is that, once people have achieved material security, they move towards values that emphasise tolerance and diversity.

Variables measuring attitudes towards religious issues are also obviously associated with the Tolerance Index. All the correlations are negative, except in the case of religious denomination. Those religious variables that have produced significant associations with the Tolerance Index are as follows: importance of religion, importance of children to learn religious faith at home, member of church or religious organisation, confidence in the churches, religious denomination, religious attendance, religious person, belief in God, belief in heaven, belief in sin, importance of God, and finally, comfort and strength obtained from religion.

Variables measuring political attitudes are also significantly associated with the Tolerance Index, and in most cases the associations are quite weak. On one hand, tolerance is positively correlated with importance of politics, discussion of politics with friends, and interest in politics. On the other hand, political inclination has a relatively strong negative association with tolerance. Several variables that may help to measure attitudes towards authoritarian values have also produced negative correlations with tolerance. Such are the cases of greater respect for authority, rating of political system under Franco, attitude towards strong leader without elections, and attitude towards army rule.

Looking at the components of social capital, the theoretical relationship between tolerance, trust, participation in voluntary associations and importance of informal networks (family and friends) has very weak empirical support in this study. On the one hand, the Tolerance Index has shown a very weak negative association with the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index. Of all the variables that form the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index, confidence in the Armed Forces and confidence in the churches are the two variables that have produced the strongest associations (negative). On the other hand, general trust has also a very weak positive association with tolerance. The element of participation in voluntary associations did not correlate with tolerance as an index. However,

several of the variables that are part of the Total Association Index have produced significant associations with tolerance, and from the group of variables that from the Total Association Index participation in church or religious association is the strongest correlate. In this context, those variables that measure participation or involvement in some sort of protest action did show positive significant associations with the Tolerance Index. That is the case of the following items: signing a petition, joining boycotts, attending lawful demonstrations, joining unofficial strikes and occupation of buildings and factories.

Finally, the Importance of Social Bonds Index has produced a very weak positive association with the Tolerance Index in only two of the samples analysed in this study, Andalusia and the aggregated sample. The two elements of the Importance of Social Bonds Index – importance of family and importance of friends – have obviously produced weak positive associations with tolerance.

Happiness, satisfaction with life as a whole and subjective well-being did not have any significant empirical association with tolerance in any of the cases analysed.

Table 7.36 shows the independent variables that have shown an explanatory relationship with the Tolerance Index for the total cases analysed in this study. This multivariate regression model has an Adjusted R Square value of .18. Age, justification of homosexuality, attitude towards immigrants coming to Spain to work, postmaterialism and political inclination hold, in that order, most of the weight in the prediction of tolerance.

Table 7.36

*Tolerance. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Total Cases*

<b>Dependent variable: Tolerance Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V216 Age	-.195132	.022748	-.144259	-8.578	.0000
V197 Justifiable: Homosexuality	.858471	.116113	.124348	7.393	.0000
V134 Approve foreign workers in the country	3.754708	.494873	.112386	7.587	.0000
Postmaterialist Index	1.853450	.305036	.098495	6.076	.0000
V123 Political inclination	-1.056861	.167815	-.096256	-6.298	.0000
V101 Men better political leaders than women	-2.137794	.426717	-.074307	-5.010	.0000
V63 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for Spanish people	-1.851349	.425686	-.066405	-4.349	.0000
V9 Importance of religion	1.338202	.336886	.062334	3.972	.0001
V96 Women single parents	2.420382	.585223	.061132	4.136	.0000
V159 Protect individual freedom	2.699503	.731315	.056186	3.691	.0002
V217 Educational level	-.405717	.137517	-.048081	-2.950	.0032
V95 Sexual freedom	1.498148	.519226	.043280	2.885	.0039
R Square			.18362		
Adjusted R Square			.18128		
Multiple R			.42851		
Standard Error			20.45273		
Significant F			.0000		
F			78.51697		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.37 shows the cluster of variables that predict tolerance in the case of Spain. Together they have an Adjusted R Square value of .21. Political inclination, attitude towards gender discrimination when jobs are scarce, age and attitude towards foreign workers are the main predictors of tolerance in this equation.

Table 7.37

*Tolerance. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Spain*

<b>Dependent variable: Tolerance Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V123 Political inclination	-1.798432	.469703	-.145992	-3.829	.0001
V61 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for men	-3.942014	1.004241	-.142128	-3.925	.0001
V216 Age	-.177669	.050255	-.131973	-3.535	.0004
V134 Approve foreign workers in the country	3.895000	1.084052	.122371	3.593	.0004
V159 Protect individual freedom	5.094201	1.720808	.106507	2.960	.0032
V197 Justifiable: Homosexuality	.736008	.273973	.101861	2.686	.0074
V151 Rating of political system under Franco	-.872708	.371393	-.091909	-2.350	.0191
R Square			.21655		
Adjusted R Square			.20868		
Multiple R			.46535		
Standard Error			21.16795		
Significant F			.0000		
F			27.52181		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.38 presents those variables that have produced an explanatory relationship with the Tolerance Index for the sample of the Basque Country. This multivariate regression model has the lowest Adjusted R Square index value of all, just .14. Justification of homosexuality, comparison of men and women as political leaders, confidence in the women's movement and age hold, in that order, most of the weight in the prediction of tolerance.

Table 7.38

*Tolerance. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Basque Country*

<b>Dependent variable: Tolerance Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V197 Justifiable: Homosexuality	1.008418	.246175	.132022	4.096	.0000
V101 Men better political leaders than women	-3.002841	.725397	-.099596	-4.140	.0000
V148 Confidence in the women's movement	-2.237246	.682202	-.077161	-3.279	.0011
V216 Age	-.105426	.036483	-.073646	-2.890	.0039
Postmaterialist Index	1.454664	.495152	.071926	2.938	.0034
V198 Justifiable: prostitution	.554944	.231364	.071221	2.399	.0166
V134 Approve foreign workers in the country	2.279675	.885729	.060693	2.574	.0101
V61 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for men	-1.816078	.843907	-.052599	-2.152	.0315
R Square			.14092		
Adjusted R Square			.13684		
Multiple R			.37540		
Standard Error			22.02568		
Significant F			.0000		
F			34.48906		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

In Table 7.39 we can see the independent variables that explain the variance of tolerance (Adjusted R Square of .19) in Andalusia. Attitude towards immigrants coming to Spain to work, age and postmaterialist values are the main predictors of tolerance in this equation. The high unemployment rate in Andalusia (33.9% of the labour force in 1995, the highest in Spain; see Table 7.42) may help explain the significant weight of variable 101 (attitude towards immigrants coming to Spain to work) in the regression model of tolerance.

Table 7.39

*Tolerance. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Andalusia*

<b>Dependent variable: Tolerance Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V134 Approve foreign workers in the country	6.203307	.954437	.176379	6.499	.0000
V216 Age	-.194335	.039288	-.144269	-4.946	.0000
Postmaterialist Index	2.461097	.609441	.118665	4.038	.0001
V197 Justifiable: Homosexuality	.731653	.205821	.107142	3.555	.0004
V101 Men better political leaders than women	-2.763630	.763010	-.101119	-3.622	.0003
V159 Protect individual freedom	3.683856	1.334243	.076969	2.761	.0059
V151 Rating of political system under Franco	-.725716	.269773	-.074501	-2.690	.0072
R Square			.19277		
Adjusted R Square			.18783		
Multiple R			.43906		
Standard Error			21.11674		
Significant F			.0000		
F			38.96009		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Galicia (Table 7.40) offers the highest Adjusted R Square (.22) of all samples. Postmaterialist values, age and political inclination are the main predictors, in this order, of tolerance in this region.

Table 7.40

*Tolerance. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Galicia*

<b>Dependent variable: Tolerance Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
Postmaterialist Index	2.803526	.542711	.166385	5.166	.0000
V216 Age	-.211736	.042211	-.159975	-5.016	.0000
V123 Political inclination	-1.338498	.293692	-.140380	-4.557	.0000
V197 Justifiable: Homosexuality	.758614	.208616	.123471	3.636	.0003
V134 Approve foreign workers in the country	3.675200	.889708	.122944	4.131	.0000
V61 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for men	-1.909309	.874123	-.065616	-2.184	.0292
R Square			.22927		
Adjusted R Square			.22444		
Multiple R			.47882		
Standard Error			17.88062		
Significant F			.0000		
F			47.54472		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.



Finally, Table 7.41 shows the results for the autonomous community of Valencia. Age, political inclination and attitude towards immigrants coming to Spain to work are the main predictors of tolerance in Valencia, with an Adjusted R Square value of .20.

Table 7.41

*Tolerance. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Valencia*

<b>Dependent variable: Tolerance Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V216 Age	-.336541	.067311	-.264227	-5.000	.0000
V123 Political inclination	-1.817193	.488091	-.178053	-3.723	.0002
V134 Approve foreign workers in the country	6.202592	1.701258	.172463	3.646	.0003
V198 Justifiable: prostitution	1.136839	.352318	.154860	3.227	.0014
V217 Educational level	-1.282880	.457845	-.152944	-2.802	.0053
Postmaterialist Index	2.340880	.977525	.119756	2.395	.0171
R Square			.21157		
Adjusted R Square			.19919		
Multiple R			.45997		
Standard Error			20.37249		
Significant F			.0000		
F			17.08463		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The first conclusion that can be drawn from these results is that levels of tolerance, at the individual, national and regional levels are quite high in the context of Spain. All five samples analysed gave scores above 70 (0 being no tolerance at all and 100 being the highest tolerance). A second conclusion is that there are some differences in the levels of tolerance in Spain and its regions, although these differences are not substantial. The third conclusion is that there are differences in the predictors of tolerance in Spain and its regions. Overall, age, attitude towards immigrants coming to Spain to work, postmaterialist values, political inclination and justification of homosexuality are present in the regression models. As Tables 7.42 (unemployment rates in Spain and regions) and 7.43 (unemployment rates in Spain and Europe) show, unemployment rates in Spain and its regions in 1995 were very high, and that circumstance may have some influence in levels of tolerance towards foreign labour forces. However, attitude towards jobs for Spanish when

they are scarce has only appeared in the regression model of the aggregated sample, and this variable holds little weight in the prediction of tolerance. Political inclination (see Table 7.44) is a significant predictor of tolerance in the aggregated sample, Spain, Galicia and Valencia. Curiously, Spain and the regions analysed in this research have shown a tendency towards centre-left political identification. Finally, confidence in the women's movement is the only item measuring trust that has made it in any of the regression models (Basque Country).

Table 7.42  
*Unemployment (%) Spain and Regions 1995*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Both sexes</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>Women</b>
Andalusia	33.91	28.73	42.86
Extremadura	30.58	23.75	43.73
Canarias	23.74	19.76	30.13
Murcia	23.70	18.35	32.80
Basque Country	22.96	17.76	30.99
Spain	22.94	18.19	30.59
Valencia	22.44	17.05	31.06
Cantabria	22.30	16.63	31.96
Madrid	20.91	16.89	26.98
Castilla - Leon	20.51	14.19	32.00
Asturias	20.18	16.53	26.29
Castilla - La Mancha	20.16	15.25	30.18
Catalonia	19.87	15.32	26.64
Galicia	17.60	14.42	21.99
La Rioja	16.10	10.34	26.51
Aragon	15.92	9.32	27.26
Baleares	14.31	11.89	17.86
Navarre	12.92	8.68	20.62

Source: Spain in Figures, 1996. INE 1996

Table 7.43

*Unemployment (%) Spain and Europe 1995*

<b>Country</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>%</b>
Spain	22.9	Greece	8.9
Finland	17.2	United Kingdom	8.8
Italy	14.4	Germany	8.3
Ireland	11.9	Portugal	7.2
France	11.5	Netherlands	7.0
Belgium	10.2	Denmark	6.7
Sweden	9.2	Luxembourg	3.9

Source: Spain in Figures, 1996. INE 1996

Table 7.44

*Political Inclination (VI23) (Means)*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
Galicia	4.91	2.15	1035
Valencia	4.88	2.23	408
Spain	4.80	1.93	861
Aggregated sample	4.51	2.09	5486
Basque Country	4.28	2.06	1835
Andalusia	4.24	2.05	1347
<b>1 LEFT-----5/6-----10 RIGHT</b>			

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

### ***7.3.2 Trust***

#### ***7.3.2.1 Interpersonal or General Trust***

This section will treat "general trust" as the dependent variable. The World Values Survey 1995-1996 provides variable 27, which measures "most people can be trusted" (value 1) versus "can't be too careful" (value 0). As mentioned in the Methodology section of this study, the item chosen to measure general trust does not allow discrimination between people, therefore it is impossible to know if those trusted are familiar or strangers to the respondent. However, I have chosen it because it is widely used in research on trust and social capital.

Table 7.45 shows that overall, levels of general trust are quite low, and those more trustful are people between 33 and 44 years of age (almost 35% of respondents in that age group answered "most people can be trusted"). The age groups that reported lower general trust towards others are the youngest (almost 73% of the under 25 years of age answered that "can't be too careful") and the oldest (71.3% of the over 65 years of age also answered that "can't be too careful"). Spain, Andalusia and Galicia follow a similar pattern (in the case of Galicia the group of 65 years of age and over are less trustful than the under 25 years of age), while Valencia reports lower general trust in the group of 45 to 54 years of age and higher general trust in the group of 55 to 64 years of age. The Basque Country offers a slightly different pattern, with the 55 to 64 years of age reporting higher levels of mistrust, but the interesting thing, as I said before, is the overall differences between this region and the other regions. The Basque Country reports significantly higher levels of general trust of all samples analysed for all group ages.

Table 7.45  
*General Trust (% by Age)*

Age	Total cases		Spain		Basque Country		Andalusia		Galicia		Valencia	
	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
15-24	27.1	72.9	27.0	73.0	39.6	60.4	14.5	85.5	25.3	74.7	23.4	76.6
25-34	32.4	67.6	31.7	68.3	43.9	56.1	26.1	73.9	27.4	72.6	21.6	78.4
35-44	34.9	65.1	31.3	68.7	43.1	56.9	24.5	75.5	41.3	58.7	23.5	76.5
45-54	32.5	67.5	30.1	69.9	45.7	54.3	23.7	76.3	30.1	69.9	13.3	86.7
55-64	29.2	70.8	29.8	70.2	35.6	64.4	23.2	76.8	27.0	73.0	26.5	73.5
65-98	28.7	71.3	28.4	71.6	38.8	61.2	21.6	78.4	23.5	76.5	22.2	77.8

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

Table 7.46 shows the means for the item "general trust" for all the samples analysed in this study. Means are .41 and under, which can be interpreted as relatively low trust. The results are very similar for all the regions, with the exception of Basque Country (.41), significantly higher than the other samples (Spain .30; Galicia .29; Valencia and Andalusia .22).

Table 7.46  
*General Trust (Means)*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
Basque Country	.41	.49	2098
Total cases	.31	.46	6674
Spain	.30	.46	1167
Galicia	.29	.46	1168
Andalusia	.22	.42	1760
Valencia	.22	.41	481

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

As I did in the previous sections, I have conducted a series of t-tests to determine whether the differences between the means of the five sets of samples from Table 7.46 are statistically significant. Table 7.47 shows the results of the t-test comparing the means of all the samples analysed in this study. Differences comparing the means from all samples are statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ), with the exception of the comparison between the samples of Spain and Galicia, and Andalusia and Valencia. In these cases the differences between the means are not statistically significant ( $p > .05$ ).

Table 7.47  
*T-Tests Comparing Means for Levels of General Trust in Each Sample*

	<b>Spain</b> Mean .30	<b>Basque Country</b> Mean .41	<b>Andalusia</b> Mean .22	<b>Galicia</b> Mean .29	<b>Valencia</b> Mean .22
Spain	-	P=.000	P=.000	P=.810	P=.000
Basque Country	-	-	P=.000	P=.000	P=.000
Andalusia	-	-	-	P=.000	P=.741
Galicia	-	-	-	-	P=.001

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

Table 7.48 presents levels of general trust at the regional level, in this case the data used is from the WVS 1995-1996 Spanish national sample. As in the case of previous analyses using regional subsamples from the Spanish data set, we must take these results as not highly statistically significant (the regional samples drawn from the national sample may be too small). Nevertheless, I have included them in this analysis with the only purpose of highlighting regional differences in terms of levels of general trust. The highest percentage of people responding that most people can be trusted corresponds to Aragon (56.8%) and Navarre (52.3%), and the lowest to Murcia (9.7%). The result from the Basque Country using the subsample from the Spanish national data set (mean .23) differs substantially from the result from the Basque Country using its independent sample (mean .41). That is also the case of Valencia (mean .36 in the subsample from the Spanish data set, and mean .22 in the Valencian independent sample). I believe the size and age distribution of the smaller regional subsamples may be a reason for these differences (see Table 7.49). Andalusia (mean .27 in the subsample from the Spanish data set, and mean .22 in the Andalusian independent sample), and Galicia (mean .26 in the subsample from the Spanish data set, and mean .29 in the Galician independent sample) have produced closer results in both analyses. Overall, the results from tables 7.45, 7.46, 7.47 and 7.48 suggest that most people in Spain and the regions analysed in this study tend to show caution when asked to trust others.

Table 7.48

*Regional General Trust: Percentages and Means*

<b>Region</b>	<b>Can't be too careful (0)</b>	<b>Most people can be trusted (1)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
Aragon	43.2	56.8	.57	.50	205
Navarre	43.7	52.3	.56	.51	16
Valencia	64.1	35.9	.36	.48	117
Castilla - La Mancha	64.4	35.6	.36	.48	73
Catalonia	65.9	34.1	.34	.48	44
Madrid	66.2	33.8	.34	.47	154
Canarias	69.4	30.6	.31	.46	186
La Rioja	71.4	28.6	.29	.49	7
Castilla - Leon	73.3	26.7	.27	.46	15
Andalusia	72.7	27.3	.27	.45	205
Extremadura	72.7	27.3	.27	.45	33
Asturias	73.5	26.5	.26	.45	34
Galicia	74.4	25.6	.26	.44	82
Basque Country	77.0	23.0	.23	.42	61
Cantabria	85.7	14.3	.14	.35	49
Murcia	90.3	9.7	.10	.30	31
Baleares		No data available			23

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data



Table 7.49

*Age and Gender Distribution in Regions (%)*

<b>Age</b>	<b>Basque Country</b>		<b>Andalusia</b>		<b>Galicia</b>		<b>Valencia</b>	
	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>
14-17	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.2	-
18-29	32.2	21.9	29.3	27.6	43.9	24.4	22.9	26.3
30-39	17.3	18.7	19.4	19.2	19.5	22.1	20.1	19.7
40-49	16.1	17.2	13.7	15.4	14.7	17.4	15.2	14.7
50-59	13.9	9.4	14.0	13.5	8.4	12.8	11.6	13.1
60-69	12.3	18.7	13.5	14.0	8.2	16.3	13.0	16.4
70 +	8.2	14.1	10.1	10.3	5.3	7.0	9.0	9.8
<b>Gender</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>
Male	48.4	49.0	48.1	48.0	44.8	50.0	48.3	49.2
Female	51.6	51.0	51.9	52.0	55.2	50.0	51.7	50.8
<b>Total N</b>	2,205	64	1,803	214	1,200	86	501	122

(1) From regional sample      (2) From national sample

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

Following is the correlational analysis of general trust and other variables from the WVS 1995-1996 (Table E.2 Appendix E). In general, the associations are very weak and therefore we cannot expect to obtain relevant results either from the regression analysis. General trust correlated positively with the two components of the Individual Subjective Well-being Index: happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole, and with the Individual Subjective Well-Being Index itself. As argued in the theoretical framework section of this study, trust in others is an essential contributor to overall happiness (Argyle, 1987).

This research has produced some empirical evidence, although fairly weak, which supports Tocqueville's theory that general trust and participation in voluntary associations are linked. There is a significant positive association between general trust and the Total Association Index, particularly between general trust and membership in church organisation, and between general trust and membership in professional organisation. Another group of variables that has produced significant positive associations with general trust is that formed by variables measuring participation in specific protest actions. That is the case of: signing a petition, joining boycotts, attending lawful demonstrations, joining unofficial strikes, and occupation of buildings or factories. Freitag (2003) found strong associations, in the case of Switzerland (also working with data from

the WVS), between social trust and institutional trust, education and life satisfaction. I have already commented on this research's results on the relationship between life satisfaction and general trust. On the other hand, the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index have shown a positive association with general trust. Looking at those variables that form the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index, confidence in the police, confidence in the press, and confidence in the political parties are the strongest correlates of general trust, and all are positive. Finally, educational level is also positively correlated with general trust in this analysis. Interestingly, number of hours watching television correlated negatively with general trust.

Other two components of social capital analysed in this study – tolerance and social bonds – have also produced significant positive associations with general trust. The Tolerance Index is the main measurement of tolerance in this research, and it has produced weak positive correlations with general trust at the individual level, and in the cases of the Basque Country, Andalusia and Galicia. In this context, there are other variables that, although do not measure tolerance, they measure attitudes towards issues that may be affected by tolerance, and which have also produced positive correlations with general trust. This is the case of the following variables: justification of homosexuality, justification of prostitution, justification of abortion, justification of divorce, and justification of suicide. Another variable of interest is the view that when jobs are scarce, jobs should be for Spanish people. This item might be taken as a measure of certain type of tolerance, in this case towards foreign workers. Its association with general trust is negative.

The Importance of Social Bonds Index is positively associated with general trust in four of the samples (Galicia, Basque Country, aggregated sample and Andalusia). While importance of family did not show a significant association with general trust as an independent variable, importance of friends did.

Political variables have also produced significant associations with general trust. The following variables from the WVS 1995-1996 have correlated positively with general trust: importance of politics, discussion of politics with friends, interest in politics, rating of political system today, and rating of political system in ten years. On the other hand, from the group of political variables, the following have correlated negatively with general trust: rating of political system under Franco, strong leader instead of parliament and elections, greater respect for authority, view of democracy as an indecisive system, and also the view that democracies are not good to maintain order.

Finally, postmaterialist values, household income, and profession of respondent are also positively associated with general trust.

Table 7.50 presents the independent variables that have shown an explanatory relationship with general trust for the total cases analysed in this study. As we mentioned earlier, results from correlational analysis suggested very weak results in the regression models. In this case, the variables in Table 7.50 only produced an Adjusted R Square index of .07. Age, the view that when jobs are scarce jobs should be for Spanish people, and postmaterialist values hold, in that order, most of the weight in the prediction of general trust. The Individual Subjective Well-Being Index has made it into the equation, although its weight in the prediction of tolerance is very weak.

Table 7.50

*General Trust. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Total Cases*

<b>Dependent variable: General trust</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V216 Age	.002991	3.9047E-04	.111991	7.659	.0000
V63 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for Spanish people	-.057269	.008290	-.097934	-6.908	.0000
Postmaterialist Index	.027766	.005921	.071977	4.689	.0000
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index	.020433	.004028	.067944	5.073	.0000
V114 Greater respect for authority	-.044219	.009874	-.067288	-4.478	.0000
V117 Interest in politics	.028442	.006832	.061455	4.163	.0000
V120 Attending lawful demonstrations	.029489	.009969	.051705	2.958	.0031
V118 Signing a petition	.027580	.010047	.047432	2.745	.0061
V119 Joining boycotts	.032255	.011482	.045787	2.809	.0050
R Square			.07068		
Adjusted R Square			.06908		
Multiple R			.26586		
Standard Error			.44904		
Significant F			.0000		
F			44.07154		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.51 shows the cluster of variables that predict general trust in the case of Spain. Together they produced an Adjusted R Square index of .03. Interest in politics, age and participation in lawful demonstrations are the main predictors of general trust in this equation. Subjective well-being is also part of this model and, as in the case of the aggregate sample, its weight is very small.

Table 7.51

*General Trust. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Spain*

<b>Dependent variable: General trust</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V117 Interest in politics	.047605	.015475	.099121	3.076	.0021
V216 Age	.002043	8.1379E-04	.081287	2.511	.0122
V120 Attending lawful demonstrations	.045156	.019430	.076733	2.324	.0203
V63 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for Spanish people	-.045867	.020328	-.069607	-2.256	.0243
V114 Greater respect for authority	-.053329	.024884	-.067786	-2.143	.0323
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index	.018167	.008967	.061493	2.026	.0430
R Square			.03916		
Adjusted R Square			.03376		
Multiple R			.19788		
Standard Error			.44966		
Significant F			.0000		
F			7.25409		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.52 shows the independent variables that explain the variance of general trust (Adjusted R Square of .09) in the Basque Country. The view that when jobs are scarce jobs should be for Spanish people, postmaterialist values, educational level and age are the main predictors of general trust in this equation. As in the previous regression models, individual subjective well-being is a weak predictor of general trust in the Basque Country.

Table 7.52

*General Trust. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Basque Country*

<b>Dependent variable: General trust</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V63 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for Spanish people	-.082423	.014962	-.149389	-5.509	.0000
Postmaterialist Index	.049688	.011181	.116523	4.444	.0000
V217 Educational level	.021173	.005405	.110358	3.917	.0001
V216 Age	.002700	8.0209E-04	.092773	3.366	.0008
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	.019661	.005374	.088908	3.658	.0003
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index	.025420	.008191	.075194	.3.103	.0019
V170 Attitude towards group you like least to hold demonstrations	.071867	.028066	.065510	2.561	.0105
V120 Attending lawful demonstrations	.034402	.016883	.052330	2.038	.0417
R Square			.09080		
Adjusted R Square			.08616		
Multiple R			.30133		
Standard Error			.47255		
Significant F			.0000		
F			19.56170		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

In the case of Andalusia (Table 7.53) the four independent variables in this regression equation have produced an Adjusted R Square Index of .04. Participation in signing a petition, age, interest in politics and greater respect for authority are the main predictors, in this order, of general trust in Andalusia.

Table 7.53

*General Trust. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Andalusia*

<b>Dependent variable: General trust</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V118 Signing a petition	.090717	.014224	.170950	6.378	.0000
V216 Age	.002361	6.0209E-04	.101561	3.922	.0001
V117 Interest in politics	.033850	.011499	.076684	2.944	.0033
V114 Greater respect for authority	-.047923	.019260	-.062694	-2.488	.0129
R Square			.04787		
Adjusted R Square			.04549		
Multiple R			.21878		
Standard Error			.40956		
Significant F			.0000		
F			20.121183		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Galicia (Table 7.54) offers the highest Adjusted R Square Index (.11) of all samples analysed in this study. Attitude towards the future, age, respect for authority, attitude towards foreign workers when jobs are scarce, importance of politics and strong leader (no parliament, no elections) are the main predictors, in this order, of general trust in Galicia. It is also significant, although the value itself is very small, that individual subjective has made it in the explanatory model of general trust in Galicia.

Table 7.54

*General Trust. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Galicia*

<b>Dependent variable: General trust</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V50 View that humanity has a bright future	.125325	.035099	.115444	3.571	.0004
V216 Age	.003291	9.8720E-04	.111035	3.334	.0008
V114 Greater respect for authority	-.064286	.021187	-.106435	-3.034	.0025
V63 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for Spanish people	-.056157	.018203	-.101266	-3.085	.0021
V7 Importance of politics	.048306	.015769	.099462	3.063	.0023
V154 Strong leader, no parliament, no elections	-.045010	.015596	-.096660	-2.886	.0040
V151 Rating of political system under Franco	-.014753	.006473	-.079557	-2.279	.0229
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index	.022813	.009205	.078778	2.478	.0134
V24 Importance of children to learn obedience	-.064620	.031332	-.068800	-2.062	.0395
R Square			.12001		
Adjusted R Square			.11122		
Multiple R			.34642		
Standard Error			.43465		
Significant F			.0000		
F			13.66733		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Finally, Table 7.55 shows the results for the region of Valencia. Priority of environment over economic growth, importance of children to learn to use their imagination, the view that when jobs are scarce jobs should be for Spanish people, and attitude towards allowing certain groups to hold demonstrations are the main predictors of general trust in Valencia, with an Adjusted R Square Index of .10

Table 7.55

*General Trust. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Valencia*

<b>Dependent variable: General trust</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V41 Importance of protecting the environment over economic growth	-.104255	.029929	-.165863	-3.483	.0005
V18 Importance of children to learn to use their imagination	.132798	.047640	.135748	2.788	.0056
V63 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for Spanish people	-.068630	.028427	-.121806	-2.414	.0162
V170 Attitude towards group you like least to hold demonstrations	.161982	.065521	.121444	2.472	.0138
R Square			.10662		
Adjusted R Square			.09774		
Multiple R			.32653		
Standard Error			.39779		
Significant F			.0000		
F			11.99467		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The first conclusion that can be drawn from these results is that a majority of respondents to the WVS 1995-1996 in Spain and its regions do not trust most people. All five samples analysed gave mean scores under .42 (0 being can't be too careful and 1 being most people can be trusted). In that point there are also some differences in the levels of general trust in Spain and its regions, particularly if we look at the results from the regional subsamples taken from the Spanish national data set. The second conclusion is that there are differences in the predictors of general trust in Spain and its regions. Overall, age (with the exception of Valencia), the view that when jobs are scarce jobs should be for Spanish people (with the exception of Andalusia), attitudes of protest (with the exceptions of Galicia and Valencia) and respect for authority (with the exceptions of the



Basque Country and Valencia) explain most of the weight of the prediction on general trust at the individual, national and regional levels. As mentioned earlier in the analysis of levels of tolerance, unemployment rates in Spain and its regions in 1995 were very high, and that circumstance may have had some influence in how people feel towards foreign labourers taking their jobs (see Tables 7.42 and 7.43). Individual subjective well-being, although very weak, appeared in three of the regression models of general trust. On the other hand, the results show that there is an association between low general trust and attitudes of tolerance (attitude towards foreign workers) and collective action (items measuring attitudes of protest, such as signing a petition and attending lawful demonstrations).

### ***7.3.2.2 Trust in Institutions***

This section will treat "confidence in organisations" as the dependent variable. The World Values Survey 1995-1996 provides variables that measure confidence in sixteen organisations or institutions (variables 135 to 150) as suggested by Inglehart (1997). I will analyse these variables separately at the individual, national and regional levels. I will also use those variables to create a Levels of Trust in Institutions Index (see Methodology section).

Table 7.56 shows results for the aggregate of the five samples. At the individual level, the institutions or organisations that people felt less confident about are the political parties (mean .85), the government in Madrid (mean 1.02), the parliament (mean 1.11), and the labour unions (mean 1.12). On the other hand, the institutions or organisations that people felt more confident about are the green or ecology movement (mean 1.73) and the police (mean 1.43). Overall, levels of trust in institutions are quite low at the individual level.

Table 7.56

*Confidence in Organisations: Percentages and Means. Total Cases*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
V.147 The green/ecol. movement	14.2	52.1	26.3	7.4	1.73	.79	6349
V.141 The police	8.2	42.5	33.6	15.7	1.43	.85	6732
V.149 The European Union	7.1	39.4	39.6	13.9	1.40	.81	6271
V.150 The United Nations	7.9	39.3	38.0	14.8	1.40	.83	6210
V.135 The Churches	15.9	28.7	34.2	21.2	1.39	.99	6858
V.146 Major companies	5.8	39.7	42.3	12.2	1.39	.77	6378
V.137 The legal system	6.9	34.2	44.1	14.8	1.33	.81	6629
V.148 The women's movement	7.6	35.6	39.4	17.4	1.33	.85	6260
V.138 The press	4.8	35.2	46.7	13.4	1.31	.76	6706
V.139 Television	3.7	29.7	50.5	16.0	1.21	.75	6814
V.145 The civil service	3.7	31.5	47.1	17.8	1.21	.77	6524
V.136 The Armed Forces	7.1	28.1	35.4	29.4	1.13	.92	6649
V.140 Labor unions	3.6	27.7	45.9	22.8	1.12	.80	6385
V.144 Parliament	3.8	27.1	45.5	23.6	1.11	.80	6542
V.142 The government in Madrid	4.1	22.9	43.6	29.3	1.02	.83	6682
V.143 Political parties	2.0	14.5	50.0	33.6	.85	.73	6682

(3) A great deal (2) Quite a lot (1) Not very much (0) None at all

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The results from the Spanish sample (Table 7.57) are very similar to those from the aggregated sample. The institutions or organisations that Spanish people felt less confident about are the political parties (mean .90), the government in Madrid (mean 1.11), the labour unions (mean 1.16) and the parliament (mean 1.20). On the other hand, the institutions or organisations that people in Spain felt more confident about are the green or ecology movement (mean 1.70) and the police (mean 1.63). These results may suggest that the low levels of trust in the national government, in the political parties and in the parliament may be affected by the sociopolitical situation in Spain in the mid-nineties. This period was characterised by sociopolitical unrest, economic recession, and claims of political corruption and illegal parties' funding. The Spanish Socialist Workers Party (Partido Socialista Obrero Español, PSOE), in government from 1982 until 1996, started its decline in 1990. Claims of dirty war against the terrorist organisation ETA during the mid-80s, and a series of political and financial scandals, involving illegal party funding (Amodia, 1996; Lancaster, 1994)

send the Socialist Party into a defeat in 1996. As McDonough et al. (1998) point out, one of the principles supporting Spanish mass politics is trust. Spanish citizens expect politicians and institutions to work for the common good.

Table 7.57

*Confidence in Organisations: Percentages and Means. Spain*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
V.147 The green/ecol. movement	12.9	51.6	28.4	7.1	1.70	.78	1101
V.141 The police	11.3	50.8	27.8	10.1	1.63	.81	1180
V. 135 The Churches	16.7	32.2	34.6	16.4	1.49	.96	1201
V.149 The European Union	6.9	46.1	34.4	12.7	1.47	.80	1094
V.150 The United Nations	7.0	42.8	37.3	13.0	1.44	.80	1078
V.137 The legal system	8.0	38.7	41.7	11.7	1.43	.80	1157
V.146 Major companies	4.5	43.0	41.5	11.0	1.41	.74	1122
V.138 The press	6.0	37.0	46.4	10.6	1.39	.75	1175
V.148 The women's movement	6.0	37.6	41.1	15.4	1.34	.81	1086
V.136 The Armed Forces	8.1	35.4	38.2	18.3	1.33	.87	1174
V.139 Television	5.5	34.0	48.9	11.6	1.33	.75	1187
V.145 The civil service	3.7	38.1	44.0	14.3	1.31	.76	1150
V.144 Parliament	3.8	32.8	43.1	20.3	1.20	.80	1149
V.140 Labor unions	4.2	28.0	47.1	20.7	1.16	.79	1136
V.142 The government in Madrid	3.9	27.1	45.6	23.4	1.11	.81	1175
V.143 Political parties	1.5	17.0	51.2	30.3	.90	.72	1163

(3) A great deal (2) Quite a lot (1) Not very much (0) None at all

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The respondents from the Basque Country (Table 7.58) felt no confidence in the Armed Forces (mean .69), followed by the government in Madrid and the political parties (both means .78), the parliament (mean .89), and the police (1.07). These results are not surprising because the armed forces and the Spanish police are seen by many in the Basque Country as occupying forces, and they are a main target of terrorist attacks. Secondly, the respondents may reflect the uneasy and difficult relationship between their autonomous government, the government of Madrid and the other national parties. On the other hand, Basques have shown more confidence in the green or ecology movement (mean 1.69) and the churches (mean 1.36).

Table 7.58

*Confidence in Organisations: Percentages and Means. Basque Country*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
V.147 The green/ecol. movement	11.9	53.1	26.7	8.2	1.69	.79	2049
V. 135 The Churches	15.0	27.6	36.0	21.4	1.36	.98	2180
V.146 Major companies	5.8	36.9	44.3	13.0	1.36	.78	2035
V.138 The press	3.7	38.3	46.7	11.3	1.34	.73	2160
V.148 The women's movement	6.3	35.4	41.3	17.0	1.31	.82	2025
V.150 The United Nations	5.9	31.7	45.1	17.3	1.26	.81	2023
V.149 The European Union	5.1	30.6	48.0	16.2	1.25	.78	2025
V.137 The legal system	4.2	30.2	49.4	16.3	1.22	.76	2135
V.139 Television	2.5	27.4	52.7	17.4	1.15	.72	2168
V.140 Labor unions	3.3	25.9	49.1	21.7	1.11	.77	2079
V.145 The civil service	2.6	25.5	50.9	20.9	1.10	.75	2085
V.141 The police	3.2	27.6	42.3	27.0	1.07	.82	2134
V.144 Parliament	1.5	17.1	50.3	31.1	.89	.73	2089
V.142 The government in Madrid	1.7	13.1	46.7	38.5	.78	.73	2135
V.143 Political parties	1.2	10.5	52.8	35.4	.78	.68	2125
V.136 The Armed Forces	2.9	12.3	35.4	49.4	.69	.80	2134

(3) A great deal (2) Quite a lot (1) Not very much (0) None at all

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Andalusia (Table 7.59) has shown low levels of confidence in the political parties (mean .97), the labour unions (mean 1.18), the television (mean 1.21) and the press (mean 1.22). The institutions that people in Andalusia trusted more are the green or ecology movement (mean 1.72) and the police (mean 1.64).

Table 7.59

*Confidence in Organisations: Percentages and Means. Andalusia*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
V.147 The green/ecol. movement	11.9	54.4	27.6	6.1	1.72	.75	1574
V.141 The police	10.4	51.4	30.3	7.9	1.64	.77	1746
V. 135 The Churches	17.8	32.1	33.1	17.0	1.51	.97	1790
V.149 The European Union	6.9	47.3	35.3	10.5	1.51	.77	1549
V.150 The United Nations	7.3	46.2	35.2	11.3	1.50	.79	1527
V.136 The Armed Forces	10.5	40.3	33.5	15.7	1.46	.88	1696
V.137 The legal system	7.5	39.4	39.1	14.0	1.40	.82	1669
V.146 Major companies	5.6	40.0	42.4	12.0	1.39	.77	1608
V.148 The women's movement	6.5	38.9	38.4	16.2	1.36	.83	1544
V.142 The government in Madrid	6.5	37.1	41.2	15.2	1.35	.81	1703
V.144 Parliament	5.2	36.4	43.7	14.8	1.32	.79	1666
V.145 The civil service	4.1	37.1	44.5	14.3	1.31	.76	1656
V.138 The press	3.9	30.5	49.3	16.3	1.22	.76	1686
V.139 Television	3.3	30.9	49.5	16.3	1.21	.75	1768
V.140 Labor unions	4.1	30.6	44.0	21.3	1.18	.81	1563
V.143 Political parties	2.9	19.3	50.0	27.8	.097	.77	1686

(3) A great deal (2) Quite a lot (1) Not very much (0) None at all

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.60 shows the results for Galicia that, overall, are very similar to those for the aggregated and the Spanish samples. Galicians felt less confident about the political parties (mean .76), the government in Madrid (mean .89), the labour unions (mean 1.04) and the parliament (mean 1.11). On the other hand, they felt more confidence in the green or ecology movement (mean 1.83) and the police (mean 1.53).

Table 7.60

*Confidence in Organisations: Percentages and Means. Galicia*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
V.147 The green/ecol. movement	21.0	48.2	23.5	7.3	1.83	.84	1152
V.141 The police	10.9	44.8	30.8	13.4	1.53	.86	1180
V.150 The United Nations	12.1	37.8	32.2	17.8	1.44	.92	1123
V.146 Major companies	7.3	39.6	40.5	12.6	1.42	.80	1149
V.149 The European Union	9.7	35.4	38.4	16.4	1.38	.87	1132
V.137 The legal system	10.5	30.0	44.0	15.5	1.36	.87	1182
V.138 The press	7.2	34.6	42.9	15.4	1.34	.82	1192
V.148 The women's movement	11.6	30.5	36.0	21.8	1.32	.94	1146
V.136 The Armed Forces	9.0	29.6	34.9	26.5	1.21	.94	1164
V.139 Television	5.5	27.0	50.0	17.5	1.21	.79	1195
V. 135 The Churches	14.2	22.2	33.3	30.3	1.20	1.03	1192
V.145 The civil service	4.9	27.1	47.4	20.7	1.16	.80	1170
V.144 Parliament	6.5	24.9	42.1	26.5	1.11	.87	1161
V.140 Labor unions	3.4	26.1	41.8	28.7	1.04	.83	1150
V.142 The government in Madrid	5.7	16.3	39.3	38.7	.89	.88	1187
V.143 Political parties	2.6	12.3	43.2	41.9	.76	.76	1175

(3) A great deal (2) Quite a lot (1) Not very much (0) None at all

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Finally, Table 7.61 shows that Valencians have little confidence in the political parties (mean .83), the government of Madrid (mean .98), the labour unions (mean 1.11) and the parliament (mean 1.12). On the other hand, they trust more the green or ecology movement (mean 1.79) and the European Union (mean 1.55).

Table 7.61

*Confidence in Organisations: Percentages and Means. Valencia*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
V.147 The green/ecol. movement	18.6	50.7	21.4	9.3	1.79	.85	473
V.149 The European Union	11.0	44.8	32.1	12.1	1.55	.84	471
V.141 The police	8.5	49.8	28.5	13.2	1.54	.83	492
V.150 The United Nations	9.8	46.0	31.4	12.9	1.53	.84	459
V.146 Major companies	5.4	43.8	40.3	10.6	1.44	.75	464
V.148 The women's movement	10.7	33.8	38.1	17.4	1.38	.89	459
V. 135 The Churches	14.3	29.1	31.3	25.3	1.33	1.01	495
V.137 The legal system	5.6	33.5	43.6	17.3	1.27	.81	486
V.138 The press	3.4	34.7	47.3	14.6	1.27	.75	493
V.136 The Armed Forces	7.3	33.3	36.8	22.7	1.25	.89	481
V.145 The civil service	4.5	32.6	45.6	17.3	1.24	.79	463
V.139 Television	2.4	31.0	50.2	16.3	1.20	.73	496
V.144 Parliament	2.5	29.4	45.3	22.9	1.12	.78	477
V.140 Labor unions	2.4	29.1	45.5	23.0	1.11	.78	457
V.142 The government in Madrid	2.7	22.2	45.0	30.1	.98	.79	482
V.143 Political parties	1.4	13.8	51.2	33.5	.83	.71	484

(3) A great deal (2) Quite a lot (1) Not very much (0) None at all

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The first conclusion that can be drawn from the analysis of trust in a number of institutions is that trust is affected by political power. An increasing number of people respond in polls that they no longer trust political parties and the government, and that is exactly what the WVS 1995-1996 data reflects in this analysis. Political corruption and scandals (in numerous occasions related to parties' finances and/or public servants) became reiterated issues in Spain in the mid-nineties. Under these circumstances, many citizens associate politics and democracy with corrupt behavior and lies (Guerra, 1996). On the other hand, reliable information is important to reinforce the credibility of the political system, and that seems not to be the case in opinion of the citizens of Andalusia, who reported little confidence in the television and in the press. The second conclusion is that there is a clear difference between the Basque Country and the other regions, not in levels of confidence but in the choice of the more trusted and the least trusted institutions. While the most trusted institution

in all cases is the green or environmental movement, the churches only come second most trusted in the Basque Country. This is not surprise as Basques are very religious and strongly committed to the Catholic Church. However, it is a surprise that the church did not rate better in the other regions, and this result may be taken as a sign of change in the role some people are willing to give to the Church. Overall, the most interesting differences appear in the group of institutions least trusted. Most samples analysed showed a similar pattern (political parties, government in Madrid, labour unions and the parliament). Andalusia added two media institutions to the list (television and the press), but it is the Basque Country the region that clearly shows a broader distrust of those institutions that represent the Spanish state (the Armed Forces, the government in Madrid, the political parties, the parliament, and the police).

In order to measure institutional trust as a whole I have manipulated those sixteen variables to create a Levels of Trust in Institutions Index (steps on how I have computed this index were explained in the Methodology section). I have applied the Alpha Chronbach Test of reliability to the items of this new variable, resulting in Alpha = .8527, and standarised item alpha = .8553. Based in these results I consider the items in the new variable highly reliable.

Table 7.62 shows the means for the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index, where 0 corresponds to no confidence at all and 100 corresponds to a great deal of confidence. At the individual level, levels of trust in institutions are low (42.76). Andalusia (46.55) has, of all samples, the highest level of trust in institutions, while the lowest corresponds to the Basque Country (38.48). Overall, these results support those obtained for the sixteen institutions previously: people in Spain and in the regions analysed in this study do not have a great deal of trust in their institutions.

Table 7.62

*Levels of Trust in Institutions Index (Means)*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
Andalusia	46.55	16.47	1801
Spain	45.26	15.15	1207
Valencia	43.40	14.29	500
Total cases	42.76	15.75	6908
Galicia	42.14	15.24	1199
Basque Country	38.47	14.37	2201

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.



As in the previous sections, I have conducted a series of t-tests to determine whether the differences between the means of the national and regional sets of samples from Table 7.62 are statistically significant. Table 7.63 shows the results of the t-test comparing the means of all samples. Differences comparing the means from all samples are statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ), with the exception of the comparison between the samples of Galicia, and Valencia ( $p > .05$ ).

Table 7.63

*T-Tests Comparing Means of Levels of Trust in Institutions Index in Each Sample*

	<b>Spain</b> Mean 45.26	<b>Basque Country</b> Mean 38.47	<b>Andalusia</b> Mean 46.55	<b>Galicia</b> Mean 42.14	<b>Valencia</b> Mean 43.40
Spain	-	p=.000	p=.027	p=.000	p=.019
Basque Country	-	-	p=.000	p=.000	p=.000
Andalusia	-	-	-	p=.000	p=.000
Galicia	-	-	-	-	p=.114

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

Table E.3 (Appendix E) presents the results for the correlational analysis of trust in institutions (taking the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index as the dependent variable) and other variables from the WVS 1995-1996. The Levels of Trust in Institutions Index has a moderately strong positive association with variables measuring political attitudes, such as satisfaction with national government, rate of political system today, rate of political system in ten years, and the view that the country should be run for all, in all samples analysed. There is also a moderate negative association with choice of party to vote in the next national elections. On the other hand, trust in institutions has a weak positive association with political inclination (only in the aggregate sample, Basque Country and Galicia), importance of politics (in all samples except Andalusia), and also a weak but negative association with discussion of politics with friends (in all samples except Galicia and Valencia). Several variables that may be of interest to measure attitudes towards authoritarian values have also produced positive correlations with trust in institutions. Such are the cases of greater respect for authority, rating of political system under Franco, attitude towards strong leader without elections, and attitude towards army rule (these last three variables produced significant correlations with trust in institutions in all samples except in the case of Valencia).

The third group of variables that has moderate associations with trust in institutions is that of the religious variables, such as: comfort from religion, importance of God, importance of religion, religious attendance, and being a religious person (all positive associations). On the other hand, the associations are negative with religious denomination, and belief in God.

Trust in institutions is also negatively correlated with perception of corruption in Spain, and with measures of "non civic" attitudes, such as cheating on taxes and avoiding a fare on public transport.

The Levels of Trust in Institutions Index has a moderately strong negative association with those variables that measure attitudes towards issues such as justification of homosexuality, justification of prostitution, justification of abortion, justification of divorce, justification of euthanasia, and justification of suicide. Age and number of children (both positive), also appear to be relevant towards attitudes of trust towards institutions.

Looking at the components of social capital, the theoretical relationship between institutional trust, general trust, tolerance, participation in voluntary associations and importance of informal networks (family and friends) has very weak empirical support. As it has been mentioned in previous sections, Freitag (2003) found strong associations, in the case of Switzerland (also working with data from the WVS) between social trust and institutional trust, education and life satisfaction. In our analysis, trust in institutions has produced a very weak positive association with general trust, and only in the case of Spain. The analysis of the Spanish and regional data also shows that there is a weak negative association between institutional trust and education. On the other hand, both components of subjective well-being (satisfaction with life as a whole and happiness) have produced weak positive associations with trust in institutions, and the association between the Individual Subjective Well-being Index and the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index is also very weak.

Trust in institutions has a positive association with the Tolerance Index (no association in the case of Valencia), and also a positive association with the Total Association Index (only in the aggregated sample, Basque Country and Valencia). In both cases the associations are very weak. In this context, those variables that measure participation or involvement in some sort of protest action did show negative significant associations with the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index. That is the case of the following items: signing a petition, attending lawful demonstrations, joining unofficial strikes (these three variables did not correlate with trust in institutions in the case of Valencia), joining boycotts and occupation of buildings and factories (both variables did not correlate with trust in institutions in the cases of Spain and Valencia). Finally, the Importance of Social Bonds Index has produced a very weak positive association with trust in institutions at the individual level, in Spain, Basque Country and Galicia.

Table 7.64 shows those independent variables that have shown an explanatory relationship with the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index at the individual level. Variables in this model have produced an Adjusted R Square of .26. Rate of current political system and satisfaction with national government hold, in that order, most of the weight in the prediction of trust in institutions. The Individual Subjective Well-Being Index has made it into the equation, although its weight in the prediction of trust in institutions is very weak.

Table 7.64

*Trust in Institutions. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Total Cases*

<b>Dependent variable: Levels of Trust in Institutions Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V152 Rating of political system today	1.045773	.111003	.155126	9.421	.0000
V165 Level of satisfaction with national government	2.262487	.310693	.125735	7.282	.0000
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	.590860	.103809	.092625	5.692	.0000
V194 Justifiable: Cheating on taxes	-.570187	.092447	-.092333	-6.168	.0000
V191 Comfort and strength from religion	2.550730	.609347	.085275	4.186	.0000
Postmaterialist Index	-1.062892	.194918	-.085059	-5.453	.0000
V210 First choice party to vote next elections	-.029435	.006510	-.067942	-4.521	.0000
V190 Importance of God	.322795	.103897	.067913	3.107	.0019
V213 Perception of corruption in Spain	-1.184767	.266880	-.067672	-4.439	.0000
V166 View that the country should be run for all	1.922100	.510633	.063857	3.764	.0002
V7 Importance of politics	.943832	.239435	.060195	3.942	.0001
V200 Justifiable: Divorce	-.224260	.077953	-.045748	-2.877	.0040
V189 Belief in sin	-1.253056	.529233	-.041885	-2.368	.0180
V179 Religious denomination	-.016491	.006622	-.041198	-2.490	.0128
V185 Belief in soul	-1.251620	.545331	-.038915	-2.295	.0218
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index	.293679	.142765	.030159	2.057	.0398
R Square			.26847		
Adjusted R Square			.26515		
Multiple R			.51814		
Standard Error			12.77223		
Significant F			.0000		
F			80.78600		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.65 shows the cluster of variables that predict levels of trust in institutions in Spain. Together they have an Adjusted R Square of .20. Rating of political system in ten years, level of satisfaction with national government, comfort and strength from religion, religious attendance and respect for authority are the main predictors of this equation.

Table 7.65

*Trust in Institutions. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Spain*

<b>Dependent variable: Levels of Trust in Institutions Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	1.330007	.216550	.205980	6.142	.0000
V165 Level of satisfaction with national government	3.190375	.626759	.172492	5.090	.0000
V191 Comfort and strength from religion	4.193129	1.164706	.143100	3.600	.0003
V181 Religious attendance	.787048	.267500	.117935	2.942	.0034
V114 Greater respect for authority	2.505815	.806096	.105680	3.109	.0020
V200 Justifiable: Divorce	-.407016	.161447	-.089207	-2.521	.0119
V194 Justifiable: Cheating on taxes	-.708310	.263966	-.088962	-2.683	.0075
V213 Perception of corruption in Spain	-1.476832	.586601	-.084525	-2.518	.0120
R Square			.21006		
Adjusted R Square			.20149		
Multiple R			.45832		
Standard Error			12.88782		
Significant F			.0000		
F			24.49795		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.66 shows the independent variables that explain the variance of trust in institutions in the Basque Country (Adjusted R Square .33). Rate of political system today, level of satisfaction with national government, greater respect for authority and attitude towards divorce are the main predictors of trust in institutions in the Basque Country.

Table 7.66

Trust in Institutions. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Basque Country

<b>Dependent variable: Levels of Trust in Institutions Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V152 Rating of political system today	1.121376	.198365	.165403	5.653	.0000
V165 Level of Satisfaction with national government	2.781516	.525633	.158880	5.292	.0000
V114 Greater respect for authority	1.934327	.477619	.112397	4.050	.0001
V200 Justifiable: Divorce	-.492409	.129556	-.103535	-3.801	.0002
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	.617767	.171660	.099925	3.599	.0003
V123 Political inclination	.624221	.181995	.095526	3.430	.0006
V213 Perception of corruption in Spain	-1.546553	.441498	-.091570	-3.503	.0005
V194 Justifiable: Cheating on taxes	-.456814	.137155	-.086487	-3.331	.0009
V210 First choice party to vote next elections	-.032735	.010507	-.078619	-3.115	.0019
V7 Importance of politics	1.118195	.373151	.075801	2.997	.0028
V166 View that the country should be run for all	1.926901	.793668	.070107	2.428	.0153
V179 Religious denomination	-.021653	.009194	-.063572	-2.355	.0187
R Square			.33927		
Adjusted R Square			.33201		
Multiple R			.58247		
Standard Error			11.22637		
Significant F			.0000		
F			46.76837		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

In the case of Andalusia (Table 7.67) the independent variables in the regression equation have produced an Adjusted R Square of .23. Level of satisfaction with national government, rating of political system in ten years, the view that the country should be run for all, comfort and strength from religion and importance of God are the main predictors, in this order, of trust in institutions in Andalusia.

Table 7.67

*Trust in Institutions. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Andalusia*

<b>Dependent variable: Levels of Trust in Institutions Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V165 Level of satisfaction with national government	3.421340	.637872	.181470	5.364	.0000
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	1.143245	.190811	.172774	5.992	.0000
V166 View that the country should be run for all	4.993004	1.040693	.160505	4.798	.0000
V191 Comfort and strength from religion	44.063412	1.226386	.121480	3.313	.0010
V190 Importance of God	.687076	.209760	.121260	3.276	.0011
V208 Feeling of being more Spanish than nationalist	-1.798091	.569179	-.088720	-3.159	.0016
V122 Occupation of buildings or factories	-2.531422	.953664	-.077440	-2.654	.0081
V151 Rating of political system under Franco	.499464	.193858	.076984	2.576	.0101
V70 Goal: make parents proud	1.482173	.597309	.071782	2.481	.0133
R Square			.23323		
Adjusted R Square			.22625		
Multiple R			.48294		
Standard Error			13.68166		
Significant F			.0000		
F			33.39218		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The independent variables in the regression equation of Galicia (Table 7.68) present an Adjusted R Square of .26. Rating of political system today, level of satisfaction with national government, belief in sin, importance of politics, attitude towards an army rule and the view on the role of government in helping the poor are the main predictors, in this order, of trust in institutions in Galicia. It is significant, although the value itself is very small, the inclusion of the Individual Subjective Well-Being Index in the explanatory model of trust in institutions in Galicia.

Table 7.68

*Trust in Institutions. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Galicia*

<b>Dependent variable: Levels of Trust in Institutions Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V152 Rating of political system today	1.583531	.181899	.250888	8.706	.0000
V165 Level of satisfaction with national government	3.372591	.539837	.189081	6.247	.0000
V189 Belief in sin	-4.845568	.939382	-.160193	-5.158	.0000
V7 Importance of politics	2.012639	.454662	.126778	4.427	.0000
V156 Army rule	2.648561	.637810	.121763	4.153	.0000
V174 View on the role of the government in helping the poor in Galicia.	3.227963	.887641	.108524	3.637	.0003
V185 Belief in soul	-2.783259	.997940	-.086487	-2.789	.0054
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index	.843944	.278404	.086347	3.031	.0025
V194 Justifiable: Cheating on taxes	-.502093	.168697	-.085486	-2.976	.0030
R Square			.26845		
Adjusted R Square			.26141		
Multiple R			.51812		
Standard Error			12.95932		
Significant F			.0000		
F			38.12283		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Finally, Table 7.69 shows the results for the region of Valencia. Satisfaction with national government, importance of religion, party to vote in the next elections, rating of political system in ten years and rating of political system today are the main predictors of trust in institutions in Valencia, with an Adjusted R Square of .23.

Table 7.69

*Trust in Institutions. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Valencia*

<b>Dependent variable: Levels of Trust in Institutions Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V165 Level of satisfaction with national government	-4.901437	.944862	-.264538	-5.187	.0000
V9 Importance of religion	2.846694	.690383	.211564	4.123	.0000
V210 First choice party to vote next elections	.061978	.021195	.151058	2.924	.0037
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	.856891	.326817	.142158	2.622	.0092
V152 Rating of political system today	.651588	.309356	.113721	2.106	.0360
R Square			.23933		
Adjusted R Square			.22706		
Multiple R			.48922		
Standard Error			12.60422		
Significant F			.0000		
F			19.50748		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

To summarise, these results suggest that levels of trust in specific institutions are very low in Spain and its regions. At the individual and the national levels, the institutions less trusted are the political parties, the government in Madrid, the parliament and the labour unions. At the regional level there are some variations in the institutions less trusted. The respondents from the Basque Country reported very low levels of confidence in the Armed Forces, followed by the government in Madrid, the political parties, the parliament and the police. Andalusia has shown low levels of confidence in the political parties, the labour unions, the television and the press. On the other hand, Galicia and Valencia showed the same pattern than Spain (very low confidence levels in the political parties, the government in Madrid, the labour unions and the parliament). The most trusted institution in all cases is the green or environmental movement. Results from the analysis of the



Levels of Trust in Institutions Index confirm the results obtained from the individual analysis of the sixteen institutions. Andalusia has, of all samples, the highest level of confidence in institutions, while the lowest corresponds to the Basque Country. Looking at the correlational analysis results, trust in institutions is quite strongly associated with political variables, with those variables that measure attitudes towards corruption and also with religious variables. In relation with the other elements of social capital, trust in institutions has showed a very weak association with general trust, tolerance, participation in voluntary associations and social bonds. On the other hand, institutional trust is very weakly associated with happiness, life satisfaction and subjective well-being. Finally, the regression analyses show that there are differences in the predictors of trust in institutions in Spain and its regions. Overall, level of satisfaction with national government is the shared predictor in all samples. Political attitudes, religious beliefs and values, and attitudes towards corrupted political behaviour explain most of the weight of the prediction on institutional trust at the individual, national and regional levels. Subjective well-being, although very weak, appeared in two of the regression models of trust in institutions.

### ***7.3.3 Participation in Voluntary Associations***

This section will treat "participation in voluntary associations" as the dependent variable. The World Values Survey 1995-1996 provides a group of variables that measure membership in nine voluntary organisations (variables 28 to 36). These voluntary associations are as follows: religious or church organisations; sport or recreation organisations; arts, music and educational organisations; labor unions; political parties; environmental organisations; professional organisations; charitable organisations; and any other form of voluntary association (Inglehart, 1997). Voluntary associations are forms of social connectedness and social bonds, which are both indicators of social capital. Associational membership therefore appears to be a good way to measure participation, civic engagement, and social capital. I will analyse variables 28 to 36 separately at the individual, national and regional levels. I will also use those variables to create a "Total Association Index". As mentioned in the methodology section, the data used in this research does not allow measuring the quality of the relationships between people as it does not provide any items to do so.

Table 7.70 shows levels of membership in voluntary associations at the individual level. Church or religious organisations have the highest level of membership (20.7% inactive and 27.3% active, and a mean of .753), while political parties have the lowest levels of membership (4.0% inactive members and 6.6% active members, mean .173). Overall, these results clearly show very low levels of membership in any type of voluntary organisations.

Table 7.70

*Participation in Voluntary Associations: Percentages and Means. Total Cases*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Not a member (0)</b>	<b>Inactive member (1)</b>	<b>Active member (2)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>
V28. Church or religious organisation	52.0	20.7	27.3	.753	6920
V29. Sport or recreation organisation	72.5	17.4	10.1	.376	6920
V30. Art, music or educational organisation	80.4	11.0	8.6	.281	6919
V35. Charitable organisation	84.2	7.4	8.4	.241	6920
V36. Any other voluntary organisation	84.1	8.6	7.4	.233	6916
V31. Labor union	87.3	4.3	8.4	.210	6917
V34. Professional organisation	86.2	6.5	7.2	.210	6916
V33. Environmental organisation	89.2	3.2	7.6	.185	6919
V32. Political party	89.4	4.0	6.6	.173	6920

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The results from the Spanish sample (Table 7.71) are very similar to those from the aggregated sample. More Spanish are members of a church or religious organisation than of any other type of organisation (17% inactive members, 26.1% active members, mean .693), while the political parties show the lowest affiliation rates (1.8% inactive members, 6.3% active members, mean .144). Like in the Spanish case, membership in voluntary associations in the Spanish regions analysed in this study concentrates almost exclusively in the church and in other religious organisations (Galicia [Table 7.74] has the strongest membership of all, with 28.3% inactive members and 35.4 % active members of a church organisation). Overall, the data show very weak membership in all voluntary associations analysed in the study, including inactive membership. These results clearly support the view from McDonough, Barnes and López-Piña (1998) that levels of participation in voluntary associations in Spain are "anemic", as their study shows that only one-third of the Spanish adult population belongs to some type of association.

Table 7.71

*Participation in Voluntary Associations: Percentages and Means. Spain*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Not a member (0)</b>	<b>Inactive member (1)</b>	<b>Active member (2)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>
V28. Church or religious organisation	56.8	17.1	26.1	.693	1211
V29. Sport or recreation organisation	79.7	13.0	7.3	.277	1211
V30. Art, music or educational organisation	85.7	7.7	6.6	.209	1211
V31. Labor union	88.4	3.2	8.3	.199	1211
V35. Charitable organisation	88.4	4.6	6.9	.185	1211
V34. Professional organisation	88.9	4.3	6.8	.178	1211
V36. Any other voluntary organisation	89.8	4.2	6.0	.163	1211
V33. Environmental organisation	91.3	2.6	6.1	.148	1211
V32. Political party	91.9	1.8	6.3	.144	1211

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Molíns and Casademunt (1998), and Montero (1998) suggest that although there are numerous pressure groups and voluntary associations today in Spain (from agricultural organisations, to church groups, and especially in increase environmental associations), the number of people affiliated to voluntary associations in Spain is very low<sup>1</sup>. This phenomenon may be linked to a political culture of delegated participation (Molíns & Casademunt 1998). People in Spain may trust the organisations as representative of interest groups, but at the same time, they may not be confident of their ability as individuals to influence public policy making through affiliation to organisations” (p.173). These views are strongly supported by the results obtained in the analysis of trust in institutions in this study. Levels of trust in specific institutions are very low in Spain and its regions, particularly in those institutions that are closer to the political power, such as political parties, government in Madrid, parliament and labour unions. On the other hand, political parties and trade unions have a very small organisational presence in Spanish society: the number of people affiliated to both, political parties and trade unions, are significantly lower than those in other European countries (Montero, 1998). Results from the WVS 1995-1996 also support this view: in all samples analysed, the civic involvement in political and union organisations is very low. McDonough, Barnes and López-Piña (1998) suggest that high unemployment, low participation of

<sup>10</sup>There were 206,363 voluntary associations in Spain in 1995 (Portela Maseda & Neira Gómez, 2003)

Spanish women in the labor market, and the role of the Catholic Church during the transition (the Church did not get involved in the organisation of a confessional party) are the main contributors to low participation in politics in Spain.

Linz (1988) argues that the creation and articulation of organisations such as pressure groups require prolonged periods of political stability, so those groups can consolidate their organisations and legitimate their activities. Spain may not have offered such institutional and political stability in the last hundred years necessary to build independent and representative organisations. During the Restoration years (1870-1923), democracy was very limited. The Second Republic (1931-1939) was a time of hope but also of intense social and political unrest, which ended up in civil war. Franco's dictatorship (1939-1975) brought the country into a regime where rights were very limited, and it was not until his death (1975) that Spain joined the club of free and democratic political systems, one of the most fundamental conditions for the emergence of active organisations and pressure groups (Molíns & Casademunt, 1998).

López de Aguilera (1990), and Portela Maseda and Neira Gómez (2003) point out that there have been changes in the type of associations people in Spain are part of. López de Aguilera (1990) suggests that those associations with a social action function have lost participants and social weight, while groups supporting members' satisfaction of interests have seen their numbers increased. In general, voluntary participation in Spain has become more heterogeneous, with very specific interests and functions, and less structured (Portela Maseda & Neira Gómez, 2003). Pérez-Díaz (2003) points out that Spanish tend to participate more actively in informal forms of networks – such as non profit, non government organisations – than in formal organisations. Pérez-Díaz (2003) also argues that, although the number of people in Spain that are members of a political party or a labour union is low, this attitude cannot be associated with a lack of support for democracy and the political parties. López de Aguilera (1990) also argues that members of voluntary associations show different motivations to those who engaged in civic participation before democracy was a reality in Spain. Before, people would take part in groups as a way to show a commitment to the collective cause and offer pressure to achieve a common goal. Now, to be part of a group has more to do with satisfying a particular interest, and it does not involve a sense of collective identity.

The respondents from the Basque Country (Table 7.72) showed slightly higher rates of participation in voluntary associations than those previously seen from the aggregate and Spanish samples. The church and religious organisations have again the highest levels of affiliation (25.2% inactive member, 29.8% active member, mean .848), while the political parties have the lowest (5.7% inactive members, 10.2% active members, mean .260).

Table 7.72

*Participation in Voluntary Associations: Percentages and Means. Basque Country*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Not a member (0)</b>	<b>Inactive member (1)</b>	<b>Active member (2)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>
V28. Church or religious organisation	45.0	25.2	29.8	.848	2205
V29. Sport or recreation organisation	60.1	24.5	15.4	.553	2205
V30. Art, music or educational organisation	72.2	15.1	12.7	.405	2205
V36. Any other voluntary organisation	74.0	13.6	12.4	.384	2205
V35. Charitable organisation	77.7	9.6	12.7	.350	2205
V31. Labor union	81.1	6.1	12.8	.317	2205
V34. Professional organisation	80.2	8.6	11.2	.310	2205
V33. Environmental organisation	83.4	4.6	12.0	.285	2205
V32. Political party	84.2	5.7	10.2	.260	2205

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Andalusia (Table 7.73) also has very low levels of membership in voluntary associations. As it happened in the previous cases, people in Andalusia have shown a preference towards church and religious organisations (15.5% inactive member, 17.7% active member, mean .510). On the other hand, political parties are the organisation Andalusians did show less interest in joining (2.3% inactive member, 4.2% active member, mean .106).

Table 7.73

*Participation in Voluntary Associations: Percentages and Means. Andalusia*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Not a member (0)</b>	<b>Inactive member (1)</b>	<b>Active member (2)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>
V28. Church or religious organisation	66.7	15.5	17.7	.510	1803
V29. Sport or recreation organisation	86.9	8.1	5.0	.181	1803
V30. Art, music or educational organisation	90.6	5.1	4.3	.136	1803
V35. Charitable organisation	90.7	5.0	4.3	.136	1803
V31. Labor union	92.2	3.2	4.5	.123	1803
V36. Any other voluntary organisation	91.7	4.5	3.8	.121	1803
V32. Political party	93.5	2.3	4.2	.106	1803
V34. Professional organisation	93.2	3.2	3.5	.103	1803
V33. Environmental organisation	94.6	1.2	4.2	.095	1803

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.74 shows the results for Galicia, which are very similar to the previous results. Galicians felt more inclined to join church and religious organisations (28.3% inactive members, 35.4% active members, mean .991), and they represent the highest levels of membership in any organisation of all samples analysed in this study. This result is not surprising because Galicia has very close knit networks, at the personal, family and organisational levels (Keating, 2001). On the other hand, Galicians felt less interested in joining political parties (5.9% inactive membership, 5.3% active membership, mean .166). This result is supported by the low levels of participation in any type of political election in Galicia, traditionally the autonomous community with the biggest absentee rate in Spain.

Table 7.74

*Participation in Voluntary Associations: Percentages and Means. Galicia*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Not a member (0)</b>	<b>Inactive member (1)</b>	<b>Active member (2)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>
V28. Church or religious organisation	36.3	28.3	35.4	.991	1200
V29. Sport or recreation organisation	62.9	25.3	11.8	.488	1200
V30. Art, music or educational organisation	73.9	16.1	10.0	.361	1199
V35. Charitable organisation	80.7	11.0	8.3	.277	1200
V34. Professional organisation	82.2	11.2	6.6	.244	1196
V36. Any other voluntary organisation	82.9	10.9	6.2	.232	1196
V33. Environmental organisation	87.0	4.8	8.2	.212	1199
V31. Labor union	88.4	4.4	7.2	.188	1197
V32. Political party	88.8	5.9	5.3	.166	1200

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Finally, Table 7.75 shows that Valencians have also chosen church and religious organisations as the number one organization to join (11.2% inactive members, 33.5% active members, mean .782). On the other hand, environmental organisations (1.4% inactive member, 3.6% active member, mean .086) and political parties (3.0% inactive members, 4.2% active members, mean .114) are the least preferred organisations to join.

Table 7.75

*Participation in Voluntary Associations: Percentages and Means. Valencia*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Not a member (0)</b>	<b>Inactive member (1)</b>	<b>Active member (2)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>
V28. Church or religious organisation	55.3	11.2	33.5	.782	501
V29. Sport or recreation organisation	81.0	11.0	8.0	.269	501
V30. Art, music or educational organisation	82.8	10.0	7.2	.244	501
V35. Charitable organisation	88.2	4.6	7.2	.190	501
V36. Any other voluntary organisation	89.6	6.0	4.4	.148	501
V34. Professional organisation	91.0	3.4	5.6	.146	501
V31. Labor union	91.8	2.6	5.6	.138	501
V32. Political party	92.8	3.0	4.2	.114	501
V33. Environmental organisation	95.0	1.4	3.6	.086	501

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The first conclusion to be drawn from the analysis of membership in a number of voluntary organisations is that levels of membership, active and inactive, in voluntary organisations are extremely low in the context of Spain and its regions. The second conclusion is that the choice of organisation to join may be affected, as it happened with levels of trust, by political power. More people today say that they not longer trust political parties and the government, and extremely low levels of membership in political parties may be a reflection of that trend. Many citizens associate politics with corruption and lies (Guerra, 1996). On the other hand, church and religious organisations are, in all cases analysed, the voluntary associations that attract more members. The third conclusion is that there are not significant differences between Spain and the regions analysed



in this study in terms of how membership in organisations is distributed. However, Valencia is the only region where political parties did not score last (environmental organisations are the least preferred, followed closely by the political parties). On the other hand, the Basque Country has, by far, the highest rates of membership in political parties of all samples analysed. As mentioned already in the sociopolitical background section, the situation in the Basque Country and the relationship between its government and the government in Madrid are quite complex. Our data does not tell us which parties are the chosen ones to join, but we can suggest that, considering the strength of regional parties in the Basque Country (the PNV, Basque Nationalist Party, has never lost one regional election since the Basque regional parliament was established in 1979), those levels of participation in political parties may be a proof of support to regional/nationalist policies.

In order to measure participation as a whole I have manipulated those nine variables to create a Total Association Index (steps on how to calculate this index were explained in the methodology section), which will be treated as the dependent variable in the correlational and regression analyses. The Total Association Index forms a composite measure, and as such, it has been tested for scale reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha for the overall scale is .8444 (.8612 standardised alpha), therefore the items in this scale combine well together and form a highly reliable scale.

Table 7.76 shows the means for the Total Association Index at the individual, national and regional levels. In a scale from 0 to 100, a value of 0 corresponds to no participation in voluntary associations at all and a value of 100 corresponds to the highest possible levels of participation in any voluntary association. At the individual level, levels of participation in voluntary associations are very low (14.79). The Basque Country (20.61) has, of all samples, the highest levels of participation in voluntary organisations, while the lowest corresponds to Andalusia (8.41). Curiously, the Basque Country was the worst performer in levels of confidence in institutions and Andalusia was the best performer in the same category (see Table 7.62). Overall, these results support those obtained for the nine voluntary associations previously analysed: people participate at very low levels in voluntary organisations in Spain and its regions.

Table 7.76  
*Total Association Index (Means)*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
Basque Country	20.61	23.31	2205
Galicia	17.54	17.68	1200
Total cases	14.79	20.63	6920
Spain	12.19	21.31	1211
Valencia	11.75	15.07	501
Andalusia	8.41	17.27	1803

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

As in the previous sections, I have conducted a series of t-tests to determine whether the differences between the means of the national and regional sets of samples from Table 7.76 are statistically significant. Table 7.77 shows the results of the t-test comparing the means of the five sets of samples. Differences comparing the means from all samples are statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ), with the exception of the comparison between the samples of Spain and Valencia ( $p > .05$ ).

Table 7.77  
*T-Tests Comparing Means of Total Association Index in Each Sample*

	<b>Spain</b> Mean 12.19	<b>Basque Country</b> Mean 20.61	<b>Andalusia</b> Mean 8.41	<b>Galicia</b> Mean 17.54	<b>Valencia</b> Mean 11.75
Spain	-	p=.000	p=.000	p=.000	p=.629
Basque Country	-	-	p=.000	p=.000	p=.000
Andalusia	-	-	-	p=.000	p=.000
Galicia	-	-	-	-	p=.000

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

Table E.4 (Appendix E) presents the results for the correlational analysis of participation in voluntary associations (using the Total Association Index as the dependent variable) between variables. These results, in general, show very weak associations. Participation in voluntary associations is positively correlated with educational level in all the samples analysed and also with the age the respondent completed full time education (no association in the cases of Spain, Andalusia and Galicia). These results support the view that those with higher levels of education also show higher levels of participation (Putnam, 1996), as the knowledge and skills acquired through formal education may help create the opportunities and the will to join others.

Socioeconomic and political factors appear to have an effect in participation in voluntary associations. On one hand, social class (no association in the cases of Andalusia and Valencia) and household income have produced weak positive associations with the Total Associations Index. On the other hand, political variables such as discussion of politics with friends, interest in politics, importance of politics, use of violence to pursue political goals, and rating of political system in ten years (this variable did not correlate with the Total Association Index in the cases of Spain and Galicia) have also produced positive correlations with participation in voluntary associations. However, political inclination only had an extremely weak positive association with participation at the individual level.

Another group of variables positively correlated with participation in voluntary associations is that formed by those variables that measure attitudes of protest, such as signing a petition (no association in the case of Valencia), joining boycotts (no association in the cases of Spain and Valencia), attending lawful demonstrations (no associations in the cases of Spain and Valencia), joining unofficial strikes (no association in the case of Valencia) and occupying buildings and factories (no association in the cases of Andalusia and Valencia).

Also correlated negatively with participation are those variables measuring environmental attitudes and values, such as attending a meeting or signing a petition to protect the environment and contribution to an environmental organisation.

In relation with the other elements of social capital, the Total Association Index has showed a very weak positive association with the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index (no association in the cases of Spain, Andalusia and Galicia). General trust has also produced a weak positive association with participation (no correlations in the cases of Spain and Valencia). On the other hand, the Tolerance Index did not correlate with the Total Association Index, although several of its components did; of particular interest is the case of attitude towards Muslims as neighbours in Valencia (negative association). Finally, the Importance of Social Bonds Index did not correlate with the Total Association Index, only one of its components (importance of friends) produced a

very weak positive association with trust in institutions at the individual level, in Spain, Basque Country and Galicia.

The Subjective Well-Being Index only produced a very weak positive correlation with participation in voluntary associations in the case of Andalusia. On the other hand, of the components of subjective well-being (satisfaction with life as a whole and happiness), only happiness is weakly associated (positive) with the Total Association Index in the case of Andalusia.

Table 7.78 shows the independent variables that have shown an explanatory relationship with the Total Association Index at the individual level. Variables in this model have produced an Adjusted R Square of .06. Educational level, attitude towards using violence to pursue political goals, and interest in politics hold, in that order, most of the weight in the prediction of participation in voluntary associations. It is interesting that the Tolerance Index, which did not correlate significantly with the Total Association Index, has made it in this equation.

Table 7.78

*Participation in Voluntary Associations. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Total Cases*

<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>Dependent variable: Total Association Index</b>				
	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V217 Educational level	.989761	.104955	.128951	9.430	.0000
V164 Violence to pursue political goals	1.876653	.241971	.095433	7.756	.0000
V117 Interest in politics	-1.734744	.272330	-.084312	-6.370	.0000
V46 Contribution to an environmental organisation	4.956019	.782959	.080852	6.330	.0000
V221 Profession	-.301498	.069982	-.054678	-4.308	.0000
Tolerance Index	-.030943	.010930	-.035355	-2.831	.0047
V45 Meeting/letter/petition to protect the environment	1.777068	.694720	.033847	2.558	.0106
R Square			.06557		
Adjusted R Square			.06451		
Multiple R			.25606		
Standard Error			19.89247		
Significant F			.0000		
F			62.10727		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.79 shows the cluster of variables that predict participation in voluntary associations in Spain, with an Adjusted R Square of .04. Educational level, justification of accepting a bribe and tolerance are the predictors of this equation.

Table 7.79

*Participation in Voluntary Associations. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Spain*

<b>Dependent variable: Total Association Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V217 Educational level	1.398883	.236838	.170891	5.906	.0000
V196 Justifiable: accepting a bribe	2.091776	.474239	.125794	4.411	.0000
Tolerance Index	-.060215	.025891	-.067359	-2.326	.0202
R Square			.04631		
Adjusted R Square			.04387		
Multiple R			.21519		
Standard Error			20.66711		
Significant F			.0000		
F			19.01718		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.80 presents the independent variables that explain the variance of participation in voluntary associations in the Basque Country (Adjusted R Square .05). Discussion of politics with friends and attitude towards being Spanish or Basque are the main predictors of this equation. It is quite interesting to see variable 205 (proud to be Spanish/nationalist) in this equation, as it is not part of any of the other regression equations on participation in voluntary associations. It is a clear sign, in my opinion, of the strong nationalist feelings in the Basque Country, and those feelings may influence attitudes towards participating in voluntary associations.

Table 7.80

*Participation in Voluntary Associations. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Basque Country*

<b>Dependent variable: Total Association Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V37 Discussion of politics with friends	-3.959052	.923660	-.123719	-4.286	.0000
V205 Proud to be Spanish	-1.631379	.453957	-.102226	-3.594	.0003
V192 Justifiable: claiming benefits one is not entitled to	.772766	.283553	.077364	2.725	.0065
V218 Age completed full time education	.224002	.089425	.071702	2.505	.0124
V44 Attitude towards reduction of water consumption	2.899137	1.191146	.069702	2.434	.0151
V211 Second choice party to vote next elections	.034727	.014304	-.068714	-2.413	.0160
R Square			.05684		
Adjusted R Square			.05204		
Multiple R			.23841		
Standard Error			20.22542		
Significant F			.0000		
F			11.84161		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

In the case of Andalusia (Table 7.81) the independent variables in the regression equation have produced an Adjusted R Square of .04. Attitude towards environmental meetings and petitions, attitude towards the use of violence to pursue political goals, educational level and interest in politics are the predictors, in this order, of participation in voluntary associations in Andalusia.

Table 7.81

*Participation in Voluntary Associations. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Andalusia*

<b>Dependent variable: Total Association Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V45 Meeting/letter/petition to protect the environment	5.878070	1.256544	.113444	4.678	.0000
V164 Violence to pursue political goals	2.175901	.457402	.111495	4.757	.0000
V217 Educational level	.545292	.173825	.080461	3.137	.0017
V117 Interest in politics	-1.221954	.456123	-.067492	-2.679	.0075
R Square			.04620		
Adjusted R Square			.04401		
Multiple R			.21494		
Standard Error			16.85386		
Significant F			.0000		
F			21.07101		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The regression equation of Galicia (Table 7.82) has an Adjusted R Square of .05. Contribution to environmental organisation, interest in politics, educational level and discussion of politics with friends are, in this order, the predictors of participation in voluntary associations in Galicia.

Table 7.82

*Participation in Voluntary Associations. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Galicia*

<b>Dependent variable: Total Association Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V46 Contribution to an environmental organisation	6.638491	1.465553	.128660	4.530	.0000
V117 Interest in politics	-1.594318	.593689	-.093761	-2.685	.0073
V217 Educational level	.498673	.201889	.074139	2.470	.0137
V37 Discussion of politics with friends	-1.760913	.859569	-.071251	-2.049	.0407
R Square			.05512		
Adjusted R Square			.05192		
Multiple R			.23477		
Standard Error			17.11276		
Significant F			.0000		
F			17.25195		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.



Finally, Table 7.83 shows the results for the region of Valencia, the regression model with the highest Adjusted R Square (.12) of all samples analysed. View on taking revolutionary action to change society, contribution to an environmental organisation, and justification of buying something stolen are, in this order, the main predictors of participation in voluntary associations in Valencia.

Table 7.83

*Participation in Voluntary Associations. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Valencia*

<b>Dependent variable: Total Association Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V124 View on revolutionary action to change society	7.655887	1.861746	.189128	4.112	.0000
V46 Contribution to an environmental organisation	6.896071	1.973557	.165745	3.494	.0005
V195 Justifiable: buying something you knew was stolen	1.051717	.356844	.136844	2.947	.0034
V130 View on fair wealth distribution	-.622280	.220001	-.129300	-2.829	.0049
V56 Accept neighbours muslims	-4.683010	1.744396	-.124584	-2.685	.0075
V45 Meeting/letter/petition to protect the environment	4.124302	1.633429	.119813	2.525	.0119
R Square			.13809		
Adjusted R Square			.12575		
Multiple R			.37161		
Standard Error			13.25962		
Significant F			.0000		
F			11.18856		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

In conclusion, these results suggest that levels of participation in voluntary associations in Spain and the regions analysed in this study are very low. Church and religious organisations are, in all cases analysed, the voluntary associations that attract more members, although religion does not appear, in any case, as a predictor of participation in voluntary associations. On the other hand, the political parties, environmental organisations, professional organisations and the labour unions are the organisations with lower number of members. Looking at differences between regions, these are not very large in relation to levels of membership and chosen associations.

Looking at the results from the correlational analysis, participation in voluntary associations has produced, in general, very weak correlations. Its association with educational level and with age the

respondent completed full time education supports the view that those with higher levels of education are also more involved with voluntary associations. Socioeconomic and political factors appear to also have an effect in participation. That is the case of social class, household income, discussion of politics with friends, interest in politics, importance of politics, use of violence to pursue political goals, and rating of political system in ten years. Variables that measure attitudes of protest have also shown a weak association with participation. In relation with the other elements of social capital, the Total Association Index has showed a very weak association with Levels of Trust in Institutions and with general trust. Subjective Well-Being and happiness have also produced a very weak association with participation in voluntary associations, and only in the case of Andalusia.

Finally, the regression analyses show that there are some differences in the predictors of participation in voluntary associations in Spain and its regions. At the individual level education, attitude towards using violence to pursue political goals, and interest in politics are the main predictors of participation in voluntary associations. In the case of Spain, educational level and justification of accepting a bribe are the predictors of this equation. In both cases, the Tolerance Index has been included in the regression models, although its weight in the predictions is very small. The Basque Country shows a different pattern, with discussion of politics with friends and feeling of being more Spanish than nationalist as the main predictors of participation in voluntary associations. In the case of Andalusia, attitude towards environmental meetings and petitions, attitude towards the use of violence to pursue political goals, educational level and interest in politics are the main predictors of participation. Galicia has one different predictor in contribution to environmental organisation, and shared predictors in interest in politics, educational level and discussion of politics with friends. Finally, Valencia also shows some variations, with view on taking revolutionary action to change society, contribution to an environmental organisation, and justification of buying something stolen as the main predictors of participation in voluntary associations.

### ***7.3.4 Social Bonds***

#### ***7.3.4.1 Informal Networks: Family***

Coleman (1988) suggests that those relationships developed within the family structure are the social capital of the family. The presence of both parents in the household, the attention the child receive from the parents, and the strength and quality of their relationship are very important contributors to the social capital within the family (Coleman, 1988). Stone (2001) agrees that these

are valuable measures of social capital at the family level, adding also those relationships between siblings, and the relationship between children and absent parents. In this context, Weiss (1996) and The World Bank (2002) support the value of those relationships nurtured within the family environment, as they help create high levels of social trust and social capital.

Unfortunately, the WVS does not provide the appropriate items to measure all of these elements. The WVS allows, however, the analysis of the importance that the family has for the respondent, with variable 4 measuring how important family is in one's life. This section will treat "importance of family" as the dependent variable. I will analyse this variable at the individual, national and regional levels. This variable will also be part of the Social Bonds Index.

Table 7.84 shows the frequencies, means and standard deviations corresponding to "importance of family" for the aggregate sample, Spain and the regions involved in this study. Overall, the results for the five samples are very similar, and they suggest that there are not significant differences in levels of importance of family between them. All means are 3.80 or above, meaning that family is a rather to very important institution in Spain.

Table 7. 84

*Importance of Family (%)*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Not at all important (1)</b>	<b>Not very important (2)</b>	<b>Rather important (3)</b>	<b>Very important (4)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
Valencia	0.2	1.8	9.2	88.8	3.87	.41	501
Basque Country	0.2	1.1	11.1	87.6	3.86	.39	2164
Andalusia	0.2	1.1	11.8	86.9	3.85	.40	1801
Total cases	0.2	1.1	13.0	85.7	3.84	.41	6872
Galicia	0.2	1.3	15.5	83.1	3.82	.43	1196
Spain	0.3	0.5	17.4	81.8	3.80	.43	1210

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Pérez-Díaz (2003, p. 468) points out that those networks created around the family structure are essential in the system of social integration in Spain and a very important element of social capital. Pérez-Díaz's view (2003, p.477) is that families in Spain accumulate all the resources of their members and redistribute them as they are needed, an attitude that may help alleviate internal conflicts. Families have also adapted to the new sociopolitical and cultural situation in the country,

where the influence of the Catholic Church has decreased considerably, and family relationships have become more egalitarian. There are objective data, such as that from official census, which back up this view. Most people in Spain live in households considered as "families" (Table 7.85), thus it is not surprising that when asked about the importance of family, more than 80% of respondents answered that family is "very important".

Table 7.85

*Types of Households (%)*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Households that do not form a family</b>	<b>Households that form a family</b>
Andalusia	12.0	88.0
Basque Country	12.5	87.5
Galicia	13.4	86.6
Spain	13.7	86.3
Valencia	14.5	85.5

Source: own elaboration from Anuario Estadístico 1997, INE

In order to determine whether the differences between the means of the five sets of samples from Table 7.84 are statistically significant I have conducted a series of t-tests. Table 7.86 shows the results of the t-test comparing the means of all the samples. Differences comparing the means from Spain and Basque Country, Spain and Andalusia, Spain and Valencia, Basque Country and Galicia, Andalusia and Galicia, and Galicia and Valencia are all statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). The differences between the means from Spain and Galicia, Basque Country and Andalusia, Basque Country and Valencia, and Andalusia and Valencia are not statistically significant ( $p > .05$ ).

Table 7.86

*T-Tests Comparing Means of Importance of Family in Each Sample*

	<b>Spain</b> Mean 3.80	<b>Basque Country</b> Mean 3.86	<b>Andalusia</b> Mean 3.85	<b>Galicia</b> Mean 3.82	<b>Valencia</b> Mean 3.87
Spain	-	p=.000	p=.002	p=.625	p=.007
Basque Country	-	-	p=.611	p=.002	p=.784
Andalusia	-	-	-	p=.012	p=.559
Galicia	-	-	-	-	p=.020

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

Results from the correlation analysis using "importance of family" as the dependent variable show that, as it happened in all the correlational analysis in this study, the associations between variables are significant but very weak. Based on this analysis, (see Appendix E, Table E.5), we can make the following generalisations. Importance of family has positive moderate associations with those variables that refer to the family in a broad sense, such as: more emphasis on family life, respect for parents, the goal of making one's parents proud, marital status, number of children, and ideal size of family (no association in Spain and Andalusia). On the other hand, the associations with the view that marriage is outdated and with importance attributed to children's having a two-parent home (no association in the case of Spain) are negative.

Religious variables have also produced moderate associations with importance of family. On one hand, correlations with religious denomination and belief in God are negative. On the other hand, correlations with importance of religion, religious attendance, being a religious person, importance of God and comfort from religion are positive.

Importance of friends, importance of work, and importance of leisure time have also shown positive associations with importance of family.

Looking at the other variables that have been used also as measures of social capital in this study, importance of family is associated with only one of the indicators of trust and that association is fairly weak. The Levels of Trust in Institutions Index is positively associated with importance of family in all samples except in the case of Valencia. Taking each of the components of the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index, confidence in the churches has produced the strongest (positive) association with importance of family in this group of variables. Of the other elements of social capital, the Tolerance Index has produced a very weak negative association with importance of family at the individual level and in Valencia. Participation in voluntary associations did not correlate in any of the cases analysed. Individually, the variables that form the Total Association Index have produced extremely weak correlations not worth to take into account here.

There is a negative association between importance of family and those variables that measure "non civic" attitudes, such as claiming benefits one is not entitled to, buying something knowing that it is stolen, avoiding a fare on public transport and cheating on taxes.

Finally, the association between importance of family and the elements of subjective well-being is very weak. Happiness (no association in the case of Spain), life satisfaction (no association in the cases of Spain, Andalusia and Valencia) and the Individual Subjective Well-Being Index all correlated positively.

Overall, these results show that there are differences between samples, but as with the previous results, they are not very substantial. The associations between importance of family and most of

the independent variables are fairly weak, so I do not expect the multivariate regression model to produce high scores either.

Table 7.87 shows the independent variables that have shown an explanatory relationship with importance of family at the individual level. Variables in this model have an Adjusted R Square of .15. Importance of friends, importance of work, emphasis on family life and marital status hold, in that order, most of the weight in the prediction of importance of family. Interestingly, the Individual Subjective Well-Being Index has made it in this equation, although its weight in the equation is very small.

Table 7.87

*Importance of Family. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Total Cases*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of family</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V5 Importance of friends	.123012	.007406	.201272	16.610	.0000
V8 Importance of work	.090013	.007462	.146178	12.183	.0000
V115 More emphasis on family life	.163639	.013887	.145249	11.784	.0000
V89 Marital status	.017371	.002457	.102325	7.071	.0000
V90 Number of children	.015063	.003485	.064577	4.322	.0000
V12 Respect for parents	.066068	.012906	.064425	5.119	.0000
V94 View that Marriage is outdated	-.062477	.012720	-.061753	-4.912	.0000
V182 Religious person	.039728	.011135	.055908	3.568	.0004
V217 Educational level	-.007503	.002007	-.050178	-3.739	.0002
V190 Importance of God	.005006	.002129	.037493	2.352	.0187
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index	.008276	.003129	.032086	2.645	.0082
R Square			.15580		
Adjusted R Square			.15425		
Multiple R			.39471		
Standard Error			.36656		
Significant F			.0000		
F			100.67923		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.88 shows the cluster of variables that predict importance of family in Spain. This equation has an Adjusted R Square of .16. Importance of friends, importance of work, and emphasis on family life are the main predictors of importance of family in Spain.

Table 7.88

*Importance of Family. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Spain*

		<b>Dependent variable: Importance of family</b>				
<b>Independent Variables</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V5	Importance of friends	.152921	.017444	.239717	8.766	.0000
V8	Importance of work	.109367	.015559	.190928	7.029	.0000
V115	More emphasis on family life	.158615	.036561	.117105	4.338	.0000
V179	Religious denomination	-.001381	3.4789E-04	-.107992	-3.970	.0001
V89	Marital status	.018934	.005887	.099360	3.216	.0013
V90	Number of children	.023438	.007901	.092279	2.966	.0031
R Square				.17015		
Adjusted R Square				.15585		
Multiple R				.41249		
Standard Error				.39035		
Significant F				.0000		
F				39.60572		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.89 presents the independent variables that explain the variance of importance of family in the Basque Country (Adjusted R Square .12). Emphasis on family life, importance of friends, marital status and importance of work are the main predictors of this equation. The Individual Subjective Well-Being Index is also part of this regression equation and, as it happened at the individual level, its weight is very small.

Table 7.89

*Importance of Family. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Basque Country*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of family</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V115 More emphasis on family life	.128759	.016944	.166568	7.599	.0000
V5 Importance of friends	.100561	.013349	.164625	7.533	.0000
V89 Marital status	.018006	.003636	.112734	4.952	.0000
V8 Importance of work	.064536	.012651	.111815	5.101	.0000
V114 Greater respect for authority	.044028	.010920	.089460	4.032	.0001
V94 View that marriage is outdated	-.066812	.021083	-.071012	-3.169	.0016
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index	.017363	.005678	.067137	3.058	.0023
R Square			.12360		
Adjusted R Square			.12034		
Multiple R			.35156		
Standard Error			.35487		
Significant F			.0000		
F			37.99713		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.



In the case of Andalusia (Table 7.90) the independent variables in the regression equation of importance of family have an Adjusted R Square of .14. Importance of friends, importance of work, and respect for parents are the main predictors, in this order, of importance of family in Andalusia.

Table 7.90

*Importance of Family. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Andalusia*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of family</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V5 Importance of friends	.122443	.013001	.215605	9.418	.0000
V8 Importance of work	.122427	.014399	.192731	8.503	.0000
V12 Respect for parents	.115606	.026197	.099998	4.413	.0000
V89 Marital status	.014729	.004442	.086964	3.316	.0009
V90 Number of children	.017423	.005585	.085056	3.119	.0018
V182 Religious person	.063776	.018580	.080025	3.432	.0006
V115 More emphasis on family life	.108094	.037935	.065226	2.849	.0044
V217 Educational level	-.006986	.003806	-.045386	-1.835	.0666
R Square			.14688		
Adjusted R Square			.14289		
Multiple R			.38324		
Standard Error			.36083		
Significant F			.0000		
F			36.86420		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The independent variables in the regression equation of Galicia (Table 7.91) have an Adjusted R Square of .20. Emphasis on family life, importance of friends, marital status and importance of work are, in this order, the main predictors of importance of family in Galicia.

Table 7.91

*Importance of Family. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Galicia*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of family</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V115 More emphasis on family life	.344915	.034843	.275782	9.899	.0000
V5 Importance of friends	.133308	.019782	.188377	6.739	.0000
V89 Marital status	.025841	.005080	.144488	5.087	.0000
V8 Importance of work	.086550	.019487	.118155	4.441	.0000
V12 Respect for parents	.103506	.028100	.104930	3.684	.0002
V217 Educational level	-.017281	.004700	-.104440	-3.677	.0002
V13 Emphasis on parents' responsibilities toward children	.061619	.020219	.084880	3.048	.0024
V6 Importance of leisure	.042366	.017478	.067378	2.424	.0155
R Square			.20308		
Adjusted R Square			.19753		
Multiple R			.45065		
Standard Error			.38690		
Significant F			.0000		
F			36.60089		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Finally, Table 7.92 shows the results for the region of Valencia. Importance of friends, ideal size of family, importance of children to learn tolerance, number of children in the family, and educational level are, in this order, the main predictors of importance of family in Valencia, with an Adjusted R Square of .22.

Table 7. 92

*Importance of Family. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Valencia*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of family</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V5 Importance of friends	.127664	.025076	.220365	5.091	.0000
V91 Ideal size of family	.076925	.018966	.179609	4.056	.0001
V19 Importance of children to learn:tolerance	.155324	.041396	.162328	3.752	.0002
V90 Number of children	.032374	.010641	.148328	3.042	.0025
V217 Educational level	-.016402	.006689	-.121253	-2.452	.0146
V115 More emphasis on family life	.153802	.059655	.115867	2.578	.0103
V12 Respect for parents	.107881	.043500	.113348	2.480	.0135
V71 To live up to what friends expect	.039536	.018819	.091174	2.101	.0362
V13 Emphasis on parents' responsibilities toward children	.060243	.029545	.090322	2.039	.0421
V94 View that marriage is outdated	-.077315	.038261	.088864	-2.021	.0439
R Square			.23993		
Adjusted R Square			.22209		
Multiple R			.48983		
Standard Error			.31688		
Significant F			.0000		
F			13.44744		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

In conclusion, these results suggest that family is quite important for the respondents to the WVS 1995-1996 in Spain and its regions, and that there are not large differences in levels of importance of family between the samples analysed. At the individual, the national, the Basque and the Galician levels importance of friends, importance of work, emphasis on family life and marital status are the main predictors of importance of family. Interestingly, subjective well-being, although quite weak, made it into the total cases and the Basque regression equations. Andalusia adds respect for parents

to importance of friends and importance of work as main predictors of importance of family. As it has happened in most correlation and regression analyses, Valencia shows a significantly different pattern. Importance of friends, ideal size of family, importance of children to learn tolerance, number of children in the family, and educational level are, in this order, the main predictors of importance of family in this region.

### 7.3.4.2 Informal Networks: Friends

This section will follow the same approach as the previous section on importance of family. In this case, "importance of friends" is the dependent variable.

Table 7.93 shows the frequencies, means and standard deviations corresponding to "importance of friends" for the total of the cases analysed in this study, Spain and the four regions. The results for the five samples are very similar, and they suggest that there are not large differences in levels of importance of friends between them. All means are 3.29 or above, meaning that friends are quite important. Galicia (53.5%) and Basque Country (52.1%) are the two samples with the highest number of people responding that friends are very important, while Spain (40.9%) has the lowest number of respondents in the same category.

Table 7. 93

#### *Importance of Friends (%)*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Not at all important (1)</b>	<b>Not very important (2)</b>	<b>Rather important (3)</b>	<b>Very important (4)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
Galicia	.4	4.9	41.1	53.5	3.47	.611	1199
Basque Country	.6	5.1	42.2	52.1	3.45	.623	2192
Total cases	.8	7.0	44.5	47.7	3.39	.652	6894
Valencia	.2	7.4	47.8	44.6	3.36	.627	500
Andalusia	.9	9.9	45.2	44.0	3.32	.686	1797
Spain	1.3	8.4	49.4	40.9	3.29	.676	1206

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

In order to determine whether the differences between the means of the five sets of samples are statistically significant I have conducted a series of t-tests. Table 7.94 shows the results of the t-test comparing the means of importance of friends of all the samples. Differences comparing the means from Spain and Basque Country, Spain and Galicia, Spain and Valencia, Basque Country and Andalusia, Basque Country and Valencia, Andalusia and Galicia, and Galicia and Valencia are all statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). The differences between the means from Spain and Andalusia, Basque Country and Galicia, and Andalusia and Valencia are not statistically significant ( $p > .05$ ).

Table 7.94

*T-Tests Comparing Means of Importance of Friends in Each Sample*

	<b>Spain</b> Mean 3.29	<b>Basque Country</b> Mean 3.45	<b>Andalusia</b> Mean 3.32	<b>Galicia</b> Mean 3.47	<b>Valencia</b> Mean 3.36
Spain	-	p=.000	p=.329	p=.000	p=.049
Basque Country	-	-	p=.000	p=.360	p=.004
Andalusia	-	-	-	p=.000	p=.190
Galicia	-	-	-	-	p=.001

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

Table E.6 (see Appendix E) shows the correlations between "importance of friends" and other variables from the WVS 1995-1996. As in the previous analyses, the associations are significant but in general very weak. Importance of friends has the strongest correlation with importance of leisure, followed by importance of family (both positive). Marital status and number of children have produced negative weak-moderate associations with importance of friends. On the other hand, educational level, living with parents and household income (no association in the case of Valencia) have produced weak positive associations.

Looking at the other variables that have been also used as measures of social capital in this study, importance of friends is weakly associated with the two indicators of trust, although not in all the samples analysed. The Levels of Trust in Institutions Index is positively associated with importance of friends only in the case of Galicia. Taking each of the composites of the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index, confidence in the United Nations has produced the strongest (positive) association with importance of friends in Valencia, followed by confidence in the political parties, also positive, in Galicia. On the other hand, general trust is positively associated with importance of friends in all samples analysed, with the exception of Spain. Of the other elements of social capital,

the Tolerance Index has produced very weak positive association with importance of friends in all samples, except in Valencia. The Total Association Index only produced significant but weak positive associations at the individual level and in the Basque Country.

Finally, the Individual Subjective Well-Being Index is positively associated with importance of friends in all samples except Spain. Of its two components, happiness has produced weak positive correlations at the individual level and in Andalusia, while satisfaction with life as a whole has produced positive associations in all cases except Spain and Valencia.

Overall, these results show that the associations between importance of friends and most of the independent variables from the WVS 1995-1996 are fairly weak, so I do not expect the multivariate regression model to produce high scores either.

Table 7.95 shows the independent variables that have an explanatory relationship with importance of friends at the individual level. Variables in this model have produced an Adjusted R Square of .17. Importance of leisure, importance of family, marital status, age, and to live up to what friends expect hold, in that order, most of the weight in the prediction of importance of friends. Tolerance (represented by the Tolerance Index), general trust (represented by variable 27), and participation in voluntary associations (represented by variables 30, 32 and 36) are part of the group of variables that explain importance of friends.

Table 7.95

*Importance of Friends. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Total Cases*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of friends</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V6 Importance of leisure	.226008	.014551	.238762	15.532	.0000
V4 Importance of family	.324610	.023883	.209503	13.592	.0000
V89 Marital status	-.028012	.005121	-.101381	-5.470	.0000
V216 Age	-.002923	7.7197E-04	-.077680	-3.786	.0002
V71 To live up to what friends expect	.051816	.011662	.066454	4.443	.0000
V32 Member of a political party	-.085867	.024446	-.063146	-3.513	.0004
V232 Size of town	-.019342	.004686	-.062011	-4.127	.0000
V15 Importance of children to learn independence	.085208	.022139	.059968	3.849	.0001
Tolerance Index	.001601	4.5816E-04	.053682	3.494	.0005
V217 Educational level	.012824	.004477	.052903	2.864	.0042
V90 Number of children	-.020718	.008141	-.052894	-2.545	.0110
V30 Member of art organisation	.055660	.020292	.048000	2.743	.0061
V27 General trust	.063568	.022072	.043301	2.880	.0040
V8 Importance of work	.040298	.015832	.039156	2.545	.0110
V36 Member of any other voluntary organisation	.049195	.022893	.037255	2.149	.0317
V7 Importance of politics	.025242	.011022	.036380	2.290	.0221
V161 View of democracies as an indecisive system	-.029169	.013420	-.033580	-2.174	.0298
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.009023	.004550	.030126	1.983	.0474
R Square			.17406		
Adjusted R Square			.17014		
Multiple R			.41721		
Standard Error			.59516		
Significant F			.0000		
F			44.42073		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.96 shows the cluster of variables that predict importance of friends in Spain. This equation has an Adjusted R Square of .19. Importance of leisure, importance of family, to live up to what friends expect and number of children are the main predictors of this regression model. The Tolerance Index has also made it into this equation.

Table 7.96

*Importance of Friends. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Spain*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of friends</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V6 Importance of leisure	.269616	.025549	.286662	10.553	.0000
V4 Importance of family	.366548	.043012	.230521	8.522	.0000
V71 To live up to what friends expect	.090575	.022338	.107584	4.055	.0001
V90 Number of children	-.041246	.010819	-.103924	-3.812	.0001
V232 Size of town	-.029216	.007918	-.097882	-3.690	.0002
Tolerance Index	.001696	7.6917E-04	.059019	2.205	.0276
R Square			.19714		
Adjusted R Square			.19295		
Multiple R			.44401		
Standard Error			.60185		
Significant F			.0000		
F			46.98239		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.



Table 7.97 presents the independent variables that explain the variance of importance of friends in the Basque Country (Adjusted R Square .18). Importance of leisure, importance of family, marital status and living up to what friends expect are the main predictors of this equation. General trust, although weak, is also part of this equation.

Table 7.97

*Importance of Friends. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Basque Country*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of friends</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V6 Importance of leisure	.246840	.020213	.269766	12.212	.0000
V4 Importance of family	.295753	.035112	.186941	8.423	.0000
V89 Marital status	-.036188	.007080	-.136696	-5.111	.0000
V71 To live up to what friends expect	.088144	.017356	.111782	5.079	.0000
V27 General trust	.104438	.028084	.082023	3.719	.0002
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.023807	.006439	.081017	3.697	.0002
V15 Importance of children to learn independence	.086201	.029112	.067397	2.961	.0031
V90 Number of children	-.025877	.012173	-.064291	-2.126	.0337
V216 Age	-.002355	.001061	-.064229	-2.220	.0265
V7 Importance of politics	.039503	.015072	.057571	2.621	.0088
V159 Protect individual freedom	.068829	.031890	.049213	2.158	.0310
R Square			.18817		
Adjusted R Square			.18306		
Multiple R			.43378		
Standard Error			.56721		
Significant F			.0000		
F			36.81108		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

In the case of Andalusia (Table 7.98) the independent variables in the regression equation of importance of friends have produced an Adjusted R Square of .14. Importance of leisure, importance of family, marital status and social class are the main predictors, in this order, of importance of family in Andalusia. General trust is also part of this equation.

Table 7.98

*Importance of Friends. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Andalusia*

		<b>Dependent variable: Importance of friends</b>				
<b>Independent Variables</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V6	Importance of leisure	.217693	.023179	.220782	9.392	.0000
V4	Importance of family	.372856	.040349	.217521	9.241	.0000
V89	Marital status	-.027654	.006922	-.093284	-3.995	.0001
V226	Social class	.075478	.019744	.088937	3.823	.0001
V71	To live up to what friends expect	.058551	.018333	.073831	3.194	.0014
V15	Importance of children to learn independence	.102360	.038177	.062561	2.681	.0074
V27	General trust	.082236	.037524	.050547	2.192	.0286
R Square				.14341		
Adjusted R Square				.13972		
Multiple R				.37870		
Standard Error				.63547		
Significant F				.0000		
F				38.86680		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The independent variables in the regression equation of Galicia (Table 7.99) have an Adjusted R Square of .16. Importance of leisure, importance of family, and marital status are, in this order, the main predictors of importance of friends in Galicia. On the other hand, general trust has a very small weight in this regression model.

Table 7.99

*Importance of Friends. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Galicia*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of friends</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V6 Importance of leisure	.228722	.024829	.256493	9.212	.0000
V4 Importance of family	.273243	.039971	.194958	6.836	.0000
V89 Marital status	-.047448	.008182	-.187756	-5.799	.0000
V15 Importance of children to learn independence	.138109	.035617	.110987	3.878	.0001
V216 Age	-.004256	.001260	-.110942	-3.378	.0008
V143 Confidence in the political parties	.066266	.022117	.082807	2.996	.0028
V8 Importance of work	.082174	.029248	.078510	2.810	.0050
V27 General trust	.098420	.037004	.073556	2.660	.0079
R Square			.16156		
Adjusted R Square			.15557		
Multiple R			.40195		
Standard Error			.56061		
Significant F			.0000		
F			26.95328		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Finally, Table 7.100 shows the regression results for the region of Valencia. Importance of family, importance of leisure, marital status and the view that democracy is a better form of government are, in this order, the main predictors of importance of family in Valencia, with an Adjusted R Square of .17. As in the previous regression models, general trust has very small weight in the prediction of importance of friends.

Table 7. 100

*Importance of Friends. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Valencia*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of friends</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V4 Importance of family	.357655	.066210	.238946	5.402	.0000
V6 Importance of leisure	.172473	.040685	.188880	4.239	.0000
V89 Marital status	-.044739	.011849	-.166858	-3.776	.0002
V163 View of democracy as a better form of government	.151195	.041846	.161137	3.613	.0003
V32 Member of a political party	-.124668	.060886	-.090275	-2.048	.0412
V27 General trust	.135984	.066444	.089809	2.047	.0413
R Square			.17885		
Adjusted R Square			.16750		
Multiple R			.42291		
Standard Error			.57501		
Significant F			.0000		
F			15.75497		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

In conclusion, these results suggest that friends are quite important for the respondents to the WVS 1995-1996 in Spain and its regions, and that there are not large differences in levels of importance of friends between the samples analysed. Importance of leisure and importance of family are the main predictors of importance of friends in all samples. Marital status is also the third main predictor of importance of friends in all cases except in Spain. Tolerance (represented by the Tolerance Index) has made it into the prediction equations at the individual level and in the Spanish case. General trust (represented by variable 27) appeared in all the regression models except Spain. On the other hand, participation in voluntary associations (represented by variables 30, 32 and 36) is part of the group of variables that explain importance of friends at the individual level.

Satisfaction with life as a whole, happiness and Subjective Well-Being Index are not part of any of the regression models of importance of friends.

### ***7.3.4.3 Importance of Social Bonds Index***

In the previous sections I have explored importance of family and importance of friends. With data from variables 4 (importance of family) and 5 (importance of friends) I have created an Importance of Social Bonds Index (for details on this index, see the methodology section). In this index a score of 0 indicates the lowest importance of social bonds (family and friends), while a score of 100 indicates the highest importance of social bonds.

The analysis of the Importance of Social Bonds Index (Table 7.101) suggests that social bonds (family and friends) are quite important in Spain and the regions analysed in this study. Galicia has the highest mean of all (88.02), followed closely by Basque Country (87.62) and Valencia (87.15). Spain has the lowest score of all (84.95).

Table 7.101

#### *Importance of Social Bonds Index (Means)*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
Galicia	88.02	13.67	1200
Basque Country	87.62	14.53	2202
Valencia	87.15	16.67	501
Total cases	86.81	14.48	6915
Andalusia	86.15	14.63	1802
Spain	84.95	15.02	1210

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

As I did in all the sections exploring the different elements of subjective well-being and social capital, I have conducted a series of t-tests to determine whether the differences between the means of the five sets of samples from Table 7.101 are statistically significant. Table 7.102 shows the results of the t-test comparing the means of all the samples. All means appeared to be significantly different, with the exception of the means from Basque Country and Galicia, Basque Country and Valencia, Andalusia and Valencia, and Galicia and Valencia ( $p > .05$ ).

Table 7.102

*T-Tests Comparing Means of Importance of Social Bonds Index in Each Sample*

	<b>Spain</b> Mean 84.95	<b>Basque Country</b> Mean 87.62	<b>Andalusia</b> Mean 86.15	<b>Galicia</b> Mean 88.02	<b>Valencia</b> Mean 87.15
Spain	-	p=. 000	p= .028	p= .000	p= .005
Basque Country	-	-	p= .002	p= .439	p= .507
Andalusia	-	-	-	p= .000	p= .173
Galicia	-	-	-	-	p= .234

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data

To bring a broader understanding of these results I have conducted a series of tests – correlations and multiple regressions – to find those variables in the World Values Survey 1995-1996 that may have an effect on importance of social bonds. Table E.7 (Appendix E) shows those variables that have correlated significantly with the Importance of Social Bonds Index and that are relevant to the theoretical framework of the study. These results are in line with those obtained for the variables 4 (importance of family) and 5 (importance of friends), as both are elements of the Importance of Social Bonds Index used in this analysis. As in all other correlational analyses in this study, associations between variables are very weak.

The variables that have shown the strongest associations (positive) with the Importance of Social Bonds Index are importance of leisure and importance of work (in this case, no correlation in Valencia). Importance of religion is also positively associated with importance of social bonds (no association in Valencia) and, from the group of religious variables, religious denomination (negative association; no correlation in the Basque Country or Galicia) and religious attendance (positive association; no correlation in Valencia) have produced the highest correlations.

Other variables that have correlated positively with the Importance of Social Bonds Index are: satisfaction with financial situation, household income (no association in Valencia) to live up to what friends expect, the goal of making one's parents proud (no association in Andalusia), ideal size of family (no association in Spain), more emphasis on family life (no association in Andalusia), the view on having a democratic system and also that democracy is a better form of government (no association in Galicia in those two variables). On the other hand, the view that marriage is outdated (no associations in Spain and Valencia) is negatively associated with the Importance of Social Bonds Index.

Looking at those variables that have been used as measures of social capital in this study, the Importance of Social Bonds Index is weakly associated with the two indicators of trust. On one hand, the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index is positively associated with importance of social bonds in all samples except in the cases of Andalusia and Valencia. Taking each of the components of the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index, confidence in the churches has produced the strongest associations with importance of social bonds in this group of variables (no association in Valencia and at the individual level). On the other hand, general trust is positively associated with importance of social bonds at the individual level, in the Basque Country, Andalusia and Galicia.

Of the other elements of social capital, participation in voluntary associations (Total Association Index) did not correlate with importance of social bonds in any of the samples analysed. On the other hand, the element of tolerance (Tolerance Index) has a very weak positive association with importance of social bonds at the individual level and in Andalusia.

Finally, the association between the Importance of Social Bonds Index and the elements of subjective well-being is very weak. Happiness (no association in the case of Galicia), satisfaction with life as a whole (no association in the case of Spain) and the Individual Subjective Well-Being Index all correlated positively with importance of social bonds.

Overall, results in Table E.7 (Appendix E) show that there are differences between samples, but as with the previous results, they are not very substantial. The associations between the Importance of Social Bonds Index and most of the independent variables are very weak, so I do not expect the multivariate regression models that follow to produce high scores either.

Table 7.103 shows the independent variables that have shown an explanatory relationship with importance of social bonds at the individual level. Variables in this model have produced an Adjusted R Square of .13. Importance of leisure, importance of work and religious attendance hold, in that order, most of the weight in the prediction of importance of social bonds. General trust (represented by variable 27) is part of this group of variables that explain importance of social bonds.

Table 7.103

*Importance of Social Bonds. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Total Cases*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of Social Bonds Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V6 Importance of leisure	4.915468	.290775	.238543	16.905	.0000
V8 Importance of work	3.572763	.308828	.162083	11.569	.0000
V181 Religious attendance	.697071	.092672	.105603	7.522	.0000
V71 To live up to what friends expect	1.254196	.243010	.071981	5.161	.0000
V227 Household income	.473583	.109777	.063923	4.314	.0000
V27 General trust	1.768758	.434253	.057140	4.073	.0000
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.280117	.096183	.042921	2.912	.0036
R Square			.12716		
Adjusted R Square			.12582		
Multiple R			.35660		
Standard Error			13.49394		
Significant F			.0000		
F			95.00915		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.



Table 7.104 shows the cluster of variables that predict importance of social bonds in Spain. This regression model has an Adjusted R Square of .18. Importance of leisure, importance of work, and importance of religion are the main predictors of this regression model.

Table 7.104

*Importance of Social Bonds. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Spain*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of Social Bonds Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V6 Importance of leisure	5.406401	.635591	.255513	8.506	.0000
V8 Importance of work	3.126802	.597701	.156830	5.231	.0000
V9 Importance of religion	1.909450	.511791	.129306	3.731	.0002
V158 View on having a cooperative party leader	4.123002	1.198216	.100895	3.441	.0006
V181 Religious attendance	.686517	.234666	.100266	2.926	.0035
V49 Importance of humans to coexist with nature	5.282574	1.620077	.096584	3.261	.0012
V118 Signing a petition	1.446127	.570433	.076356	2.535	.0114
R Square			.18685		
Adjusted R Square			.18096		
Multiple R			.43226		
Standard Error			13.27692		
Significant F			.0000		
F			31.74337		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table 7.105 presents the independent variables that explain the variance of importance of social bonds in the Basque Country (Adjusted R Square .12). Importance of leisure, importance of work, satisfaction with financial situation, religious attendance and happiness are the predictors of importance of social bonds in this equation.

Table 7.105

*Importance of Social Bonds. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Basque Country*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of Social Bonds Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V6 Importance of leisure	4.543686	.435945	.216716	10.423	.0000
V8 Importance of work	3.964067	.436622	.188795	9.079	.0000
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.802416	.142761	.118005	5.621	.0000
V181 Religious attendance	.555606	.131017	.088679	4.241	.0000
V10 Happiness	1.500356	.540046	.058834	2.778	.0055
R Square			.12263		
Adjusted R Square			.12052		
Multiple R			.35019		
Standard Error			13.47369		
Significant F			.0000		
F			58.06054		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

In the case of Andalusia (Table 7.106) the independent variables in the regression equation of importance of social bonds have produced an Adjusted R Square of .14. Importance of leisure, importance of work, the view that democracies are not good to maintain order and importance of religion are the main predictors, in this order, of importance of social bonds in Andalusia.

Table 7.106

*Importance of Social Bonds. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Andalusia*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of Social Bonds Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V6 Importance of leisure	5.590544	.524739	.273656	10.654	.0000
V8 Importance of work	3.188785	.609725	.134405	5.230	.0000
V162 View of democracies as no good to maintain order	-2.168172	.500344	-.109897	-4.333	.0000
V9 Importance of religion	1.483619	.361909	.104070	4.099	.0000
V174 View on the role of the government in helping the poor in Andalusia	-2.223511	.667510	-.084579	-3.331	.0009
R Square			.14104		
Adjusted R Square			.13785		
Multiple R			.37556		
Standard Error			13.09016		
Significant F			.0000		
F			44.20361		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

The independent variables in the regression equation of Galicia (Table 7.107) have an Adjusted R Square of .12. Importance of leisure, importance of work, more emphasis on family life and emphasis on parents' responsibilities for children are, in this order, the main predictors of importance of social bonds in Galicia. Trust is represented in this equation by the Levels of Trust in Institutions Index, which has a very small weight in the prediction of importance of social bonds.

Table 7.107

*Importance of Social Bonds. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Galicia*

<b>Dependent variable: Importance of Social Bonds Index</b>					
<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V6 Importance of leisure	4.367727	.566262	.219056	7.713	.0000
V8 Importance of work	2.531216	.658603	.109940	3.843	.0001
V115 More emphasis on family life	3.943963	1.212756	.095974	3.252	.0012
V13 Emphasis on parents' responsibilities toward children	2.122908	.667551	.091412	3.180	.0015
V189 Belief in sin	-2.296791	.822904	-.084006	-2.791	.0053
V91 Ideal size of family	.979583	.377713	.074347	2.593	.0096
Levels of Trust in Institutions Index	.066180	.026174	.073901	2.528	.0116
V67 View on working until satisfied with result	1.488666	.598415	.071077	2.488	.0130
R Square			.12214		
Adjusted R Square			.11575		
Multiple R			.34949		
Standard Error			12.78363		
Significant F			.0000		
F			19.09638		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Finally, Table 7.108 shows the regression results of importance of social bonds for the region of Valencia. Importance of leisure, the view of democracy as a better government system and jobs for young people when they are scarce are, in this order, the main predictors in this equation, with an Adjusted R Square of .12.

Table 7. 108

*Importance of Social Bonds Index. The Influence of Expected Predictors. Valencia*

		<b>Dependent variable: Importance of Social Bonds Index</b>				
<b>Independent Variables</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Sig T</b>
V6	Importance of leisure	4.200022	.941033	.205328	4.463	.0000
V163	View of democracy as a better form of government	2.853729	.948779	.138979	3.008	.0028
V62	When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for young people	-2.001992	.736746	-.123720	-2.717	.0068
V131	Cautious attitude towards life changes	.622992	.247296	.116425	2.519	.0121
V44	Attitude towards reduction of water consumption	-4.256423	1.669104	-.116123	-2.550	.0111
V69	View on working until late because he/she likes to work	1.711885	.719823	.107910	2.378	.0178
R Square				.13140		
Adjusted R Square				.11919		
Multiple R				.36248		
Standard Error				13.15706		
Significant F				.0000		
F				10.76549		

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

In conclusion, these results suggest that social bonds (family and friends) are quite important for the respondents to the WVS 1995-1996 in Spain and its regions, and that there are not large differences in levels of importance of social bonds between the samples analysed. Importance of leisure is the main predictor of importance of social bonds in all samples. Importance of work is the second main predictor of importance of social bonds in all samples, except in Valencia. Variables that refer to the family in a broad sense – such as more emphasis on family life and emphasis on parents' responsibilities toward children – are only part of the regression model of Galicia. Religious variables – such as religious attendance (individual level and Basque Country) and

importance of religion (Spain and Andalusia) – and political variables – such as the view of democracies as no good to maintain order (Andalusia) and democracies as a better government system (Valencia) – are also in the cluster of variables that predict importance of social bonds. Looking at the other measures of social capital, general trust (represented by variable 27) has appeared in the regression model of the total cases sample, and Levels of Trust in Institutions Index in the model of Galicia. Finally, happiness is a weak predictor of importance of social bonds in the Basque Country.

## **7.4 Conclusion**

This section of the study aimed to empirically address the research questions of this thesis: How do levels of subjective well-being differ between regions in Spain? How do levels of social capital differ between regions in Spain? And to what extent are social capital and subjective well-being linked within those regions in Spain?

In answer to the first research question, results from the statistical analysis show that there are regional differences within Spain in overall levels of subjective well-being, although those differences are not large. The highest levels of subjective well-being correspond to Valencia, followed by the Basque Country, Andalusia and Galicia. There are also very small regional differences in the predictors of subjective well-being. Financial situation, health status, control over one's life, and marital status are shared predictors by all samples. Overall, most people in Spain and in the regions analysed in this study have reported high levels of subjective well-being (happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole).

This study has used several measures of social capital, due to the complexity and multidimensionality of the concept. Thus, to answer the question on levels of social capital in Spain and its regions, I have analysed levels of tolerance, trust (general trust and trust in institutions), participation in voluntary associations, and importance of social bonds (importance of family and friends).

The statistical analysis clearly suggests variations in levels of tolerance within the four Spanish regions analysed, although these differences are not very large. The most tolerant regions are Andalusia and the Basque Country, while Valencia is the region with lowest levels of tolerance. There are also very small variations in the predictors of tolerance in Spain and the regions. Age, attitude towards immigrants coming to Spain to work, postmaterialist values, political inclination and justification of homosexuality are present in all the regression models. Political inclination is a significant predictor of tolerance in Spain, Galicia and Valencia, while confidence in the women's movement is the only item measuring trust that has made it in any of the regression models (Basque

Country). Overall, Spain and the regions analysed in this study have reported high levels of tolerance.

Levels of general trust are quite low in Spain and its regions. The Basque Country is the region that reported higher general trust towards others, while Valencia has the lowest score of all. There are also differences between regions in the predictors of general trust, although in most cases age, attitude towards foreign workers when jobs are scarce, attitudes of protest and respect for authority are the best predictors of general trust. On the other hand, people in Spain and in the regions analysed in this study do not have a great deal of trust in their institutions either. Andalusia is the region with highest levels of trust in institutions, while the Basque Country has the lowest. There are also regional variations in the predictors of trust in institutions. Overall, level of satisfaction with national government is the shared predictor in all samples. Political attitudes, religious beliefs and values, and attitudes towards corrupted political behaviour are the best predictors of institutional trust at the individual, national and regional levels. Subjective well-being, although very weak in its predictive power, appeared in two of the regression models of trust in institutions.

Levels of membership, active and inactive, in voluntary organisations are also extremely low in Spain and its regions. Looking at differences between regions, these are not very large in relation to levels of membership and chosen associations. The Basque Country has, of all samples, the highest rates of participation in voluntary organisations, while the lowest rates occur in Andalusia. There are also numerous variations in the predictors of participation in voluntary associations in Spain and its regions. The Basque Country has discussion of politics with friends and feeling of being Spanish or nationalist as the main predictors of participation in voluntary associations. In the case of Andalusia, attitude towards environmental meetings and petitions, attitude towards the use of violence to pursue political goals, educational level and interest in politics are the main predictors of participation. Galicia has one different predictor in contribution to an environmental organisation, and shared predictors in interest in politics, educational level and discussion of politics with friends. Finally, Valencia has attitude towards taking revolutionary action to change society, contribution to environmental organisation, and acceptability of buying something stolen as the main predictors of participation in voluntary associations.

Social bonds (family and friends) are quite important in Spain and in the regions analysed in this study, and the differences between regions are not large. Overall, proportionality more people in Galicia give importance to social bonds, followed closely by Basque Country and Valencia. Importance of leisure is the main predictor of importance of social bonds in all regions, while importance of work is the second main predictor of importance of social bonds in all regions, except in Valencia.

In answer to the third research question, results from correlation and regression analyses are very weak, thus not supporting a strong association between subjective well-being and social capital. Subjective well-being is not associated with tolerance in its index form, although it has very weak associations with some of the variables that form this index. On the other hand, subjective well-being has also very weak associations with both measures of trust. Subjective well-being has a correlation with institutional trust in all samples but Valencia, and with general trust within Galicia and the Basque Country, as well as in the aggregated data set. In relation with participation, subjective well-being has produced weak correlations with its index form (Total Association Index), only in the case of Andalusia, although several of the variables that form that index showed weak associations. Finally, social bonds and subjective well-being are associated in all the samples analysed in this study.



## **PART 8**

### **LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH**

A research questionnaire's aim is to obtain valid information to widen an area of knowledge. One problem for all kind of studies is that the researcher cannot ask everything (De Miguel, 1997); he or she has to choose what to ask in that specific survey, and maybe ask some other things in the future. There are numerous constraints to the design of a questionnaire, from material to ethical considerations. Another measurement limitation is associated to the nature of the concept or concepts to be analysed. As Cox (1998) points out, it is hard to accurately measure concepts that refer to human attitudes, behaviour and feelings. The purpose of those who designed the WVS was not specifically oriented towards an analysis and interpretation of data about subjective well-being and social capital. Actually, none of these concepts is mentioned as such in any of the questions in this survey, although there are two variables that measure happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole, which have been identified as elements of subjective well-being by numerous authors, including Inglehart. Social capital happens to be a multidimensional concept that is widely used and is defined and measured in numerous ways, depending on the discipline we are working from, and the conceptual and operational frameworks of the research. Its multidimensionality adds to the complexity of identifying appropriate indicators or measures. Another issue relates to the problem of distinguishing between social capital, its determinants and its outcomes. Some outcomes of social capital, such as reciprocity and tolerance, may act also as determinants.

The World Values Survey was designed to analyse a variety of attitudes and values in a very broad sense. Therefore, a great concern of this thesis was to work with secondary data derived from instruments that have not been designed to measure social capital in particular, and might not be as precise as desired. As Stone (2001, p. 2) points out "... data gathered originally for purposes other than the study of social capital are unlikely to provide conceptually thorough measures of it." This circumstance has also made very complex the manipulation and analysis of the data. The variables selected from the WVS database did not fit perfectly the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the research. Moreover, many of the empirical relationships identified were relatively weak.

This research has analysed data for one national sample and four regional samples because they were the only ones available for Spain from the World Values Survey. I would have liked to analyse other Spanish regional samples, for example the one from Catalonia, but suitable data are not available for this region in the 1995-1996 WVS survey.

When I first started the data analysis in 1999 I believed that the World Values Survey was a highly reliable source of information, as academics and institutions were using it worldwide and it

offered the advantage of the access to several representative databases. I expected some challenges, but not of the kind I was about to find out. The regional questionnaires of Andalusia, Basque Country, Galicia and Valencia seemed to produce various anomalous responses. Some variables, such as the language and region where the interview was conducted, showed confusing values from one sample to another. I reported my findings to my supervisor, Professor Alan Black, and I sent a questionnaire with the remarks to the Spanish researchers responsible of the data collection and coding. They took quite long to answer my queries, but when they did they just confirmed my worst fears: the data had numerous serious mistakes and it would need to be reviewed. Between February 2001 and August 2002 I did not have reliable data to analyse. Finally I obtained a copy of the reviewed data in December 2002 during a trip to Madrid. At this point I must admit to have found that the new data has at least one error, but fortunately that error is not relevant for my analysis.

## **PART 9**

### **CONCLUSION**

This thesis aimed to explore the concepts of subjective well-being and social capital and to empirically test the theoretical links between these phenomena, as suggested by the literature, in the context of Spain and four of autonomous communities, or regions, using data from the World Values Survey 1995-1996.

Subjective well-being refers to subjective cognitive evaluations of overall quality of life that individuals make continuously taking into account their lives' circumstances and experiences. It is widely accepted that two main components of subjective well-being are satisfaction with life as a whole – as a cognitive experience – and happiness – as an affective experience. Measurement of subjective well-being is therefore affected by its multidimensionality, by the influence of life circumstances in the individuals' evaluations of their lives, and by cultural values. Most measures of subjective well-being are based on individuals' self-reports, and although they have their limitations, they have also shown high levels of validity and reliability. There are numerous scales designed to measure subjective well-being, and choosing one scale or another would depend on theoretical and methodological issues. This study has used Inglehart's (1997) "Satisfaction with Life as a Whole Index" (based on Andrews and Withey's [1976] "Life as a Whole Index") and a "happiness" scale to measure levels of subjective well-being in Spain and in the four regions involved in this study.

This thesis suggests that in Spain, the Basque Country, Andalusia, Galicia and Valencia most people are quite happy or very happy. Also most people in Spain and in the regions analysed have reported high levels of satisfaction with life as a whole. Happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole are, as I have pointed out before, core elements of subjective well-being. Thus, the results obtained using the subjective well-being measure reflect the results from the happiness and satisfaction with life as a whole analyses. Most people in Spain and in the regions analysed in this study have reported high levels of subjective well-being. Valencia has reported the highest levels of subjective well-being, followed by the Basque Country, Andalusia and Galicia.

Social capital refers to those relationships between social actors (individuals and organisations) that are supported by norms, sanctions, tolerance, trust, social networks, obligations and expectations, and that enable cooperation towards the achievement of mutual benefit. Social capital is not distributed homogeneously, grows as it is used, and diminishes as its use decreases. As a multidimensional concept, it is important to understand its components (such as social networks, trust, tolerance, cooperation and reciprocity) and outcomes individually, as well as how they are interrelated, in order to identify measuring instruments. Levels of tolerance and trust (interpersonal

and institutional), membership of voluntary associations and attitude towards specific social networks (such as family and friends) are the indicators of social capital used in this study.

Based on the statistical analysis, this study has come to the following conclusions: First, there are some differences between regions of Spain in levels of social capital, but these differences are not large. Second, Spain, the Basque Country, Andalusia, Galicia and Valencia are very tolerant. The most tolerant regions are Andalusia and the Basque Country, while Valencia is the least tolerant.

Third, levels of general trust are very low within Spain and its regions. People in the Basque Country trust others more than people from the other regions analysed, and Valencians less. On the other hand, people in Spain and in the regions analysed in this study do not trust their institutions either. Institutions are more trusted in Andalusia, while institutional distrust is larger in the Basque Country. There is a significant rejection of the Spanish Constitution and Spanish institutions (such as the Spanish government and parliament, the national police and the Armed Forces) by political and social sectors in the Basque Country. Speaking of countries such as Australia, Cox (1995) argues that levels of trust are affected by the political system and the institutions that make up that system. In the case of Spain and its regions, substantial numbers of people have a negative attitude towards those institutions that represent traditional order and authority (such as the police, the Armed Forces, the legal system, etc), an attitude that may have its roots in the sociopolitical events that followed the Spanish Civil War. On the other hand, features that increase dissatisfaction with governments and political systems, such as crime, drug-addiction and unemployment (the last of these being particularly high in Spain in 1995, see Table 7.42) may affect the levels of interpersonal trust as well as levels of trust towards governments and other social institutions (cf. Latham, 1998). Other issues, such as corrupt political behaviour and scandals – in Spain related mainly to parties' finances and/or public servants – may enhance the anti-political and anti-institutional attitude of many Spanish citizens, and therefore diminish overall levels of trust.

It is quite interesting to find that in Spain and its regions there are fairly high levels of tolerance of minorities despite the low levels of general and institutional trust. Cox (1995; 1998) argues that growing levels of trust allow people to develop attitudes of tolerance towards others. However, results from the present study indicate that people may show tolerance towards minorities even when levels of general trust are relatively low. Hollis (1998) suggests that it would be of interest to identify what promotes social cohesion in low trust societies such as Spain, and how public policies and institutions could be shaped to strengthen social cohesion.

Fourth, levels of membership, active and inactive, in voluntary organisations are also extremely low in Spain and the four regions analysed. People in the Basque Country are more engaged in voluntary associations, while Andalusia has the lowest levels of participation of all samples. The sociopolitical situation in the Basque Country may well have had an effect in these results. The last

ten years have seen an emergence of voluntary associations in this region as a reaction against violence. Collective action has become an important way to put pressure on the terrorist band ETA, on those autonomous and national institutions that might become abusive of their power – such as the police – and on those citizens who show apathy about the sociopolitical issues in the Basque Country (Funes, 1998). Overall, Spain has been a country with very low levels of organised collective action after the democratic transition of the seventies (Encarnación, 2001). As suggested by López de Aguilera (1990) the strong separation between the political scene and everyday life that is current in many Western societies has reduced the impact that people have in political decisions. This depoliticisation of people's lives has accompanied increases in individualistic attitudes, decreases in use of public spaces, and rising levels of mistrust towards strangers.

Brehm and Rahn (1997), Cox (1998), Freitag (2003), Latham (1998), Putnam et al. (1993), Stone (2001), and Weiss (1996) support the view that there is a reciprocal relationship between the development of social trust and people's involvement in positive social relationships; thus it is not surprising that with such low levels of trust, collective action in Spain and in the four regions analysed here are so low.

Fifth, social bonds (relationships with family and friends), or what Stone and Hughes (2002) would call "informal relations" are very important in Spain and in the regions analysed in this study. Overall, people in Galicia give more importance than in other regions to family and friends. People in the Basque Country and Valencia also give relatively high importance to family and friends.

This study has already discussed the multidimensionality of social capital, and how some of those dimensions may not necessarily have positive features and outcomes. Social capital can perhaps be categorised as "good" social capital and as "bad" social capital based on its outcomes. However, this is a categorisation that is difficult to make when the research measures elements of social capital using data that have not been designed for that purpose. In the case of social ties (such as family, friends and membership in voluntary organisations), these may act as a form of social control over anti-social behaviour. So, in that way, they constitute "good" social capital. However, they can also limit individual freedoms. Those involved in such ties might be expected to follow various norms in order to benefit from collective action, and this may involve the surrender of some personal power and freedoms. The data used in this study does not provide the kind of information necessary to distinguish clearly between relationships that constitute "good" social capital and those that constitute "bad" social capital. Networks may foster beneficial actions, but they can also constrain actions that would be beneficial to everyone. Some social ties (within the family and within organisations) may nurture mistrust, prejudice, discrimination and segregation, benefiting some of their members but excluding outsiders from the benefits of collective action. The data used in this study do not provide the kind of information that would allow further exploration of this matter. For

example, this study does not analyse participation or belonging to networks that involve organised crime and street gangs, the kind of associations that produce "bad social capital".

Finally, this thesis has tested empirically the view that social factors may have an effect on subjective well-being. Some of the literature on social capital suggests that there is a positive association between the development of trust, tolerance, collective action and subjective well-being.; for example, participation in voluntary associations may play an important role in the pursuit of desired levels of subjective well-being. However, participation and subjective well-being have extremely weak links at best in the samples analysed in this study. Numerous authors have also suggested that there is a relationship between subjective well-being, social ties, such as relationships within the family and friends, interpersonal trust, and tolerance. In the case of social ties, the results obtained from the statistical analysis show that there is actually a positive, but weak, association between social bonds (considering family and friends important) and subjective well-being. On the other hand, subjective well-being and trust (general trust and institutional trust) have very weak associations in most of the samples analysed. Finally, our analysis has found no empirical evidence of an association between subjective well-being and tolerance. Subjective well-being, in the cases of Spain and the regions analysed here, is predicted by financial situation, health status, control over one's life and marital status. Results from this data analysis may suggest that the people who answered the World Values Survey in Spain, Andalusia, Basque Country, Galicia and Valencia have tended to link their subjective well-being to materialist and individualist values (financial situation and personal health) over collectively-oriented values. This may be an explanation for the weak association between subjective well-being and social capital.

## REFERENCES

- Agranoff, R. and J.A. Ramos Gallarín. 1997. "Toward federal democracy in Spain: An examination of intergovernmental relations." *Publius*, 27: 1-38.
- Aguilar, P. 1998. "The memory of the civil war in the transition to democracy: the peculiarity of the Basque case. (Special issue on politics in democratic Spain: No longer different?)". *West European Politics*, 21: 5-25.
- Almond, G., and S. Verba. 1963. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Amodia, J. 1996. "Spain at the polls: The general election of 3 March 1996." *West European Politics*, 19: 813-819.
- Andrews, F., and R. Inglehart. 1979. "The structure of subjective well-being in nine Western societies." *Social Indicators Research*, 6: 73-90.
- Andrews, F., and A. McKennell. 1980 "Measures of self-reported well-being: Their affective, cognitive, and other components." *Social Indicators Research*, 8: 127-155.
- Andrews, F., and J. Robinson. 1991. "Measures of Subjective Well-Being". In J. Robinson, P. Shaver and L. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes* (vol 1, pp. 61-114). San Diego, California: Academic Press Inc.
- Andrews, F., and S. Withey. 1976. *Social Indicators of Well-Being. American's Perceptions of Life Quality*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Arato, A. 1996. "Emergencia, declive y reconstrucción del concepto de sociedad civil. Pautas para análisis futuros." *Isegoria*, 13: 5-17.
- Arendt, H. 1958. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Argyle, M. 1987. *The Psychology of Happiness*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Baker, L., J. Cesa, M. Gatz, and C. Mellins. 1992 "Genetic and environmental influences of positive and negative affect: Support for a two-factor theory." *Psychology and Aging*, 7: 158-163.
- Baum, F., C. Palmer, C. Modra, C. Murray, and R. Bush. 2000. "Families, social capital and health." In I. Winter (Ed.), *Social Capital and Public Policy in Australia* (pp. 250-275). Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.
- Beauchamp, T., and J. Childress. 1989. *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Belk, R. 1985. "Materialism: Trait aspects of living in the material world." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12: 265-280.
- Bell, D. 1998. "Residential Community Associations: Community or Disunity?" In A. Etzioni (Ed.), *The Essential Communitarian Reader* (pp. 167-176). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

- Bellah, R. 1998. "Community Properly Understood: A Defense of 'Democratic Communitarism'". In A. Etzioni (Ed.), *The Essential Communitarian Reader* (pp. 15-19). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Bennett, W. 1998. "The uncivic culture: communication, identity, and the rise of lifestyle politics." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 31:741-761.
- Bernscheid, E., and J. Lopes. 1997. "A Temporal Model of Relationship Satisfaction and Stability". In R. Sternberg and M. Hojjat (Eds.), *Satisfaction in Close Relationships* (pp. 129-159). New York: Guildford Press.
- Biddle, B. 1986. "Recent developments in role theory." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12: 67-92.
- Blau, P. 1964. *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: John Wiley.
- Blishen, B., and T. Atkinson. 1980. "Anglophone and Francophone Differences in Perceptions of the Quality of Life in Canada." In A. Szalai and F. Andrews (Eds.), *The Quality of Life. Comparative Studies* (pp. 25-39). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977a. "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction". In J. Karabel and A. Halsley (Eds.), *Power and Ideology in Education* (pp. 487-511). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977b. *Outline of a Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bradburn, N. 1969. *The Structure of Psychological Well-Being*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Bradburn, N., and D. Caplovitz. 1965. *Reports on Happiness. A Pilot Study of Behavior Related to Mental Health*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Brehm, J., and W. Rahn. 1997. "Individual level evidence for the causes and consequences of social capital." *American Journal of Political Science*, 41: 999-1023.
- Brunstein, J. 1993. "Personal goals and subjective well-being." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65: 1061-1070.
- Burroughs, E., and A. Rindfleisch. 2002. "Materialism and well-being: A conflicting values perspective." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29: 348-370.
- Bush, R., and F. Baum. 2001. "Health, Inequities, Community and Social Capital." In R. Eckersley, J. Dixon and B. Douglas (Eds.), *The Social Origins of Health and Well-Being* (pp. 189-204). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, A. 1981. *The Sense of Well-Being in America. Recent Patterns and Trends*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Campbell, A., P. Converse, and W. Rodgers. 1976. *The Quality of American Life*. New York: Sage.
- Cantril, H. 1965. *The Pattern of Human Concerns*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.



- Carver, C., and M. Scheier. 1990. "Origins and functions of positive and negative affect: A control-process view." *Psychological Review*, 97: 19-35.
- Casado, D. 1990. "Acción voluntaria y responsabilidad política." *Documentación Social*, 80: 171-178.
- Champlin, D. 1997. "Culture, natural law, and the restoration of community." *Journal of Economic Issues*, 31: 575-584.
- Christopher, J. 1999. "Situating psychological well-being: Exploring the cultural roots of its theory and research." *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 77: 141-152.
- Coleman, J. 1973. "Loss of power." *American Sociological Review*, 38: 1-17.
- Coleman, J. 1986a. "Social theory, social research, and a theory of action." *American Journal of Sociology*, 91: 1309-1335.
- Coleman, J. 1986b. *Individual Interests and Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coleman, J. 1988. "Social capital in the creation of human capital." *American Journal of Sociology*, 94: S95-120.
- Colomer, J. M. 1998. "The Spanish 'state of autonomies': non-institutional federalism." *West European Politics*, 21: 40-52.
- Costa, P., and R. McCrae. 1980. "Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: Happy and unhappy people." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38: 668-678.
- Costa, P., and R. McCrae. 1984. "Personality as a Lifelong Determinant of Well-Being." In C. Matatesta and C. Izard (Eds.), *Emotion in Adult Development* (pp. 141-156). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Cox, E. 1995. *A Truly Civil Society*. Sydney: ABC Books.
- Cox, E. 1998. "Measuring Social Capital As Part of Progress and Well-Being." In R. Eckersley (Ed.), *Measuring Progress. Is Life Getting Better?* (pp. 157-167). Collingwood, Victoria: CSIRO Publishing.
- Cummins, R. 2000. "Personal income and subjective well-being: a review." *Journal of Happiness*, 1: 133-58.
- Cummins, R. 2003. "Normative life satisfaction: measurement issues and a homeostatic model." *Social Indicators Research*, 64: 225-256.
- Cummins, R., and H. Nistico. 2002. "Maintaining life satisfaction: The role of positive cognitive bias." *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3: 37-69.
- Dahrendorf, R. 1998. "A Precarious Balance: Economic Opportunity, Civil Society, and Political Liberty." In A. Etzioni (Ed.), *The Essential Communitarian Reader* (pp. 73-94). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

- Davis, J. 1984. "New money, an old man/lady and 'two's company': Subjective welfare in the NORC General Social Surveys, 1972-1982." *Social Indicators Research*, 15: 319-350.
- De Miguel, A. 1997. *Manual del Perfecto Sociologo*. Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- Diener, E. 1984. "Subjective well-being." *Psychological Bulletin*, 95: 542-575.
- Diener, E. 1994. "Assessing subjective well-being: Progress and opportunities." *Social Indicators Research*, 31: 103-157.
- Diener, E., and R. Larsen. 1984. "Temporal stability and cross-situational consistency of positive and negative affect." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47: 871-883.
- Diener, E., E. Suh, and S. Oishi. 1997. "Recent findings on subjective well-being." [On-line] *paper 1.html at s.psych.uiuc.edu*.
- Diener, E., E. Suh, R. Lucas, and H. Smith. 1999. "Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress." *Psychological Bulletin*, 125: 276-302.
- Doyal, L., and I. Gough. 1991. *A Theory of Human Need*. Hampshire: MacMillan Education.
- Eastis, C. 1998. "Organizational diversity and the production of social capital: One of these groups is not like the other." *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 42: 66-77.
- Eckersley, R. 1997. *Perspectives on progress: Is life getting better? A discussion paper on economic growth, quality of life and ecological sustainability* (working paper 97/27). Population-Development-Environment Project. Resource Futures Program. Canberra: CSIRO Wildlife and Ecology.
- Eckersley, R. 2001. "Culture, Health and Well-Being." In R. Eckersley, J. Dixon and B. Douglas (Eds.), *The Social Origins of Health and Well-Being* (pp. 51-70). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, B., and M. Foley. 1998. "Civil society and social capital beyond Putnam." *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 42: 124-139.
- Ellison, C. 1991. "Religious involvement and subjective well-being." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 32: 80-99.
- Emmons, R., and E. Diener. 1985. "Personality correlates of subjective well-being." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 11: 89-97.
- Encarnación, O. 2001. "Civil society and the consolidation of democracy in Spain." *Political Science Quarterly* 116: 53-79.
- Entrena, F., and J. Gómez-Mateos. 2000. "Globalization and socio-economic restructuring in Andalusia. Challenges and possible alternatives." *European Sociological Review* 16: 93-114.
- Etzioni, A. 1995. "Old Chestnuts and New Spurs." In A. Etzioni (Ed), *New Communitarian Thinking. Persons, Virtues, Institutions, and Communities* (pp. 16-34). Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia.

- Etzioni, A. 1998. "A Matter of Balance, Rights and Responsibilities." In A. Etzioni (Ed.), *The Essential Communitarian Reader* (pp. ix-xxiv). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Foley, M., and B. Edwards. 1998. "Beyond Tocqueville: Civil society and social capital in comparative perspective." *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 42: 5-20
- Freitag, M. 2003. "Beyond Tocqueville: The origins of social capital in Switzerland." *European Sociological Review*, 19: 217-232.
- Fukuyama, F. 1995. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: Free Press.
- Funes, M. J. 1998. "Social responses to political violence in the Basque country: Peace movements and their audience." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42: 493-510.
- George, L. 1981. "Subjective Well-Being: Conceptual and Methodological Issues." *Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 2: 345-382.
- González Sánchez, M., and B. Mena Merchán. 1990. "Práctica participativa y comunidad social." *Documentación Social*, 80: 201-206.
- Granovetter, M. 1985. "Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness." *American Journal of Sociology*, 91: 481-510.
- Gregory, R. 1999. "Social capital theory and administrative reform: Maintaining ethical probity in public service." *Public Administration Review*, 59: 63-71.
- Grew, R. 1999. "Finding social capital: The French Revolution in Italy." *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 29: 407-433.
- Grotatert, C. 1998. "Social Capital: The missing link?" *Social Capital Initiative*. Working Paper No. 3. The World Bank. Social Development Family. Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Network. <http://www.inform.umd.edu/EdRes/Colleges/BSOS/Depts/IRIS>.
- Grootaert, C. and T. Van Bastelaer. 2001. "Understanding and measuring social capital: A synthesis of findings and recommendations from the Social Capital Initiative." *Social Capital Initiative*. Working Paper No. 24. The World Bank. <http://www.inform.umd.edu/EdRes/Colleges/BSOS/Depts/IRIS/IRIS/docs/sci24.pdf>.
- Guerra, R. 1996. "Participación, ciudadanía y democracia: ¿Hacia el tercer sistema?" *Isegoria*, 13: 162-169.
- Hagedorn, J. 1996. "Happiness and self-deception: An old question examined by a new measure of subjective well-being." *Social Indicators Research*, 38: 139-160.
- Hall, P. 2003. "El capital social en Gran Bretaña". In R. Putnam. (Ed.), *El Declive del Capital Social. Un Estudio Internacional Sobre las Sociedades y el Sentido Comunitario*. (pp. 35-92). Barcelona: Galaxia Gutenberg, Circulo de Lectores.
- Hamann, K. 1999. "Federalist institutions, voting behavior, and party systems in Spain." *Publius*, 29: 111-137.

Hamburg, D., G. Elliot, and D. Parron. (Eds.). 1982. *Health and Behaviour: Frontiers of Research in the Biobehavioral Sciences*. Washington: National Academy Press.

Hanifan, L. (1916). "The rural school community centre." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 67: 130-138.

Hankis, E. 1980. "Structural Variables in Cross-Cultural Research on the Quality of Life." In A. Szalai and F. Andrews (Eds.), *The Quality of Life. Comparative Studies* (pp. 41-56). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Hayek, F. 1960. *The Constitution of Liberty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Headey, B. 1993. "An economic model of subjective well-being: Integrating economic and psychological theories." *Social Indicators Research*, 28: 97-116.

Headey, B., E. Holmstrom., and A. Wearing. 1985. "Models of well-being and ill-being." *Social Indicators Research*, 17: 211-234.

Headey, B., and A. Wearing. 1989. "Personality, life events, and subjective well-being: Toward a dynamic equilibrium model." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57: 731-739.

Headey, B., and A. Wearing. 1992. *Understanding Happiness: A Theory of Subjective Well-Being*. Sydney: Longman Cheshire.

Herbert, C., and J. Milsum. 1990. *Measuring Health: The Documentation and Evaluation of Measurement Procedures Currently Used to Measure Well-Being*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Hollis, M. 1998. *Trust Within Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hosen, R., D. Solovey-Hosen, and L. Stern. 2003. "Education and capital development: Capital as durable personal, social, economic and political influences on the happiness of individuals." *Education*, 123: 496-513.

Hyppä, M. and J. Mäki. 2003. "Social participation and health in a community rich in stock of social capital." *Health Education Research*, 18: 770-779.

Inglehart, R. 1990. *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R. 1997. *Modernization and Postmodernization. Cultural, Economic and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Inkeles, A., and L. Diamond. 1980. "Personal Development and National Development. A Cross-National Perspective." In A. Szalai and F. Andrews (Eds.), *The Quality of Life. Comparative Studies* (pp. 73-110). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE), 1996. *Spain in Figures 1996*. Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE).

Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE). 1997. *Anuario Estadístico de España, 1997*. Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE).

- Jacobs, S., and Willits, F. 1994. "Objective and subjective indicators of community evaluation: A Pennsylvania Assessment." *Social Indicators Research*, 32: 161-177.
- Junta Electoral Central (2002). <http://www.congreso.es>. Ministerio del Interior.
- Kaplan, R., and J. Anderson. 1988. "A general health policy model: Update and applications." *Health Services Research*, 23: 203-235.
- Kasser, T., and R. Ryan. 1993. "A dark side of the American dream: Correlates of financial success as a central life aspiration." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65: 410-422.
- Kasser, T., and R. Ryan. 1996. "Further examining the American dream: Differential correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic goals." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22: 280-287.
- Kawachi, I., B. Kennedy, K. Lochner, and D. Prothrow-Stith. 1997. "Social capital, income inequality, and mortality." *American Journal of Public Health*, 87: 14191-14198.
- Keane, J. 1998. *Civil Society. Old Images, New Visions*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Keating, M. 2001. "Rethinking the region: Culture, institutions and economic development in Catalonia and Galicia." *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 8: 217-34.
- Kenworthy, L. 1997. "Civic engagement, social capital, and economic cooperation." *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 40: 645-656.
- Kilpatrick, S. 2002. "Learning and building social capital in a community of family farm business." *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 21: 446-461.
- Knoke, D. 1986. "Associations and interest groups." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12: 1-21.
- Kobasa, S. 1979. "Stressful life events, personality and health: An inquiry into hardiness." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37: 1-11.
- Lancaster, T. 1994. "A new phase for Spanish democracy? The general election of June 1993." *West European Politics*, 17: 183-190.
- Lappe, F., and P. Du Bois. 1997. "Building social capital without looking backward." *National Civic Review*, 86: 119-128.
- Larson, J. 1993. "The measurement of social well-being." *Social Indicators Research*, 28: 285-296.
- Larson, J. 1996. "The World Health Organization's definition of health: Social versus spiritual health." *Social Indicators Research*, 38: 181-192.
- Latham, M. 1998. *Civilising Global Capital. New Thinking for Australian Labor*. St. Leonards: Allen & Unwin.
- Latham, M. 2000. "If only men were angels." In I. Winter (Ed.), *Social Capital and Public Policy in Australia* (pp. 192-224). Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.
- Lawrence, R., and J. Liang. 1988. "Structural integration of the Affect Balance Scale and the Life Satisfaction Index A: Race, sex, and age differences." *Psychology and Aging*, 3: 375-384.

- Lawton, M. 1983. "The varieties of well-being." *Experimental Aging Research*, 9: 65-72.
- Lawton, M. 1997. "Measures of quality of life and subjective well-being." *Generations*, 21: 45-48.
- Lawton, M., M. Kleban, and E. Di Carlo. 1984. "Psychological well-being in the aged: Factorial and conceptual dimensions." *Research on Aging*, 6: 67-97.
- Linz, J. 1988. "Política e Intereses a lo Largo de un Siglo en España," 1880-1980. In M. Pérez Iruela. and S. Giner (Eds.), *El Corporativismo en España* (pp. 69-112). Barcelona: Ariel.
- Locke, J. 1663. *Essays on the Law of Nature*. (1954 W. von Leyden Ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- López de Aguilera, I. 1990. "Estado, sociedad civil y procesos de participación." *Documentación Social*, 80: 11-51.
- Martín, P. 1990. "Responsabilidad pública y participación social." *Documentación Social*, 80: 123-130.
- Martínez Navarro, E. 1990. "Autonomía y solidaridad para una democracia participativa." *Documentación Social*, 80: 69-94.
- Maslow, A. 1970. *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- McDonough, P., S. Barnes., and A. López Piña. 1998. *The Cultural Dynamics of Democratization in Spain*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- McMichael, C, and L. Manderson. 2004. "Somali women and well-being: social networks and social capital among immigrant women in Australia." *Human Organisation*, 63: 88-99.
- Memmott, P. and A. Meltzer 2003. "Modelling social capital in a remote Australian indigenous community." In A. Dale and J. Onyx (Eds.) *A Dynamic Balance: Social Capital and Sustainable Community Development*. (pp. 105-126). Vancouver, UBC Press.
- Mena Merchán, B. 1990. "Participación social y desarrollo comunitario." *Documentación Social*, 80: 207-218.
- Michalos, A. 1980. "Satisfaction and happiness." *Social Indicators Research*, 8: 385-422.
- Miranda, M.J, and J. Villanueva. 1983. "Condiciones de vida: Expectativas para un cambio." *Alfoz*, 2: 42-47.
- Molins, J.M., and A. Casademunt. 1998. "Pressure groups and the articulation of interests." *West European Politics*, 21: 124-146.
- Montero, J.R. 1998. "Stabilising the democratic order: electoral behaviour in Spain." *West European Politics*, 21: 53-79.
- Moreno, L. 1997. "Federalization and ethnoterritorial concurrence in Spain." *Publius*, 27: 65-84.

- Moreno, L. 1998. "Ethnoterritorial concurrence in plural societies: The Spanish Comunidades Autónomas. *Instituto de Estudios Sociales Avanzados (CSIC), Working Paper 98-06*. <http://www.iesam.csic.es/doctrab/dt-9806.htm>. Revised version of the paper presented at the conference In Search of Justice and Stability: Liberal Justice and Political Stability in Multinational Societies, 26-28 March 1998, Mc Gill University, Group of Research on Multinational States, North Hatley, Quebec, Canada. Published in A. Gagnon and J. Tully (Eds.), *Multinational Democracies* (pp. 201-221). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Moreno, L. 1999. "La 'vía' media española del régimen de bienestar mediterráneo." *Unidad de Políticas Comparadas (CSIC) Documento de Trabajo 99-05*:<http://www.iesam.csic.es/doctrab/dt-9905.htm>. Published in *Papers, Revista de Sociología*, 63-64: 67- 82 (2001).
- Moxley, R., and C. Proctor. 1995. "Community solidarity, political competitiveness, and social rigidity: Relationships with social and health services." *Rural Sociology*, 60: 310-322.
- Muldoon, M., S. Barger, J. Flory, and S. Manuck. 1998. "What are quality of life measurements measuring?" *British Medical Journal (International Edition)*, 316: 542-545.
- Muller, E, and M. Seligson. 1994. "Civic culture and democracy: The question of causal relationship." *American Political Science Review*, 88: 635-652.
- Myers, D. and E. Diener. 1995. "Who is happy?" *Psychological Science*, 6: 10-19.
- Myers, D., and E. Diener. 1997. "The science of happiness." *The Futurist*, 31: S1-7.
- Norris, P. 1996. "Does television erode social capital? A reply to Putnam." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 29: 474-480.
- North, D. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oaks, D. 1998. "Rights and Responsibilities." In A. Etzioni (Ed.), *The Essential Communitarian Reader* (pp. 97-105). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- O'Connell, M. 2003. "Anti 'social capital'. Civic values versus economic equality in the EU." *European Sociological Review*, 19: 241-248.
- Oishi, S., E. Diener, R. Lucas, and E. Suh. 1999. "Cross-cultural variations in predictors of life satisfaction: Perspectives from needs and values." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 25: 980-990.
- Oliver, P. 1984. "Active and token contributors to local collective action." *American Sociological Review*, 49: 601-610.
- Olson, M. 1982. *The Rise and Decline of Nations: Economic Growth, Stagflation, and Social Rigidities*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Onyx, J. and P. Bullen. 2000. "Measuring social capital in five communities." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 36: 23-42.
- Pallarés, F. and M. Keating. 2003. "Multi-level electoral competition. Regional elections and party systems in Spain." *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 10: 239-55.

- Paramio, L. 1998. "Sin confianza no hay democracia: electores e identidades políticas." *Instituto de Estudios Sociales Avanzados (CSIC)*. Documento de Trabajo 9. <http://www.iesam.csic.es/doctrab/dt-9803.htm>.
- Paramio, L. 2000. "Democracia y ciudadanía en el tiempo de los medios audiovisuales." *Unidad de Políticas Comparadas (CSIC)* Documento de Trabajo 00-07. <http://www.iesam.csic.es/doctrab/dt-0007.htm>.
- Patulny, R. 2004. "Social capital norms: Networks and practices – a critical evaluation." *Social Policy Research Centre (SPRC)*. Discussion Paper No. 134. University of New South Wales.
- Pérez-Díaz, V. 1986. "Economic policies and social pacts in Spain during the transition: The two faces of neo-corporatism." *European Sociological Review* 2: 1-19.
- Pérez-Díaz, V. 1995. "La sociedad civil como posibilidad." *Claves de la Razón Práctica*, 50: 16-29.
- Pérez-Díaz, V. 1996a. *España Puesta a Prueba. 1976-1996*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Pérez-Díaz, V. 1996b. "Sociedad civil: Una interpretación y una trayectoria." *Isegoria*, 13: 19-38.
- Pérez-Díaz, V. 1998. *The Return of Civil Society. The Emergence of Democratic Spain*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pérez-Díaz, V. 2003. "De la guerra civil a la sociedad civil: el capital social en España entre los años treinta y los años noventa del siglo XX." In R. Putnam (Ed), *El Declive del Capital Social. Un Estudio Internacional Sobre las Sociedades y el Sentido Comunitario*. (pp. 427-489). Barcelona: Galaxia Gutenberg, Círculo de Lectores.
- Portela Maseda, M., and I. Neira Gómez. 2003. "Capital social: las relaciones sociales afectan al desarrollo." *Colección de Documentos*. Tema 3: el desarrollo y sus dimensiones. Documento No. 106: 1-25. [http://www.iigov.org/documentos/?p=3\\_0106](http://www.iigov.org/documentos/?p=3_0106).
- Portes, A. 1998. "Social capital: its origins and applications in modern sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24: 1-24.
- Portes, A., and P. Landolt. 1996. "The downside of social capital." *The American Prospect*, 26: 18-21.
- Portes, A., and J. Sensenbrenner. 1993. "Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action." *American Journal of Sociology*, 98:1320-1350.
- Pusey, M. 1998. "Incomes, Standards of Living and Quality of Life. Preliminary Findings from the Middle Australia Project." In R. Eckersley (Ed.), *Measuring Progress. Is Life Getting Better?* (pp.183-197). Collinwood, Victoria: CSIRO Publishing.
- Putnam, R. 1993. "The prosperous community. Social capital and public life." <http://epn.org/prospect/13/13putn.html>.
- Putnam, R. 1995. "Bowling alone: America's declining social capital." *Journal of Democracy*, 6: 65-78.
- Putnam, R. 1996. "The strange disappearance of civic America." <http://epn.org/prospect/24/24putn.html>.



- Putnam, R. and K. Goss (2003). "Introducción." In R. Putnam. (Ed.), *El Declive del Capital Social. Un Estudio Internacional Sobre las Sociedades y el Sentido Comunitario*. (pp.7-33). Barcelona: Galaxia Gutenberg, Círculo de Lectores.
- Putnam, R., R. Leonardi,, and R. Nanetti. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Pye, L. 1999. "Civility, social capital, and civil society: Three powerful concepts for explaining Asia. Patterns of social capital: Stability and change in comparative perspective. Part 2." *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 29: 763-772.
- Radcliff, B. 2001. "Politics, markets, and life satisfaction: The political economy of human happiness." *The American Political Science Review*, 95: 939-952.
- Rapley, M, and L. Hoggood. 1997. "Quality of life in a community-based service in rural Australia." *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 22: 125-141.
- Rawls, J. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, Massachussets: Harvard University Press.
- Reform Group on Welfare Reform (The). 2000. *Participation Support for a More Equitable Society*. Canberra: The Reform Group on Welfare Reform.
- Requena Santos, F. 1994. "Redes de amistad, felicidad y familia." *Reis*, 66: 73-89.
- Richins, M., and S. Dawson. 1992. "A consumer values orientation for materialism and its measurement: Scale development and validation." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19: 303-316.
- Rico, A., M. Fraile, and P. González. 1998. "Regional decentralisation of health policy in Spain: Social capital does not tell the whole story." *West European Politics*, 21: 180-192.
- Rivera, J.A. 1996. "Por qué existe el Estado y no mas bien la anarquía? (El anarco-comunitarismo de Michael Taylor). *Isegoria*, 13: 59-98.
- Rodríguez Villasante, T. 1990. "Alternativas para un voluntariado activo." *Documentación Social*, 80: 179-200.
- Rodríguez Villasante, T. 1995. *Las Democracias Participativas. De la Participación Ciudadana a las Alternativas de Sociedad*. Madrid: Ediciones HOAC.
- Roher Institute (The). 1993. *Social Well-Being. A Paradigm for Reform*. North York, Ontario: The Roher Institute.
- Rorty, R. 1998. *Truth and Progress* (vol. 3). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ryan, R., K. Sheldon, T. Kasser, and E. Deci. 1996. All goals are not created equal: An organismic perspective on the nature of goals and their regulation. In P. Gollwitzer and J. Bargh (Eds.), *The Psychology of Action: Linking Cognition and Motivation to Behavior* (pp. 7-47). New York: Guildford Press.
- Ryff, C. 1989. "Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57: 1069-1081.

- Salvaris, M. 1998. "Citizenship and Progress." In R. Eckersley (Ed.), *Measuring Progress. Is Life Getting Better?* (pp. 3-20). Collingwood, Victoria: CSIRO Publishing.
- Santacreu Soler, J.M. and M. García Andreu. 2002. *La Transició Democràtica al País Valencià*. Simat de la Vall: La Xara Edicions.
- Saunders, P. 1996. "Income, health and happiness." *Australian Economic Review*, 29: 353-66.
- Schultz, T. 1977. "Investment in Human Capital." In J. Karabel and A. Halsey (Eds.) *Power and Ideology in Education* (pp. 313-324). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Selznick, P. 1998. "Social Justice: A Communitarian Perspective". In A. Etzioni (Ed), *The Essential Communitarian Reader* (pp. 61-71). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Sen, A. 1992. *Inequality Reexamined*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Smith, T. 1979. "Happiness: Time trends, seasonal variations, intersurvey differences, and other mysteries." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 42: 18-30.
- Smith, J. 1998. "Global civil society? Transnational social movement organizations and social capital." *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 42: 93-107.
- Smith, M., L. Beaulieu, and A. Seraphine. 1995. "Social capital, place of residence, and college attendance." *Rural Sociology*, 60: 363-380.
- Spragens, T Jr. 1995. "Communitarian Liberalism." In A. Etzioni (Ed), *New Communitarian Thinking. Persons, Virtues, Institutions, and Communities* (pp. 37-51). Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia.
- Stack, S., and J. Eshleman. 1998. "Marital status and happiness: A 17-nation study." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60: 527-36.
- Stolle, D., and T. Rochon. 1998. "Are all associations alike? Member diversity, associational type, and the creation of social capital." *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 42: 47-65.
- Stone, W. 2000. "Social Capital, Social Cohesion and Social Security." Paper presented at *The Year 2000 International Research Conference on Social Security*. Helsinki, Finland.
- Stone, W. 2001. "Measuring social capital: Towards a theoretical informed measurement framework for researching social capital in family and community life." *Australian Institute of Family Studies*. Research Paper No 24: 1-38. <http://www.aifs.org.au/institute/pubs/RP24.pdf>.
- Stone, W., and J. Hughes. 2002. "Social capital: Empirical meaning and measurement validity." *Australian Institute of Family Studies*. Research Paper No 27:1-64.<http://www.aifs.org.au/institute/pubs/RP27.pdf>.
- Sullivan, W. 1995. "Institutions as the Infrastructure of Democracy." In A. Etzioni (Ed.), *New Communitarian Thinking. Persons, Virtues, Institutions, and Communities* (pp. 170-180). Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia.
- Swank, D. 1996. "Culture, institutions, and economic growth: Theory, recent evidence, and the role of communitarian polities." *American Journal of Political Science*, 40: 660-679.

- Szalai, A. 1980. "The Meaning of Comparative Research on the Quality of Life." In A. Szalai and F. Andrews (Eds.), *The Quality of Life. Comparative Studies* (pp. 7-21). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Tilly, C. 1984. "Social Movements and National Politics." In C. Bright and S. Harding (Eds.), *Statemaking and Social Movements: Essays in History and Theory* (pp. 297-317). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Tocqueville, A (de). 1835-1840. *La Democracia en América*. Madrid: Orbis (1985).
- Uslaner, E. 1999. "Morality Plays: Social Capital and Moral Behaviour in Anglo-American Democracies." In J. Van Deth, M. Maraffi, K. Newton, and P. Whiteley (Eds.), *Social Capital and European Democracy* (pp. 213-239). London: Routledge.
- Valenzuela, A., and S. Dornbusch. 1994. "Familism and social capital in the academic achievement of Mexican origin and Anglo adolescents." *Social Science Quarterly*, 75: 18-36.
- Vallespín, F. 1996. "Sociedad civil y <<crisis de la política>>". *Isegoría*, 13: 39-58.
- Veenhoven, R. 1984. *Conditions of Happiness*. Dordrecht, Holland: Reidel.
- Veenhoven, R. 1992. *Happiness in Nations; Subjective Appreciation of Life in 56 Nations, 1946-1992*. Rotterdam: Risbo, Erasmus University. ftp.eur.nl/pub/database.happiness/nations.zip
- Veenhoven, R. 1994a. *Correlates of Happiness; 7836 Findings from 603 Studies in 69 Nations 1911-1994*. Rotterdam: Risbo, Erasmus University. ftp.eur.nl/pub/database.happiness/correlat.zip.
- Veenhoven, R. 1994b. "Is happiness a trait? Tests of the theory that a better society does not make people any happier." *Social Indicators Research*, 32: 101-160.
- Veenhoven, R. 1996. "Developments in satisfaction-research." *Social Indicators Research*, 37: 1-46.
- Veenhoven, R. 1998. "Quality of life in individualistic society. A comparison of 43 nations in the early 1990's." In *International Conference of Sociology*. Montreal, Canada.
- Verba, S., K. Schlozman, and H. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Volunteerism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vidal-Beneyto, J. 2004. "The construction of collective memory: from Franco to Democracy." *Diogenes*, 201: 17-26.
- Wall, E., G. Ferrazzi, and F. Schryer. 1998. "Getting the goods on social capital." *Rural Sociology*, 63: 300-22.
- Wallis, A. 1998. "Social capital and community building. Building healthier communities. Ten years of learning (part 2)." *National Civic Review*, 87: 317-336.
- Wallis A., J. Crocker, and B. Schechter. 1998. "Social capital and community building: Part one." *National Civic Review*, 87: 253-271.

- Walzer, M. 1995. "The Communitarian Critique of Liberalism." In A. Etzioni (Ed) *New Communitarian Thinking. Persons, Virtues, Institutions, and Communities*, (pp. 52-70). Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia.
- Weil, F. 1989. "The sources and structure of legitimation in Western democracies: A consolidated model tested with time-series data in six countries since World War II." *American Sociological Review*, 54: 682-706.
- Weisberg, J. 1996. *In Defense of Government. The Fall and Rise of Public Trust*. New York: Scribner.
- Weiss, D. 1996. *Towards a Theory on the Formation of Social Capital*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Minnesota.
- World Bank Group. 2002. *Social Capital for Development*. The World Bank, Washington. <http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/scapital/Schowmeas1.htm>.
- Yamagishi, T, and M. Yamagishi. 1994. "Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan." *Motivation and Emotion*, 18: 129-166.
- Youniss, J., J. McLellan, and M. Yates. 1997. "What we know about engendering civic identity." *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 40: 620-631.

## APPENDICES

## Appendix A. List of Tables

	Page
Table 2.1	22
Distribution of votes and seats in the Congress (Lower House), general elections, 3 <sup>rd</sup> of March 1996.	
Table 6.1	84
Age and gender distribution in Galicia and Valencia.	
Table 7.1	94
Levels of happiness (% by age).	
Table 7.2	95
Happiness (means).	
Table 7.3	96
T-tests comparing means for levels of happiness in each sample.	
Table 7.4	96
Happiness Index: High happiness % minus low happiness %.	
Table 7.5	99
Happiness. The influence of expected predictors. Model I. Total cases.	
Table 7.6	99
Happiness. The influence of expected predictors. Model II. Total cases.	
Table 7.7	100
Happiness. The influence of expected predictors. Spain.	
Table 7.8	101
Happiness. The influence of expected predictors. Basque Country.	
Table 7.9	102
Happiness. The influence of expected predictors. Andalusia.	
Table 7.10	102
Happiness. The influence of expected predictors. Galicia.	
Table 7.11	103
Happiness. The influence of expected predictors. Valencia.	
Table 7.12	105
Levels of satisfaction with life as a whole (% by age).	
Table 7.13	106
Satisfaction with life as a whole (means).	
Table 7.14	106
T-tests comparing means for levels of satisfaction with life as a whole in each sample.	
Table 7.15	107
Life Satisfaction Index: High life satisfaction % minus low life satisfaction %.	
Table 7.16	110
Satisfaction with life as a whole. The influence of expected predictors. Total cases.	
Table 7.17	111
Satisfaction with life as a whole. The influence of expected predictors. Spain.	
Table 7.18	112
Satisfaction with life as a whole. The influence of expected predictors. Basque Country.	
Table 7.19	113
Satisfaction with life as a whole. The influence of expected predictors. Andalusia.	
Table 7.20	113
Satisfaction with life as a whole. The influence of expected predictors. Galicia.	
Table 7.21	114
Satisfaction with life as a whole. The influence of expected predictors. Valencia.	
Table 7.22	116
Inglehart's Subjective Well-Being Index for national and regional samples	
Table 7.23	117
Inglehart's Subjective Well-Being Index for regional sub-samples within the national sample	
Table 7.24	118
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index.	
Table 7.25	118
T-tests comparing means of Individual Subjective Well-Being Index in each sample.	

	Page	
Table 7.26	Average earnings per worker and month (4 <sup>th</sup> quarter of 1995) in industry and services in Spain and regions.	120
Table 7.27	Subjective well-being. The influence of expected predictors. Total cases.	123
Table 7.28	Subjective well-being. The influence of expected predictors. Spain.	124
Table 7.29	Subjective well-being. The influence of expected predictors. Basque Country.	125
Table 7.30	Subjective well-being. The influence of expected predictors. Andalusia.	126
Table 7.31	Subjective well-being. The influence of expected predictors. Galicia.	127
Table 7.32	Subjective well-being. The influence of expected predictors. Valencia.	128
Table 7.33	Tolerance Index (means).	130
Table 7.34	T-Tests comparing means for levels of tolerance in each sample	130
Table 7.35	Regional Tolerance Index (means) from Spanish national sample.	131
Table 7.36	Tolerance. The influence of expected predictors. Total cases.	134
Table 7.37	Tolerance. The influence of expected predictors. Spain.	135
Table 7.38	Tolerance. The influence of expected predictors. Basque Country.	136
Table 7.39	Tolerance. The influence of expected predictors. Andalusia.	137
Table 7.40	Tolerance. The influence of expected predictors. Galicia.	138
Table 7.41	Tolerance. The influence of expected predictors. Valencia.	139
Table 7.42	Unemployment (%) Spain and regions 1995.	140
Table 7.43	Unemployment (%) Spain and Europe 1995.	141
Table 7.44	Political inclination (V123) (means).	141
Table 7.45	General trust (% by age).	143
Table 7.46	General trust (means).	144
Table 7.47	T-tests comparing means for levels of general trust in each sample.	144
Table 7.48	Regional general trust: percentages and means.	146
Table 7.49	Age and gender distribution in regions (%).	147
Table 7.50	General trust. The influence of expected predictors. Total cases.	149
Table 7.51	General trust. The influence of expected predictors. Spain.	150
Table 7.52	General trust. The influence of expected predictors. Basque Country.	151
Table 7.53	General trust. The influence of expected predictors. Andalusia.	152
Table 7.54	General trust. The influence of expected predictors. Galicia.	153
Table 7.55	General trust. The influence of expected predictors. Valencia.	154
Table 7.56	Confidence in organisations: percentages and means. Total cases.	156
Table 7.57	Confidence in organisations: percentages and means. Spain.	157
Table 7.58	Confidence in organisations: percentages and means. Basque Country.	158
Table 7.59	Confidence in organisations: percentages and means. Andalusia.	159

	Page
Table 7.60	Confidence in organisations: percentages and means. Galicia. 160
Table 7.61	Confidence in organisations: percentages and means. Valencia. 161
Table 7.62	Levels of Trust in Institutions Index (means). 162
Table 7.63	T-tests comparing means of Levels of Trust in Institutions Index in each sample. 163
Table 7.64	Trust in institutions. The influence of expected predictors. Total cases. 165
Table 7.65	Trust in institutions. The influence of expected predictors. Spain. 166
Table 7.66	Trust in institutions. The influence of expected predictors. Basque Country. 167
Table 7.67	Trust in institutions. The influence of expected predictors. Andalusia. 168
Table 7.68	Trust in institutions. The influence of expected predictors. Galicia. 169
Table 7.69	Trust in institutions. The influence of expected predictors. Valencia. 170
Table 7.70	Participation in voluntary associations: percentages and means. Total cases. 172
Table 7.71	Participation in voluntary associations: percentages and means. Spain. 173
Table 7.72	Participation in voluntary associations: percentages and means. Basque Country. 175
Table 7.73	Participation in voluntary associations: percentages and means. Andalusia. 176
Table 7.74	Participation in voluntary associations: percentages and means. Galicia. 177
Table 7.75	Participation in voluntary associations: percentages and means. Valencia. 178
Table 7.76	Total Association Index (means). 180
Table 7.77	T-tests comparing means of Total Association Index in each sample. 180
Table 7.78	Participation in voluntary associations. The influence of expected predictors. Total cases. 182
Table 7.79	Participation in voluntary associations. The influence of expected predictors. Spain. 183
Table 7.80	Participation in voluntary associations. The influence of expected predictors. Basque Country. 184
Table 7.81	Participation in voluntary associations. The influence of expected predictors. Andalusia. 185
Table 7.82	Participation in voluntary associations. The influence of expected predictors. Galicia. 186
Table 7.83	Participation in voluntary associations. The influence of expected predictors. Valencia. 187
Table 7.84	Importance of family (%). 189
Table 7.85	Types of households (%). 190
Table 7.86	T-tests comparing means of importance of family in each sample. 190
Table 7.87	Importance of family. The influence of expected predictors. Total cases. 192
Table 7.88	Importance of family. The influence of expected predictors. Spain. 193



	Page	
Table 7.89	Importance of family. The influence of expected predictors. Basque Country.	194
Table 7.90	Importance of family. The influence of expected predictors. Andalusia.	195
Table 7.91	Importance of family. The influence of expected predictors. Galicia.	196
Table 7.92	Importance of family. The influence of expected predictors. Valencia.	197
Table 7.93	Importance of friends (%).	198
Table 7.94	T-tests comparing means of importance of friends in each sample.	199
Table 7.95	Importance of friends. The influence of expected predictors. Total cases.	201
Table 7.96	Importance of friends. The influence of expected predictors. Spain.	202
Table 7.97	Importance of friends. The influence of expected predictors. Basque Country.	203
Table 7.98	Importance of friends. The influence of expected predictors. Andalusia.	204
Table 7.99	Importance of friends. The influence of expected predictors. Galicia.	205
Table 7.100	Importance of friends. The influence of expected predictors. Valencia.	206
Table 7.101	Importance of Social Bonds Index (means).	207
Table 7.102	T-tests comparing means of Social Bonds Index in each sample.	208
Table 7.103	Social bonds. The influence of expected predictors. Total cases.	210
Table 7.104	Social bonds. The influence of expected predictors. Spain.	211
Table 7.105	Social bonds. The influence of expected predictors. Basque Country.	212
Table 7.106	Social bonds. The influence of expected predictors. Andalusia.	213
Table 7.107	Social bonds. The influence of expected predictors. Galicia.	214
Table 7.108	Social bonds. The influence of expected predictors. Valencia.	215
Table C.1	Distribution of votes and seats in the Congress (Lower House), general elections, 15 <sup>th</sup> of June 1977.	246
Table C.2	Distribution of votes and seats in the Congress (Lower House), general elections, 1 <sup>st</sup> of March 1979.	247
Table C.3	Distribution of votes and seats in the Congress (Lower House), general elections, 28 <sup>th</sup> of October 1982.	248
Table C.4	Distribution of votes and seats in the Congress (Lower House), general elections, 22 <sup>nd</sup> of June 1986.	249
Table C.5	Distribution of votes and seats in the Congress (Lower House), general elections, 29 <sup>th</sup> of October 1989.	250
Table C.6	Distribution of votes and seats in the Congress (Lower House), general elections, 6 <sup>th</sup> of June 1993.	251
Table C.7	Distribution of votes and seats in the Congress (Lower House), general elections, 12 <sup>th</sup> of March 2000.	252
Table C.8	Distribution of votes and seats in the Congress (Lower House), general elections, 14 <sup>th</sup> of March 2004.	253
Table D.1	Correlations between happiness and other variables from WVS 1995-1996.	254

		Page
Table D.2	Correlations between life satisfaction and other variables from WVS 1995-1996.	260
Table D.3	Correlations between Individual Subjective Well-Being and other variables from WVS 1995-1996.	266
Table E.1	Correlations between Tolerance Index and other variables from WVS 1995-1996.	272
Table E.2	Correlations between general trust and other variables from WVS 1995-1996.	279
Table E.3	Correlations between Levels of Trust in Institutions Index and other variables from WVS 1995-1996.	286
Table E.4	Correlations between Total Association Index and other variables from WVS 1995-1996.	294
Table E.5	Correlations between importance of family and other variables from WVS 1995-1996.	301
Table E.6	Correlations between importance of friends and other variables from WVS 1995-1996.	308
Table E.7	Correlations between Importance of Social Bonds Index and other variables from WVS 1995-1996.	315

## Appendix B. List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ABS	Affect Balance Score
BNG	Bloque Nacionalista Galego = Galician Nationalist Bloc
CC	Coalición Canaria = Canary Coalition
CIU	Convergencia I Unió = Convergence and Union
ETA	Euskadi Ta Askatasuna = Basque Country and Freedom
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GRAPO	Grupo Revolucionario Antifascista Primero de Octubre = Antifascist Revolutionary Group First of October
HB	Herri Batasuna = People United
INE	Instituto Nacional de Estadística = National Institute of Statistic
NAS	Negative affect Score
NSWPs	Non-Statewide Parties
PAS	Positive Affect Score
PCBs	Positive Cognitive Biases
PNV	Partido Nacionalista Vasco = Nationalist Basque Party
PP	Partido Popular = Popular Party
PSOE	Partido Socialista Obrero Español = Spanish Socialist Workers Party
SCI	Social Capital Initiative
SWB	Subjective Well-Being
WVS	World Values Survey

## Appendix C. Electoral Results Spanish General Elections

Table C.1

*Distribution of Votes and Seats in the Congress (Lower House). General Elections, 15<sup>th</sup> of June 1977*

Party or Coalition of Parties	Votes	(% )*	Seats	(%)
Unión de Centro Democrático (UCD)	6,309,517	34.52	165	47.14
Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE)	4,467,745	24.44	103	29.43
Alianza Popular (AP)	1,471,527	8.05	16	4.57
Partido Comunista de España (PCE)	1,150,774	6.30	12	3.43
Socialistes de Catalunya (PSC-PSOE)	870,362	4.76	15	4.29
Partido Socialista Popular - Unidad Socialista (PSP-US)	816,754	4.47	6	1.71
Partit Socialista Unificat de Catalunya (PSUC)	561,132	3.07	8	2.29
Pacte Democràtic per Catalunya (PDC)	514,647	2.82	11	3.14
Partido Nacionalista Vasco (PNV)	296,193	1.62	8	2.29
Coalición Electoral Unió del Centro i la Democracia Cristiana de Catalunya (UDC-CD)	172,791	0.95	2	0.57
Esquerra de Catalunya - Front Electoral Democratic (EC-FED)	143,954	0.79	1	0.29
Candidatura Independiente del Centro (CIC)	67,017	0.37	2	0.57
Euskadiko Ezquerria - Izquierda de Euskadi (EE-IE)	61,417	0.34	1	0.29
Total	16,903,830		350	
Other parties**	1,374,255	7.52		
Total votes to candidatures	18,278,085			

Source: Junta Electoral Central. Ministerio del Interior, 2001.

\* Based on votes obtained by all candidatures.

\*\* Candidatures that have obtained votes but not seats.

Table C.2

*Distribution of Votes and Seats in the Congress (Lower House). General Elections, 1<sup>st</sup> of March 1979*

<b>Party or Coalition of Parties</b>	<b>Votes</b>	<b>(%)*</b>	<b>Seats</b>	<b>(%)</b>
Unión de Centro Democrático (UCD)	6,291,341	35.08	168	48.00
Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE)	5,476,969	30.54	121	34.57
Partido Comunista de España (PCE)	1,939,733	10.82	23	6.57
Coalición Democrática (CD)	1,070,637	5.97	9	2.57
Convergencia i Unió (C i U)	483,353	2.70	8	2.29
Unión Nacional (UN)	379,460	2.12	1	0.29
Partido Socialista de Andalucía - Partido Andaluz (PSA-PA)	325,842	1.82	5	1.43
Partido Nacionalista Vasco ( PNV)	275,292	1.54	7	2.00
Herri Batasuna (HB)	172,110	0.96	3	0.86
Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya - Front Nacional de Catalunya i Partit Social Demócrata de Catalunya (ERC)	123,452	0.69	1	0.29
Euskadiko Ezquerria (EE)	85,677	0.48	1	0.29
Unión del Pueblo Canario (UPC)	58,953	0.33	1	0.29
Partido Aragonés Regionalista (PAR)	38,042	0.21	1	0.29
Unión del Pueblo Navarro (UPN)	28,248	0.16	1	0.29
Total	16,749,109		350	
Other parties**	1,184,539	6.61		
Total votes to candidatures	17,933,648			

Source: Junta Electoral Central. Ministerio del Interior, 2001.

\* Based on votes obtained by all candidatures.

\*\* Candidatures that have obtained votes but not seats.

Table C.3

*Distribution of Votes and Seats in the Congress (Lower House). General Elections, 28<sup>th</sup> of October 1982*

<b>Party or Coalition of Parties</b>	<b>Votes</b>	<b>(%)*</b>	<b>Seats</b>	<b>(%)</b>
Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE)	8,551,791	40.82	177	50.57
Alianza Popular ( AP)**	5,543,107	26.46	107	30.57
Partido Socialista de Catalunya (PSC)	1,575,601	7.52	25	7.14
Unión de Centro Democrático (UCD)	1,354,858	6.47	11	3.14
Partido Comunista de España (PCE)	686,423	3.28	3	0.86
Convergencia i Unió (CIU)	772,726	3.69	12	3.43
Centro Democrático y Social (CDS)	600,842	2.87	2	0.57
Partido Nacionalista Vasco (PNV)	395,656	1.89	8	2.29
Herri Batasuna (HB)	210,601	1.01	2	0.57
Partit Socialista Unificat de Catalunya (PSUC)	158,553	0.76	1	0.29
Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya (ERC)	138,116	0.66	1	0.29
Euskadiko Ezkerra (EE)	100,326	0.48	1	0.29
Total	20,088,600		350	
Other parties***	863,000	4.12		
Total votes to candidatures	20,951,600			

Source: Junta Electoral Central. Ministerio del Interior,

\* Based on votes obtained by all candidatures.

\*\* In coalition with PDP, UL, PAR, UPN, UV. It also includes 139,148 votes and 2 seats obtained in the Basque provinces in coalition with UCD.

\*\*\* Candidatures that have obtained votes but not seats.

Table C.4

*Distribution of Votes and Seats in the Congress (Lower House). General Elections, 22<sup>nd</sup> of June 1986*

<b>Party or Coalition of Parties</b>	<b>Votes</b>	<b>(%)*</b>	<b>Seats</b>	<b>(%)</b>
Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE)	7,601,985	37.86	163	46.57
Coalición Popular (CP)	5,247,677	26.13	105	30.00
Centro Democrático y Social (CDS)	1,838,799	9.16	19	5.43
Partit dels Socialistes de Catalunya (PSC-PSOE)	1,299,733	6.47	21	6.00
Convergencia i Unió (CiU)	1,014,258	5.05	18	5.14
Izquierda Unida (IU)	768,158	3.83	6	1.71
Partido Nacionalista Vasco (PNV)	309,610	1.54	6	1.71
Herri Batasuna (HB)**	215,282	1.07	5	1.43
Unió de L'Esquerra Catalana (UEC)	123,912	0.62	1	0.29
Euskadiko Ezquerria (EE)	107,053	0.53	2	0.57
Coalición Galega (CG)	79,972	0.40	1	0.29
Partido Aragonés Regionalista (PAR)	73,004	0.36	1	0.29
Agrupaciones Independientes de Canarias (AIC)	65,664	0.33	1	0.29
Unió Valenciana (UV)	64,403	0.32	1	0.29
Total	18,809,510		350	
Other parties***	1,272,223	6.34		
Total votes to candidatures	20,081,733			

Source: Junta Electoral Central. Ministerio del Interior, 2002.

\*Based on votes obtained by all candidatures

\*\* Sum of the votes obtained in Vizcaya, Guipuzcoa y Navarra: 215,282

\*\*HB (Vizcaya) 97,252

\*\*HB (Guipuzcoa) 80,032

\*\*HB (Navarra) 37,998

\*\*\* Candidatures that have obtained votes but not seats.

Table C.5

*Distribution of Votes and Seats in the Congress (Lower House). General Elections, 29<sup>th</sup> of October 1989*

<b>Party or Coalition of Parties</b>	<b>Votes</b>	<b>(%)*</b>	<b>Seats</b>	<b>(%)</b>
Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE)	6,991,593	34.35	155	44.29
Partido Popular (PP)	5,117,049	25.14	101	28.86
Izquierda Unida (IU)	1,627,136	8.00	14	4.00
Centro Democrático y Social (CDS)	1,617,716	7.95	14	4.00
Partit dels Socialistes de Catalunya (PSC-PSOE)	1,123,975	5.52	20	5.71
Convergencia i Unió (CIU)	1,032,243	5.07	18	5.14
Eusko Alderdi Jetzalea - Partido Nacionalista Vasco (EAJ-PNV)	252,119	1.24	5	1.43
Iniciativa per Catalunya (IC)	231,452	1.14	3	0.86
Herri Batasuna (HB)	217,278	1.07	4	1.14
Partido Andalucista (PA)	212,687	1.05	2	0.57
Unión Valenciana (UV)	144,924	0.71	2	0.57
Eusko Alkartasuna (EA)	136,955	0.67	2	0.57
Euskadiko Ezkerra (EE)	105,238	0.52	2	0.57
Unión del Pueblo Navarro - Coalición PP (UPN-PP)	92,216	0.45	3	0.86
PP- Coalición Centristas de Galicia (PP-CG)	76,707	0.38	3	0.86
Partido Aragonés Regionalista (PAR)	71,733	0.35	1	0.29
Agrupaciones Independientes de Canarias (AIC)	64,767	0.32	1	0.29
Total	19,115,788		350	
Other parties**	1,236,099	6.07		
Total votes to candidatures	20,351,887			

Source: Junta Electoral Central. Ministerio del Interior, 2002.

\* Based on votes obtained by all candidatures.

\*\* Candidatures that have obtained votes but not seats.



Table C.6

*Distribution of Votes and Seats in the Congress (Lower House). General Elections, 6<sup>th</sup> of June 1993*

<b>Party or Coalition of Parties</b>	<b>Votes</b>	<b>(%)*</b>	<b>Seats</b>	<b>(%)</b>
Partido Popular (PP)	8,089,235	34.56	138	39.43
Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE)	7,872,245	33.64	141	40.29
Izquierda Unida (IU)	1,905,673	8.14	15	4.29
Partit dels Socialistes de Catalunya (PSC-PSOE)	1,277,838	5.46	18	5.14
Convergencia i Unió (CIU)	1,165,783	4.98	17	4.86
Eusko Alderdi Jetzalea - Partido Nacionalista Vasco (EAJ-PNV)	291,448	1.25	5	1.43
Iniciativa per Catalunya (IC)	273,444	1.17	3	0.86
Coalición Canaria (CC)	207,077	0.88	4	1.14
Herri Batasuna (HB)	206,876	0.88	2	0.57
Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya (ERC)	189,632	0.81	1	0.29
Partido Aragonés Regionalista (PAR)	144,544	0.62	1	0.29
Coalición Eusko Alkartasuna - Euskal Ezkerra (EA-EUE)	129,293	0.55	1	0.29
Unió Valenciana (UV)	112,341	0.48	1	0.29
Unión del Pueblo Navarro - Partido Popular (UPN-PP)	112,228	0.48	3	0.86
Total	21,977,657		350	
Other parties**	1,425,528	6.09		
Total votes to candidatures	23,403,185			

Source: Junta Electoral Central. Ministerio del Interior, 2002.

\* Based on votes obtained by all candidatures.

\*\* Candidatures that have obtained votes but not seats.

Table C.7

*Distribution of Votes and Seats in the Congress (Lower House). General Elections, 12th of March 2000*

<b>Party or Coalition of Parties</b>	<b>Votes</b>	<b>(%)*</b>	<b>Seats</b>	<b>(%)</b>
Partido Popular (PP)	10,321,178	45.24	183	52.29
Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE)	7,918,752	34.71	125	35.71
Izquierda Unida (IU)	1,263,043	5.54	8	2.29
Convergencia i Unió (CIU)	970,421	4.25	15	4.29
Eusko Alderdi Jeltzalea-Partido Nacionalista Vasco (EAJ-PNV)	353,953	1.55	7	2.00
Bloque Nacionalista Galego (BNG)	306,268	1.34	3	0.86
Coalición Canaria (CC)	248,261	1.09	4	1.14
Partido Andalucista (PA)	206,255	0.90	1	0.29
Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya (ERC)	194,715	0.85	1	0.29
Iniciativa per Catalunya - Els Verds (IC-EV)	119,290	0.52	1	0.29
Eusko Alkartasuna (EA)	100,742	0.44	1	0.29
Chunta Aragonesista (CHA)	75,356	0.33	1	0.29
Total	22,078,234		350	
Other parties**	736,233	3.23		
Total votes to candidatures	22,814,467	100.00		

Source: Junta Electoral Central. Ministerio del Interior, 2002.

\* Based on votes obtained by all candidatures.

\*\* Candidatures that have obtained votes but not seats.

Table C.8

*Distribution of Votes and Seats in the Congress (Lower House). General Elections, 14th of March 2004*

<b>Party or Coalition of Parties</b>	<b>votes</b>	<b>(%)*</b>	<b>seats</b>	<b>(%)</b>
Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE)	11,026,163	43.27	164	46.86
Partido Popular (PP)	9,635,491	37.81	146	41.71
Convergencia i Unió (CIU)	835,471	3.28	10	2.86
Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya (ERC)	652,196	2.56	8	2.29
Eusko Alderdi Jeltzalea-Partido Nacionalista Vasco (EAJ-PNV)	420,980	1.65	7	2.00
Coalición Canaria (CC)	235,221	0.92	3	0.86
Izquierda Unida (IU)	801,821	3.15	2	0.57
Iniciativa per Catalunya Verde- Esquerra Unida I Alternativa (ICV-EUIA )	234,790	0.92	2	0.57
Bloque Nacionalista Galego (BNG)	208,688	0.82	2	0.57
Union del Pueblo Nvarro- Partido Popular (UPN-PP)	127,653	0.50	2	0.57
Esquerra Unida Pais Valenciá + I. Republicana (ENTESA)	123,611	0.49	1	0.29
Chunta Aragonesista (CHA)	94,252	0.37	1	0.29
Eusko Alkartasuna (EA)	80,905	0.32	1	0.29
Nafarroa Bai (NA-BAI)	61,045	0.24	1	0.29
Total	24,538,287		350	
Other parties**	945,217	3.71		
Total votes to candidatures	25.483.504	100.00		

Source: Junta Electoral Central. Ministerio del Interior, 2004

\* Based on votes obtained by all candidatures.

\*\* Candidatures that have obtained votes but not seats.

## Appendix D. Happiness, Life Satisfaction and Individual Subjective Well-Being Index. Tables of Correlations.

Table D.1

*Correlations between Happiness and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (1)*

Variables	Total cases	Spain	B. Country	Andalusia	Galicia	Valencia
Postmaterialist Index	.0262**	-	.0555*	-	-	-
Levels of Trust in Institutions Index	.0612	.0623**	.0701*	.0495**	.0740*	-
Total Association Index	-	-	-	.0746*	-	-
Importance of Social Bonds Index	.0864	.0587**	.1185	.0818*	-	.1033**
V4 Importance of family	.0887	-	.1035	.0775*	.0926*	.1126**
V5 Importance of friends	.0357*	-	-	.0583**	-	-
V6 Importance of leisure	.0975	.0902	.0766	.1407	.0703**	.0914
V7 Importance of politics	.0304**	-	-.0792	-	-	-
V8 Importance of work	.0713	-	.0922	.0617*	-	.1145**
V9 Importance of religion	.0473	-	.0629*	-	.0611**	-
V11 State of health	.2281	.2555	.1872	.2362	.2571	.2265
V12 Respect for parents	.0776	-	.1454	-	.0869*	-
V13 Emphasis on parents' responsibilities towards their children	-	-	.0555**	-	-	-
V15 Importance of children to learn independence	-.0448	-	-.0794	-	-	-
V17 Importance of children to learn responsibility	.0311**	-	-	-	-	-
V19 Importance of children to learn tolerance	.0264**	.0688**	-	-	-	-
V22 Importance of children to learn religious faith	.0526	-	.0722*	-	-	-
V24 Importance of children to learn obedience	.0298**	-	.0572*	-	.0594	-
V27 General trust	.0353**	-	.0461**	-	.0670**	-
V28 Member church organisation	.0752	.0941*	.0994	.0598**	.0960*	-
V29 Member sport organisation	-	-	-	.0734*	-	-
V30 Member of art organisation	-	-	-	.0533**	-	-
V32 Member political party	-.0238**	-	-	-	-.0873*	-
V35 Member charitable organisation	.0270**	-	.0519**	.0603**	-	-
V36 Member of any other voluntary organisation	.0364*	-	.0582*	.0553**	-	.1224*

Table D.1

*Correlations between Happiness and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (2)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V37 Discussion of politics with friends	-.0238**	-	-.0605*	-	-	-
V38 Increase taxes to protect environment	.0552	-	.0894	-	.0732**	-
V39 Increase prices to protect environment	.0580	-	.0742*	-	.0731**	.0979**
V40 View that environment may be fixed by international laws	-	-	-	-	-	.1261*
V42 Choosing products better for environment	.0460	.0592**	-	.0790*	-	-
V43 Recycling for environmental reasons	.0502	.0784*	-	.0979	-	-
V44 Attitude towards reduction of water consumption	.0306**	-	-	.0588**	.0767*	.0914**
V50 View that humanity has a bright future	-	-	-	-	.0729**	-
V51 Accept neighbours with criminal record	-.0393**	-	-.0490**	-.0595**	-	-
V54 Accept neighbours who are heavy drinkers	-	-	-.0506**	-	-	-
V60 Accept neighbours who are homosexuals	-	-	-.0674	-	-	-
V61 When jobs are scarce, jobsshould be for men	-	-	.0420**	-.0732*	-	-
V63 When jobs are scarce, jobsshould be for Spanish people	-	-	-	-	-	.1267*
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.2083	.2506	.1863	.2137	.1975	.2154
V65 Satisfaction with life as a whole	.3918	.3642	.3955	.3677	.4308	.4320
V66 Freedom of choice/ control over one's life	.1755	.1675	.1463	.1876	.1512	.2659
V67 View on work until satisfied with result	.0522	-	.0566*	.0839	-	-
V68 View on disappointment if don't accomplish goals	-	-	-	.0627*	-	-
V69 View on working until late because he/she likes to work	.0438	-	-	.0713*	-	-
V70 Goal of making one's parents proud	.0733	-	.1223	.0545**	.1132	.1574
V71 To live up to what friends expect	.0298**	-	.0664*	-	-	-
V76 Important not much pressure in job	-	-	-	-	-	-.1219*
V77 Important good job security	-	-	-	-	-	-.1219*
V78 Important to have job respected	-	-	-	-	-.0605**	-
V82 Important to achieve something in job	-	-	-	-	-.0637**	-

Table D.1

*Correlations between Happiness and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (3)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V89 Marital status	.0890	.0697**	.1166	.0666*	.0854*	.1036**
V90 Number of children	-	-.0732	-	-.0672	-	-
V91 Ideal size of family	.0341*		-	-	-	-
V92 Importance attributed to children's having a two-parent home	.0354*		-	-	-	-
V94 View that marriage is outdated	-.0702		-.0713*	-.0633*	-.0858*	-.1085**
V95 Sexual freedom	-	.0589**	-	-	-	-
V98 Working mother as good as non-working mother	.0375*	.0630**	-	.0578**	-	-
V99 Housewife job as fulfilling as paid job	.0510	-	.0919	-	-	.1623
V102 Problem if wife earns more than husband	-.0564	-	-.0603*	-.0987	-	-
V111 Less emphasis on money	-	-	-.0597*	-	-	-
V114 Greater respect for authority	-	-	.0464**	-	-	.1107**
V115 More emphasis on family life	.0561	.0581**	.0711*	-	-	-
V117 Interest in politics	-	-	-.0620*	-	-	-
V118 Signing a petition	-	-	-.0661*	-	-	-
V119 Joining in boycotts	-.0453	-	-.0831	-	-	-
V120 Attending lawful demonstrations	-	-	-.0518**	-	-	-
V121 Joining unofficial strikes	-.0385*	-	-.0648*	-	-	-
V122 Occupying buildings or factories	-.0423*	-	-.0692*	-	-.0662**	-
V123 Political inclination	.0644	.1126*	.1044	-	-	-
V125 Equal incomes	.0443	-	.0547**	.0618**	-	-
V128 View that competition is good	-	-	.0447**	-	.0648**	.1027**
V129 Hard work brings a better life	-	.0619**	-	-	.0823*	.1218*
V130 View on fair wealth distribution	-	-	.0556**	.0852	-	-
V131 Cautious attitude towards life changes	-	-	-	-	.0776*	-
V133 View on import of foreign goods	-	-	-	-	-	-.1020**
V135 Confidence in churches	.0777	-	.1407	-	.0948*	-
V136 Confidence in the armed forces	.0413*	-	.0623*	-	-	-
V137 Confidence in the legal system	.0372	-	.0849	-	-	-

Table D.1

*Correlations between Happiness and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (4)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V139 Confidence in the television	.0404*	.0747**	-	.0750*	-	-
V141 Confidence in the police	.0508	.0799*	-	-	.0731**	-
V142 Confidence in the government in Madrid	.0449	-	-	-	.0865*	-
V143 Confidence in the political parties	.0253*	-	-	-	-	-
V144 Confidence in the parliament	-	-	-	-	.0741**	-
V145 Confidence in the civil service	.0521	-	.0442**	.0835*	-	-
V146 Confidence in the major companies	.0558	-	.0676*	.0774*	-	-
V149 Confidence in the European Union	.0643	.0920*	-	.0994	.0743**	-
V150 Confidence in the United Nations	.0705	-	-	.1022	.0682**	.1108**
V151 Rating of political system under Franco	-	-	.0830	-	-	-
V152 Rating of political system today	.0252**	-	.0463**	-	-	-
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	.0414*	-	.0597*	-	.0697**	-
V157 View on having a democratic system	.0308**	-	-	-	.0671**	-
V165 Satisfaction with national government	.0599	-	.0901	.0560**	-	-
V166 View that the country should be run for all	.0645	-	.0689*	.0596**	.0631**	.1067**
V167 Group like least	.0472	.0617**	.0675*	-	.0792*	-
V168 View on group one likes least holding public office	-.0319**	-	-	-	-.0647**	-
V170 View on group one likes least holding demonstrations	-.0544	-	-.0743*	-	-.0594**	-
V179 Religious denomination	-.0687	-.0717**	-.0860	-.0482	-.0656	-
V180 Brought up religiously at home	.0351*	-	.0489**	-	.0579**	-
V181 Attendance to Church	.0621	.0651**	.1214	-	.0619**	-
V182 Religious person	.0839	.0904*	.0979	-	.0993*	-
V183 Belief in God	.0447	-	.0801	-	-	-
V184 Belief in life after death	.0522	.0741**	.0853	-	-	-
V185 Belief in soul	.0406*	-	.0619*	-	-	-
V186 Belief in the devil	-	-	.0515**	-	-	-
V188 Belief in heaven	.0543	-	.0932	-	-	-
V189 Belief in sin	.0375*	-	.0614*	-	-	-

Table D.1

*Correlations between Happiness and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (5)*

	p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
Variables	Total cases	Spain	B. Country	Andalusia	Galicia	Valencia
V190 Importance of God	.0832	.0788*	.1207	.0492**	.0834*	-
V191 Comfort from religion	.0543	-	.0924	-	-	-
V192 Justifiable: claiming benefits one is not entitled to	-	.0769*	-	-	-	-
V193 Justifiable: avoiding a fare on public transport	-.0291**	-	-.0639*	-	-	-
V194 Justifiable: cheating on taxes	-.0380*	-	-.0537**	-	-.0964*	-
V195 Justifiable: Buying something you know is stolen	-.0379*	-	-.0511**	-	-.0673**	-
V197 Justifiable: homosexuality	-	.0786*	-.0758*	-	-	-
V198 Justifiable: prostitution	-	-	-.0933	-	-	-
V199 Justifiable: abortion	-.0342*	-	-.0825	-	-	-
V200 Justifiable: divorce	-	.0646**	-.0796	-	-	-
V201 Justifiable: euthanasia	-.0607	-	-.1011	-	-	-
V202 Justifiable: suicide	-.0790	-	-.1149	-	-.0929*	-.1296*
V203 Geographical group belong to (1)	-	-	-.0524**	-	-.0597**	-
V204 Geographical group belong to (2)	-	-	-.0527**	.0478**	-	-
V205 Proud to be Spanish (or from own region)	.0544	.0744**	.0773	-	-	.1579
V206 Born in Spain	-	-	-	-	-	.0991**
V207 Year came to Spain	-	-	-	-.2316*	-	-
V208 Feeling of being more Spanish than nationalist	-.0317**	-	-	-.0504**	-	-
V209 Spanish spoken at home more than regional/other language	-	-	-	-	.0657**	-.1379*
V213 Perception of corruption in Spain	-	-	-.0444**	-	-	-
V216 Age	-.0502	-.1054	-	-.1259	-	-
V217 Educational level	.0257**	.0887*	-	.0659*	-	-
V218 Age completed full time education	-	-	-	.0523**	-	-
V219 Living with parents	-	-	-.0623*	-	-	-
V220 Employment status	.0594	-	.0702	.0572**	.0608	-
V221 Profession respondent	.0547	.0592**	-	.0963	-	.1159**
V225 Family savings	.0770	.0727**	.0999	.0626**	-	.1125**
V226 Social class	.0741	.1203	-	.0481**	.1019*	.1258*



Table D.1

*Correlations between Happiness and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (6)*

	p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V227 Household income	.0936	.1064*	.0900*	.1506	-	
V228 Hours watching television	-	-	-.0487**	-	-	
V232 Size of town	-.0270**	-	-.0689*	-	-	
V233 Ethnic group	-	-.0610**	-	-	-	
V234 Region	-	-	.0839	-	-	

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table D.2

*Correlations between Life Satisfaction and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (1)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>	
Postmaterialist Index	.0410*	-	-	.1077	-	-	
Levels of Trust in Institutions Index	.0548	.0594**	.0636*	-	.1444	-	
Importance of Social Bonds Index	.0830	-	.0941	.0731*	.0977*	.0932**	
V4 Importance of family	.0685	-	.1081	-	.0614**	-	
V5 Importance of friends	.0680	-	.0621*	.0726*	.0901*	-	
V6 Importance of leisure	.0818	.0757*	.0433**	.1339	.0686**	-	
V8 Importance of work	.0241**	-	-	-	-	-	
V9 Importance of religion	.0499	-	.0988	-	-	-	
V10 Happiness	.3918	.3642	.3955	.3677	.4308	.4320	
V11 State of health	.2265	.2087	.2013	.2405	.2349	.2477	
V12 Respect for parents	.0349**	-	.0782	-	.0726**	-	
V13 Emphasis on parents' responsibilities towards their children	.0447	-	.0694*	.0519	-	-	
V15 Importance of children to learn independence	-	-	-	-	-	.0953**	
V17 Importance of children to learn responsibility	.0708	.0987*	-	.0925	-	-	
V19 Importance of children to learn tolerance	.0509	-	-	.0874	-	-	
V20 Importance of children to learn to save money	-.0403**	-	-.0604*	-	-	-.1408*	
V22 Importance of children to learn religious faith	.0538	.0572**	.0728*	-	-	-	
V27 General trust	.0566	-	.0780	-	.0682**	-	
V28 Member church organisation	.0472	-	.0583*	-	.0881*	-	
V29 Member sport organisation	.0311**	-	-	-	-	-	
V30 Member of art organisation	-	-.0596**	-	.0612**	-	-	
V31 Member of labour union	-	-	-.0456**	.0485**	-	-	
V33 Member of environmental organisation	-	-.0635**	-	-	-	-	
V34 Member professional organisation	.0238**	-	-	.0476**	-	-	
V35 Member charitable organisation	.0571	-	.0626*	.0793*	-	-	
V36 Member of any other voluntary org.	.0385*	-	-	.0832	-	-	
V38 Increase taxes to protect environment	.0923	.0776*	.1135	.0631**	.1237	-	
V39 Increase prices to protect environment	.0613	-	.1060	.0499**	-	.1103**	

Table D.2

*Correlations between Life Satisfaction and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (2)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V40 View that environment may be fixed by international laws	-.0332**	-	-.0541**	-.1079	-	.1052**
V42 Choosing products better for environment	.0632	-	-	.1166	.0598**	-
V43 Recycling for environmental reasons	.0601	-	.0620*	.0926	-	-
V44 Attitude towards reduction of water consumption	.0244**	-.0591**	-	.0757*	-	-
V45 Attending meeting to protect environment	.0388*	-	-	.0571	-	-
V46 Contribution to an environmental org.	-	-	.0525**	-	-	-
V50 View that humanity has a bright future	-	-	-	.0472**	-	-
V58 Accept neighbours with AIDS	.0273**	-	-	-	.0581**	-
V61 When jobs are scarce, jobsshould be for men	-.0587	-	-	-.1062	-	-.0889**
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.4861	.5004	.4793	.4899	.4320	.5376
V66 Freedom of choice/ control over one's life	.3751	.4482	.2798	.4489	.3111	.4226
V67 View on work until satisfied with result	.1023	-	.1035	.1143	.1277	.1339*
V68 View on disappointment if don't accomplish goals	-.0287**	-.0674**	-	-	-	-
V69 View on working until late because he/she likes to work	.0466	-	-	-	.0970*	.1690
V70 Goal of making one's parents proud	.0566	-	.0948	-	.0700**	-
V71 To live up to what friends expect	-	-.0763*	-	-	.0578**	-
V75 Important good pay	-.0681	-	-	-.0465**	-.1132	-.1574
V76 Important not much pressure in job	-	-	-	-	-	-.1030**
V77 Important good job security	-	-	-	-	-	-.1030**
V78 Important to have job respected	.0289**	-	.0716*	-	-	-
V80 Important to use initiative in job	.0498	-	-	.0849	-	-
V81 Importance of generous holidays	-	-	-.0506**	.0489**	-	-
V82 Important to achieve something in job	.0500	-	-	.0528**	-	-
V83 Important to have a responsible job	.0471	.0604**	.0800	-	.0658**	-
V84 Importance of a job that is interesting	-	-	.0447**	-	-	-

Table D.2

*Correlations between Life Satisfaction and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (3)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>	
V85 Important job to meet one's abilities	.0646	-	.0632*	.1005	-	.1033**	
V88 View on following instructions at work	-	-	-	-.0655*	-	-	
V89 Marital status	.0586	-	.1000	.0476**	.0874*	-	
V90 Number of children	-	-.0727**	-	-	-	-	
V91 Ideal size of family	-	-	.0465**	-	-	-	
V92 Importance attributed to children's having a two-parent home	-	-	-.0492**	-	-	-	
V93 View that women need to have children to be fulfilled	-	-	.0521**	-	-	-	
V94 View that marriage is outdated	-.0492	-	-.0747*	-.0690*	-	-	
V95 Sexual freedom	-	.0627**	-	-	-	-	
V98 Working mother as good as non- working mother	.0436	.0618**	-	.0598**	-	-	
V99 Housewife job as fulfilling as paid job	.0432	-	-	-	.0648**	.1140**	
V100 Husband and wife contributing to income	.0257**	-	-	-	-	.1177*	
V102 Problem if wife earns more than husband	-.0791	-	-.0589*	-.0979	-.0718**	-.2175	
V103 University more important for boys	-.0709	-.0632**	-	-.1098	-	-.1448*	
V111 Less emphasis on money	-	.0637**	-	-	-	-	
V112 Less importance placed on work	-.0253**	-	-	-	-	-	
V113 More emphasis on technology	.0485	-	.0670*	.0776*	-	-	
V114 Greater respect for authority	.0383*	-	.0626*	-	-	-	
V115 More emphasis on family life	.0605	.0893*	.0700*	-	.0743**	-	
V118 Signing a petition	.0363*	-	-	.0553**	-	-	
V120 Attending lawful demonstrations	.0403*	-	-	.0764*	-	-	
V121 Joining unofficial strikes	-	-	-.0491**	-	-	-	
V123 Political inclination	.0485	.1370	.0765*	-	-	-	
V124 View on revolutionary action to change society	-	-	.0765*	-	-	-	
V125 Equal incomes	.0558	.0700**	.0675*	.0724*	-	-	
V127 View on government providing for everyone	-.0632	-.1193	-.0515**	-.0604**	-.0750**	-	
V128 View that competition is good	.0441	-	.0586*	-	.1046	.0971**	

Table D.2

*Correlations between Life Satisfaction and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (4)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>	
V129 Hard work brings a better life	.0519	.0831*	-	-	.1046	.1075**	
V130 View on fair wealth distribution	.0808	.0700**	.0752*	.1217	-	.1453*	
V132 New ideas better than old ones	.0610	-	.0844	.0924	-	-	
V133 Import of foreign goods	-	-	-	-	-	-.1262*	
V134 Let foreign workers in the country	.0441	.1109	-	-	.0720**	-	
V135 Confidence in churches	.0478	-	.0892	-	.0945*	-	
V136 Confidence in the armed forces	.0292**	-	-	-	.0994*	.0947**	
V137 Confidence in the legal system	.0417*	-	.0743*	-	-	-	
V138 Confidence in the press	-	-	-	.0627**	-	-	
V139 Confidence in the television	-	-	-.0480**	.0517**	-	-	
V141 Confidence in the police	.0436	.0698**	.0452**	-	.1241	-	
V142 Confidence in the government in Madrid	.0307**	-	-	-	.1195	-	
V143 Confidence in the political parties	-	-	-	-	.0636**	-	
V144 Confidence in the parliament	.0332*	-	.0458**	-	.1103	-	
V145 Confidence in the civil service	.0384*	-	-	-	.0825*	.1163**	
V146 Confidence in the major companies	-	.0589**	.0497**	-	-	-	
V147 Confidence in the ecology movement	.0381*	-	-	-	.0848*	-	
V149 Confidence in the European Union	.0873	.1088	.0775	.0901	.1232	-	
V150 Confidence in the United Nations	.0825	.0882*	.0630*	.0895	.1064	.1017**	
V152 Rating of political system today	.0705	.1034	.0561*	.0597**	.1143	-	
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	.0997	.0789**	.0729*	.1253	.1139	.0988**	
V154 Strong leader instead of elections	-.0385*	-	-	-.0744*	-	-	
V157 View on having a democratic system	.0396*	-	-	-	.1048	-	
V159 Protect individual freedom	.0297**	-	-	.0585**	.0681**	-	
V163 View of democracy as a better form of government	.0383*	-	-	-	.0637**	-	
V164 Violence to pursue political goals	.0438	-	-	.0495**	-	-	

Table D.2

*Correlations between Life Satisfaction and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (5)*

	p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
Variables	Total cases	Spain	B. Country	Andalusia	Galicia	Valencia
V165 Satisfaction with national government	.0688	-	.1070	-	-	-
V166 View that the country should be run for all	.0648	-	.0505**	.0559**	.0642**	.0949**
V167 Group like least	.0293**	-	.0552**	-	-	-
V179 Religious denomination	-.0316*	-	-.0528**	-	-.0632**	-
V180 Brought up religiously at home	.0282**	-	-	-	.1150	-
V181 Attendance to Church	.0499	-	.0999	-	-	-
V182 Religious person	.0457	.0584**	.0624*	-	.0849*	-
V183 Belief in God	.0245**	-	.0727*	-	-	-
V184 Belief in life after death	-	-	.0741*	-	-	-
V185 Belief in soul	.0416	-	.0664*	-	-	-
V188 Belief in heaven	-	-	.0474**	-	-	-
V189 Belief in sin	-	-	.0493**	-	-	-
V190 Importance of God	.0776	-	.1159	.0814*	.1038	-
V191 Comfort from religion	.0380*	-	.0650*	-	-	-
V192 Justifiable: claiming benefits one is not entitled to	-.0300**	-	-.0483**	-	-.0887*	-
V193 Justifiable: avoiding a fare on public transport	-	-	-	-	-.0680**	-
V194 Justifiable: cheating on taxes	-.0324*	-	-	-	-.1058	-.1397*
V195 Justifiable: Buying something you know is stolen	-.0518	-.0726**	-.0801	-	-.0889*	-
V196 Justifiable: accepting a bribe	-	-.0583**	-	-	-	-
V197 Justifiable: homosexuality	.0357*	.0945*	-	-	-	.1133**
V198 Justifiable: prostitution	-	.0635**	-.0428**	-	-.0810*	-
V199 Justifiable: abortion	-	-	-	.0633*	-	-
V200 Justifiable: divorce	.0314**	.0782*	-	.0554**	-	-
V201 Justifiable: euthanasia	-	-	-	-	-.0620**	-
V202 Justifiable: suicide	-.0415*	-	-.0765*	-	-.0754**	-
V203 Geographical group belong to (1)	-	-	-.0436**	-	-	-
V204 Geographical group belong to (2)	-	-	-	.0629*	-	-
V205 Proud to be Spanish (or from own region)	-	-	.0447**	-.0468**	-	-

Table D.2

*Correlations between Life Satisfaction and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (6)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V206 Born in Spain	-.0256	-	-	-.0562**	-	-
V209 Spanish spoken at home more than regional/other language	-	.1258	-	-	-	-
V213 Perception of corruption in Spain	-.0438	-	-.0560**	-	-	-.1489*
V216 Age	-	-.0746**	.0431**	-.0531**	-	-
V217 Educational level	.0675	.0919*	-	.0905	.0644**	.1255*
V218 Age completed full time education	-	-	-	.0685*	-	-
V219 Living with parents	-.0308**	-	-.0815	-	-	-
V220 Employment status	-	.0837*	.0701*	.1028	.0954*	.1149**
V221 Profession respondent	.0696	-	.0732*	.1104	-	-
V223 Chief wage earner employment status	.0465	-	.0714*	.0469**	-	-
V224 Profession chief wage earner	.0485	-	.0951	-	-	-
V225 Family savings	.1142	.1174	.1099	.1428	.0893*	.1200**
V226 Social class	.1306	.0953*	.1160	.1493	.1315	.1461*
V227 Household income	.1569	.1363	.1369	.1943	.0944*	.1825
V228 Hours watching television	-.0457	-	-.0477**	-.0563**	-	-
V232 Size of town	-.0326	.0634**	-.0563**	-.1136	-	.1136**
V233 Ethnic group	-	-	-	.0785*	-	-
V234 Region	.0889	-	.0887	-	-	-

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table D.3

*Correlations between Individual Subjective Well-Being Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (1)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>	
Postmaterialist Index	-	-	-	.0711*	-	-	
Levels of Trust in Institutions Index	.0679	.0714**	.0775	.0504**	.1323	-	
Importance of Social Bonds Index	.1002	.0569**	.1226	.0944	.0905*	.1138**	
Total Association Index	-	-	-	.0628*	-	-	
V4 Importance of family	.0918	.0655**	.1233	.0636*	.0840*	.1005**	
V5 Importance of friends	.0637	-	.0517**	.0808*	.0633**	.0909**	
V6 Importance of leisure	.1084	.1023	.0722*	.1656	.0845*	-	
V7 Importance of politics	-	-	-.0552**	-	-	-	
V8 Importance of work	.0547	-	.0531**	.0566**	-	.1051**	
V9 Importance of religion	.0583	.0629**	.0975	-	.0619**	-	
V11 State of health	.2715	.2796	.2295	.2891	.2900	.2745	
V12 Respect for parents	.0645	-	.1282	-	.0933*	-	
V13 Emphasis on parents' responsibilities towards their children	.0451	-	.0761	.0505**	-	-	
V15 Importance of children to learn independence	-.0260**	-	-.0557*	-	-	-.1079**	
V17 Importance of children to learn responsibility	.0625	.0944*	-	.0849	-	-	
V19 Importance of children to learn tolerance	.0470	.0748**	-	.0490**	-	-	
V20 Importance of children to learn to save money	-.0457	-	-.0461**	-	-	-.1413*	
V22 Importance of children to learn religious faith	.0634	.0603**	.0874	-	-	.0885**	
V27 General trust	.0557	-	.0746*	-	.0796*	-	
V28 Member church organisation	.0734	.0620**	.0929	.0514**	.1104	-	
V29 Member sport organisation	.0389	-	-	.0679*	-	-	
V30 Member of art organisation	-	-	-	.0712*	-	-	
V31 Member of labour union	-	-	-.0492**	-	-	-	
V34 Member professional organisation	-	-	-	.0517**	-	-	
V35 Member charitable organisation	.0513	-	.0690*	.0854	-	-	
V36 Member of any other voluntary organisation	.0460	-	.0575*	.0850	-	.1179*	



Table D.3

*Correlations between Individual Subjective Well-Being Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (2)*

p < .001 \* p < .01 \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V38 Increase taxes to protect environment	.0910	.0743**	.1254	.0568**	.1219	-
V39 Increase prices to protect environment	.0731	-	.1122	.0576**	.0692**	.1289*
V40 View that environment may be fixed by international laws	-	-	-	-.0668**	-	.1348*
V42 Choosing products better for environment	.0661	-	-.0445**	-.1236	-	-
V43 Recycling for environmental reasons	.0663	-	-.0455**	-.1209	-	-
V44 Attitude towards reduction of water consumption	.0316*	-	-	-.0896	-.0761*	-.0959**
V45 Attending meeting to protect environment	-	-	-	-.0530**	-	-
V50 View that humanity has a bright	-	.0601**	.0811	.1030	.1358	-
V51 Accept neighbours with criminal record	-.0297**	-	-.0489**	-.0493**	-	-
V54 Accept neighbours who are heavy drinkers	-	-	-.0478**	-	-	-
V61 When jobs are scarce, jobsshould be for men	-.0496	-	-	-.1074	-	-
V63 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for Spanish people	-	-	-	-	-	.0989**
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.4243	.4627	.4028	.4347	.3840	.4420
V66 Freedom of choice/ control over one's life	.3365	.3823	.2566	.3947	.2803	.4088
V67 View on work until satisfied with result	.0930	-	.0955	.1191	.1104	.1061**
V69 View on working until late because he/she likes to work	.0543	-	-	.0626*	.0765*	.1529*
V70 Goal of making one's parents proud	.0747	-	.1269	.0575**	.0637**	-
V71 To live up to what friends expect	.0280**	-.0650**	.0589*	-	-	-
V75 Important good pay	-.0540	-	-	-	-.1002*	-.0961**
V76 Important not much pressure in job	-	-	-	-	-	-.1336*
V77 Important good job security	-	-	-	-	-	-.1336*
V78 Important to have job respected	.0335*	-	.0703*	-	-	-
V80 Important to use initiative in job	.0387*	-	-	.0767*	-	-
V81 Importance of generous holidays	-	-	-	.0480**	-	-.1011**
V82 Important to achieve something in job	.0404*	-	-	.0475**	.0694**	-

Table D.3

*Correlations between Individual Subjective Well-Being Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (3)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

Variables	Total cases	Spain	B. Country	Andalusia	Galicia	Valencia
V83 Important to have a responsible job	.0411*	-	.0691*	-	-	-
V85 Important job to meet one's abilities	.0503	-	.0587*	.0856	-	-
V88 View on follow instructions at work	-	-	-	-.0619*	-	-
V89 Marital status	.0878	.0641**	.1298	.0679*	.1024	-
V90 Number of children	-	-.0878*	-	-	-	-
V92 Importance attributed to children's having a two-parent home	.0280**	-	.0541**	-	-	-
V93 View that women need to have children to be fulfilled	-	-	-	-	-	-
V94 View that marriage is outdated	-.0706	-	-.0856	-.0810*	-.0757**	-
V95 Sexual freedom	-	.0731**	-	-	-	-
V98 Working mother as good as non-working mother	.0500	.0766*	-	.0700*	.0610**	-
V99 Housewife job as fulfilling as paid job	.0558	-	.0780	-	-	.1733
V100 Husband and wife contributing to income	-	-	-	-	-	.1114**
V102 Problem if wife earns more than husband	-.0821	-	-.0715*	-.1174	-	-.1710
V103 University more important for boys	-.0561	-.0598**	-	-.0977	-	-
V110 View on fighting for your country	.0289**	-	-	-	-	-
V111 Less emphasis on money	-	.0717**	-.0565*	-	-	-
V112 Less importance placed on work	-.0259**	-	-	-	-	-
V113 More emphasis on technology	.0553	-	.0896	.0853	-	-
V114 Greater respect for authority	.0419*	-	.0646*	-	-	.1123**
V115 More emphasis on family life	.0683	.0891*	.0805	.0566**	.0702**	-
V118 Signing a petition	-	-	-.0635*	.0484**	-	-
V119 Joining in boycotts	-.0285**	-	-.0678*	-	-	-
V120 Attending lawful demonstrations	-	-	-.0445**	.0626*	-	-
V121 Joining unofficial strikes	-.0335*	-	-.0686*	-	-.0594**	-.0991**
V122 Occupying buildings/factories	-.0297**	-	-.0606*	-	-	-
V123 Political inclination	.0671	.1529	.1066	-	-	-

Table D.3

*Correlations between Individual Subjective Well-Being Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (4)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V124 View on revolutionary action to change society	-	-	.0694*	-	-	-
V125 Equal incomes	.0603	-	.0760	.0813*	-	-
V127 View on government providing for everyone	-.0698	-.0908*	-.0668*	-.0770*	-.0810*	-
V128 View that competition is good	.0440	-	.0630*	-	.1012*	.1172**
V129 Hard work brings a better life	.0620	.0886*	-	-	.1109	.1357*
V130 View on fair wealth distribution	.0747	-	.0747*	.1259	-	.1278*
V131 Cautious attitude towards life changes	-	-	-	-.0670*	.0726**	-
V132 New ideas better than old ones	.0489	-	.0868	.0725*	-	-
V133 Import of foreign goods	-	-	-	-	-	-.1295*
V134 Let foreign workers in the country	.0313**	.0929*	-	-	-	-
V135 Confidence in churches	.0744	-	.1364	-	.1098	-
V136 Confidence in the armed forces	.0407*	-	.0592*	-	.0878*	-
V137 Confidence in the legal system	.0457	-	.0911	.0500**	-	-
V138 Confidence in the press	-	-	-	.0490**	-	-
V139 Confidence in the television	-	-	-	.0748*	-	-
V141 Confidence in the police	.0554	.0880*	.0448**	-	.1187	.0979**
V142 Confidence in the government in Madrid	.0432	-	-	.0529**	.1218	-
V144 Confidence in the parliament	.0324*	-	-	-	.1109	-
V145 Confidence in the civil service	.0535	-	-	.0561**	.0720**	.0947**
V146 Confidence in the major companies	.0546	.0618**	.0663*	.0628**	-	-
V147 Confidence in the ecology movement	.0290**	-	-	-	.0726**	-
V149 Confidence in the European Union	.0912	.1201	.0597*	.1146	.1213	-
V150 Confidence in the United Nations	.0914	.0875*	.0601*	.1168	.1049	.1238*
V151 Rating of political system under Franco	-	-	.0599*	-	-	-
V152 Rating of political system today	.0570	.0706**	.0589*	-	.1004*	-
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	.0842	-	.0745*	.0745*	.1097	-

Table D.3

*Correlations between Individual Subjective Well-Being Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (5)*

	p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V154 Strong leader instead of elections	-.0292**	-	-	-	-	-
V155 Experts making decisions for the country	-.0269**	-.0664**	-	-	-	-
V157 View on having a democratic system	.0489*	-	-	-	.1042	-
V159 Protect individual freedom	-	-	-	.0485**	-	-
V163 View of democracy as a better form of government	.0303**	-	-	-	.0614**	-
V164 Violence to pursue political goals	.0339*	-	-	-	-	-
V165 Satisfaction with national government	.0767	-	.1160	-	-	-
V166 View that the country should be run for all	.0756	-	.0667*	.0699*	.0731**	.1190**
V167 Group like least	.0451	.0673**	.0733*	-	.0751**	-
V170 View on group one likes least holding demonstrations	-.0261**	-	-.0490**	-	-	-
V179 Religious denomination	-.0580	-.0577**	-.0813	-	-.0730**	-
V180 Brought up religiously at home	.0379*	.0584**	-	-	.1053	-
V181 Attendance to Church	.0672	.0602**	.1326	-	.0608**	-
V182 Religious person	.0767	.0922*	.0943	-	.1050	-
V183 Belief in God	.0404*	-	.0912	-	-	-
V184 Belief in life after death	.0413*	-	.0984	-	-	-
V185 Belief in soul	.0501	-	.0780*	-	.0656**	-
V188 Belief in heaven	.0409*	-	.0848	-	-	-
V189 Belief in sin	-	-	.0659*	-	-	-
V190 Importance of God	.0951	.0762*	.1388	.0818*	.1099	-
V191 Comfort from religion	.0554	.0640**	.0921	-	-	-
V192 Justifiable: claiming benefits one is not entitled to	-	-	-.0479**	-	-.0860*	-
V193 Justifiable: avoiding a fare on public transport	-.0301**	-	-.0530**	-	-.0659**	-
V194 Justifiable: cheating on taxes	-.0408*	-	-.0501**	-	-.1210	-.1298*
V195 Justifiable: buying something you know is stolen	-.0530	-	-.0778	-	-.0919*	-.0894**
V197 Justifiable: homosexuality	-	.1044	-.0550**	-	-	-
V198 Justifiable: prostitution	-	.0597**	-.0786	-	-.0596**	-
V199 Justifiable: abortion	-	-	-.0650*	-	-	-

Table D.3

*Correlations between Individual Subjective Well-Being Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (6)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V200 Justifiable: divorce	-	.0868*	-.0601*	-	-	-
V201 Justifiable: euthanasia	-.0357*	-	-.0828	-	-	-
V202 Justifiable: suicide	-.0710	-	-.1143	-	-.0965*	-.1160**
V203 Geographical group belong to (1)	-.0251**	-	-.0593*	-	-	-
V204 Geographical group belong to (2)	-	-	-	.0674*	-	-
V205 Proud to be Spanish (or from own region)	.0406*	.0711**	.0744*	-	-	.1444*
V206 Born in Spain	-	-	-	-.0557**	-	.0894**
V208 Feeling of being more Spanish than nationalist	-.0293**	-	-	-	-	-
V209 Spanish spoken at home more than regional/other language	-	.0904*	-	-	-	-.0953**
V213 Perception of corruption in Spain	-.0331*	-	-.0587*	-	-	-.1129**
V216 Age	-.0416*	-.1089	.0488**	-.1053	-	-
V217 Educational level	.0560	.1070	-	.0939	.0587**	.0929**
V218 Age completed full time	-	-	-	.0723*	-	-
V219 Living with parents	-.0296**	-	-.0850	-	-	-
V220 Employment status	.0929	.0781*	.0868	.0982	.0974*	.1120**
V221 Profession respondent	.0758	-	.0657*	.1242	-	.1257**
V223 Chief wage earner	.0342*	-	.0477**	-	-	-
V224 Profession chief wage earner	.0371*	-	.0670*	-	-	-
V225 Family savings	.1163	.1161	.1273	.1258	.0898*	.1350*
V226 Social class	.1240	.1284	.0952	.1217	.1404	.1593
V227 Household income	.1516	.1451	.1388	.2097	.0886*	.1495*
V228 Hours watching television	-.0423*	-	-.0595*	-	-	-
V232 Size of town	-.0378*	-	-.0769*	-.0933	-	-
V233 Ethnic group	-	-	-	.0543**	-	-
V234 Region	.0731	-	.1058	-	-	-

Source: own elaboration, from WVS 1995-1996 data.

**Appendix E. Elements of Social Capital: Tolerance Index, General Trust, Levels of Trust in Institutions Index, Total Association Index, Importance of Family, Importance of Friends and Importance of Social Bonds Index. Tables of Correlations.**

Table E.1

*Correlations between Tolerance Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (1)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05		
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
Levels of Trust in Institutions Index	.0807	.1020	.0494*	.0829	.1155	-
Postmaterialist Index	.2241	.1685	.2008	.2436	.3270	.2308
Importance of Social Bonds Index	.0371*	-	-	.0559*	-	-
V4 Importance of family	-.0327*	-	-	-	-	-.1188*
V5 Importance of friends	.0714	.0844*	.0707*	.0809*	.0583**	-
V6 Importance of leisure	.0642	.0764*	-	.1115	-	-
V7 Importance of politics	.0674	-	.0831	.0573**	.0864*	-
V8 Importance of work	-	.0686**	-	.0678*	-	-
V9 Importance of religion	-.1132	-.0884*	-.0980	-.0779*	-.2385	-.1310*
V11 State of health	.1046	.1284	.0955	.0991	.1296	-
V12 Respect for parents	-.0901	-.0957*	-.0773	-.0739*	-.1396	-
V13 Emphasis on parents' responsibilities towards their children	-.0925	-	-.0931	-.1237	-.0605**	-.1535*
V14 Importance of children to learn good manners	-.1001	-.1079	-.1129	-.0555**	-.1483	-
V15 Importance of children to learn independence	.1136	.1151	.1208	.0665*	.1962	-
V16 Importance of children to learn hard work	-.0668	-.0723	-.0540	-.0826	-.0637**	-
V17 Importance of children to learn responsibility	.0297**	-	-	.0895	-	-
V19 Importance of children to learn tolerance	.0512	-	-	.0864	.1190	-
V20 Importance of children to learn to save money	-.1058	-.1658	-.1081	-.0782*	-.1183	-
V22 Importance of children to learn religious faith	-.0993	-.0766*	-.1302	-	-.2076	-.1148**
V23 Importance of children to learn unselfishness	-.0414*	-.0769*	-	-.0566**	-	-.1464*
V24 Importance of children to learn obedience	-.0780	-.0824*	-.1252	-	-.1094	-
V27 General trust	.0691	-	.0933	.0502**	.1188	-

Table E.1

*Correlations between Tolerance Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (2)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V28 Member of church organisation	-.0924	-.1210	-.0727*	-	-.2138	-
V29 Member of sport organisation	.0271**	-	.0441**	-	-	-
V30 Member of art organisation	.0457	-	.0549**	.0607**	-	-
V33 Member of environmental organisation	.0338*	-	.0518**	-	.0883*	-
V36 Member of other voluntary organisation	.0433	-	.0574*	-	-	-
V37 Discussion of politics with friends	.1046	.1086	.1064	.1075	.0940*	.1238*
V38 Increase taxes to protect environment	.0986	-	.0929	.1038	.1875	-
V39 Increase prices to protect environment	.1242	.0635**	.1247	.0992	.2205	.1771
V40 View that environment may be fixed by international laws	-.0519	-.0699**	-.0498**	-	-	-
V41 Importance of protecting the environment over economic growth	-.0636	-	-.0871	-	-.1048	-.1088**
V42 Choosing products better for the environment	.1306	.1307	.1078	.1390	.1740	.1416*
V43 Recycling for environmental reasons	.1148	.1061	.1036	.1121	.1535	.1175*
V44 Attitude towards reduction of water consumption	.0607	.0749*	.0537**	.0723*	.1145	-
V45 Meeting/letter/petition to protect environment	.1148	-	.1243	.0859	.1862	.1519*
V46 Contribution to an environmental organisation	.0574	-	.0566*	-	.1073	-
V47 More emphasis on tradition	-	.0806**	-	-	-.0846*	-
V48 Express own preferences to build good relationships	-.0434*	-	-.0641*	-	-.0927*	-
V49 Importance of humans coexisting with nature	.0444	.0701**	.0460**	-	-	-
V61 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for men	-.1930	-.2681	-.1794	-.1722	-.2005	-.2030
V62 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for young people	-.0956	-.0717**	-.0763	-.1239	-.1119	-.1292*
V63 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for Spanish people	-.1888	-.1341	-.1902	-.1865	-.2007	-.2910
V67 View on work until satisfied with result	-	-	-	-	-	-.0932**
V69 View on working until late because he/she likes to work	-.0475	-.0698**	-	-	-	-.1568
V70 Goal of making one's parents proud	-.0944	-.0952*	-.1077	-	-.1367	-.1748
V71 To live up to what friends expect	-.0731	-	-.0734*	-.0721*	-.0792*	-.1393*

Table E.1

*Correlations between Tolerance Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (3)*

	p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V72 View that work makes life worth living	-.0634	-.0635**	-.0524**	-	-.1221	-.1159**
V75 Important good pay in job	-.1099	-.0898*	-.1132	-.1388	-.1100	-
V76 Important not much pressure in job	-.0916	-.0867*	-.0897	-.1329	-.1055	-
V77 Important good job security	-.0963	-.1071	-.1474	-.0735*	-.1465	-
V78 Important to have job respected	-.1542	-.1238	-.1664	-.1248	-.2003	-.1754
V79 Important good working hours	-.0787	-.0744**	-.0550**	-.1095	-.1273	-
V81 Important generous holidays	-.0683	-	-.0594*	-.1358	-.0634**	-
V82 Important to achieve something in job	-.0505	-.0894*	-.0450**	-	-.0947*	-
V83 Important to have a responsible job	-.0848	-.0933*	-.0791	-.0664*	-.0942*	-.1364*
V84 Important to have an interesting job	-.0305**	-	-	-	-	-
V85 Important job to meet one's abilities	-.0496	-.0703**	-.0506**	-	-.0733**	-.1142**
V87 Employees to own business and elect managers	-.0718	-.0824*	-.0927	-	.0974*	-.1405*
V88 View on follow instructions at work	-.0952	-.0875*	-.0815	-.1052	-.1125	-.0973**
V89 Marital status	-.1192	-.1040	-.1076	-.1108	-.1580	-.1604
V90 Number of children	-.1506	-.1434	-.1166	-.1789	-.2252	-.1560
V91 Ideal size of family	-	-	.0627*	-	-	-
V92 Importance attributed to children's having a two-parent home	-.1219	-.1114	-.1024	-.1341	-.1395	-.2075
V93 View that women need to have children to be fulfilled	-.1489	-.1512	-.1466	-.1604	-.1569	-.1506*
V94 View that marriage is outdated	.0793	-	.0846	.0749*	.1491	.0952**
V95 Sexual freedom	.1398	.0887*	.1155	.1975	.1721	.1614
V96 View on women single parents	.1533	.1946	.1217	.2024	.1430	.1252*
V98 Working mother as good as non-working mother	.0999	.1132	.0752	.1350	.0912*	-
V99 Housewife job as fulfilling as paid job	-.0571	-.0881*	-	.1048	-	-.1450*
V100 Husband and wife contributing to income	.0292**	-	-	-	-	-
V101 Men better political leaders than women	-.2068	-.1787	-.2022	-.2121	-.2404	-.2091
V102 Problem if wife earns more than husband	-.1025	-.1421	-.0927	-.0666*	-.1393	-.1069**
V103 University more important for boy	-.1311	-.1462	-.1323	-.1307	-.1090	-.1315*



Table E.1

*Correlations between Tolerance Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (4)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V110 View on fighting for your country	-.0691	-	-.0641*	-.0529**	-.1362	-.1075**
V111 Less emphasis on money	.0789	-	.0655*	.0923	.1324	-
V112 Less importance placed on work in our lives	.0769	.0758**	.0637*	-	.1438	.1447*
V113 More emphasis on technology	-.0294**	-	-.0504**	-	-.0758**	-
V114 Greater respect for authority	-.1598	-.1100	-.1487	-.1389	-.2646	-.2127
V115 More emphasis on family life	-.0780	-	-.0798	-.0560**	-.1350	-.1274*
V117 Interest in politics	.0875	.1045	.0862	.0559**	.0927*	.1483*
V118 Signing a petition	.1451	.1620	.1678	.1025	.1819	.2074
V119 Joining boycotts	.1533	.1188	.1524	.1288	.2133	.1827
V120 Attending lawful demonstrations	.1637	.1493	.1734	.1428	.2076	.2078
V121 Joining unofficial strikes	.1415	.0898*	.1394	.1196	.2232	.1423*
V122 Occupation of buildings or factories	.1225	-	.1449	.1096	.1604	.1023**
V123 Political inclination	-.1828	-.2401	-.1531	-.0890*	-.2580	-.2448
V124 View on revolutionary action to change	-.0571	-	-.0981	-	-.0896*	-
V125 Equal incomes	.0267**	-	.0560*	-	-	-
V126 Increase government ownership of business	.0422*	-	.0530**	-	.1416	.1402*
V128 View that competition is good	-	-	-.0890	.0724*	-	-
V131 Cautious attitude towards life changes	-	-	-	-	-.0584**	-.1043**
V132 New ideas better than old ones	.0431*	.1116	-	.0712*	-	-
V133 Import of foreign goods	.0789	.0633**	.0762*	.0949	.0686**	-
V134 Let foreign workers in the country	.1998	.1553	.1606	.2400	.2367	.2124
V135 Confidence in the churches	-.1433	-.1139	-.1294	-.1256	-.2409	-.1597
V136 Confidence in the Armed Forces	-.1583	-.1930	-.1159	-.1417	-.2523	-.1484*
V137 Confidence in the legal system	-.0618	-.1208	-	-	-.0684**	-.1376*
V138 Confidence in the press	-.0321*	-.0687**	-	-	-	-
V139 Confidence in the television	-.0847	-.0687**	-.0547**	-.1016	-.1276	-
V140 Confidence in the labor unions	.0413*	-	.0515**	-	.1387	-
V141 Confidence in the police	-.1132	-.1241	-.0950	-.1073	-.1500	-.1216*
V142 Confidence in the government in Madrid	-.0643	-.0667**	-.0743*	-.0866	-.0594**	-

Table E.1

*Correlations between Tolerance Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (5)*

	p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V143 Confidence in the political parties	-.0279**	-	-	-.0636*	-	-
V144 Confidence in the parliament	-.0391*	-	-.0571*	-.0482**	-	-
V145 Confidence in the civil service	-.0574	-	-.0461**	-.0823*	-.0626**	-.0960**
V146 Confidence in the major companies	-.0955	-.0978*	-.0972	-.0734*	-.1011*	-.1284*
V147 Confidence in the green/ecology movement	.0937	-	.1175	.0946	.1232	.1182**
V148 Confidence in the women's movement	.1081	.0724**	.1642	.0636**	.1016*	.1174**
V149 Confidence in the European Union	-.0328*	-	-	-	-.0647**	-
V150 Confidence in the United Nations	-.0365*	-	-	-	-	-
V151 Rating of political system under Franco	-.1948	-.2433	-.1267	-.1742	-.2537	-.2352
V154 Strong leader, no parliament, no elections	-.1583	-.1892	-.1598	-.1511	-.1652	-
V155 Experts making decisions for the country	-.0681	-	-.0979	-.0526**	-	-
V156 Army rule	-.1368	-.1481	-.0662*	-.1725	-.1972	-.0962**
V157 View on having a democratic system	.0583	.0948*	-	.0656*	.0952*	-
V158 View on having a cooperative party leader	.1054	.1030*	.1056	.1167	.0772*	.1376*
V159 Protect individual freedom	.1863	.2061	.1770	.1344	.2606	.1748
V160 In democracy, the economic system runs badly	-.0916	-.0989*	-	-.1181	-.1060	-.1817
V161 View of democracy as an indecisive system	-.1050	-.1137	-.0785	-.0904	-.1454	-.1801
V162 View of democracies as no good to maintain order	-.1388	-.1520	-.1026	-.1261	-.2065	-.1398*
V163 View of democracy as a better form of government	.0622	.1581	-	.0632**	.0743**	-
V164 Violence to pursue political goals	.0309**	.0670**	-	-	-	-
V165 Level of satisfaction with national government	-.0598	-	-.0635*	-.0771*	-.1480	-
V166 View that the country should be run for all	-.0544	-	-.0763*	-	-.1344	-
V168 View on group one likes least holding public office	.0326*	-	-	-	-	-
V169 View on group one likes least teaching in schools	.0309**	-	-	-	-	-
V170 View on group one likes least holding public demonstrations	.1093	.1064	.1206	.0575**	.1345	.1706
V177 View on purpose of life	.0575	-	.0689*	.0699*	-	-

Table E.1

*Correlations between Tolerance Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (6)*

	p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V179 Religious denomination	.0884	.0678**	.0904	.0573**	.1402	-
V180 Brought up religiously at home	-.0331*	-	-.0540**	-	-.0581**	-
V181 Religious attendance	-.1433	-.1855	-.1023	-.1115	-.2346	-.1910
V182 Religious person	-.1102	-.0790*	-.0971	-.0671*	-.2306	-.1426*
V183 Belief in God	-.0953	-.0603**	-.0745*	-.0731*	-.1958	-.1351*
V185 Belief in human soul	-.0482	-	-	-	-.1340	-
V186 Belief in the devil	-.0558	-	-.1020	-	-.0741**	-
V187 Belief in hell	-.0832	-	-.1072	-.0698*	-.1132	-.1352*
V188 Belief in heaven	-.1189	-.0727**	-.1052	-.1100	-.2189	-.1418*
V189 Belief in sin	-.1229	-.1135	-.0981	-.0958	-.2131	-.1821
V190 Importance of God	-.1285	-.1438	-.0987	-.1025	-.2134	-.1760
V191 Comfort and strength from religion	-.1138	-.1189	-.1003	-.0951	-.1796	-.1421*
V193 Justifiable: Avoiding a fare on public transport	.0289**	-	.0488**	-	.0873*	-
V195 Justifiable: Buying something you knew was stolen	.0472	-	.0984	-	.1012	-
V197 Justifiable: Homosexuality	.2934	.2759	.3138	.2647	.3569	.2846
V198 Justifiable: Prostitution	.2340	.2130	.2473	.2240	.2645	.2570
V199 Justifiable: Abortion	.2070	.2182	.2113	.2209	.2200	.2032
V200 Justifiable: Divorce	.1989	.1798	.1885	.2276	.2338	.2111
V201 Justifiable: Euthanasia	.1552	.1736	.1589	.1241	.1911	.1675
V202 Justifiable: Suicide	.1488	.0843*	.1901	.1121	.1730	.1967
V203 Geographical group belong to (1)	.0527	.1063	.0554**	-	-	.1227*
V204 Geographical group belong to (2)	.0382*	-	-	.0647*	-	-
V205 Proud to be Spanish (or from own region)	-	-.1447	.0620*	-	-	-
V206 Born in Spain	.0272**	-	.0808	-	-	-
V208 Feeling of being more Spanish than nationalist	-.0483	-	-.0769	-	-.0822*	-.0967**
V209 Spanish spoken at home more than regional/other language	-	.0595**	-	-.0464**	.0918*	-
V213 Perception of corruption in Spain	-	-.0802*	-	-	.0680**	-
V216 Age	-.2585	-.2469	-.2334	-.2548	-.3387	-.3120
V217 Educational level	.1631	.1823	.1413	.1811	.2142	.1556

Table E.1

*Correlations between Tolerance Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (7)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V218 Age completed full time education	-	.0630**	.0771*	.0951	-.0925*	-
V219 Living with parents	.1487	.1335	.1460	.1457	.1639	.1769
V221 Profession respondent	.0253**	-	-	.0710*	-	
V223 Chief wage earner employment status	-.0551	-	-.0883	-.0613*	-	
V224 Profession chief wage earner	-.0547	-	-.0973	-.0600**	-	
V225 Family savings	-	.0794*	-	-	-	
V226 Social class	-	-	-	.0670*	-	
V227 Household income	.0705	.0746**	.0606**	-	.1190	
V228 Hours of watching television	-.0399*	-	-.0471**	-.0466**	-	
V232 Size of town	.0265**	-	-		.0626**	
V233 Ethnic group	-	-	-	-.0622*	-	
V234 Region	-	-	-.0514	-	-	

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table E.2

*Correlations between General Trust and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (1)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index	.0557	-	.0746*	-	.0796*	-
Levels of Trust in Institutions Index	-	.0833*	-	-	-	.1139**
Postmaterialist Index	1493	.0655**	.1716	.0729*	.1167	.0996**
Importance of Social Bonds Index	.0662	-	.0776	.0531**	.0861*	-
Tolerance Index	.0691	-	.0933	.0502**	.1188	-
Total Association Index	.0853	-	.0600*	.0594**	.0588**	-
V5 Importance of friends	.0961	-	.1237	.0626**	.0995*	.1295*
V6 Importance of leisure	.0532	-	.0641*	-	-	.1190*
V7 Importance of politics	.1310	.1099	.1023	.1135	.1551	.1024**
V8 Importance of work	-.0619	-	-.0825	-	-	-.1190*
V9 Importance of religion	-	-	.0466**	-	-.0580**	-
V10 Happiness	.0353**	-	.0461**	-	.0670**	-
V11 State of health	.0755	.0674**	.0992	.0524**	.0611**	-
V12 Respect for parents	-.0450	-	-	-	-.0849*	-
V13 Emphasis on parents' responsibilities towards their children	-.0588	-	-.0588*	-	-	-
V14 Importance of children to learn good manners	-.1250	-	-.1369	-.0795*	-.1082	-.1206*
V15 Importance of children to learn independence	.1037	.0828*	.1044	-	.0866*	.1282*
V16 Importance of children to learn hard work	-.0288**	-	-.0527**	-	-	-
V19 Importance of children to learn tolerance	.0344*	-	.0642*	-	-	-.0910**
V20 Importance of children to learn to save money	-	-	-.0475**	-	-	-.0918**
V22 Importance of children to learn religious faith	-	-	.0472**	-	-	-
V24 Importance of children to learn obedience	-.1233	-.0905*	-.1125	-.0509**	-.1573	-.0990**
V28 Member of church organisation	.0280**	-	-	.1096	-	-
V29 Member sport organisation	.0659	-	-	-	-	-
V30 Member of art organisation	.0728	.0754**	.0650*	-	.0875*	-
V31 Member labour union	.0589	.0710**	-	.0830	-	-
V32 Member political party	.0370*	-	-	-	-	-

Table E.2

*Correlations between General Trust and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (2)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>	
V33 Member of environmental organisation	.0564	-	.0439**	-	.0783*	-	
V34 Member professional organisation	.0745	-	.1008	.0904	-	-	
V35 Member charitable organisation	.0762	-	.0560**	.0934	.0613**	-	
V36 Member of any other voluntary organisation	.0604	-	.0918	-	-	-	
V37 Discussion of politics with friends	.1249	.0629**	.1294	.0517**	.1388	.1452*	
V38 Increase taxes to protect environment	.0593	.0933*	.0640*	-	.0735**	.1006**	
V39 Increase prices to protect environment	.0368*	-	.0477**	-	-	.1058**	
V41 Importance of protecting the environment over economic growth	-.0662	-	-.0733*	-	-.0863*	-.2015	
V42 Choosing products better for the environment	.0650	-	.0554*	.0561**	.0924*	.1339*	
V43 Recycling for environmental reasons	.0838	-	.0637*	.0480**	.1087	-	
V44 Attitude towards reduction of water consumption	-	-	.0538**	-	.0665**	-	
V45 Meeting/letter/petition to protect the environment	.0742	-	.0534**	.0606**	.0987*	-	
V46 Contribution to an environmental organisation	.0514	-	-	.0576**	.0708**	-	
V48 Express own preferences to build good relationships	-.0641	-.0733**	-.0580**	-.0522**	-.0711**	-	
V49 Importance of humans coexisting with nature	-.0349*	-.0939*	-	-	-	-	
V50 View that humanity has a bright future	.1077	.1161	-	.1401	.1479	-	
V51 Accept neighbours with criminal record	.0760	.0590**	.0793	-	.1243	-	
V52 Accept neighbours from other race	-	-	.0529**	-	-	-	
V53 Accept neighbours who are political extremists	.0305**	-	No data	-	-	-	
V54 Accept neighbours who are heavy drinkers	.0273**	-	-	.0527**	-	-	
V56 Accept neighbours who are muslims	.0290**	.0771*	.0648*	-	-	-	
V57 Accept neighbours who are immigrants	-	-	.0645*	-	-	-	
V58 Accept neighbours who are people with AIDS	.0600	-	.1018	-	.0861*	-	
V59 Accept neighbours who are drug addicts	.0654	-	.0851	.0495**	.1056	-	
V60 Accept neighbours who are homosexuals	.0503	-	.0605*	.0496**	.1016*	-	
V61 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for men	-.0770	-	-.1171	-	-.0585**	-	
V62 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for young people	-.0631	-.0649**	-	-	-.0949*	-.1012**	

Table E.2

*Correlations between General Trust and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (3)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>	
V63 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for Spanish people	-.1540	-.0872*	-.1673	-.0821*	-.1728	-.1771	
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.0909	.0919*	.1159	-	-	.1060**	
V65 Satisfaction with life as a whole	.0566	-	.0780	-	.0682**	-	
V66 Freedom of choice/ control over one's life	.0266**	.0771**	.0684*	-	-	-	
V67 View on work until satisfied with result	-.0278**	-.0583**	-	-	-	-	
V68 View on disappointment if don't accomplish goals	-.0558	-.1182	-.0720*	-	-	-	
V69 View on working until late because he/she likes to work	-.0382*	-	-	-	-	-	
V70 Goal of making one's parents proud	-.1274	-.1434	-.1134	-.0494**	-.1328	-	
V71 To live up to what friends expect	-.0418*	-	-.0683*	-	-	-	
V72 View that work makes life worth living	-.0848	-	-.0628*	-	-.1277	-	
V75 Important good pay in job	-.0404*	-	-.0638*	-	-	-	
V76 Important not much pressure in job	.0282**	-	-	-	-	-	
V77 Important good job security	-.0344*	-	-.0885	-	-	-	
V78 Important to have job respected	-.0729	-	-.0586*	-.0522**	-.0898*	-.1283*	
V79 Important good working hours	.0330*	-	-	-	-	-	
V82 Important to achieve something in job	.0251**	-	-	-	-	-	
V84 Important to have an interesting job	.0644	-	.0517**	-	.0832*	-	
V87 Employees to own business and elect managers	.0301**	-	-	-	-	-	
V88 View on following instructions at work	-.0814	-	-	-.0564**	-.0604**	-.1315*	
V89 Marital status	-	-	-	.0497**	-	-	
V90 Number of children	-.0271**	-	-	-	-	-	
V91 Ideal size of family	.0532	-	.0710*	.0638*	-	-	
V92 Importance attributed to children's having a two-parent home	-.0579	-.0639**	-.0697*	-	-	-	
V93 View that women need to have children to be fulfilled	-.0620	-	-.0553**	-	-.0878*	-	
V94 View that marriage is outdated	-	-	-.0468**	-	-	-	
V98 Working mother as good as non-working mother	.0935	.1039	.1178	-	-	.1129**	
V100 Husband and wife contributing to income	-	-	-	-.0726*	-	-	
V101 Men better political leaders than women	-.0534	-	-.0597*	-	-.1090	-	

Table E.2

*Correlations between General Trust and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (4)*

	p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V102 Problem if wife earns more than husband	-.0559	-	-.0810	-	-.0848*	-
V103 University more important for boy	-.0322*	-	-.0591*	.0611**	-.0938*	-
V110 View on fighting for your country	-.0798	-	-.0840	-	-.0919*	-
V111 Less emphasis on money	.0579	-	.0558**	-	.0979*	-
V112 Less importance placed on work in our lives	.0843	-	.1193	-	.1058	.1238*
V113 More emphasis on technology	-	-	-.0830	-	-	-
V114 Greater respect for authority	-.1323	-.0799*	-	-.0747*	-.1823	-
V115 More emphasis on family life	-.0750	-	-	-.0608**	-.1237	-
V117 Interest in politics	.1482	.1263	.1255	.1286	.1440	.1501*
V118 Signing a petition	.1548	.0830*	.1034	.1829	.1434	-
V119 Joining boycotts	.1575	.0871*	.1291	.0984	.1498	.1446*
V120 Attending lawful demonstrations	.1505	.1090	.1295	.1124	.1264	-
V121 Joining unofficial strikes	.1293	.0608**	.1191	.1142	.0964*	-
V122 Occupation of buildings or factories	.0984	-	.0817	.0772*	.0969*	-
V123 Political inclination	-.0383*	-	-	-	-.0907*	-
V124 View on revolutionary action to change society	.0459	-	.0500**	.0568**	-	-.1124**
V125 Equal incomes	.0267**	-	-	.0754*	-	-
V127 View on government providing for everyone	-.0412*	-	-.0645*	-	-	-
V128 View that competition is good	-.0499	-	-.0701*	-	-.0582**	-
V129 Hard work brings a better life	-	-	.0442**	.0736*	-	-
V130 View on fair wealth distribution	.0649	.0677**	.0755*	-	.0653**	.1651
V132 New ideas better than old ones	-	.0641**	-.0552**	-	-	-
V133 Import of foreign goods	.0777	.0752**	.0783*	.0607**	.0668**	-
V134 Approve foreign workers in the country	.0861	.0856*	.1071	-	.1081	-
V136 Confidence in the Armed Forces	-.0876	-	-.0535**	-	-.1112	-
V137 Confidence in the legal system	.0326*	.0677**	.0662*	-	-	-
V138 Confidence in the press	.0516	-	.0474**	.0543**	-	.1258*
V139 Confidence in the television	-.0267**	-	-.0468**	-	-	-



Table E.2

*Correlations between General Trust and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (5)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>	
V140 Confidence in the labour unions	.0569	-	-	.0632**	.0868*	.0994**	
V141 Confidence in the police	.0418*	.0617**	-	-	-	.1384*	
V142 Confidence in the government in Madrid	-	.0860*	-	-	-	-	
V143 Confidence in the political parties	.0574	.1209	.0753*	-	.0906*	-	
V144 Confidence in the parliament	.0260**	.1136	-	-	.0720**	-	
V145 Confidence in the civil service	-	.0759**	-	-	-	-	
V146 Confidence in the major companies	-.0298**	-	-	-	-.0858*	-	
V148 Confidence in the women's movement	.0282**	-	-	-	-	-	
V149 Confidence in the European Union	-	.1064*	-	-	-	-	
V150 Confidence in the United Nations	-	.0660**	-	-	-	-	
V151 Rating of political system under Franco	-.0763	-	-.0505**	-	-.1412	-	
V152 Rating of political system today	.0496	.1326	.0894	-	.1243	-	
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	.0753	.1351	.0827	.0629**	.0993*	-	
V154 Strong leader, no parliament, no elections	-.0765	-	-.0885	-	-.1490	-	
V155 Experts making decisions for the country	-.0399*	-	-.0637*	-	-.1257	-	
V156 Army rule	-.0617	-	-.0640*	-	-.0799*	-	
V157 View on having a democratic system	.0512	.0915*	-	-	.0610**	-	
V158 View on having a cooperative party leader	.0266**	-	-	.0708*	-	-	
V159 Protect individual freedom	.1027	-	.1313	-	.1354	-	
V160 In democracy, the economic system runs badly	-.0787	-	-.0938	-	-.1389	-	
V161 View of democracy as an indecisive system	-.1134	-	-.1775	-	-.1720	-	
V162 View of democracies as no good to maintain order	-.0829	-	-.1078	-	-.1590	-.1514*	
V163 View of democracy as a better form of government	.0418*	-	-	-	.0955*	-	
V164 Violence to pursue political goals	-	-	-.0441**	-	-	-	
V166 View that the country should be run for all	.0533	.0950*	-	-	-	.1175**	
V168 View on group one likes least holding public office	.0846	.1030	.1030	-	.0951*	-	

Table E.2

*Correlations between General Trust and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (6)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>	
V169 View on group one likes least teaching in schools	.0404*	-	-	-	.0774*	-	
V170 View on group one likes least holding public demonstrations	.1215	-	.1416	-	.0982*	.1688	
V177 View on purpose of life	-	-	-	.0489**	-	-	
V179 Religious denomination	.0268**	-	-	-	-	.0952**	
V181 Religious attendance	.0398*	-	.0594*	-	-	-	
V182 Religious person	-.0606	-	-	-	-.0938*	-.1466*	
V183 Belief in God	-.0662	-	-	-.0614**	-.0945*	-.1664	
V184 Belief in life after death	-	-	.0640*	-	-	-	
V185 Belief in human soul	-.0285**	-	-	-.0591**	-	-	
V186 Belief in the devil	-.0367*	-	-	-	-	-	
V189 Belief in sin	-.0471	-	-	-	-.0814*	-	
V190 Importance of God	-.0511	-	-	-	-	-.0912**	
V191 Comfort and strength from religion	-.0385*	-	-	-	-	-	
V194 Justifiable: cheating on taxes	-	-	-	-	-.0776*	-	
V196: Justifiable: accepting a bribe	-	-	-	-	-.0808*	-	
V197 Justifiable: Homosexuality	.1005	-	.1111	.0790*	.1030	-	
V198 Justifiable: Prostitution	.0650	-	.0520**	.0609**	-	-	
V199 Justifiable: Abortion	.0480	-	-	-	-	-	
V200 Justifiable: Divorce	.0399*	-	-	-	.0980*	-	
V202 Justifiable: Suicide	.0780	-	.0570**	-	.0737**	.1037**	
V203 Geographical group belong to (1)	.0275**	-	-	-	.0738**	-	
V204 Geographical group belong to (2)	.0248**	-	-	-	-	.1012**	
V205 Proud to be Spanish (or from own region)	-.0327*	-	-	-	-.0625**	-	
V206 Born in Spain	-	-	.0433**	-	-	-	
V207 Year came to Spain	-	-	-.1005**	-	-	-.1767**	
V208 Feeling of being more Spanish than nationalist	-.0681	-	-.0543**	-.0480**	-	-.0959**	
V209 Spanish spoken at home more than regional/other language	.0301**	-	-	-	.0708**	-	
V213 Perception of corruption in Spain	-.0781	-.0857*	-.1236	-.1150	-	-	

Table E.2

*Correlations between General Trust and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (7)*

	p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V214 Gender	-	-	-	-.0622*	-	-
V217 Educational level	.1403	.0637**	.1599	.0739*	.1491	.1481*
V218 Age completed full time education	-	-	.1078	-	-	.1301**
V219 Living with parents	-	-	-	-.0603**	-	-
V220 Employment status	.0590	-	.0439**	-	-	-
V221 Profession respondent	.1029	.0880*	.0953	.0978	-	.1434**
V223 Chief wage earner employment status	.0578	-	-	.0801*	-	-
V224 Profession chief wage earner	.0683	.0687**	.0523**	.0621*	-	-
V225 Family savings	.0422*	.0919*	-	.0511**	-	-
V226 Social class	.0588	-	-	-	.1010*	-
V227 Household income	.1137	.0756**	.0740*	-	.1085*	.1301**
V228 Hours of watching television	-.0720	-	-.0621*	-	-	-
V232 Size of town	.0385	-	.0868	-	.1052	-.1156**

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table E.3

*Correlations between Levels of Trust in Institutions Index and Other Variables from WVS  
1995-1996 (1)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index	.0679	.0714	.0775	.0504	.1323	-
Postmaterialist Index	.1797	.1003*	.1419	.1680	.1255	-
Importance of Social Bonds Index	.0486	.0705**	.0578*	-	.1123	-
Tolerance Index	.0807	.1020	.0494**	.0829	.1155	-
Total Association Index	.0254**	-	.0439**	-	-	.0921**
V4 Importance of family	.0690	.0830*	.0795	.0722*	.0774*	-
V5 Importance of friends	-	-	-	-	.0932*	-
V6 Importance of leisure	-.0389*	-	-.0516**	-	-	-
V7 Importance of politics	.0408*	.0721**	.0565*	-	.1091	.1452*
V8 Importance of work	.0369*	-	.0648*	-	-	-
V9 Importance of religion	.2714	.2543	.2749	.2654	.2552	.2554
V10 Happiness	.0612	.0623**	.0701*	.0495**	.0740**	-
V11 State of health	.0931	.0660**	-	.1665	.1087	-
V12 Respect for parents	.1154	.0842*	.0879	-	.1763	-
V13 Emphasis on parents' responsibilities towards their children	.1322	.0947*	.1106	.1019	.0937*	-
V14 Importance of children to learn good manners	.1096	.0609**	.0889	-	.1155	-
V15 Importance of children to learn independence	-.1445	-.0760*	-.1319	-.1201	-.1228	-.1220*
V16 Importance of children to learn hard work	.0373*	.0986*	.0587*	-	-	-
V17 Importance of children to learn responsibility	-.0581	-	-	-.0746*	-	-
V20 Importance of children to learn to save money	.0333*	-	.0496**	-	.0626	-
V22 Importance of children to learn religious faith	.1568	.1431	.1561	.1540	.1541	.1429*
V24 Importance of children to learn obedience	.0775	-	.0763	-	.0854*	-
V27 General trust	-	.0833*	-	-	-	.1139**
V28 Member of church organisation	.0488	.0852*	.1366	.0532**	-	-
V29 Member sport organisation	-.0641	-.0694**	-	-	-	-
V30 Member of art organisation	-.0486	-	-	-	-	-

Table E.3

*Correlations between Levels of Trust in Institutions Index and Other Variables from WVS  
1995-1996 (2)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B.Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>	
V33 Member of environmental organisation	-.0347*	-	-	-	-	-	
V34 Member professional organisation	-.0314*	-	-	-	-	-	
V35 Member charitable organisation	-	-.0502**	.0589*	-	-	-	
V36 Member of any other voluntary organisation	-.0242	-	-	-	-	-	
V37 Discussion of politics with friends	-.1003	-.0627**	-.1027	-.0874	-	-	
V38 Increase taxes to protect environment	.0399*	.1006*	-	.0714*	-	-	
V39 Increase prices to protect environment	.0421*	.1126	-	-	-	-	
V40 View that environment may be fixed by international laws	-	-	-	.0609**	-	-	
V41 Importance of protecting the environment over economic growth	-	-	.0452**	-	-	-	
V42 Choosing products better for the environment	-	-	-	.0707*	-	-	
V43 Recycling for environmental reasons	.0785	-	-	.0900	-	.1132**	
V44 Attitude towards reduction of water consumption	-.0960	-.1198	-.0518**	-	-	-.0933**	
V45 Meeting/letter/petition to protect the environment	.0657	-	.0782	.0512**	-	-	
V47 More emphasis on tradition	-	-	.0735*	-	-	-	
V48 Express own preferences to build good relationships	-	-.0646**	-	-	-	-	
V49 Importance of humans coexisting with nature	-.0379*	-	-.0532**	-	-	-	
V50 View that humanity has a bright future	.1425	.1620	.1575	.0822*	.1950	.1116**	
V51 Accept neighbours with criminal record	-.0972	-.1199	-.0902	-	-.0964*	.1578	
V52 Accept neighbours from other race	-	-	-	-	-.0772*	-	
V53 Accept neighbours who are political extremists	.0785	-.0677**	No data	.0767*	-	-	
V54 Accept neighbours who are heavy drinkers	-.0333*	-	-	-.0586**	-	.1423*	
V56 Accept neighbours who are muslims	-	-	-	-	-.0930*	-	
V57 Accept neighbours who are immigrants	-	-	-	-	-.1303	-	
V58 Accept neighbours who are people with AIDS	-.0963	-.1428	-.0466**	-.1119	-.0788*	-	

Table E.3

*Correlations between Levels of Trust in Institutions Index and Other Variables from WVS  
1995-1996 (3)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B.Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>	
V59 Accept neighbours who are drug addicts	-.0671	-	-	-.0837	-.0741**	.	
V60 Accept neighbours who are Homosexuals	-.0968	-.1066	-.0607*	-.1134	-.0808*	-	
V61 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for men	.1331	.1043	.1007	.1258	.0869*	-	
V62 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for young people	.0685	-	.0522**	.1147	.0627**	-	
V63 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for Spanish people	.0799	-	-	.0908	.0709**	.0963**	
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.0404*	.1219	.0530**	-	.1183	-	
V65 Satisfaction with life as a whole	.0548	.0594**	.0636*	-	.1444	-	
V67 View on work until satisfied with result	.0622	.0691**	.1037	-	.0800*	-	
V69 View on working until late because he/she likes to work	.1255	.1322	.1069	-	.1452	-	
V70 Goal of making one's parents proud	.1850	.0963*	.2056	.1330	.1623	.1639	
V71 To live up to what friends expect	.1406	.1026	.1108	.1340	.1971	.1193*	
V72 View that work makes life worth living	.1588	.0832*	.1610	.1668	.1147	-	
V75 Important good pay in job	.0418*	-	-	.0586**	-	.1002**	
V76 Important not much pressure in job	-.0302**	-	-	-	-	-	
V77 Important good job security	.0641	-	-	.0887	-	-	
V78 Important to have job respected	.0737	-	.0831	.0823	.0843*	-	
V79 Important good working hours	-.0355*	-	-.0524**	-	-	-	
V80 Important to use initiative in job	-.0809	-	-	-.0869	-	-.0950**	
V81 Important generous holidays	-.0454	-	-	-	-.0871	-	
V82 Important to achieve something in job	-	-	-	-.0542**	-	-	
V83 Important to have a responsible job	.0375*	-	.0960	-	-	-	
V84 Important to have an interesting job	-.0535	-	-.0460**	-	-	-	
V85 Important job to meet one's abilities	-	.0623**	-	-	-	-	
V87 Employees to own business and elect managers	.0694	-	.1441	-	.0644**	-	
V88 View on following instructions at work	.1043	.0643**	.1000	.0859	-	-	

Table E.3

*Correlations between Levels of Trust in Institutions Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (4)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05		
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B.Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V89 Marital status	.0810	.0647**	.0578**	.0968	.0640**	-
V90 Number of children	.1747	.1039	.1630	.2053	.1379	-
V91 Ideal size of family	.0590	-	.0891	-	-	.1048**
V92 Importance attributed to children's having a two-parent home	.1137	.0954*	.1009	.1169	.0986*	.0903**
V93 View that women need to have children to be fulfilled	.1608	.1205	.1486	.1399	.0990*	-
V94 View that marriage is outdated	-.1477	-.0813*	-.1907	-.1103	-.1642	-.1338*
V95 Sexual freedom	-.0710	-.1522	-.0982	-	-.0615**	-
V96 View on women single parents	-.0778	-.1384	-.0808	-.0661*	-.0838*	-.1500*
V98 Working mother as good as non-working mother	.0629	-	-	.0788*	-	-
V99 Housewife job as fulfilling as paid job	.1411	.1407	.1485	.1153	.1675	.1325*
V101 Men better political leaders than women	.1206	.1039*	.1030	.0898	.1336	.1123**
V102 Problem if wife earns more than husband	.0463	-	-	.0808*	-	-
V103 University more important for boy	.0889	.0584**	.0928	-	.1105	-
V110 View on fighting for your country	.1907	.1442	.1926	.1258	.1764	.1313*
V111 Less emphasis on money	-	-	-.0447**	-	-	-
V112 Less importance placed on work in our lives	-.0570	-	-.0714*	-	-.0589**	-
V113 More emphasis on technology	.1037	.1501	.1179	-	.0948*	-
V114 Greater respect for authority	.2570	.1726	.2859	.1899	.1896	.1502*
V115 More emphasis on family life	.1173	.0803*	.1128	.0601**	.1049	.0996**
V116 View on Scientific advances to help mankind	.0861	-	.1161	-	.0737*	-
V117 Interest in politics	-	-	-	-	-	.1432*
V118 Signing a petition	-.1410	-.0746**	-.0965	-.1044	-.0592**	-
V119 Joining boycotts	-.1831	-	-.2141	-.1377	-.0921*	-
V120 Attending lawful demonstrations	-.1417	-.0674**	-.0932	-.0984	-.0958*	-
V121 Joining unofficial strikes	-.1966	-.0815*	-.2520	-.0969	-.1671	-
V122 Occupation of buildings/factories	-.1461	-	-.1953	-.0545**	-.1108	-
V123 Political inclination	.1042	-	.2122	-	.1112	-

Table E.3

*Correlations between Levels of Trust in Institutions Index and Other Variables from WVS  
1995-1996 (5)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B.Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V124 View on revolutionary action to change society	.1437	.0856*	.1754	.1049	.1343	.1353*
V126 Increase government ownership of business	-	-	-.0666*	-.0688*	-	-
V127 View on government providing for everyone	-	-	-	.0628*	-.1246	-
V128 View that competition is good	.0926	-	.1109	.0730*	.0748**	.1126**
V129 Hard work brings a better life	.1505	.0603**	.1859	.1174	.1452	.1479*
V130 View on fair wealth distribution	.0730	.0706**	.0880	-	.1181	.1565*
V131 Cautious attitude towards life changes	.0718	-	.1100	-	.1016*	-
V133 Import of foreign goods	-	-	.0603*	-	-	-
V134 Approve foreign workers in the country	-.0245**	-	-.0684*	-	-	-
V151 Rating of political system under Franco	.1475	.0653**	.2045	.0619**	.1296	-
V152 Rating of political system today	.2872	.2117	.3124	.2572	.2595	.1904
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	.2408	.2295	.2584	.2314	.2230	.2307
V154 Strong leader, no parliament, no elections	.1300	.0740**	.1262	.0984	.1514	-
V155 Experts making decisions for the country	.0602	.0922*	.0657*	-	.0847*	-
V156 Army rule	.1402	.0820*	.1656	.0637**	.1889	-
V157 View on having a democratic system	.1048	.1324	.1493	.0667*	.0887*	.1542*
V159 Protect individual freedom	-.1467	-	-.2030	-.1094	-.1107	-
V160 In democracy, the economic system runs badly	-.0280**	-	-	-	-	-.1328*
V163 View of democracy as a better form of government	.0689	.0672**	.1310	-	-	.0946**
V164 Violence to pursue political goals	.0505	-	.1303	-	-	-
V165 Level of satisfaction with national government	.3030	.2363	.3462	.3299	.3202	.3343
V166 View that the country should be run for all	.2481	.1493	.2918	.2963	.2410	.3039
V167 Group like least	.0985	-	.1219	.0870	-	-
V168 View on group one likes least holding public office	-.0443	-	-.0639*	-	-	-
V169 View on group one likes least teaching in schools	-.0322*	-	-	-	-	-



Table E.3

*Correlations between Levels of Trust in Institutions Index and Other Variables from WVS  
1995-1996 (6)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B.Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>	
V170 View on group one likes least holding public demonstrations	-.0804	-	-.0641*	-	-	-	
V171 View on people living in poverty compared to ten years	-.1127	-.1228	-.1284	-.0700*	-.1329	-	
V173 View on the poor's chances of escaping from poverty	.1105	-	.0918	.1143	.1694	-	
V174 View on the role of the government in helping the poor in the country/region	.1676	.1701	.1264	.2086	.1988	.1289*	
V175 View on the role of the government in helping poor countries	1412	.1699	.0549**	.1827	.1421	-	
V176 View on economic help to poor countries	.0554	.0774*	-	.1348	.1165	.0999*	
V177 View on purpose of life	-	-	.0671*	-	.0725**	-	
V179 Religious denomination	-.2070	-.1998	-.2520	-.1631	-.1722	-.1543*	
V180 Brought up religiously at home	.0927	.1070	.0610	.0666*	.1595	.1488*	
V181 Religious attendance	.2239	.2507	.2784	.2171	.2545	.1957	
V182 Religious person	.2308	.1883	.2709	.1891	.2327	.1912	
V183 Belief in God	-.2181	-.1576	-.2234	-.1997	-.1912	-.1669	
V184 Belief in life after death	-.1408	-.1284	-.1682	-.1069	-.1317	-.1449*	
V185 Belief in human soul	-.1848	-.1574	-.1822	-.1414	-.2157	-.1630	
V186 Belief in the devil	-.1214	-.1177	-.0785	-.0713*	-.1402	-.0994**	
V187 Belief in hell	-.1377	-.1385	-.1051	-.0713*	-.1758	-.0981**	
V188 Belief in heaven	-.2192	-.1717	-.2056	-.1961	-.2209	-.1463*	
V189 Belief in sin	-.2100	-.1780	-.2016	-.1775	-.2300	-.1369*	
V190 Importance of God	.2813	.2434	.2894	.2578	.2232	.2281	
V191 Comfort and strength from religion	.2881	.2791	.3162	.2590	.2390	.2471	
V192 Justifiable: claiming benefits one is not entitled to	-.0881	-.0806*	-.0744*	-.0864	-	-	
V193 Justifiable: avoiding a fare on public transport	-.1368	-.1151	-.1063	-.0823*	-.1491	-	
V194 Justifiable: cheating on taxes	-.1991	-.1338	-.1857	-.1590	-.1686	-.1103**	
V195 Justifiable: Buying something you knew was stolen	-.1315	-.0885*	-.1292	-.0723*	-.1232	-	
V197 Justifiable: Homosexuality	-.1777	-.1055	-.1849	-.1279	-.1728	-	
V198 Justifiable: Prostitution	-.1855	-.1464	-.1937	-.1247	-.1569	-.1000**	

Table E.3

*Correlations between Levels of Trust in Institutions Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (7)*

	p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B.Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V199 Justifiable: Abortion	-.2063	-.1785	-.2193	-.1294	-.1977	-.1001**
V200 Justifiable: Divorce	-.2004	-.1806	-.1989	-.1649	-.1795	-.1113**
V201 Justifiable: Euthanasia	-.2003	-.1777	-.1915	-.1498	-.2059	-.1330*
V202 Justifiable: Suicide	-.1896	-.1543	-.1790	-.1450	-.1721	-
V203 Geographical group belong to (1)	-	-	-	-	-.0671**	-
V204 Geographical group belong to (2)	-.0258**	-	-	-	-	-.0994**
V205 Proud to be Spanish	.0535	.1529	-.0653*	.0475**	-	-
V206 Born in Spain	-	-	-.1167	-	-	-
V208 Feeling of being more Spanish than nationalist	-.1392	-	-.2414	-	-	-
V209 Spanish spoken at home more than regional/other language	-	-	-	-	-.0960*	-
V210 First choice party to vote next elections	-.2007	-.1176	-.1765	-.1943	-.2013	-.2555
V211 Second choice party to vote next elections	-.1925	-.1101	-.2193	-.1900	-.1793	-.1660*
V212 Party would never vote	-.0882	-.0856**	-.0499**	-.1258	-.0820*	-
V213 Perception of corruption in Spain	-.1815	-.1321	-.2534	-.1467	-.1532	-.2173
V214 Gender	.0738	-	.0764	.0929	.0629**	-
V216 Age	.2073	.1577	.1948	.2718	.2012	.0919**
V217 Educational level	-.1635	-.1096	-.1080	-.1853	-.1305	-
V218 Age completed full time education	-	-	-.0533**	-.0635*	.0668**	-
V219 Living with parents	-.1093	-.0621**	-.0946	-.1614	-.0918*	-
V220 Employment status	-.0657	-	-.0512**	-.0489**	-	-.1085**
V221 Profession respondent	-.1105	-.1355	-.0726*	-.1161	-	-
V223 Chief wage earner employment status	-.0436*	-	-	-	-	-
V224 Profession chief wage earner	-.0321*	-	-	-	-	-
V225 Family savings	-	-	.0635*	-	-	.1288*
V226 Social class	-.0442	-	-	-.0836	-.0578**	-
V227 Household income	-.1543	-.1158	-.0726*	-.1011	-.1158	-
V228 Hours of watching television	.1257	.0706**	.0735*	.1131	.0821*	.1219*
V232 Size of town	-.0675	-.0587**	-	-.1297	-.0954*	-

Table E.3

*Correlations between Levels of Trust in Institutions Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (8)*

	p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B.Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V233 Ethnic group	-	-	-	.0475**	-	

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table E.4

*Correlations between Total Association Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (1)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

Variables	Total cases	Spain	B. Country	Andalusia	Galicia	Valencia
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index	-	-	-	.0628*	-	-
Levels of Trust in Institutions Index	.0254**	-	.0439**	-	-	.0921**
Postmaterialist Index	.1376	.1018	.0969	.0523**	.0950*	-
V5 Importance of friends	.0539	-	.0699*	-	-	-
V6 Importance of leisure	-	-	.0435**	-	-	-
V7 Importance of politics	.1262	.0797*	.1114	.0898	.0919*	.1832
V9 Importance of religion	-	-	-	-	-	.0998**
V10 Happiness	-	-	-	.0746*	-	-
V11 State of health	-.0759	-	-.0749	-.1168	-	-
V12 Respect for parents	-.0659	-	-	-.0619*	-	-
V13 Emphasis on parents' responsibilities towards their children	-.0675	-	-	-	-	-
V14 Importance of children to learn good manners	-.0797	-	-	-.0635*	-	-
V15 Importance of children to learn independence	.0901	.0761*	.0725*	-	-	-
V16 Importance of children to learn hard work	-.0243**	-	-	-	-	-
V17 Importance of children to learn responsibility	.0317*	-	-	-	-	-
V19 Importance of children to learn tolerance	-	-	-	-.0630*	-	-
V20 Importance of children to learn to save money	-	-	-	-.0567**	-	-
V22 Importance of children to learn religious faith	-	-	-	-.0545**	-	-
V23 Importance of children to learn unselfishness	-	-	.0451**	-	-	-
V24 Importance of children to learn obedience	-.1030	-.1002	-.0880	-	-	-
V27 General trust	.0853	-	.0600*	.0594**	.0588**	-
V37 Discussion of politics with friends	.1718	.0694**	.1626	.1275	.1512	.1645
V38 Increase taxes to protect environment	.0315**	-	-	.0483**	-	-.1279*
V39 Increase prices to protect environment	.0286**	-	-	-	.0634**	-
V42 Choosing products better for the environment	-.0865	-	-.1067	-.0545**	-.0848*	-
V43 Recycling for environmental reasons	-.0855	-.0921*	-	-	-.0905*	-

Table E.4

*Correlations between Total Association Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (2)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V44 Attitude towards reduction of water consumption	.0435	-	-.0617*	-	-	-
V45 Meeting/letter/petition to protect the environment	-.1099	-.1002	-.0419**	-.1336	-.1113	-.1343*
V46 Contribution to an environmental organisation	-.1121	-.0926*	-.1028	-.0847	-.1464	-.1845
V47 More emphasis on tradition	-.0279**	-	-	-	-	-
V48 Express own preferences to build good relationships	-	-	-	-.0909	-	-
V49 Importance of humans coexisting with nature	-.0256**	-	-	-	-	-
V50 View that humanity has a bright	.0398*	.0964*	-	-	.1014*	-
V51 Accept neighbours with criminal record	.0346*	-	.0649*	-	-	-
V52 Accept neighbours from other race	-.0374*	-	-	-	-	-
V53 Accept neighbours who are political extremists	-.0460*	-.0710**	No data	-	-	-
V54 Accept neighbours who are heavy drinkers	-	-	.0467**	-	-.0745	-
V55 Accept neighbours who are emotionally unstable	-	-.0566**	-	-	-	-
V56 Accept neighbours who are muslims	-.0427	-.0658**	-	-.0539**	-	-.1702
V57 Accept neighbours who are immigrants	-.0395*	-.0814*	-	-.0665*	-	-
V59 Accept neighbours who are drug addicts	.0295**	-	.0469**	-	-	-
V60 Accept neighbours who are homosexuals	.0324*	-	-	-	-	-
V61 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for men	-.0937	-	-.0584*	-	-.0745**	-
V62 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for young people	-.0582	-	-.0576*	-	-	-
V63 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for Spanish people	-.1084	-	-.0784	-.1004	-	-.1365*
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.0650	-	-	.0519**	.1013	-
V66 Freedom of choice/ control over one's life	-	-	-	-	-	.0974**
V67 View on work until satisfied with result	-	-	-	.0542**	-	.1201*
V68 View on disappointment if don't accomplish goals	.0270**	-	-	-	-	-
V69 View on working until late because he/she likes to work	-	-	.0506**	-	-	.1078**

Table E.4

*Correlations between Total Association Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (3)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V70 Goal of making one's parents proud	-.0402*	-	-	-	-	.1132**
V71 To live up to what friends expect	-	-	-	-	-	.0890**
V72 View that work makes life worth living	-.0513	-.0662**	-	-.0589**	-	-
V75 Important good pay in job	-.0384*	-	-.0669*	-	-	-
V76 Important not much pressure in job	.0290**	-	-	.0818*	-	-
V77 Important good job security	-.0397*	-.0848*	-	-	-	-
V79 Important good working hours	.0326*	-	-	-	-	-
V80 Important to use initiative in job	.1089	.0808*	.0745	.0798*	.0788*	-
V81 Important generous holidays	.0459	-	-	.0624*	-	-
V82 Important to achieve something in job	.0508	.0587**	-	-	-	-
V84 Important to have an interesting job	.0304**	-	-	-	-	-
V85 Important job to meet one's abilities	.0271**	-	-	.0520**	-	-
V88 View on following instructions at work	-.0842	-	-.0514**	-.0532**	-.0657**	.0905**
V89 Marital status	-.0327*	-.0895*	-	-	-	-
V90 Number of children	-.0841	-.0860*	-.0634*	-.0527**	-	-
V91 Ideal size of family	-.0257**	.0891*	-	-	-	-
V92 Importance attributed to children's having a two-parent home	.0393*	-	-	-	-	-
V93 View that women need to have children to be fulfilled	-.0770	-	-	-	-	-.0970**
V95 Sexual freedom	-	-	-	.0747*	-	-
V98 Working mother as good as non- working mother	.0753	-	.0700*	.0608**	-	-
V99 Housewife job as fulfilling as paid job	-	-	-	-	.0762**	-.1087**
V100 Husband and wife contributing to income	-.0247**	-	-.0509**	-	-	-
V101 Men better political leaders than women	-.0289**	-	-	-	-	-.1296*
V102 Problem if wife earns more than husband	-.0559	-	-.0625*	-.0651*	-	-
V103 University more important for boy	-.0253**	-	-	-	-	-
V110 View on fighting for your country	-.0468	-	-	-	-	-

Table E.4

*Correlations between Total Association Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (4)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V111 Less emphasis on money	-	-	-	-	-	-.1367*
V112 Less importance placed on work in our lives	.0394	.0820*	.0543**	-	-	-
V113 More emphasis on technology	-	-.0717**	-	-	.0742**	-
V114 Greater respect for authority	-.0985	-.1058	-	-.0690*	-	-
V115 More emphasis on family life	-.0473	-.0655**	-	-	-	-
V116 View on scientific advances to help mankind	-	.0949*	-	-	-	-
V117 Interest in politics	.1526	.0905*	.1185	.1124	.1608	.2145
V118 Signing a petition	.1574	.0833*	.0652*	.1262	.1378	-
V119 Joining boycotts	.1251	-	.0656*	.0743*	.0924*	-
V120 Attending lawful demonstrations	.1458	-	.0760	.0962	.1246	-
V121 Joining unofficial strikes	.1168	.0763**	.0574**	.0666*	.1056	-
V122 Occupation of buildings or factories	.1055	.0696**	.0564**	-	.1267	-
V123 Political inclination	.0286**	-	-	-	-	-
V124 View on revolutionary action to change society	.0376*	-	-	.0886	-	-.1719
V125 Equal incomes	-.0440	-.0644**	-	-.0691*	-	-
V126 Increase government ownership of business	-.0291**	-	-	-	-	.1072**
V127 View on government providing for everyone	-.0433	-	-.0510**	-	-	-
V128 View that competition is good	-.0377*	-	-	-.0528**	-	-
V129 Hard work brings a better life	-	-.0834*	.0532**	-	-	-
V130 View on fair wealth distribution	.0564	-	.0458**	-.1043	-	-.1644
V131 Cautious attitude towards life changes	-	-	-	-.0742*	-	-
V134 Approve foreign workers in the country	-	-	-	.0579**	-	-
V135 Confidence in the churches	-	-	-	-	-	.1211*
V137 Confidence in the legal system	-	-	.0440**	-	-	-
V139 Confidence in the television	-.0340*	-.0671**	-	-	-	-
V140 Confidence in the labour unions	.0288**	-	.0553**	-	-	-
V136 Confidence in the Armed Forces	-.0814	-	-	.0740*	-	-

Table E.4

*Correlations between Total Association Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (5)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V141 Confidence in the police	-.0579	-	-	-	-	-
V142 Confidence in the government in Madrid	-.0536	-	-	-	-	-
V143 Confidence in the political parties	-	-	.0775	-	-	.1115**
V144 Confidence in the parliament	-	-	-	-	-	.1076**
V145 Confidence in the civil service	-	-	.0701*	-	-	.1304*
V148 Confidence in the women's movement	-	-	.0684*	-	-	-
V149 Confidence in the European Union	-	-	-	-	-	.1091**
V151 Rating of political system under Franco	-.0472	-	-	-	-	-
V152 Rating of political system today	-.0388*	-	-	-	-	-
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	.0395*	-	.0605*	.0542**	-	.1716
V155 Experts making decisions for the country	-	-	-	-	-	-.1609*
V156 Army rule	-	.0767**	-	.0865*	-	-.0972**
V158 View on having a cooperative party leader	.0365*	-	-	-	-	-
V159 Protect individual freedom	.0816	.0678**	.0441**	.0855	-	-
V160 In democracy, the economic system runs badly	-.0323**	-	-	-.0532**	-.0870*	-
V161 View of democracy as an indecisive system	-.0612	-	-.0608*	-	-.0735**	-
V162 View of democracies as no good to maintain order	-.0359*	-	-.0859	-	-.0641**	-
V164 Violence to pursue political goals	-.1073	-.0647**	-.1054	-.1144	-.0788*	-.1221*
V165 Level of satisfaction with national government	-.0307**	-	-	-	-	-
V166 View that the country should be run for all	.0288**	-	.0518**	-	-	-
V167 Group like least	-.0612	-.1025	-	-	-	-
V168 View on group one likes least holding public office	.0505	-	-	-	-	-
V169 View on group one likes least teaching in schools	.0297**	-	-	-	-	-
V170 View on group one likes least holding public demonstrations	.1042	-	-	.0767*	.0868*	-
V171 View on people living in poverty compared to ten years ago	.0362*	-	-	-	-	-



Table E.4

*Correlations between Total Association Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (6)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V175 View on the role of the government in helping poor countries	-	.0712**	-.0473**	-	-	-
V177 View on purpose of life	.0591	.0627**	.0513**	-	-	-
V179 Religious denomination	-	-	-.0528**	-	-	-.0984**
V180 Brought up religiously at home	.0265**	-	-	-	-	.1472*
V181 Religious attendance	.0606	-	.0480**	.0717*	-	.1243*
V182 Religious person	-	-	-	-.0536**	-	.0962**
V183 Belief in God	-	-	-	-	-	-.1056**
V186 Belief in the devil	.0568	-	-	-	-	-
V187 Belief in hell	.0520	.0589**	-	-	-	-
V188 Belief in heaven	.0444	-	-	-	-	-
V191 Comfort and strength from religion	-	-	-	-.0486**	-	-
V192 Justifiable: claiming benefits one is not entitled to	.1036	.0730**	.1087	.1018	-	.0985**
V193 Justifiable: avoiding a fare on public transport	.0967	.0953*	-	.1188	-	.1256*
V194 Justifiable: cheating on taxes	.0916	.0759*	-	.0892	-	.1318*
V195 Justifiable: Buying something you knew was stolen	.0837	.1167	-	-	-	.1881
V196 Justifiable: accepting a bribe	.0796	.1291	.0437**	.0827*	-	-
V197 Justifiable: Homosexuality	.0804	-	-	-	-	-
V198 Justifiable: Prostitution	.0842	.0598**	.0686*	-	-	-
V199 Justifiable: Abortion	.0638	-	.0473**	-	-	-
V200 Justifiable: Divorce	.0470	-	-	-	-	-
V201 Justifiable: Euthanasia	.0409*	-	-	-	-	-
V202 Justifiable: Suicide	.0807	-	.0542**	.0658*	-	-
V203 Geographical group belong to (1)	-	-	-.0442**	-	-	.1024**
V204 Geographical group belong to (2)	.0436	.0766*	-	-	-	-
V205 Proud to be Spanish	-	-	.1193	-	-	-
V206 Born in Spain	.0301**	-	.1233	-	.0667**	-
V207 Year came to Spain	-.1092	-	-	-	-.0636**	-

Table E.4

*Correlations between Total Association Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (7)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V208 Feeling of being more Spanish than nationalist	-.0754	.0626**	-.0704*	-.0827	-	-
V209 Spanish spoken at home more than regional/other language	-.0327*	-	-.0468**	-	-	-
V210 First choice party to vote next elections	-	-	-.0558**	-	-.0667**	-.1091**
V211 Second choice party to vote next elections	-.0453*	-	-.1032	-	-.0944*	-
V213 Perception of corruption in Spain	-.0250**	-	-.0622*	-	-.0713**	-
V214 Gender	-.0382*	-	-	-.0667*	-	-
V216 Age	-.0818	-.1206	-.0616*	-.0757*	-	-
V217 Educational level	.1810	.1628	.1258	.1298	.1368	.1330*
V218 Age completed full time education	.0512	-	.1103	-	-	.1396*
V219 Living with parents	.0490	.0748*	-	-	-	-
V220 Employment status	.0838	-	.0578*	.0656*	.1033	-
V221 Profession respondent	.1052	.0618**	.0867	-	.1059	.1269**
V223 Chief wage earner employment status	.0856	-	.0833*	-	.0734**	-
V224 Profession chief wage earner	.0660	-	.0539**	-	.0681**	-
V226 Social class	.1015	.1296	.0991	-	.0988*	-
V227 Household income	.1660	.1482	.0738*	.1032	.0898*	.1052**
V228 Hours of watching television	-.1062	-.0659**	-.0763	-.0685*	-	-
V232 Size of town	-.0273**	.0899*	-.0826	-	-	.1126**

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table E.5

*Correlations between Importance of Family and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (1)*

Variables	p < .001   * p < .01   ** p < .05					
	Total cases	Spain	B. Country	Andalusia	Galicia	Valencia
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index	.0918	.0655**	.1233	.0636*	.0840*	.1005**
Tolerance Index	-.0327*	-	-	-	-	-.1188
Levels of Trust in Institutions Index	.0690	.0830*	.0795	.0722*	.0774*	-
Postmaterialist Index	.0600	-	-	.0619**	.1307	-
V5 Importance of friends	.2070	.2636	.1674	.2346	.1620	.2337
V6 Importance of leisure	.0795	.1310	.0464**	.1469	.1698	-
V8 Importance of work	.1944	.2323	.1677	.2263	.2142	.1093**
V9 Importance of religion	.1633	.1645	.1628	.1257	.2142	.1669
V10 Happiness	.0887	-	.1035	.0775*	.0926*	.1126**
V12 Respect for parents	.1364	.0813*	.1181	.1253	.2064	.2147
V13 Emphasis on parents' responsibilities towards their children	.0889	-	.0788	.0815*	.1826	.1678
V14 Importance of children to learn good manners	.0666	.0840*	.0528**	.0568**	.1092	-
V15 Importance of children to learn independence	-.0901	-	-.1028	-.0950	-.1218	-.0899**
V16 Importance of children to learn hard work	.0452	-	.0616*	-	-	-
V17 Importance of children to learn responsibility	.0778	.0736**	.0791	.0916	.0849*	-
V19 Importance of children to learn tolerance	.0516	-	-	.0513**	-	.2077
V22 Importance of children to learn religious faith	.0675	-	.0749	.0707*	.0725**	-
V24 Importance of children to learn obedience	.0415*	.0862*	-	-	-	-
V28 Member of church organisation	.0334*	-	.0853	-	-	-
V30 Member of art organisation	-	-	-.0504**	-	-	-
V32 Member political party	-.0240**	-	-	-	-	-
V33 Member of environmental organisation	-.0296**	-	-	-	-	-
V35 Member charitable organisation	.0252**	-	-	-	-	-
V38 Increase taxes to protect environment	-	-	.0521**	-	-	-
V42 Choosing products better for the environment	-.0401*	-	-.0657*	-	-	-
V43 Recycling for environmental reasons	-	-	-	-	-	.0923**
V44 Attitude towards reduction of water consumption	-.0393*	-.0668**	-	-	-	-.1197*

Table E.5

*Correlations between Importance of Family and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (2)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V45 Meeting/letter/petition to protect the environment	.0410*	-	.0538**	-	.0655**	-
V46 Contribution to an environmental organisation	.0340*	.0568**	.0636*	-	-	-
V48 Express own preferences to build good relationships	-.0405*	-.0816*	-	-	-.0633**	-
V49 Importance of humans coexisting with nature	.0562	.1425	-	.0624*	-	.1071**
V51 Accept neighbours with criminal record	-.0275**	-	-.0479**	-	-.0570**	-.0945**
V54 Accept neighbours who are heavy drinkers	-.0442	-	-	-.0619*	-	-.1194
V55 Accept neighbours who are emotionally unstable	-.0245**	-.0703**	-	-	-	-
V59 Accept neighbours who are drug addicts	-.0396*	-	-	-	-	-
V61 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for men	.0266**	-	-	.0541**	-	-
V63 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for Spanish people	.0714	.1049	.0639*	.0628*	.0586**	.1244*
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.0401*	-	.0815	-	-	-
V65 Satisfaction with life as a whole	.0685	-	.1081	-	.0614**	-
V66 Freedom of choice/ control over one's life	.0358*	-	-	-	.0840*	-
V67 View on work until satisfied with result	.0911	.0772*	.0807	.0782*	.1356	-
V68 View on disappointment if don't accomplish goals	.0276**	-	-	-	-	-
V69 View on working until late because he/she likes to work	.0544	.0660**	-	.0522**	.0847*	-
V70 Goal of making one's parents proud	.1411	.1312	.1628	.0716*	.1831	.2256
V71 To live up to what friends expect	.0499*	-	.0490**	-	-	.1819
V72 View that work makes life worth living	.0562	.0996*	.0480**	-	.0599**	-
V75 Important good pay in job	-	-	-	.0602**	-	-
V77 Important good job security	.0482	-	.0425**	.0672*	.1023	-
V78 Important to have job respected	.0704	.0765*	.0680*	.0519**	.1036	-
V79 Important good working hours	-	-	-	.0484**	-	-
V81 Important generous holidays	-.0523	-.0581**	-	-	-.0967*	-.1020**
V82 Important to achieve something in job	.0352*	-	-	-	.0834*	-

Table E.5

*Correlations between Importance of Family and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (3)*

p &lt; .001 \* p &lt; .01 \*\* p &lt; .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V83 Important to have a responsible job	.0384*	-	.0677*	-	.0719**	-
V84 Important to have an interesting job	-	-	-	-	-	-.0942**
V85 Important job to meet one's abilities	.0446	-	-	.0540**	-	-
V87 Employees to own business and elect managers	-.0836	-	-.1177	-	-.0964*	-.1591*
V89 Marital status	.1544	.1611	.1589	.1305	.1875	.1460*
V90 Number of children	.1363	.1279	.1472	.1105	.1632	.1740
V91 Ideal size of family	.0916	-	.1173	-	.1304	.2518
V92 Importance attributed to children's having a two-parent home	-.0874	-	-.0832	-.0563**	-.1301	-.2198
V93 View that women need to have children to be fulfilled	.0573	.0610**	.0582*	.0628**	-	-
V94 View that marriage is outdated	-.1342	-.0730**	-.1435	-.0915	-.2166	-.1529
V95 Sexual freedom	-.0553	-.0945*	-	-	-	-
V96 View on women single parents	-.0451	-	-	-.0688*	-.0688**	-
V99 Housewife job as fulfilling as paid job	.0626	-	.0523**	-	.1132	.1168**
V100 Husband and wife contributing to income	.0311**	.0784*	-	-	-	-
V110 View on fighting for your country	.0476	.0724**	-	-	.0939*	.1535*
V111 Less emphasis on money	.0363*	-	-	.0789*	-	-
V112 Less importance placed on work in our lives	-.0645	-.0916*	-.0468**	-	-.1075	-.1239*
V114 Greater respect for authority	.1182	.1013*	.1442	.0942	.1465	.1691
V115 More emphasis on family life	.1898	.1524	.1921	.1100	.3215	.3316
V116 View on scientific advances to help mankind	-	-	.0507**	-	-	-
V117 Interest in politics	-	-	-.0509**	-	-	-
V119 Joining boycotts	-.0810	-	-.1103	-.0522**	-.1444	-.1576*
V120 Attending lawful demonstrations	-.0296**	-	-	-	-	-
V121 Joining unofficial strikes	-.0958	-.0867*	-.1239	-	-.1591	-.1240*
V122 Occupation of buildings/factories	-.1010	-	-.1411	-.0564**	-.1469	-.1300*
V123 Political inclination	.0830	.1079*	.1095	-	.1151	-

Table E.5

*Correlations between Importance of Family and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (4)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V124 View on revolutionary action to change society	-.0580	-.1114	-.0716*	-	-.0848*	-
V125 Equal incomes	-.0331*	-	-.0506**	-	-	-
V126 Increase government ownership of business	.0339*	-	-	-	-.0611**	-
V128 View that competition is good	.0501	-	.0633*	-	.0914*	-
V129 Hard work brings a better life	.0504	-	-	.0895	.0677**	.1127**
V130 View on fair wealth distribution	.0288**	-	.0758*	-	-	-
V131 Cautious attitude towards life changes	.0491	-	-	.0644*	.0934*	-
V132 New ideas better than old ones	-.0283**	-.0663**	-	-	-	-
V133 Import of foreign goods	.0554	-	-.0571**	-.0485**	-	-
V134 Approve foreign workers in the country	-	-	-.0542**	-	-	-
V135 Confidence in the churches	.1443	.1312	.1594	.1194	.1735	.1273*
V136 Confidence in the Armed Forces	.0603	-	.0636*	.0746*	.1207	-
V137 Confidence in the legal system	.0645	.1071	.0837	-	-	-
V141 Confidence in the police	.0750	.0760*	.0612*	.0901	.1420	-
V142 Confidence in the government in Madrid	.0337*	-	.0548**	-	-	-
V144 Confidence in the parliament	.0342*	-	.0510**	-	-	-
V145 Confidence in the civil service	.0470	-	.0797	-	-	-
V146 Confidence in the major companies	.0487	.0823*	.0505**	-	-	-
V148 Confidence in the women's movement	-	-	-.0556**	-	-	-
V149 Confidence in the European Union	.0331*	-	.0527**	-	-	-
V151 Rating of political system under Franco	.0383*	-	-	-	.0892*	-
V152 Rating of political system today	.0271**	-	.0709*	-	-	-
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	.0773	-	.0940	.0834*	.0772**	.1064**
V154 Strong leader, no parliament, no elections	-	-	-.0456**	-	-	-
V156 Army rule	-	-.0821*	-	-	-	-
V157 View on having a democratic system	.0798	-	.0981	.0824*	.0850*	-

Table E.5

*Correlations between Importance of Family and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (5)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V158 View on having a cooperative party leader	.0421*	.0750**	-	-	-	-
V159 Protect individual freedom	-.0384*	-	-	-.0966	-	-
V160 In democracy, the economic system runs badly	-	-.0836*	-	-	-	-
V162 View of democracies as no good to maintain order	-	-	-	-	.0593**	-
V163 View of democracy as a better form of government	.0869	.0843*	.0983	.0918	.0795*	-
V164 Violence to pursue political goals	.0360*	-	.0618*	-	-	-
V165 Level of satisfaction with national government	.0529	-	.0713*	-	.0933*	-
V166 View that the country should be run for all	-	-	.0674*	-	-	-
V167 Group like least	.0284**	-	-	.0530**	.0721**	-
V168 View on group one likes least holding public office	-.0472	-	-.0925	-	-	-
V169 View on group one likes least teaching in schools	-.0358*	-	-.0446**	-.0502**	-	-.1842
V170 View on group one likes least holding public demonstrations	-.0474	-	-.0701*	-	-	-.1532*
V173 View on the poor's chances of escaping from poverty	-	-	.0454**	-	-	-
V174 View on the role of the government in helping the poor in the country/region	-	-	-	-.0619**	-	-
V175 View on the role of the government in helping poor countries	-	-	-	-.0535**	-	-
V176 View on economic help to poor countries	.0290**	-	-	.0478**	-	-
V177 View on purpose of life	-	-	.0433**	-	-	-
V179 Religious denomination	-.1423	-.1493	-.1517	-.1226	-.1471	-.1558
V180 Brought up religiously at home	.0815	.1449	.0553**	.0645*	.0762*	-
V181 Religious attendance	.1545	.1550	.1751	.1048	.1983	.1554*
V182 Religious person	.1635	.1364	.1766	.1248	.2125	.1473*
V183 Belief in God	-.1314	-.0879*	-.1585	-.0925	-.1779	-.1467*
V184 Belief in life after death	-.0716	-.0833*	-.0955	-.0589**	-.0800*	-
V185 Belief in human soul	-.0734	-.0571**	-.1026	-	-.1211	-
V186 Belief in the devil	-.0481	-	-.0569*	-	-.0887*	-
V187 Belief in hell	-.0677	-	-.0724*	-.0667*	-.0861*	-

Table E.5

*Correlations between Importance of Family and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (6)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V188 Belief in heaven	-.0947	-.0614**	-.1158	-.0740*	-.1471	-
V189 Belief in sin	-.0994	-.0682**	-.0870	-.0696*	-.1897	-.1301*
V190 Importance of God	.1564	.0810*	.1884	.1273	.2131	.1923
V191 Comfort and strength from religion	.1395	.1238	.1312	.1221	.1865	.1427*
V192 Justifiable: claiming benefits one is not entitled to	-.0830	-.0754**	-.0641*	-.0932	-.1110	-.1253*
V193 Justifiable: avoiding a fare on public transport	-.1066	-.1079	-.0759	-.1098	-.1758	-.1084**
V194 Justifiable: cheating on taxes	-.0588	-	-.0587*	-.0692*	-.0831*	-
V195 Justifiable: Buying something you knew was stolen	-.1052	-.1113	-.0907	-.0864	-.1620	-.1300*
V196 Justifiable: accepting a bribe	-.0426	-	-	-.0496**	-.0813*	-.0924**
V197 Justifiable: Homosexuality	-.0357*	-	-.0771	-	-	-
V198 Justifiable: Prostitution	-.0756	-	-.0895	-.0664*	-.1395	-
V199 Justifiable: Abortion	-.0891	-	-.1108	-.0835	-.1228	-.0895**
V200 Justifiable: Divorce	-.0594	-	-.0890	-.0549**	-.0640**	-
V201 Justifiable: Euthanasia	-.0721	-	-.0926	-.0581**	-.1237	-
V202 Justifiable: Suicide	-.1190	-	-.1265	-.0976	-.2032	-.1478*
V203 Geographical group belong to (1)	-.0638	-	-.0601*	-.0574**	-	-.1408*
V204 Geographical group belong to (2)	-.0330*	-	-	-	-	-.0990**
V205 Proud to be Spanish	-	.0945*	-	-	-	-
V206 Born in Spain	-.0243**	-	-	-	-	-
V207 Year came to Spain	.0689*	-	-	.2140**	-	-
V208 Feeling of being more Spanish than nationalist	.0255**	-	.0656*	-	.0609**	-
V210 First choice party to vote next elections	-.0665	-	-	-.0686**	-.0641**	-.1621*
V211 Second choice party to vote next elections	-.0512*	-.0899**	-.0602**	-	-	-
V212 Party would never vote	-.0330**	-.0689**	-	-.1003	-	-
V213 Perception of corruption in Spain	-.0542	-	-.0750*	-	-.0786*	-
V214 Gender	.0925	.0885*	.0962	.0715*	.1137	.1247*
V216 Age	.1058	.0850*	.1131	.0770*	.1405	.1530*
V217 Educational level	-.0449	-.0814*	-.0760	-	-	-



Table E.5

*Correlations between Importance of Family and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (7)*

	p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V218 Age completed full time education	-	-	-.0799*	-	-	-
V219 Living with parents	-.1158	-.1283	-.1048	-.1129	-.1258	-.1411*
V220 Employment status	.0309**	-		-	.0621**	-
V221 Profession respondent	-	-		.0553**	-	-
V224 Profession chief wage earner	.0272**	-		-	-	
V228 Hours of watching television	-	-	-	-	-	.0945**
V232 Size of town	-	-		.0652*	-	
V233 Ethnic group	-	-		-	-.1152	

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

Table E.6

*Correlations between Importance of Friends and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (1)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>	
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index	.0637	-	.0517**	.0808*	.0633**	.0909**	
Tolerance Index	.0714	.0844*	.0707*	.0809*	.0583**	-	
Total Association Index	.0539	-	.0699*	-	-	-	
Levels of Trust in Institutions Index	-	-	-	-	.0932*	-	
Postmaterialist Index	.0938	-	.0830	.0670*	.0927*	.1249*	
V4 Importance of family	.2070	.2636	.1674	.2346	.1620	.2337	
V6 Importance of leisure	.3026	.3367	.2936	.2982	.2837	.2669	
V7 Importance of politics	.1222	.1136	.1156	.1443	.0862*	-	
V8 Importance of work	.0953	.1453	.0475**	.1444	.0883*	-	
V9 Importance of religion	.0293**	.1120	-	-	-	-	
V10 Happiness	.0357*	-	-	.0583**	-	-	
V11 State of health	-.0714	-	-.0774	-.0552**	-	-.1062**	
V12 Respect for parents	-.0344*	-	-	-	-	-	
V13 Emphasis on parents' responsibilities towards their children	-.0407*	-	-.0690*	-	-	-	
V14 Importance of children to learn good manners	-.0424	-	-	-	-.0640**	-	
V15 Importance of children to learn independence	.1013	-	.0953	.0721*	.1267	-	
V16 Importance of children to learn hard work	-	.0661**	-	-	-	-	
V17 Importance of children to learn responsibility	.0412*	.0725**	-	.0521**	-	-	
V19 Importance of children to learn tolerance	.0372*	-	-	.0611**	-	-	
V20 Importance of children to learn to save money	-.0287**	-.0637**	-	-	-	-	
V24 Importance of children to learn obedience	-	-	-.0922	-	-	-	
V27 General trust	.0961	-	.1237	.0626*	.0995*	.1295*	
V29 Member sport organisation	.0540	-	.0627*	-	-	-	
V30 Member of art organisation	.0728	.0595**	.0709*	-	-	-	
V33 Member of environmental organisation	.0445	-	.0555*	-	-	-	
V34 Member professional organisation	.0388*	-	.0456**	.0558**	-	-	
V35 Member charitable organisation	.0440	-	.0707*	-	-	-	

Table E.6

*Correlations between Importance of Friends and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (2)*

		p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>	
V36 Member of any other voluntary organisation	.0634	-	.0770	-	-	-	
V37 Discussion of politics with friends	.0790	.0623**	.0545**	.0842	-	-	
V38 Increase taxes to protect environment	.0635	-	.0539**	.0744*	.0749**	-	
V39 Increase prices to protect environment	.0605	-	.0769	.0745*	-	-	
V42 Choosing products better for the environment	-.0688	-	-.0460**	-.1005	-.0635**	-	
V43 Recycling for environmental reasons	-.0553	-	-	-.0548**	-.0678**	-	
V45 Meeting/letter/petition to protect the environment	-.0754	-	-.0567*	-.0987	-.0824*	-	
V46 Contribution to an environmental organisation	-.0377*	-	-.0431**	-.0612*	-.0651**	-	
V47 More emphasis on tradition	-.0491	-	-	-.0851*	-	-.1524*	
V48 Express own preferences to build good relationships	-.0278**	-.0646**	-	-	.0814*	-	
V49 Importance of humans coexisting with nature	.0348*	.0636**	-	.0596**	-	-	
V50 View that humanity has a bright	.0357*	-	-	-	.0616**	-	
V51 Accept neighbours with criminal record	.0349*	.0748*	-	-	-	-.0880**	
V52 Accept neighbours from other race	.0389*	-	.0607*	.0636*	-	-	
V53 Accept neighbours who are political extremists	-.0326**	-	No data	-	-	-	
V54 Accept neighbours who are heavy drinkers	.0354*	-	-	-	.0782*	-	
V56 Accept neighbours who are muslims	.0540	.0797*	.0500**	.0726*	-	-	
V57 Accept neighbours who are immigrants	.0511	-	.0665*	.0560**	-	-	
V58 Accept neighbours who are people with AIDS	.0603	.0622**	.0678*	-	-	-	
V59 Accept neighbours who are drug addicts	.0519	-	.0451**	.0627*	-	-	
V60 Accept neighbours who are homosexuals	.0740	.0736**	.0841	.0792*	-	-	
V61 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for men	-.0786	-	-.0540**	-.0872	-	-.1024**	
V62 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for young people	-.0282**	-	-	-.0540**	-	-.1159**	
V63 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for Spanish people	-.0601	-	-.0549**	-	-.1046	-	
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.1041	.0846*	.1231	.0696*	.0752*	-	

Table E.6

*Correlations between Importance of Friends and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (3)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V65 Satisfaction with life as a whole	.0680	-	.0621*	.0726*	.0901*	-
V66 Freedom of choice/ control over one's life	.0510	-	.0655*	.0531**	.0672**	-
V67 View on work until satisfied with result	-	.0771*	-	-	-	-
V68 View on disappointment if don't accomplish goals	-	-	-	-	.0665**	-
V69 View on working until late because he/she likes to work	-	-	-	-	.0666**	.1070**
V71 To live up to what friends expect	.0916	.1114	.0899	.0835*	.1164	.1085**
V72 View that work makes life worth living	-.0420*	-	-	-	-	-.1040**
V75 Important good pay in job	-	-	-	-	-	-
V76 Important not much pressure in job	.0237**	-	-	-.0479**	-	-
V77 Important good job security	-	-	-	.0533**	-	-
V79 Important good working hours	.0469	-	.0424**	-	-	-
V80 Important to use initiative in job	.0790	-	.0723*	.0800*	-	-
V81 Important generous holidays	.0282**	-	-	-	-	-
V82 Important to achieve something in job	.0538	-	.0452**	.0717*	-	-
V83 Important to have a responsible job	.0676	-	-	-	.0657**	-
V84 Important to have an interesting job	-	-	-	.0884	.0910*	-
V87 Employees to own business and elect managers	-	-	.0539**	-	-.0647**	-
V88 View on following instructions at work	-.0429	-	-.0479**	-	-	-
V89 Marital status	-.1117	-.0769*	-.1144	-.0714*	-.1131	-.1628
V90 Number of children	-.1077	-.1174	-.0903	-.0812*	-.0616**	-.1459*
V92 Importance attributed to children's having a two-parent home	.0537	-	.0897	.0518**	-	-
V93 View that women need to have children to be fulfilled	-.0511	-	-.0664*	-	-	-
V95 Sexual freedom	.0418*	-	.0532**	-	-	-
V96 View on women single parents	-	-	-	.0546**	-	-
V98 Working mother as good as non- working mother	.0544	-	.0676*	-	-	-
V99 Housewife job as fulfilling as paid job	-	-	-	-	-	-.0973**

Table E.6

*Correlations between Importance of Friends and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (4)*

	p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V100 Husband and wife contributing to income	.0282**	-	-	-	-	.1030**
V101 Men better political leaders than women	-.0536	-	-.0622*	-	-	-.1039**
V102 Problem if wife earns more than husband	-.0605	-	-.0563**	-.0900	-	-
V103 University more important for boy	-.0712	-	-.0627*	-	-.0711**	-.1160**
V110 View on fighting for your country	-.0306**	-	-	-	-	-
V111 Less emphasis on money	.0480	-	-	.0781*	-	-
V112 Less importance placed on work in our lives	-	-	.0465**	-	-	-
V113 More emphasis on technology	-	-	-	.0568**	-	-
V114 Greater respect for authority	-.0576	-	-.0444**	-	-.0603**	-
V115 More emphasis on family life	-.0400*	-	-.0551**	-	-	-
V116 View on scientific advances to help mankind	-	-	-.0607*	-	-	-
V117 Interest in politics	.0727	.0749**	-	.1108	-	-
V118 Signing a petition	.0954	.1247	.0512**	.0726*	-	-
V119 Joining boycotts	.0848	.0761**	.0833	.0564**	-	-
V120 Attending lawful demonstrations	.1054	.1147	.0595*	.0832*	.0606**	-
V121 Joining unofficial strikes	.0983	-	.0699*	.0878	.0898*	.1079**
V122 Occupation of buildings/factories	.0798	-	.0670*	.0493**	.0738**	-
V123 Political inclination	-	-	-	-	-	-.1086**
V124 View on revolutionary action to change society	.0479	-	-	.0586**	-	.0944**
V126 Increase government ownership of business	-	-	-	-	-	.1269*
V128 View that competition is good	-	-	-	.0792*	-	-
V129 Hard work brings a better life	.0286**	-	-	.0817*	-	-
V130 View on fair wealth distribution	.0413*	-	.0737*	.0500**	-	-
V131 Cautious attitude towards life changes	-	-	-	.0527**	-	.1454*
V132 New ideas better than old ones	-	-	-	-.0490**	-	.1061**
V133 Import of foreign goods	.0316**	-	-	.0774*	-	-
V134 Approve foreign workers in the country	.0720	-	.0701*	.0629*	-	.1370*

Table E.6

*Correlations between Importance of Friends and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (5)*

	p < .001	* p < .01	** p < .05			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V136 Confidence in the Armed Forces	-.0470	-	-	-	-	-
V137 Confidence in the legal system	-	-	-	-	.0675**	-
V138 Confidence in the press	.0259**	-	-	-	-	-
V140 Confidence in the labour unions	.0278**	-	-	-	.0926*	-
V143 Confidence in the political parties	.0320*	-	.0653*	-	.1025	-
V144 Confidence in the parliament	-	-	-	-	.0820*	-
V145 Confidence in the civil service	.0276**	-	.0595*	-	-	-
V147 Confidence in the green/ecology movement	.0674	.0796*	.0899	-	.0653**	-
V148 Confidence in the women's movement	.0643	.0697**	.0831	.0542**	.0858*	-
V149 Confidence in the European Union	.0306**	-	-	-	-	-
V150 Confidence in the United Nations	.0293**	-	-	-	-	.1151**
V151 Rating of political system under Franco	-.0701	-	-.0723*	-	-.0625**	-.1024**
V152 Rating of political system today	-	-	-	-	.0835*	.1096**
V154 Strong leader, no parliament, no elections	.0501	-	-.0555**	-.0587**	-	-
V156 Army rule	-.0637	-.0847*	-.0586*	-.0721*	-	-
V157 View on having a democratic system	.0627	.0719**	-	.1013	-	.1319*
V158 View on having a cooperative party leader	.0482	.0856*	-	.0823*	-	.1170**
V159 Protect individual freedom	.0829	.0587**	.1128	.0531**	-	-
V160 In democracy, the economic system runs badly	-.0577	-.0675**	-	-.0829*	-	.1253*
V161 View of democracy as an indecisive system	-.0741	-.0804*	-	-.1196	-	-
V162 View of democracies as no good to maintain order	-.0611	-.0683**	-	-.1190	-	-
V163 View of democracy as a better form of government	.0579	.0781*	-	.0748*	-	.2091
V164 Violence to pursue political goals	-	-	-	-	.0703**	-
V165 Level of satisfaction with national government	-.0256**	-	-	-	-	-
V166 View that the country should be run for all	-.0351*	-.0602**	-	-	-	-
V170 View on group one likes least holding public demonstrations	.0616	.0643**	.0491**	-	-	-

Table E.6

*Correlations between Importance of Friends and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (6)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

Variables	Total cases	Spain	B. Country	Andalusia	Galicia	Valencia
V171 View on people living in poverty compared to ten years ago	-	-	-	-	-.0637**	-
V173 View on the poor's chances of escaping from poverty	-	-	-.0574*	-	.0589**	-
V174 View on the role of the government in helping the poor in the country/region	-.0547	-.0744**	-	-.0825*	-	-
V175 View on the role of the government in helping poor countries	-.0535	-.0689**	-	-.0810*	-	-
V176 View on economic help to poor countries	.0809	.0765*	.0457**	.0591**	.1046	-
V177 View on purpose of life	.0521	-	.0708*	-	-	-
V179 Religious denomination	-	-	.0628*	-.0520**	-	-
V181 Religious attendance	.0296**	.0892*	-	-	-	-
V182 Religious person	-.0386*	-	-	-	-.0680**	-
V183 Belief in God	.0449	-	-	-	-	-
V184 Belief in life after death	-.0430	-.0594**	-.0426**	-.0559**	-	-
V188 Belief in heaven	.0245**	-	-	-	-	-
V189 Belief in sin	.0393*	-	-	.0527**	-	-
V190 Importance of God	-.0424	-	-	-	.0636**	-
V191 Comfort and strength from religion	-.0375*	-	-	-	-	-
V192 Justifiable: claiming benefits one is not entitled to	-	-	-	-	-.0608**	-
V194 Justifiable: cheating on taxes	.0291**	-	-	-	-	-
V195 Justifiable: Buying something you knew was stolen	.0384*	-	-	-	-	-
V196 Justifiable: accepting a bribe	-	-	-	-	-.0658**	-
V197 Justifiable: Homosexuality	.0819	.0714**	.0902	-	.0622**	-
V198 Justifiable: Prostitution	.0436	-	.0545**	-	-	-
V199 Justifiable: Abortion	.0549	-	-	-	-	.1315*
V200 Justifiable: Divorce	.0489	-	-	-	-	-
V201 Justifiable: Euthanasia	.0290**	-	-	-	-	.0934**
V202 Justifiable: Suicide	.0471	-	.0569**	-	-	-
V204 Geographical group belong to (2)	-	-	-	.0475**	-	-
V205 Proud to be Spanish	-	-	.0498**	-	-	-
V206 Born in Spain	-	-	.0625*	-	-	-

Table E.6

*Correlations between Importance of Friends and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (7)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V207 Year came to Spain	-.0623*	-	-	-	-	-
V208 Feeling of being more Spanish than nationalist	-.0419*	-	-.0453**	-	-	-
V209 Spanish spoken at home more than regional/other language	-.0384*	-	-.0660*	-.0636*	-	-
V212 Party would never vote	-.0455*	-	-.0793*	-	-	-
V213 Perception of corruption in Spain	-.0341*	-	-	-	-	-
V214 Gender	-	-	.0521**	-	-	-
V216 Age	-.0631	-.0686**	-.0498**	-.0798*	-	-
V218 Age completed full time education	.0419*	-	.0981	-	-	.1431*
V219 Living with parents	.0931	.0617**	.0903	.0795*	.0661**	.1477*
V220 Employment status	-	-	-	.0541**	-	-
V217 Educational level	.1424	.0924*	.0941	.1729	.1053	.1311*
V223 Chief wage earner employment status	.0743	-	-	.1221	-	-
V224 Profession chief wage earner	.0318*	-	-	-	-	-
V225 Family savings	.0458	-	-	-	-	.0983
V226 Social class	.0693	-	-	.1361	-	-
V227 Household income	.1205	.0770**	.0671**	.1228	.0835*	-
V228 Hours of watching television	-.0501	-	-	-	-	-
V232 Size of town	-	-.1009	-	-	-	-

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.



Table E.7

*Correlations between Importance of Social Bonds Index and Other Variables from 1995-1996 (1)*

WVS

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

Variables	Total cases	Spain	B. Country	Andalusia	Galicia	Valencia
Individual Subjective Well-Being Index	.1002	.0569**	.1226	.0944	.0905*	.1138**
Tolerance Index	.0371*	-	-	.0559**	-	-
Levels of Trust in Institutions Index	.0486	.0705**	.0578*	-	.1123	-
Postmaterialist Index	.0361*	-	-	-	-	-
V6 Importance of leisure	.2662	.3140	.2313	.3051	.2066	.2417
V7 Importance of politics	.0661	.0861*	-	.0998	.0657**	-
V8 Importance of work	.1951	.2166	.2155	.2107	.1498	-
V9 Importance of religion	.0854	.1578	.0512**	.0949	.1130	-
V10 Happiness	.0864	.0587**	.1185	.0818*	-	.1033**
V11 State of health	-.0451	-	-	-	-	-
V12 Respect for parents	.0554	-	.0691*	.0667*	.0828*	-
V13 Emphasis on parents' responsibilities towards their children	-	-	-	-	.1334	-
V15 Importance of children to learn independence	.0259**	-	-	-	-	-
V16 Importance of children to learn hard work	.0302**	.0669**	.0447**	-	-	-
V17 Importance of children to learn responsibility	.0718	.0930*	.0551**	.0839	-	-
V19 Importance of children to learn tolerance	.0671	-	.0840	.0731*	-	.1290*
V20 Importance of children to learn to save money	.0304**	-	-	-	-	-
V27 General trust	.0662	-	.0776	.0531**	.0861*	-
V28 Member of church organisation	-	-	.0506**	-	-	-
V30 Member of art organisation	.0304**	-	-	-	-	-
V31 Member labour union	-.0245**	-	-	-	-	-
V35 Member charitable organisation	.0398*	-	.0565*	-	-	-
V36 Member of any other voluntary organisation	.0381*	-	.0449**	-	-	-
V37 Discussion of politics with friends	.0465	-	-	.0518**	-	-
V38 Increase taxes to protect environment	.0539	-	.0452**	.0737*	-	-

Table E.7

*Correlations between Importance of Social Bonds Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (2)*

p < .001 \* p < .01 \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V39 Increase prices to protect environment	.0481	-	.0493**	.0705*	-	-
V40 View that environment may be fixed by international laws	-	-	-	-	-	.0996**
V41 Importance of protecting the environment over economic growth	-	-	-	-.0489**	-	-
V42 Choosing products better for the environment	-.0724	-.0567**	-.0656*	-.0992	-.0679**	-
V43 Recycling for environmental reasons	-.0402*	-	-	-.0526**	-	-
V44 Attitude towards reduction of water consumption	-	-	-	-	-	-.1091**
V45 Meeting/letter/petition to protect the environment	-.0391*	-	-	-.0799*	-	-
V46 Contribution to an environmental organisation	-	-	-	-	-.0673**	-
V47 More emphasis on tradition	-.0320**	-	-	-	-	-
V48 Express own preferences to build good relationships	-.0395*	-.0827*	-	-	-.0864*	-
V49 Importance of humans coexisting with nature	.0602	.1142	-	.0730*	-	-
V50 View that humanity has a bright	.0369*	-	-	-	.0713**	.1119**
V51 Accept neighbours with criminal record	-	-	-	-	-	-.1175*
V52 Accept neighbours from other race	.0335*	-	.0507**	.0599**	-	-
V53 Accept neighbours who are political extremists	-.0304**	-	No data	-	-	-
V56 Accept neighbours who are muslims	.0492	.0793*	.0473**	.0671*	-	-
V57 Accept neighbours who are immigrants	.0390*	-	.0468**	.0513**	-	-
V58 Accept neighbours who are people with AIDS	.0390*	-	-	-	-	-
V60 Accept neighbours who are homosexuals	.0545	.0683**	.0503**	.0526**	-	-
V61 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for men	-.0476	-	-.0528**	-	-	-
V62 When jobs are scarce, jobs should be for young people	-	-	-	-	-	-.1082**
V64 Satisfaction with financial situation	.0972	.0685**	.1274	.0691*	.0602**	.0967**
V65 Satisfaction with life as a whole	.0830	-	.0941	.0731*	.0977*	.0932**
V66 Freedom of choice/ control over one's life	.0605	-	.0725*	.0477**	.0953*	-
V67 View on work until satisfied with result	.0593	.0936*	-	.0635*	.1022	-

Table E.7

*Correlations between Importance of Social Bonds Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (3)*

p < .001 \* p < .01 \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V68 View on disappointment if don't accomplish goals	-	-	-	-	.0649**	-
V69 View on working until late because he/she likes to work	.0328*	.0703**	-	-	.0934*	.1204*
V70 Goal of making one's parents proud	.0652	.0828*	.0738*	-	.1168	.1476*
V71 To live up to what friends expect	.0901	.0991*	.0855	.0721*	.0940*	.1826
V77 Important good job security	-	-	-	.0755*	-	-
V78 Important to have job respected	.0386*	-	-	-	.0673**	-
V79 Important good working hours	.0314*	-	-	.0478**	-	-
V80 Important to use initiative in job	.0521	-	.0422**	.0606**	-	-
V82 Important to achieve something in job	.0542	.0628**	-	.0555**	.0580**	-
V83 Important to have a responsible job	-	-	-	-	.0693**	-
V84 Important to have an interesting job	.0502	-	.0427**	.0779*	-	-
V85 Important job to meet one's abilities	.0395*	-	-	.0561**	-	-
V87 Employees to own business and elect managers	-.0312**	-	-	-	-.0971*	-
V91 Ideal size of family	.0574	-	.0557**	.0547**	.1031	.1176**
V92 Importance attributed to children's having a two-parent home	-	-	-	-	-	-.1233*
V94 View that marriage is outdated	-.0618	-	-.0620*	-.0541**	-.1262	-
V96 View on women single parents	-	-	-	-	-.0573**	-
V98 Working mother as good as non- working mother	.0394*	-	.0570*	-	-	-
V99 Housewife job as fulfilling as paid job	.0287**	-	-	-	-	-
V100 Husband and wife contributing to income	.0363*	-	-	-	-	-
V101 Men better political leaders than women	-.0474	-	-.0600*	-	-	-
V102 Problem if wife earns more than husband	-.0496	-	-	-.0883	-	-
V103 University more important for boy	-.0553	-	-.0472**	-	-.0687**	-
V110 View on fighting for your country	-	.0674**	-	-	-	-
V111 Less emphasis on money	.0511	.0583**	-	.0949	-	-

Table E.7

*Correlations between Importance of Social Bonds Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (4)*

p < .001 \* p < .01 \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V112 Less importance placed on work in our lives	-.0250**	-	-	-	-.0593**	-
V113 More emphasis on technology	-	-	-	.0497**	-	-
V114 Greater respect for authority	.0243**	-	.0471**	.0507**	-	-
V115 More emphasis on family life	.0635	.0944*	.0518**	-	.1240	.1460*
V117 Interest in politics	.0401*	-	-	.0751*	-	-
V118 Signing a petition	.0604	.1130	-	.0489**	-	-
V120 Attending lawful demonstrations	-	.0844*	-	.0519**	-	-
V121 Joining unofficial strikes	.0273**	-	-	.0551**	-	-
V126 Increase government ownership of business	-	-	-	-	-	.0996**
V128 View that competition is good	.0323*	-	-	.0622**	-	-
V129 Hard work brings a better life	.0467	-	-	.1056	.0600**	.0917**
V130 View on fair wealth distribution	.0465	-	.0883	-	-	-
V131 Cautious attitude towards life changes	.0366*	-	-	.0704*	-	.1361*
V132 New ideas better than old ones	-	-	-	-.0638*	-	.0941**
V134 Approve foreign workers in the country	.0384*	-	-	-	-	-
V135 Confidence in the churches	-	.0690**	.0812	.0581**	.1095	-
V136 Confidence in the Armed Forces	.0667	-	-	-	.0581**	-
V137 Confidence in the legal system	.0482	-	.0575*	.0487**	.0853*	-
V140 Confidence in the labour unions	-	-	-	-	.0583**	-
V141 Confidence in the police	.0335*	.0614**	-	.0474**	.0995*	-
V142 Confidence in the government in Madrid	-	-	-	-	-	.0901**
V143 Confidence in the political parties	.0338*	-	.0664*	-	.0587**	-
V144 Confidence in the parliament	.0256**	-	-	-	.0852*	-
V145 Confidence in the civil service	.0494	.0775*	.0899	-	-	-
V146 Confidence in the major companies	.0339*	.0772**	-	-	-	-
V147 Confidence in the green/ecology movement	.0558	.0806*	.0522**	-	.0585**	-

Table E.7

*Correlations between Importance of Social Bonds Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (5)*

p < .001 \* p < .01 \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V148 Confidence in the women's movement	.0415*	.0719**	-	-	.0610**	-
V149 Confidence in the European Union	.0450	-	.0492**	-	.0664**	-
V150 Confidence in the United Nations	.0352*	-	-	-	-	.1024**
V151 Rating of political system under Franco	-.0289**	-	-	-	-	-
V152 Rating of political system today	.0241**	-	-	-	.0846*	.0957**
V153 Rating of political system in 10 years	.0475	-	-	.0740*	.0775**	.1246**
V156 Army rule	-.0486	-.0986*	-	-.0626**	-	-
V157 View on having a democratic system	.0839	.0795*	.0611*	.1144	-	.1272*
V158 View on having a cooperative party leader	.0552	.1040*	-	.0744*	-	-
V159 Protect individual freedom	.0342*	-	.0633*	-	-	-
V160 In democracy, the economic system runs badly	-.0521	-.0860*	-	-.0745*	-	.1368*
V161 View of democracy as an indecisive system	-.0510	-.0878*	-	-.1058	-	-
V162 View of democracies as no good to maintain order	-.0364*	-.0695**	-	-.1113	-	-
V163 View of democracy as a better form of government	.0845	.0990*	.0511**	.1016	-	.2000
V164 Violence to pursue political goals	.0344*	-	-	-	.0794*	-
V166 View that the country should be run for all	-	-.0673**	-	-	-	-
V167 Group like least	-	-	-	.0469**	-	-
V168 View on group one likes least holding public office	-	-	-.0535**	-	-	-
V169 View on group one likes least teaching in schools	-	-	-	-	-	-.1243*
V174 View on the role of the government in helping the poor in the country/region	-.0400*	-.0588**	-	-.0971	-	-
V175 View on the role of the government in helping poor countries	-.0402*	-.0706**	-	-.0840*	-	-
V176 View on economic help to poor countries	.0651	.0707**	-	.0644*	.0929*	-
V177 View on purpose of life	.0475	-	.0716*	-	-	-
V179 Religious denomination	-.0618	-.0871*	-	-.1012	-	-.1179*
V180 Brought up religiously at home	.0378*	.0820*	-	-	-	-

Table E.7

*Correlations between Importance of Social Bonds Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (6)*

p < .001 \* p < .01 \*\* p < .05

Variables	Total cases	Spain	B. Country	Andalusia	Galicia	Valencia
V181 Religious attendance	.0965	.1406	.0971	.0734*	.0826*	-
V182 Religious person	.0455	.0819*	.0464**	-	-	-
V183 Belief in God	-.0314*	-	-.0527**	-	-	-
V184 Belief in life after death	-.0670	-.0851*	-.0777	-.0736*	-.0720**	-
V185 Belief in human soul	-.0381*	-	-.0461**	-	-	-
V186 Belief in the devil	-	-	-	-	-.0814*	-
V187 Belief in hell	-	-	-	-	-.0787*	-
V188 Belief in heaven	-.0359*	-.0606**	-	-	-.0838*	-
V189 Belief in sin	-	-	-	-	-.1161	-
V190 Importance of God	.0494	-	.0875	-	.0636**	-
V191 Comfort and strength from religion	.0420*	.0711**	.0449**	-	.0704**	-
V192 Justifiable: claiming benefits one is not entitled to	-.0452	-.0580**	-	-.0696*	-.0996*	-
V193 Justifiable: Avoiding a fare on public transport	-.0488	-.0624**	-	-.0758*	-.1017	-
V195 Justifiable: Buying something you knew was stolen	-.0264**	-.0899*	-	-	-	-
V196 Justifiable: accepting a bribe	-.0367*	-.0601**	-	-	-.0895*	-
V197 Justifiable: Homosexuality	.0448	-	-	-	-	-
V202 Justifiable: Suicide	-.0284**	-	-	-.0783*	-.0669**	-
V203 Geographical group belong to (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-.0889**
V208 Feeling of being more Spanish than nationalist	-	-	-	-.2112**	-	-
V209 Spanish spoken at home more than regional/other language	-.0288**	-	-.0439**	-.0608	-	-
V210 First choice party to vote next election	-	-	-	-	-.0627**	-
V212 Party would never vote	-.0546	-	-.0568**	-.0748*	-	-
V213 Perception of corruption in Spain	-.0519	-	-.0555**	-	-.0820*	-
V214 Gender	.0572	-	.0834	.0477**	-	-
V216 Age	-	-	-	-	.0701**	-
V217 Educational level	.0882	-	.0544**	.1402	.0574**	-
V218 Age completed full time education	-	-	-	.0486**	-	-
V220 Employment status	.0257**	-	-	.0531**	-	-

Table E.7

*Correlations between Importance of Social Bonds Index and Other Variables from WVS 1995-1996 (7)*

p < .001   \* p < .01   \*\* p < .05

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total cases</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>B. Country</b>	<b>Andalusia</b>	<b>Galicia</b>	<b>Valencia</b>
V221 Profession respondent	-	-	-	.0546**	-	-
V223 Chief wage earner employment status	.0629	-	-	.1076*	-	-
V224 Profession chief wage earner	.0326*	-	-	-	-	-
V225 Family savings	.0344*	-	.0657*	-	-	-
V226 Social class	.0508	-	-	.1083	-	-
V227 Household income	.1025	.0931*	.0799*	.1019	.0703**	-
V232 Size of town	-	-.0912*	-	.0543**	-	-

Source: own elaboration from WVS 1995-1996 data.

**Appendix F. Complete Questionnaire for World Values Survey  
1995 -1996. Spain. Basque Country, Andalusia, Galicia and Valencia.**

**1995-1996 WORLD VALUES SURVEY**

- V1. Survey number  
V2. Country code  
    08 Spain  
    75 Basque Country  
    78 Andalusia  
    79 Galicia  
    80 Valencia  
V3. Interview number

**WORLD VALUES SURVEY  
1995 QUESTIONNAIRE, FINAL VERSION  
Institute for Social Research  
The University of Michigan**

**Note:** This is the definitive questionnaire (20/05/95) used in all the countries/regions involved in the World Values Survey 1995-1996. In the case of Spain and the four regions (Basque Country, Andalusia, Galicia and Valencia), the interviewer will substitute the word **[Spain]** or **[Spanish]** with the equivalent from each autonomous region.

**INTRODUCTION BY INTERVIEWER:**

Hello, I am from **[NAME OF ORGANISATION]**. We are carrying out the **[SPANISH]** part of a world-wide study of what people value in life. This study will interview samples representing most of the world's people. Your name has been selected at random as part of a representative sample of the **[SPANISH]** public. I'd like to ask your views on a number of different subjects. Your help will contribute to a better understanding of what people all over the world believe and want out of life.



**SHOW CARD A**

Please say, for each of the following, how important it is in your life. Would you say...

	Very <u>important</u>	Rather <u>important</u>	Not very <u>important</u>	Not at all <u>important</u>	<u>DK</u>
V4. Family	1	2	3	4	9
V5. Friends	1	2	3	4	9
V6. Leisure time	1	2	3	4	9
V7. Politics	1	2	3	4	9
V8. Work	1	2	3	4	9
V9. Religion	1	2	3	4	9

V10. Taking all things together, would you say you are:

1. Very happy
2. Quite happy
3. Not very happy
4. Not at all happy
9. DK [**DO NOT READ OUT**]

V11. All in all, how would you describe your state of health these days? Would you say it is ...

**(READ OUT REVERSING ORDER FOR ALTERNATE CONTACTS)**

1. Very good
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor
5. Very poor
9. DK [**DO NOT READ OUT**]

**SHOW CARD B**

V12. With which of these two statements do you tend to agree? **(CODE ONE ANSWER ONLY)**

- A. Regardless of what the qualities and faults of one's parents are, one must always love and respect them.
- B. One does not have the duty to respect and love parents who have not earned it by their behaviour and attitudes.

- 1. Tend to agree with statement A
- 2. Tend to agree with statement B
- 9. DK **[DO NOT READ OUT]**

**SHOW CARD C**

V13. Which of the following statements best describes your views about parents' responsibilities to their children? **(CODE ONE ONLY)**

- 1. Parents' duty is to do their best for their children even at the expense of their own well-being
- 2. Parents have a life of their own and should not be asked to sacrifice their own well-being for the shake of their children
- 3. Neither

DK **[DO NOT READ OUT]**

**SHOW CARD D**

Here is a list of qualities that children can be encouraged to learn at home. Which, if any, do you consider to be especially important? Please, choose up to five.

	<u>Important</u>	<u>Not mentioned</u>
V14. Good manners	1	2
V15. Independence	1	2
V16. Hard work	1	2
V17. Feeling of responsibility	1	2
V18. Imagination	1	2
V19. Tolerance and respect for other people	1	2
V20. Thrift, saving money and things	1	2
V21. Determination, perseverance	1	2
V22. Religious faith	1	2
V23. Unselfishness	1	2
V24. Obedience	1	2

V25. Here is a shorter list of things that children can be encouraged to learn. If you had to choose, which one of these do you consider to be the most important thing for a child to learn at home?

V26. And what would you say is the second most important thing for a child to learn?

	<u>Most important</u>	<u>Second most important</u>
Thrift, saving money and things	1	1
Obedience	2	2
Determination, perseverance	3	3
Religious faith	4	4
DK [DO NOT READ OUT]	9	9

V27. Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?

1. Most people can be trusted
2. Can't be too careful [TRANSLATION: = "have to be very careful"]
9. DK [DO NOT READ]

Now I am going to read off a list of voluntary organisations; for each one, could you tell me whether you are an active member, an inactive member or not a member of that type of organisation?

	<u>Active member</u>	<u>Inactive member</u>	<u>Do not belong</u>
V28. Church or religious organisation	1	2	3
V29. Sport or recreation organisation	1	2	3
V30. Art, music or educational organisation	1	2	3
V31. Labor union	1	2	3
V32. Political party	1	2	3
V33. Environmental organisation	1	2	3
V34. Professional organisation	1	2	3
V35. Charitable organisation	1	2	3
V36. Any other voluntary organisation	1	2	3

V37. When you get together with your friends, would you say you discuss political matters frequently, occasionally or never?

1. Frequently
2. Occasionally
3. Never

DK [DO NOT READ OUT]

**SHOW CARD F**

I am going to read out some statements about the environment. For each one I read out, can you tell me whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree or disagree strongly? **(READ OUT EACH STATEMENT AND CODE AN ANSWER FOR EACH)**

	<u>Strongly agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly disagree</u>	<u>DK</u>
V38. I would agree to an increase in taxes if the extra money were used to prevent environmental damage	1	2	3	4	9
V39. I would buy things at 20% higher than usual prices if it would help protect the environment	1	2	3	4	9
V40. Spanish environmental problems can be solved without any international agreements to handle them	1	2	3	4	9

V41. There are two statements people sometimes make when discussing the environment and economic growth. Which of them comes closer to your own point of view?

1. Protecting the environment should be given priority, even if it causes slower economic growth and some loss of jobs.
2. Economic growth and creating jobs should be the top priority, even if the environment suffers to some extent
3. Other answer **(IF VOLUNTEERED)**
9. DK

Which, if any, of these things have you done in the last 12 months, out of concern for the environment?

	<u>Have done</u>	<u>Have not</u>	<u>DK</u>
V42. Have you chosen household products that you think are better for the environment?	1	2	9
V43. Have you decided for environmental reasons to reuse or recycle something rather than throw it away?	1	2	9
V44. Have you tried to reduce water consumption for environmental reasons?	1	2	9
V45. Have you attended a meeting or signed a letter or petition aimed at protecting the environment?	1	2	9
V46. Have you contributed to an environmental organisation?	1	2	9

For each of the following pairs of statements, please tell me which one comes closest to your own views:

V47.

1. We should emphasize tradition more than high technology; OR
2. We should emphasize high technology more than tradition.
9. DK

V48.

1. To build good human relationships, it is most important to try to understand others' preferences; OR
2. To build good relationships, it is most important to express one's own preferences clearly.
9. DK

V49.

1. Human beings should master nature; OR
2. Humans should coexist with nature.
9. DK

V50.

1. Humanity has a bright future; OR
2. Humanity has a bleak future.
9. DK

**SHOW CARD G**

On this list are various groups of people. Could you please sort out any that you would not like to have as neighbours? (CODE AN ANSWER FOR EACH)

	<u>Mentioned</u>	<u>Not mentioned</u>
V51. People with a criminal record	1	2
V52. People of a different race	1	2
V53. Political extremists	1	2
V54. Heavy drinkers	1	2
V55. Emotionally unstable people	1	2
V56. Muslims	1	2
V57. Immigrants/foreign workers	1	2
V58. People who have AIDS	1	2
V59. Drug addicts	1	2
V60. Homosexuals	1	2

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Neither</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>DK</u>
V61. When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women	1	2	3	9
V62. When jobs are scarce, older people should be forced to retire from work early	1	2	3	9
V63. When jobs are scarce, employers should give priority to Spanish people over immigrants	1	2	3	9

**SHOW CARD H**

V64. How satisfied are you with the financial situation of your household? If "1" means you are completely dissatisfied on this scale, and "10" means you are completely satisfied, where would you put your satisfaction with your household's financial situation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Dissatisfied					Satisfied					DK = 99

V65. All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days? Please, use this card to help with your answer.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

Dissatisfied Satisfied    DK= 99

V66. Some people feel they have completely free choice and control over their lives, while other people feel that what they do has no real effect on what happens to them. Please, use this scale where 1 means "none at all" and 10 means "a great deal" to indicate how much freedom of choice and control you feel you have over the way your life turns out.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

None at all A great deal    DK= 99

Now I'd like to ask you some questions about how you feel about work - whether it is work in the home or outside the home. Could you tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements: do you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly?

	Strongly <u>agree</u>	Agree	Disagree	Strongly <u>disagree</u>	DK
V67. I almost always continue to work on a task until I am satisfied with the result.	1	2	3	4	9
V68. I feel disappointed in myself when I don't accomplish my personal goals.	1	2	3	4	9
V69. I like work so much that I often stay up late at night to finish it.	1	2	3	4	9
V70. One of my main goals in life has been to make my parents proud.	1	2	3	4	9
V71. I make a lot of effort to live up to what my friends expect.	1	2	3	4	9

**SHOW CARD I**

V72. Which point on this scale most clearly describes how much weight you place on work (including housework and school work), as compared with leisure or recreation?

1. It's leisure that makes life worth living, not work
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
5. Work is what makes life worth living, not leisure
9. DK

**SHOW CARD J**

V73. Now I would like to ask you something about the things which would seem to you, personally, most important if you were looking for a job. Here are some of the things many people take into account in relation to their work. Regardless of whether you're actually looking for a job, which one would you, personally, place first if you were looking for a job?

1. A good income so that you do not have any worries about money
2. A safe job with no risk of closing down or unemployment
3. Working with people you like
4. Doing an important job which gives you a feeling of accomplishment
9. DK

V74. And what would be your second choice?

1. A good income so that you do not have any worries about money
2. A safe job with no risk of closing down or unemployment
3. Working with people you like
4. Doing an important job which gives you a feeling of accomplishment
9. DK



**SHOW CARD J2**

Here are some more aspects of a job that people say are important. Please, look at them and tell me which ones you personally think are important in a job? **(CODE ALL MENTIONED)**

	<u>Mentioned</u>	<u>Not mentioned</u>
V75. Good pay	1	2
V76. Not too much pressure	1	2
V77. Good job security	1	2
V78. A job respected by people in general	1	2
V79. Good hours	1	2
V80. An opportunity to use initiative	1	2
V81. Generous holidays	1	2
V82. A job in which you feel you can achieve something	1	2
V83. A responsible job	1	2
V84. A job that is interesting	1	2
V85. A job that meets one's abilities	1	2

V86. Imagine two secretaries, of the same age, doing practically the same job. One finds out that the other earns considerably more than she does. The better paid secretary, however, is quicker, more efficient and more reliable at her job. In your opinion, is it fair or not fair that one secretary is paid more than the other?

1. Fair
2. Not fair
9. DK **[DO NOT READ OUT]**

**SHOW CARD K**

V87. There is a lot of discussion about how business and industry should be managed. Which of these four statements comes closest to your opinion? **(CODE ONE ONLY)**

1. The owners should run their business or appoint the managers
2. The owners and the employees should participate in the selection of managers
3. The government should be the owner and appoint the managers
4. The employees should own the business and should elect the managers
9. DK **[DO NOT READ OUT]**

V88. People have different ideas about following instructions at work. Some say that one should follow one's superior's instructions even when one does not fully agree with them. Others say that one should follow one's superior's instructions only when one is convinced that they are right. With which of these two opinions do you agree?

1. One should follow instructions
2. Must be convinced first
3. Depends **[IF VOLUNTEERED]**
9. DK **[DO NOT READ OUT]**

V89. Are you currently... **(READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY)**

1. Married
2. Living together as married
3. Divorced
4. Separated
5. Widowed
6. Single

V90. Have you had any children? **IF YES**, how many?

0. None
1. 1 child
2. 2 children
3. 3 children
4. 4 children
5. 5 children
6. 6 children
7. 7 children
8. 8 or more children
9. No answer

V91. What do you think is the ideal size of the family - how many children, if any?

0. None
1. 1 child
2. 2 children
3. 3 children
4. 4 children
5. 5 children
6. 6 children
7. 7 children
8. 8 or more children
9. No answer

V92. If someone says a child needs a home with both a father and a mother to grow up happily, would you tend to agree or disagree?

1. Tend to agree
2. Tend to disagree
9. DK [**DO NOT READ OUT**]

V93. Do you think that a woman has to have children in order to be fulfilled or is this not necessary?

1. Needs children
2. Not necessary
9. DK [**DO NOT READ OUT**]

V94. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? (**READ OUT**): " Marriage is an out-dated institution"

1. Agree
2. Disagree
9. DK [**DO NOT READ OUT**]

V95. If someone says that individuals should have the chance to enjoy complete sexual freedom without being restricted, would you tend to agree or disagree?

1. Tend to agree
2. Tend to disagree
3. Neither/it depends [**IF VOLUNTEERED**]
9. DK [**DO NOT READ OUT**]

V96. If a woman wants to have a child as a single parent but she doesn't want to have a stable relationship with a man, do you approve or disapprove?

1. Approve
2. Disapprove
3. Depends [**IF VOLUNTEERED**]
9. DK [**DO NOT READ OUT**]

V97. If you were to have only one child, would you rather have it be a boy or a girl?

1. A boy
2. A girl
3. It makes no difference
9. DK

People talk about the changing roles of men and women today. For each of the following statements I read out, can you tell me how much you agree with each. Do you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly?

	Strongly <u>agree</u>	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	DK
V98. A working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work	1	2	3	4	9
V99. Being a housewife is just as fulfilling as working for pay	1	2	3	4	9
V100. Both the husband and wife should contribute to household income	1	2	3	4	9
V101. On the whole, men make better political leaders than women do	1	2	3	4	9
V102. If a woman earns more money than her husband, it's almost certain to cause problems	1	2	3	4	9
V103. A university education is more important for a boy than for a girl	1	2	3	4	9

**SHOW CARD L**

V104. People sometimes talk about what the aims of this country should be for the next ten years. On this card are listed some of the goals which different people would give top priority. Would you please say which one of these you, yourself, consider the most important? **CODE ONE ANSWER ONLY UNDER "First Choice".**

V105. And which would be the next most important? **CODE ONE ANSWER ONLY UNDER "Second Choice".**

	First <u>choice</u>	Second <u>choice</u>
A high level of economic growth	1	1
Making sure this country has strong defense forces	2	2
Seeing that people have more say about how things are done at their jobs and in their communities	3	3
Trying to make our cities and countryside more beautiful	4	4
DK [DO NOT READ OUT]	9	9

**SHOW CARD M**

V106. If you have to choose, which one of the things on this card would you say is most important?

**CODE ONE ANSWER ONLY**

V107. And which would be the next most important? **CODE ONE ANSWER ONLY**

	First <u>choice</u>	Second <u>choice</u>
Maintaining order in the nation	1	1
Giving people more say in important government decisions	2	2
Fighting rising prices	3	3
Protecting freedom of speech	4	4
DK [DO NOT READ OUT]	9	9

**SHOW CARD N**

V108. Here is another list. In your opinion, which one of these is most important? **CODE ONE ANSWER ONLY**

V109. And what would be the next most important? **CODE ONE ANSWER ONLY**

	First <u>choice</u>	Second <u>choice</u>
A stable economy	1	1
Progress toward a less impersonal and more humane society	2	2
Progress toward a society in which ideas count more than money	3	3
The fight against crime	4	4
DK [DO NOT READ OUT]	9	9

V110. Of course, we all hope that there will not be another war, but if were to come to that, would you be willing to fight for your country?

1. Yes
2. No
9. DK [DO NOT READ OUT]

I'm going to read out a list of various changes in our way of life that might take place in the near future. Please tell me for each one, if it were to happen, whether you think it would be a good thing, a bad thing, or don't you mind?

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Don't mind</u>	<u>Bad</u>	<u>DK</u>
V111. Less emphasis on money and material possessions	1	2	3	9
V112. Less importance placed on work in our lives	1	2	3	9
V113. More emphasis on the development of technology	1	2	3	9
V114. More respect for authority	1	2	3	9
V115. More emphasis on family life	1	2	3	9

V116. In the long run, do you think the scientific advances we are making will help or harm mankind?

1. Will help
2. Will harm
3. Some of each
9. DK **[DO NOT READ OUT]**

V117. How interested would you say you are in politics?

1. Very interested
2. Somewhat interested
3. Not very interested
4. Not at all interested
9. DK **[DO NOT READ OUT]**

**SHOW CARD O [WHICH LISTS "HAVE DONE", "MIGHT DO", "WOULD NEVER DO"]**

Now I'd like you to look at this card. I'm going to read some different forms of political action that people can take, and I'd like you to tell me, for each one, whether you have actually done any of these things, whether you might do it or would never, under any circumstances, do it.

	<u>Have done</u>	<u>Might do</u>	<u>Would never do</u>	<u>DK</u>
V118. Signing a petition	1	2	3	9
V119. Joining in boycotts	1	2	3	9
V120. Attending lawful demonstrations	1	2	3	9
V121. Joining unofficial strikes	1	2	3	9
V122. Occupying buildings or factories	1	2	3	9

**SHOW CARD P**

V123. In political matters, people talk of "the left" and "the right". How would you place your views on this scale, generally speaking?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
									Left	Right	DK = 99

**SHOW CARD Q**

V124. On this card are three basic kinds of attitudes concerning the society we live in. Please choose the one which best describes your own opinion. **CODE ONE ONLY**

1. The entire way our society is organised must be radically changed by revolutionary action
2. Our society must be gradually improved by reforms
3. Our present society must be valiantly defended against all subversive forces
9. DK **[DO NOT READ OUT]**

**SHOW CARD R**

Now I'd like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left; 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right; and if your views fall somewhere in between, you can choose any number in between.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	DK = 99
V125. Incomes should be made more equal						We need larger income differences as incentives for individual effort				

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	DK = 99
V126. Private ownership of business and industry should be increased						Government ownership of business and industry should be increased				

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	DK = 99
V127. The government should take more responsibility to ensure that everyone is provided for						People should take more responsibility to provide for themselves				



1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 DK = 99

V128. Competition is good. It stimulates  
people to work hard and develop new ideas

Competition is harmful.  
It brings out the worst in people

---

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 DK = 99

V129. In the long run, hard work usually  
brings a better life - it's more a matter of  
luck and connections

Hard work doesn't generally  
bring success

---

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 DK = 99

V130. People can only get rich at  
the expense of others

Wealth can grow so there's  
enough for everyone

---

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 DK = 99

V131. One should be cautious  
about making major changes

You will never achieve much  
in life unless you act boldly

---

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 DK = 99

V132. Ideas that have stood the test  
of time are generally best

New ideas are generally  
better than old ones

---

V133. Do you think is better if:

1. Goods made in other countries can be imported and sold here if people want to buy them;

OR that:

2. There should be stricter limits on selling foreign goods here, to protect the jobs of people in this  
country

9. DK

V134. How about people from other countries coming here to work. Which one of the following do you think the government should do?

1. Let people come who wants to?
2. Let people come as long as there are jobs available?
3. Place strict limits on the number of foreigners who can come here?
4. Prohibit people coming here from other countries?
9. DK

I am going to name a number of organisations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all?

	<u>A great deal</u>	<u>Quite a lot</u>	<u>Not very much</u>	<u>None at all</u>	<u>DK</u>
V135. The churches	1	2	3	4	9
V136. The armed forces	1	2	3	4	9
V137. The legal system	1	2	3	4	9
V138. The press	1	2	3	4	9
V139. Television	1	2	3	4	9
V140. Labor unions	1	2	3	4	9
V141. The police	1	2	3	4	9
V142. The government in Madrid	1	2	3	4	9
V143. Political parties	1	2	3	4	9
V144. Parliament	1	2	3	4	9
V145. The Civil service	1	2	3	4	9
V146. Major companies	1	2	3	4	9
V147. The Green/Ecology movement	1	2	3	4	9
V148. The Women's movement	1	2	3	4	9
V149. The European Union	1	2	3	4	9
V150. The United Nations	1	2	3	4	9

**SHOW CARDS**

People have different views about the system for governing this country. Here is a scale for rating hoe well things are going: 1 means very bad and 10 means very good.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	DK = 99
Very bad									Very good	

V151. Where on this scale would you put the political system as it was in Franco's regime?

\_\_\_\_\_   
 (write in score, from 1 to 10)

V152. Where on this scale would you put the political system as it is today?

\_\_\_\_\_   
 (write in score, from 1 to 10)

V153. Where on this scale would you put the political system as you expect it will be ten years from now?

\_\_\_\_\_   
 (write in score, from 1 to 10)

I am going to describe various types of political systems and ask what you think about each as a way of governing this country. For each one, would you say it is a very good, fairly good, fairly bad or very bad way of governing this country?

Very good   Fairly good   Fairly bad   Very bad   DK

V154. Having a strong leader who does not have to bother with parliament and elections      1            2            3            4            9

V155. Having experts, not government, make decisions according to what they think is best for the country      1            2            3            4            9

V156. Having the army rule      1            2            3            4            9

V157. Having a democratic political system      1            2            3            4            9

V158. In politics, different parties often hold different views. Which do you think is better:

1. A party leader should stand firm for what he or she believes, even if others disagree;

OR

2. A party leader should be prepared to cooperate with other groups, even if it means compromising some important beliefs.

9. DK

V159. If you had to choose, which would you say is the most important responsibility of government:

1. To maintain order in society; OR
2. To respect freedom of the individual.
9. DK

I'm going to read off some things that people sometimes say about a democratic political system. Could you please tell me if you agree strongly, agree, disagree or disagree strongly, after I read each one of them?

	<u>Agree strongly</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree strongly</u>	<u>DK</u>
V160. In democracy, the economic system runs badly	1	2	3	4	9
V161. Democracies are indecisive and have too much squabbling	1	2	3	4	9
V162. Democracies aren't good at maintaining order	1	2	3	4	9
V163. Democracy may have problems but it's better than any other form of government	1	2	3	4	9

Here is one more statement. How strongly do you agree or disagree with it?

V164. Using violence to pursue political goals is never justified	1	2	3	4	9
---	---	---	---	---	---

V165. How satisfied are you with the way the people now in national office are handling the country's affairs? Would you say you are very satisfied, fairly satisfied, fairly dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?

1. Very satisfied
2. Fairly satisfied
3. Fairly dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied
9. DK **[DO NOT READ OUT]**

V166. Generally speaking, would you say that this country is run by a few big interests looking out for themselves, or that it is run for the benefit of all the people?

1. Run by a few big interests
2. Run for all the people
9. DK **[DO NOT READ OUT]**

V167. I'd like to ask you about some groups that some people feel are threatening to the social and political order in this society. Would you please select from the following list the one group or organisation that you like **least**?

1. Hard-line communists/left extremists
2. Capitalists
3. ETA members
4. Immigrants
5. Homosexuals
6. Criminals
7. Neo-Nazis/Right extremists

Do you think that **[NAME LEAST-LIKED GROUP JUST IDENTIFIED]** should be allowed to:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>DK</u>
V168. Hold public office?	1	2	9
V169. Teach in our schools?	1	2	9
V170. Hold public demonstrations?	1	2	9

Now I'd like to ask you some questions about the problem of poverty, in **[Spain]** and in other countries.

V171. Would you say that today a larger share, about the same share, or a smaller share of the people in this country are living in poverty than were ten years ago?

1. A larger share
2. About the same share
3. A smaller share
9. DK

V172. Why, in your opinion, are there people in **[Spain]** who lived in need? Here are two opinions:  
Which comes closest to your view?

1. They are poor because of laziness and lack of will power
2. They are poor because society treats them unfairly
9. DK

V173. In your opinion, do most poor people in **[Spain]** have a chance of escaping from poverty, or is there very little chance of escaping?

1. They have a chance
2. There is very little chance
9. DK

V174. Do you think that what the government is doing for people in poverty in **[Spain]** is about the right amount, too much, or too little?

1. Too much
2. About the right amount
3. Too little
9. DK

V175. In some economically less developed countries, many people are living in poverty. Do you think that what the other countries of the world are doing to help them is about right, too much, or too little?

1. Too much
2. About the right amount
3. Too little
9. DK

V176. Some people favor, and others are against, having **[Spain]** to provide economic aid to poorer countries. Are you personally...

1. Very much for
2. For to some extent
3. Somewhat against
4. Very much against
9. DK

V177. How often, if at all, do you think about the meaning and the purpose of life? (**READ OUT IN REVERSE ORDER FOR ALTERNATE CONTACTS**)

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. Rarely
4. Never
9. DK [**DO NOT READ OUT**]

**SHOW CARD T**

V178. Here are two statements which people sometimes make when discussing good and evil. Which one comes closest to your own point of view?

- A. There are absolutely clear guidelines about what is good and evil. These always apply to everyone, whatever the circumstances.
- B. There can never be absolutely clear guidelines about what is good and evil. What is good and evil depends entirely upon the circumstances at the time.
  1. Agree with statement A
  2. Agree with statement B
  3. Disagree with both [**IF VOLUNTEERED**]
  9. DK [**DO NOT READ OUT**]

V179. Do you belong to a religious denomination?

**IF YES:** Which one?

**IF NO: CODE 0**

	<u>Religious denomination</u>
NO, not a member	0
Roman Catholic	1
Protestant	2
Orthodox (Russian, Greek, etc.)	3
Jew	4
Muslim	5
Hindu	6
Buddhist	7
Other ( <b>WRITE IN</b> ) _____	8
No answer	9

**NOTE: If your own society does not fit into this coding system, please devise an alternative, following this as closely as possible; point out any variations when sending the data.**

**ASK ALL**

V180. Were you brought up religiously at home?

1. Yes
2. No
9. No answer

**SHOW CARD U**

V181. Apart from weddings, funerals and christenings, about how often do you attend religious services these days?

1. More than once a week
2. Once a week
3. Once a month
4. Only on special holy days
5. Once a year
6. Less often
7. Never, practically never
9. No answer

V182. Independently of whether you go to church or not, would you say you are... **(READ OUT)**

1. A religious person
2. Not a religious person
3. A convinced atheist
9. DK [**DO NOT READ OUT**]

Which, if any, of the following do you believe in? **(READ OUT AND CODE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH)**

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>DK</u>
V183. Do you believe in God?	1	2	9
V184. Do you believe in life after death?	1	2	9
V185. Do you believe people have a soul?	1	2	9
V186. Do you believe the Devil exists?	1	2	9
V187. Do you believe in hell?	1	2	9
V188. Do you believe in heaven?	1	2	9
V189. Do you believe in sin?	1	2	9



**SHOW CARD V**

V190. How important is God in your life? Please use this scale to indicate: 10 means very important and 1 means not at all important.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	DK = 99
Not at all									Very	

V191. Do you find that you get comfort and strength from religion?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 9. DK **[DO NOT READ OUT]**

**SHOW CARD W**

Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. **READ OUT STATEMENTS. CODE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH STATEMENT.**

V192. Claiming government benefits to which you are not entitled

Never justifiable										Always justifiable									
1	/	2	/	3	/	4	/	5	/	6	/	7	/	8	/	9	/	10	DK = 99

V193. Avoiding a fare on public transport

Never justifiable										Always justifiable									
1	/	2	/	3	/	4	/	5	/	6	/	7	/	8	/	9	/	10	DK = 99

V194. Cheating on taxes if you have a chance

Never justifiable										Always justifiable									
1	/	2	/	3	/	4	/	5	/	6	/	7	/	8	/	9	/	10	DK = 99

V195. Buying something you knew was stolen

Never justifiable										Always justifiable									
1	/	2	/	3	/	4	/	5	/	6	/	7	/	8	/	9	/	10	DK = 99

V196. Someone accepting a bribe in the course of their duties

Never justifiable										Always justifiable									
1	/	2	/	3	/	4	/	5	/	6	/	7	/	8	/	9	/	10	DK = 99

V197. Homosexuality

Never justifiable

Always justifiable

1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 DK = 99

V198. Prostitution

Never justifiable

Always justifiable

1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 DK = 99

V199. Abortion

Never justifiable

Always justifiable

1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 DK = 99

V200. Divorce

Never justifiable

Always justifiable

1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 DK = 99

V201. Euthanasia - ending the life of the incurably sick

Never justifiable

Always justifiable

1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 DK = 99

V202. Suicide

Never justifiable

Always justifiable

1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 DK = 99

**SHOW CARD X**

V203. To which of these geographical groups would you say you belong first of all?

V204. And the next?

	<u>First</u>	<u>Next</u>
Locality or town where you live	1	1
State or region of country where you live	2	2
Spain as a whole	3	3
Europe	4	4
The world as a whole	5	5
DK [DO NOT READ OUT]	9	9

V205. How proud are you to be **[Spanish]**

1. Very proud
2. Quite proud
3. Not very proud
4. Not at all proud
5. **[IF VOLUNTEERED]:** I am not **[Spanish]**
9. **DK [DO NOT READ OUT]**

V206. Were you born in **[Spain]**?

1. Yes  
No **IF NO:** Where were you born?
2. Latin America
3. North America
4. Asia
5. Europe (except Spain)
6. Africa
7. Other
8. Rest of Spain

V207. (If no) In what year did you come to **[Spain]**?

1. Within past 2 years
2. Within past 3-5 years
3. 6-10 years ago
4. 11-15 years ago
5. More than 15 years ago

**SHOW CARD Y**

V208. Which of the following best describes you? Just call out one of the letters of this card.

1. [A] Only (from region)
2. [B] More (from region) than Spanish
3. [C] As (from region) as Spanish
4. [D] More Spanish than (from region)
5. [E] Only Spanish
9. DK

V209. What language do you normally speak at home?

3. Spanish
4. Catalan
5. Vasco
6. Gallego
7. Valenciano
8. English
9. French
10. Other
11. No answer

**SHOW CARD Z**

V210. If there were a national election tomorrow, for which party on this list would you vote? Just call out the number on this card. **If DON'T KNOW:** Which party appeals to you most?

V211. And which party would be your second choice?

V212. And is there any party on this list that you would never vote for?

	<u>First choice</u>	<u>Second choice</u>	<u>Never would vote for</u>
01. Partido Popular (PP)	01	01	01
02. Partido Socialista Obrero Espanol (PSOE)	02	02	02
03. Centro Democratico y Social (CDS)	03	03	03
04. Izquierda Unida (IU)	04	04	04
05. Ecologistas	05	05	05
06. Convergencia y Union (CIU)	06	06	06
07. Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya (ERC)	07	07	07
08. Partido Nacionalista Vasco (PNV)	08	08	08
09. Eusko Alkartasuna (EA)	09	09	09
10. Herri Batasuna (HB)	10	10	10
11. Union Alavesa (UA)	11	11	11
12. Plazandrea	12	12	12
13. Union del Pueblo Navarro (UPN)	13	13	13
14. Coalicion Gallega (CG)	14	14	14
15. Bloque Nacionalista Gallego(BNG)	15	15	15
16. Partido Andalucista (PA)	16	16	16
17. Partido Andaluz Progresista (PAP)	17	17	17
18. Coalicion Canaria (CC)	18	18	18

	<u>First choice</u>	<u>Second choice</u>	<u>Never would vote for</u>
19. Centro Canarias Independent (CCI)	19	19	19
20. Asociacion Independiente Canaria (AIC)	20	20	20
21. Asamblea Majorera	21	21	21
22. Partido Nacionalista Canario (PNC)	22	22	22
23. Izquierda Canaria (ICAN)	23	23	23
24. Partido Regionalista Cantabro (PRC)	24	24	24
25. Partido Aragonés Regionalista (PAR)	25	25	25
26. Extremadura Unida (EU)	26	26	26
27. Union Valenciana(UV)	27	27	27
90. Other	90	90	90
91. Blank	91	91	91
92. Would not vote	92	92	92
98. DK	98	98	98
99. No answer	99	99	99

V213. How widespread do you think bribe taking and corruption is in this country?

1. Almost no public officials are engaged in it
2. A few public officials are engaged in it
3. Most public officials are engaged in it
4. Almost all public officials are engaged in it
9. DK

#### DEMOGRAPHICS

V214. Sex of respondent

1. Male
2. Female

V215. Can you tell me your year of birth, please? 19\_\_\_\_

**[ENTER ONLY THE LAST TWO DIGITS OF THE YEAR: "19" IS ASSUMED]**

V216. This means you are \_\_\_\_ years old

**[ALSO A TWO DIGIT VARIABLE]**

V217. What is the highest educational level that you have attained?

**IF STUDENT, CODE HIGHEST LEVEL HE/SHE EXPECTS TO COMPLETE**

1. No formal education
2. Incomplete primary school
3. Complete primary school
4. Incomplete secondary school: technical/vocational type
5. Complete secondary school: technical/vocational type
6. Incomplete secondary: university-preparatory type
7. Complete secondary: university-preparatory type
8. Some university-level education, without degree
9. University-level education, with degree
0. DK/No answer

V218. At what age did you or will you complete your full time education, either at school or at an institution of higher education? Please exclude apprenticeships:

**[IF STUDENT, CODE AGE AT WHICH HE/SHE EXPECTS TO COMPLETE EDUCATION]**

**WRITE IN AGE IN YEARS \_\_\_\_\_ [TWO DIGITS]**

V219. Do you live with your parents?

1. Yes
2. No

V220. Are you employed now or not? IF YES:

About how many hours a week? If more than one job: only for the main job.

Has paid employment

- |                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Full time (30 hours a week or more)   | 1 |
| Part time (less than 30 hours a week) | 2 |
| Self employed                         | 3 |

If no paid employment

- |                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Retired/pensioned                | 4 |
| Housewife not otherwise employed | 5 |
| Student                          | 6 |
| Unemployed                       | 7 |
| Other PLEASE SPECIFY _____       | 8 |

V221. In which profession/occupation do you or did you work? If more than one job, the main job?  
What is/was your job there? **WRITE IN AND CODE V221 BELOW**

---

1. Employer/manager of establishment with 10 or more employees
2. Employer/manager of establishment with less than 10 employees
3. Professional worker: lawyer, accountant, teacher, etc
4. Supervisory - office worker: supervises others
5. Non - manual - office worker: non - supervisory
6. Foreman and supervisor
7. Skilled manual worker
8. Semi - skilled manual worker
9. Unskilled manual worker
10. Farmer: has own farm
11. Agricultural worker
12. Member of armed forces, security personnel
13. Never had a job

V222. Are you the chief wage earner in your household?

1. Yes **GO TO V225**
2. No **GO TO V223**

V223. Is the chief wage earner employed now or not?

1. Yes
2. No

V224. In which profession/occupation does he/she work? (or did work). If more than one job, the main job? What is/was his/her job there? **WRITE IN AND CODE V224 BELOW**

- 
1. Employer/manager of establishment with 10 or more employees
  2. Employer/manager of establishment with less than 10 employees
  3. Professional worker: lawyer, accountant, teacher, etc
  4. Supervisory - office worker: supervises others
  5. Non - manual - office worker: non - supervisory
  6. Foreman and supervisor
  7. Skilled manual worker
  8. Semi - skilled manual worker
  9. Unskilled manual worker
  10. Farmer: has own farm
  11. Agricultural worker
  12. Member of armed forces, security personnel
  13. Never had a job

V225. During the past year, did your family:

1. Save money
2. Just get by
3. Spent some savings
4. Spent savings and borrowed money
9. DK, NA

V226. People sometimes describe themselves as belonging to the working class, the middle class, or the upper or lower class. Would you describe yourself as belonging to the:

1. Upper class
2. Upper middle class
3. Lower middle class
4. Working class
5. Lower class
9. DK **[DO NOT READ OUT]**



**SHOW INCOME CARD AA**

V227. Here is a scale of incomes. We would like to know in what group your household is, counting all wages, salaries, pensions and other incomes that come in. Just give the letter of the group your household falls into, before taxes and other deductions.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Lowest decile					Highest decile				

No answer = 98

**[CODE INCOME CATEGORIES BY DECILES FOR YOUR SOCIETY, 1 = LOWEST DECILE, 10 = HIGHEST DECILE]**

**Note: In the Basqye Country:**

- 1. – 45,000 ptas**
- 2. 45-75,000 ptas**
- 3. 75-100,000 ptas**
- 4. 100-150,000 ptas**
- 5. 150-200,000 ptas**
- 6. 200-275,000 ptas**
- 7. 275-350,000 ptas**
- 8. 350-450,000 ptas**
- 9. 450-1,000,000 ptas**
- 10. More than 1,000,000 ptas**

V228. Do you ever watch television? **IF YES:** How much time do you usually spend watching television on an average weekday (**NOT WEEKENDS**)?

1. Do not watch TV or do not have access to TV
2. 1-2 hours per day
3. 2-3 hours per day
4. More than 3 hours per day
9. DK

V229. Time at the end of the interview:\_\_\_\_\_

V230. Total length of interview:\_\_\_\_\_ Hours\_\_\_\_\_ Minutes

V231. During the interview the respondent was ...

1. Very interested
2. Somewhat interested
3. Not very interested

V232. Size of town:

1. Under 2,000
2. 2,000 - 5,000
3. 5 -10,000
4. 10 - 20,000
5. 20 - 50,000
6. 50 - 100,000
7. 100 - 500,000
8. 500,000 and more

V233. Ethnic group *[code by observation]*

1. Caucasian white
2. Negro Black
3. South Asian: Indian, Pakistani, etc.
4. East Asian: Chinese, Japanese, etc.
5. Arabic, Central Asian
6. Other: write in \_\_\_\_\_

V234. Region where the interview was conducted:

1. Andalucia
2. Aragon
3. Asturias
4. Baleares
5. Catalunya
6. Canarias
7. Cantabria
8. Castilla - Leon
9. Castilla - La Mancha
10. Extremadura
11. Galicia

Region where the interview was conducted (continuation)

12. La Rioja
13. Madrid
14. Murcia
15. Navarra
16. Pais Vasco
17. Pais Valenciano

V235. Language in which interview was conducted

1. Spanish
2. Autonomous region own language

V236. Weight variable

Provide a 4 - digit weight variable here to correct your sample to reflect national distributions of key variables. If no weighting is necessary, simply code each case as "1.00" (coded as "100" since it will be assumed that the last two digits of this variable are to the right of the decimal point). It is especially important to correct for education. For example, if your sample contains twice as many university - educated respondents as there are in the adult population as a whole, members of this group should be given a weight of .5 (coded as "50").

**OPTIONAL: As a methodological test, you may add the following:**

V237. At the end of this interview, we would like to come back to a problem we had touched on earlier. I will read you some goals which different people consider more or less important for this country. Could you please tell me how important you consider each of these goals to be: would you say it is very important, important, not very important or not at all important for this country?

Very important   Important   Not very important   Not at all important   DK

V237a. Maintaining order

in the nation	1	2	3	4	9
---------------	---	---	---	---	---

V237b. Giving people more  
say in important government

decisions	1	2	3	4	9
-----------	---	---	---	---	---

V237c. Fighting rising prices	1	2	3	4	9
-------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

V237d. Protecting freedom

of speech	1	2	3	4	9
-----------	---	---	---	---	---

V238. If you had a serious health condition/problem, would you think it would be better to go to a private clinic/hospital, or to go to a public (Social Security) hospital/clinic?

1	2	3	4	5	9
Private				Public	DK

V239. And if you had a not serious health condition/problem, would you think it would be better to go to a private clinic/hospital, or to go to a public (Social Security) hospital/clinic?

1	2	3	4	5	9
Private				Public	DK

V240. In general, do you think that the public health system in **[Spain]** is now better, the same, or worse than five years ago?

1. Better
2. The same
3. Worse
9. DK