

19.1.2 Bonding

Project Name: CONNECTING Nature (Grant Agreement no. 730222)

Author/s and affiliations: Adina Dumitru¹, Catalina Young², Irina Macsinga²

¹ *University of A Coruña, Spain*

² *West University of Timisoara, Romania*

Bonding Social Capital	Social Justice and Social Cohesion
Description and justification	<p>Social capital is largely conceived in terms of the nature, extent, and outcomes of networks and associated norms of reciprocity, thus generally seen as a contributor to individual and group (community, nation) growth, well-being, and progress (Szreter & Woolcock, 2004). Social capital enables individuals to gain access to resources (ideas, information, money, services, and favours) and to have accurate expectations regarding the behaviour of others by virtue of their participation in relationships that are themselves the product of networks of association (Claridge, 2018; Szreter & Woolcock, 2004). Data on bonding social capital (BoSC) can provide an indication of connections within a group or community characterised by high levels of similarity in demographic characteristics, attitudes, and available information and resources (Claridge, 2018). These connections foster social support by allowing people to access favors, information, and emotional support (Claridge, 2018). BoSC fulfils an important social function by providing the norms and trust that facilitate the kind of collaborative action required by initiatives like NBS/Nature-based Infrastructure. Conversely, Nature-based solutions have been hailed as beneficial to social cohesion and social capital (Ibes, 2015; Low, Taplin & Scheld, 2005; Volker, Flap & Lindenburg, 2007; Oldenburg, 1989). Oldenburg (1989) analyses the unique role of outdoor spaces as “third places” with significant value in the well-being of urban existence in that they supply community members with publicly accessible spaces for gathering, socializing, and recreating (as quoted in Ibes, 2015).</p>
Definition	<p>Trusting and co-operative relations between members of a network who see themselves as being similar, in terms of their shared social identity (socio-demographics) (Claridge, 2018; Szreter and Woolcock, 2004).</p>

Strengths and weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + reliable indicator of resources that encourage reciprocity and collaboration within community/group/organization - tightly structured and mostly exclusive - networks with excessive levels of bonding tend to breed bias and racism, creating out-groups and exclusion (Claridge, 2018; Szreter & Woolcock, 2004) - Putnam (2000) described it as a source of support to people “getting by” (as quoted in Claridge, 2018) – more impactful as a source of support to people who suffer from socio-economic hardship or poor health, than as a resource for initiatives that challenge the status-quo (e.g., NBS) - several studies have found that bonding social capital has either no effect or a negative effect on economic outcomes (Claridge, 2018) <p><i>+/- general agreement as to the importance of a balance of bonding and bridging social capital (see SC2), in that neither is negative per se but can be negative depending on the balance and context. The precise nature of the social identity boundaries, and the political salience of bonding and bridging groups are highly context specific (Claridge, 2018; Szreter & Woolcock, 2004).</i></p>
Measurement procedure (P) and tool (T)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☒ P: Scale inventory/Questionnaire (survey procedure, paper-and-pencil administration, computer-based administration) ☒ T: Scale consisting of 2 items measuring the presence of BoSC type of connections, and respondent’s perception of quality of interactions within BoSC type of connections (Anucha et al., 2006 – item 1 adapted to purposes of current study; item 2 formulated for the purposes of current study)
Scale of measurement	<p>1. Thinking about people you interact with ... (e.g., in your community garden, in your local park), are most of them of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...the same family or kin group (coded as [1]yes or [0]no), ...the same religion (coded as [1]yes or [0]no), ...the same gender (coded as [1]yes or [0]no), ...the same age (coded as [1]yes or [0]no), ...the same ethnic or linguistic group/race/caste/tribe (coded as [1]yes or [0]no), ...the same occupation (coded as [1]yes or [0]no), ...the same educational background or level (coded as [1]yes or [0]no), ...and/or mostly the same income (coded as [1]yes or [0]no)? <p>2. Thinking about these same people, how would you rate the quality of your interactions with them?</p> <p>1 ...2...3...4...5...6...7</p> <p>extremely dissatisfied (1)... extremely satisfied (7)</p>
Data source	

Required data	✓ Essential: NBS characteristics for each city/site, more specifically objectives (short-, medium-, and long-term) and challenges
Data input type	Quantitative (quantitative and qualitative, if participatory data collection is opted for)
Data collection frequency	Before and after NBS implementation, then aligned with timing of targeted objectives.
Level of expertise required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Methodology and data analysis requires high expertise in psycho-social research <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative data collection requires no expertise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Basic training needed if participatory data collection is opted for
Synergies with other indicators	SC2. Bridging Social Capital SC4.1 Trust in community SC4.2 Solidarity between neighbours SC4.3 Tolerance and respect SC5.1 Perceived safety SC5.2 Actual/real safety SC6 Place attachment (Sense of place): Place Identity SC9 Empowerment: Perceived control and influence over NBS decision-making SC12 Social desirability
Connection with SDGs	Goal 1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere Goal 2. End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture Goal 3. Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
Opportunities for participatory data collection	Participatory methods (e.g., collaborative participatory data collection) may be applied to garner community-relevant information on BoSC's role in NBS implementation and expansion.
Additional information	

References

- Anucha, U., Diamini, N.S., Yan, M.C., & Smylie, L. (2006). *Social capital and the welfare of immigrant women: A multi-level study of four ethnic communities in Windsor*. Status of Women Canada's Policy Research Fund. Retrieved from <http://www.researchgate.net>
- Claridge, T. (2018). Functions of social capital – bonding, bridging, linking. *Social Capital Research*, 1-7. Retrieved from <https://d1fs2th61pidml.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Functions-of-Social-Capital.pdf?x96784>
- Fonseca, X., Lukosch, S., & Brazier, F. (2018). *Social cohesion revisited: a new definition and how to characterize it*. *Innovation. The European Journal of Social Science Research*. doi: 10.1080/13511610.2018.1497480
- Granovetter, M.S. (1973). *The strength of weak ties*. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1360-1380. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org>
- Ibes, D.C. (2015). A multi-dimensional classification and equity analysis of an urban park system: A novel methodology and case study application. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 137, 122–137. doi: 10.1016/j.landurbplan.2014.12.014
- Low, S., Taplin, D., & Scheld, D. (2005). *Rethinking urban parks: Public space and cultural diversity*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. Book excerpt retrieved from <http://www.urbanlab.org/articles/Low,%20Setha%20M.,%20Taplin,%20Dana,%20and%20Scheld,%20Suzanne%202005.%20Rethinking%20urban%20parks.%20Public%20space%20&%20cultural%20diversity..pdf>
- Volker, B., Flap, H., & Lindenberg, S. (2007). When are neighbourhoods communities? Community in Dutch neighbourhoods. *European Sociological Review*, 23, 99–114.
- Oldenburg, R. (1989). *The great good place*. New York, NY: Paragon House. Book excerpt retrieved from https://canvas.harvard.edu/files/1085417/download?download_frd=1&verifier=o9y8EiLcwZDn7VUMVsmwE4m4yvS1Arlxut85ghjp
- Szreter, S., & Woolcock, M. (2004). Health by association? Social capital, social theory, and the political economy of public health. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 33(4), 650–667.