19.3   Trust within the community

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

Author/s and affiliations: Adina Dumitru[1], Catalina Young[2], Irina Macsinga[2]

[1] *Universitry of A Coruña, Spain*

[2] *West University of Timisoara, Romania*

Trust within the community	Social Justice and Social Cohesion
Description and justification	Trust, solidarity, tolerance, and respect are generally understood as manifestations of a cohesive society, one that works towards the well-being of all the members, i.e., towards the common good. Although the benefits of communitarian social capital (BoSC, BrSC, LSC) depend upon more basic structural factors of which inequality, level of education of the population and its ethnic-racial composition are considered as the most important, trust, solidarity, tolerance, and respect are core elements in the process of creating or building social capital which enables people to expect good from others (reciprocity) and to act on behalf of others in order to create a better future for all (Cloete, 2014). Moreover, whilst good governance has a significant impact on social cohesion by increasing trust, tolerance, and acceptance of diversity, it is in fact each individual who actually create trust and guarantee reciprocity through concurrent values and by abiding to norms that guide the process of participation in networks. It seems that people with values like honesty, trustworthiness, integrity, who care for their fellow humans, are likely to create social capital that could lead to the formation of public good (Cloete, 2014). Therefore, trust, solidarity, tolerance, and respect are considered fundamental resources in the inception, implementation, and potential success of any collective initiatives like NBS. Moreover, social cohesion has been proven to represent an important resource for long-term environmental sustainability in that socially cohesive communities tend to be more supportive of environmentally sustainable attitudes and behaviors compared with those communities where social cohesiveness is weaker (Uzzell, Pol & Badenas, 2002). The cognitive components of social cohesion, like trust, tolerance or respect, attachment, reflect the quality of social interactions which take place within neighborhoods or cities (Stafford et al., 2003), and can be particularly relevant as both precursors and mediators of community response to environmental planning decision and change (Mihaylov & Perkins, 2014).

Definition	Perception that members of one's community are trustworthy and trust each other, as well as perception of how trust within community has changed over time.
Strengths and weaknesses	+ reliable indicator of solid premises for collaboration and reciprocity among members of a community + evolution of perception of trust can be traced back into the history of a community, and events that either decreased or boosted trust can be integrated as "lessons learnt" in the process of design and implementation of NBS + provides consistent information about the values that lay the foundation of both explicit and implicit norms within a community - highly context-dependent, its actual benefits for a local NBS can be foreseen through a good understanding of the values that shore up perceived trust, and of the recent history of the community (i.e., through qualitative methods like case studies, focus groups, and/or participatory data collection)
Measurement procedure (P) and tool (T)	☒ *Quantitative P*: Scale inventory/Questionnaire (survey procedure, paper-and-pencil administration, computer-based administration) o T: items measuring perception of trust from "Trust and Solidarity" scale of the *Integrated Questionnaire for the Measurement of Social Capital* (SC-IQ) (Grootaert et al., 2004) adapted to purposed of NBS research o T: Trust Scale in *Neighbourhood Social Cohesion* measurement tool (Stafford et al., 2003) ☒ *Qualitative P*: o T: case study methodology – structured interviews, focus-groups, case study analysis o T: participatory data collections methods, such as collaborative participatory data collection, bodies as tools for data collection, photo elicitation
Scale of measurement	▪ SC-IQ (Grootaert et al., 2004) – 4 items measuring perception of trust from "Trust and Solidarity" scale *In every community, some people get along with others and trust each other, while other people do not. Now, I would like to talk to you about trust and solidarity in your community.* **1.** Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in your dealings with other people? 1 Most people can be trusted 2 You can't be too careful **2.** In general, do you agree or disagree with the following statements? 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly A. Most people who live in this city/neighborhood can be trusted. B. In this city/neighborhood, one has to be alert or someone is likely

to take advantage of you. C. Most people in this city/neighborhood are willing to help if you need it. D. In this city/neighborhood, people generally do not trust each other in matters of lending and borrowing money.
3. Now I want to ask you how much you trust different types of people. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means a very small extent and 5 means a very great extent, how much do you trust the people in that category? 1. To a very small extent 2. To a small extent 3. Neither small nor great extent 4. To a great extent 5. To a very great extent A. People from your ethnic or linguistic group/race/caste/tribe B. People from other ethnic or linguistic groups/race/caste/tribe C. Shopkeepers D. Local government officials E. Central government officials F. Police G. Teachers H. Nurses and doctors I. Strangers
4. Do you think that over the last five years*, the level of trust in this city/neighborhood has gotten better, worse, or stayed about the same? [* ENUMERATOR: TIME PERIOD CAN BE CLARIFIED BY SITUATING IT BEFORE/AFTER MAJOR EVENT] 1 Gotten better 2 Gotten worse 3 Stayed about the same

- Neighbourhood Social Cohesion (Stafford et al., 2003) – Trust Scale

Trust is measured by the use of a series of opposing statements at either end of a row of seven boxes; respondents are asked to place a tick in the one box which best represents their agreement with the following statements:
1. People in this area would do something if a house was being broken into
2. In this area people would stop children if they saw them vandalising things
3. People would be afraid to walk alone after dark
4. People in this area will take advantage of you
5. If you were in trouble, there are lots of people in this area who would help you
6. Most people in this area can be trusted.

Data source	
Required data	✓ Essential: NBS characteristics for each city/site, more specifically objectives (short-, medium-, and long-term) and challenges ✓ Desirable: Data on significant events in the recent history of the community with implications for the evolution of a sense of shared trust among its members
Data input type	Quantitative (quantitative and qualitative, if case study methodology and/or participatory data collection are opted for)

Data collection frequency	Before NBS implementation and/or aligned with timing of targeted (especially long-term) objectives
Level of expertise required	☒ Methodology and data analysis requires high expertise in psycho-social research ☒ Quantitative data collection requires no expertise ☒ Qualitative data collection through case study methodology requires high expertise in psycho-social research ○ Basic training needed if participatory data collection is opted for
Synergies with other indicators	SC1 Bonding social capital SC2 Bridging social capital SC3 Linking social capital 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 Goal 4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all Goal 5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls Goal 6. Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all Goal 7. Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all Goal 8. Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all Goal 10. Reduce inequality within and among countries Goal 11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable Goal 12. Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns Goal 13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts Goal 16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all

	and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels
Opportunities for participatory data collection	Participatory methods (e.g., collaborative participatory data collection) may be applied to collect community-relevant information on the evolution of a sense of shared trust among its members; they present the opportunity to perform a gap analysis, if needed, in order to address (diagnosed) breaches of trust that could negatively impact NBS implementation and expansion.
Additional information	
References	Cloete, A. (2014). Social cohesion and social capital: Possible implications for the common good. *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 35(3). doi:10.4102/ve.v35i3.1331 Grootaert, C., Narayan, D., Jones, V.N., & Woolcock, M. (2004). *Measuring Social Capital: An Integrated Questionnaire*. World Bank Working Paper 18. Washington D.C.: World Bank. Retrieved from http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/515261468740392133/Measuring-social-capital-an-integrated-questionnaire Mihaylov, N., & Perkins, D.D. (2014). Community Place Attachment and its Role in Social Capital Development in Response to Environmental Disruption. In L. Manzo & P. Devine-Wright (Eds.), *Place Attachment: Advances in Theory, Methods and Research* (pp. 61-74). Routledge. Stafford, M., Bartley, M., Sacker, A., Marmot, M., Wilkinson, R., Boreham, R., & Thomas, R. (2003). Measuring the Social Environment: Social Cohesion and Material Deprivation in English and Scottish Neighbourhoods. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 35(8), 1459–1475. doi:10.1068/a35257 Uzzell, D., Pol, E., & Badenas, D. (2002). Place identification, social cohesion, and environmental sustainability. *Environment and Behavior,* 34(1), 26-53. doi: 10.1177/0013916502034001003