

19.4 Solidarity among neighbours

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*

Solidarity among neighbours	Social Justice and Social Cohesion
<p>Description and justification</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>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 & Badenes, 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).</p> <p>Solidarity is a particularly elusive concept, like most important concepts in our lives, such as health, love, or happiness (Prainsack & Buyx, 2012). Social solidarity as a practice requires contributions</p>

	<p>in terms of time, effort and emotional investments, or money that groups or individuals make to assist others. Prainsack and Buyx (2012) underline the notion that motivations, feelings such as empathy, etc., are not sufficient to satisfy the operationalization of solidarity as practice, unless they manifest themselves in acts.</p> <p>Individuals come to engage in solidarity practices through recognition of similarity with one (or more) other people in a relevant aspect (interpersonal level), forms of solidarity institutionalization defined by social norms of ‘good conduct’ (group practices), and/or highly institutionalized structures (contractual and legal manifestations) (Prainsack and Buyx, 2012). Authors make plain that not every practice of solidarity at interpersonal and/or group level solidifies into contractual and legal manifestations, and the former can exist without highly institutionalized structures. In contrast, interpersonal and group practices may change (i.e., break away) following the institutionalization into contractual and legal manifestations of solidarity (i.e., the welfare society arrangements). Accordingly, collecting data on the typical manifestations of solidarity within a certain community and society (state, nation – the wider culture) (i.e., through qualitative research approaches) can best inform NBS initiatives on both existing resources and pitfalls when it comes to this complex layer of enacted values.</p>
Definition	<p>A shared practice (or a cluster of such practices) reflecting a collective commitment to carry ‘costs’ (financial, social, emotional, or otherwise) to assist others (Prainsack & Buyx, 2012).</p>
Strengths and weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + reliable indicator of solid premises for partnership around and towards the common good (i.e., awareness of sameness/similarity with fellow community members) + evolution of solidarity practices can be traced back into the history of a community, and events that either endangered or inspired solidarity 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 abstract a concept that requires attention to operationalization so as to distinguish it from empathy, friendship, charity, dignity, reciprocity, altruism, and trust - highly context-dependent, its actual benefits for a local NBS can be foreseen through a good understanding of the existing structures for enactment of a core value like solidarity within a certain community, and of its recent history (i.e., through qualitative methods like case studies, focus groups, and/or participatory data collection)

Measurement procedure (P) and tool (T)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☒ <i>Quantitative P:</i> Scale inventory/Questionnaire (survey procedure, paper-and-pencil administration, computer-based administration) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ T: items measuring perception of solidarity from "Trust and Solidarity" scale of the <i>Integrated Questionnaire for the Measurement of Social Capital (SC-IQ)</i> (Grootaert et al., 2004) adapted to purposed of NBS research ☒ <i>Qualitative P:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ T: case study methodology – structured interviews, focus-groups, case study analysis ○ T: participatory data collections methods, such as collaborative participatory data collection, bodies as tools for data collection, photo elicitation <p><i>Quantitatively measured as perception of own willingness to manifest solidarity (i.e., elusive, idealized, abstract), and perception of solidarity manifested by fellow community members (a closer fit to the understanding of the concept as a practice). Consequently, qualitative methods are valuable to capturing idiosyncratic manifestations of solidarity within a certain community that could inform NBS implementation and successful development.</i></p>
Scale of measurement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SC-IQ (Grootaert et al., 2004) – 2 items measuring perception of own willingness to manifest solidarity, and perception of solidarity manifested by fellow community members from "Trust and Solidarity" scale <p><i>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.</i></p> <p>5. How well do people in your city/neighborhood help each other out these days? Use a five point scale, where 1 means always helping and 5 means never helping. 1 Always helping 2 Helping most of the time 3 Helping sometimes 4 Rarely helping 5 Never helping</p> <p>6. If a community project does not directly benefit you, but has benefits for many others in the city/neighborhood, would you contribute time or money to the project? A. Time B. Money 1 Will not contribute time 1 Will not contribute money 2 Will contribute time 2 Will contribute money.</p>
Data source	
Required data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 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 solidarity practices and relevant structures
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	<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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative data collection through case study methodology requires high expertise in psycho-social research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 SC4.1 Trust in community 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	See 4.1. Trust in community
Opportunities for participatory data collection	Participatory methods (e.g., collaborative participatory data collection) may be applied to collect community-relevant information on past and present enactments of solidarity (layers, structures); they present the opportunity to grasp both existing resources and potential pitfalls of relevance to emergent NBS initiatives within a certain community and culture of social solidarity.
Additional information	
References	Cloete, A. (2014). Social cohesion and social capital: Possible implications for the common good. <i>Verbum et Ecclesia</i> , 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.), <i>Place Attachment: Advances in Theory, Methods and Research</i> (pp. 61-74). Routledge. Prainsack, B. & Buyx, A. (2012). Solidarity In Contemporary Bioethics - Towards A New Approach. <i>Bioethics</i> , 26(7), 343-350. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8519.2012.01987.x 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

19.5 Tolerance and respect

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*

Tolerance and respect	Social Justice and Social Cohesion
<p>Description and justification</p>	<p>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</p>