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Summary

Much modern research concerning cathedrals in contemporary society is interested in understanding those who enter cathedrals as visitors. Less academic attention, however, has been given to those who regularly enter the cathedral as worshippers. This dissertation focuses on those who state that they are regular members of five cathedral congregations in England and Wales through the conceptual lens of social capital.

The dissertation is divided into two main parts. Part one is concerned with the social capital, and religious social capital. Chapter one will focus on the foundational work of Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman and Robert Putnam before overviewing the theoretical developments of the construct. Chapter two will then focus on the theoretical development of religious and spiritual capital as a way of understanding the particular social capital produced by religious organisations and people.

Part two explores the responses of 361 regular members of five cathedrals in England and Wales. The statistics demonstrate the importance of the atmosphere and the musical tradition in attracting people to become members of the cathedral congregation. Further, it is demonstrated that cathedrals display good levels of social capital, with high levels of trust, reciprocity and experiences of community. Part two then goes on to explore the relationship between social capital and a range of individual differences indicators, including sex, age, proximity to the cathedral, social class, frequency of prayer, and voluntary participation. The dissertation concludes with recommendations as to how cathedrals within England and Wales may develop levels of social capital among regular members of their congregations.
Introduction
Within recent years academic interest concerning cathedrals has grown. Part of this interest has been fuelled by two projects based in the University of Wales, Bangor. Funded by the European Social Fund Objective One scheme, whereby Objective One areas in Europe (that is those areas whereby the GDP is less than 75% of the European average) are primed with funding to improve conditions. A research grant to generate fifty-two PhD studentships was won by the University of Wales, Bangor to create partnerships between the academic institution and small to medium enterprises (SMEs) in Wales. The then Unit for Practical Theology, part of the School of Theology and Religious Studies, won two of these grants in partnership with two Welsh cathedrals.

The first project, in partnership with St Davids Cathedral, directed by the Revd Canon Professor Leslie J Francis and Dr Mandy Robbins, and researched by the Revd Jennie Annis, was concerned with the academic investigation of tourism and visitors within the cathedral. The project was divided into two parts. The first part investigated the general demographics of visitors. The second part investigated the spirituality of those who enter the cathedral gates. Two publications have now been produced from the first part of that project (Williams, Francis, Robbins and Annis, 2007; and Francis, Williams, Annis and Robbins, 2007).

The second project, directed by Dr Mandy Robbins and the Revd Canon Professor Leslie J Francis, and researched by Mr Emyr Williams, was concerned with the academic investigation of Bangor Cathedral's work concerning culture, tourism and business ethics. The project was divided into two distinct academic pieces of research. The first was concerned with a consideration of the context of mission and
ministry for Bangor Cathedral. The research demonstrated, through analysis of historical statistical data, that Bangor Cathedral has the potential to develop mission and ministry in seven areas of community life.

The second part of the project is taken up by the present dissertation. This dissertation presents a unique insight into the attitudes to, and experiences of, social capital among regular members of five cathedral congregations in England and Wales. Starting with Bangor Cathedral this project has gone on to include cathedrals in St Asaph, St Davids, Chester and Exeter in order to develop a nuanced picture of cathedral life to aid decision-making with the business partner.

Cathedrals have been variously described as 'flagships of the spirit' in contemporary society (Platten & Lewis, 1998) and, in relation to the majority Anglican cathedrals in the United Kingdom, windows into the Church of England (Archbishops' Commission on Cathedrals, 1994). As of yet, however, academic research has not tended to focus on these institutions, except, perhaps, the specific field of research that is interested in understanding visitors to cathedrals. As the Archbishops' Commission on Cathedrals (1994) noted, cathedrals comprise several types of community, ranging from the clergy and staff who work in the cathedral, to the visitors who attend services for civic, or other non-religious events (for example, graduation ceremonies). One, as of yet, academically unresearched community is that of the worshippers in the cathedral, particularly those who defined themselves as regular attenders. Church attendance figures would suggest that this group, the worshippers in cathedrals, is the success story of the Church of England in the very early part of the twenty-first century, with the number of worshippers in cathedrals
growing substantially (see further Church of England, 2007). As such it is important to begin to explore regular members of cathedral congregations in England and Wales.

At the same time as the growth in the interest in cathedrals, there has been a surge in the use of the construct of social capital in research. As will be demonstrated in Chapter One, social capital refers to the networks people create, and the resources they are able to give and to receive from them. Social capital theory has been applied to illuminate many areas of enquiry, including abortion (Rossier, 2007), financial development (Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales, 2004), health (Westin and Westerling, 2007), public libraries (Varheim, 2007), multilingualism (Lanza and Svendsen, 2007), natural disasters (Munasinghe, 2007), smoking (Lindström and Janzon, 2007), terrorism (Hausman, Hanlon and Seals, 2007) and welfare reform (Campbell, 2007).

It is against this background that the current dissertation will be based. Through the use of social scientific techniques, as exemplified by the school of empirical theology (Francis, 2005a), this dissertation will investigate the social capital of regular congregation members in five cathedrals in England and Wales.

The dissertation will be divided into two main parts and into ten chapters. Part one will focus on the conceptual development of social capital. Chapter one provides an overview of the basis, development and criticisms of the construct. Chapter two will discuss the conceptual extension of social capital into religious capital and spiritual capital. Part two will focus on the data analysis of the 'Cathedral and You' project. Chapter three will provide the rationale and methodology for the project. Chapter
four will present the overall statistics for reasons for choosing to worship at the cathedral, and for levels of social capital. Chapter five will explore sex differences in relation to social capital. Chapter six will investigate the differences between the youngest and oldest members of the cathedral congregation. Chapter seven will focus on the differences between those who travelled a short distance and those who travelled a longer distance to the cathedral. Chapter eight discuss the differences between those who have a high frequency of personal prayer and those who have a low frequency of personal prayer. Chapter nine will highlight the differences between those who are, or have been, employed in non-professional occupations and those who are, or have been, employed in professional occupations. Chapter ten focuses on the differences between those who participate in voluntary work and those who do not participate in voluntary work.

Chapter one will deal with the theoretical basis of social capital. First, an understanding will be sought from three scholars often quoted as developing the construct of social capital for academic use. Thus, the work of Bourdieu will be discussed, and it will be noted how he links social capital with economic capital. The work of Coleman to form and refine the construct, will be explored. The development of the construct by Putnam will then be analysed. Second, the chapter will move on to outline the developments made to the construct by other scholars. Third, literature focusing on three aspects of social capital (bonding, bridging and linking) will be introduced. Fourth, criticisms and weaknesses of the construct will be introduced to understand better the ways in which the construct can be used.
Chapter two will discuss the extension of the construct of social capital to include religious capital and spiritual capital. The chapter begins by introducing research concerned with religious social capital. This is distinct from general social capital in the influence that a religious community and a set of religious beliefs has upon an individual's activities. In particular the edited volume by Smidt (2003a) is focused on, being the first book to concentrate entirely on the subject of religion as social capital. The chapter then moves on to discuss the development of spiritual capital.

Chapter three moves on to examine issues concerning research into cathedrals, and research into social capital. First, research that has already been conducted into the role of cathedrals in contemporary society is overviewed. Starting with the call of the Archbishops' Commission on Cathedrals (1994) for cathedrals to develop their potential in the areas of mission, education, music and tourism, attention is given to studies that have sought to understand those who visit cathedrals and the case is argued for why broader research into cathedral congregations would be beneficial. Second, issues concerning the measurement of social capital are discussed. It is argued that no general consensus has been formed concerning the operationalisation of the construct, and that this has led to a wide array of interpretations. The advantages and disadvantages of both qualitative and quantitative methodology within social capital research are highlight. It is argued that a micro level, social-psychological, quantitative approach to such research can provide an additional dimension of understanding, in comparison to more qualitative and macro level studies. The chapter then moves on to discuss the layout and content of the questionnaire, before introducing general statistics for the sample. Finally, the chapter outlines the mode of analysis to be used throughout the dissertation, that is the
cross-tabular chi-square routine, and introduces how, where appropriate, the sample is
dichotomised to produce 2X2 grids.

Chapter four provides the basic statistics relating to social capital among the sample
of regular members of the cathedral congregation. First, reasons for choosing to
worship in the cathedral are explored. It is demonstrated that, despite anecdotal
evidence to the contrary, those who worship in the cathedral do not choose to do so to
be anonymous to other members of these congregations and to members of the clergy.
Rather, it is demonstrated that the music and the feeling of peace within the cathedral
are the most important factors. Second, the congregations' perceptions of social
capital are explored. It is demonstrated that good levels of trust, reciprocity and
openness of community were felt by those who completed the questionnaire.

While chapter four presents the overall levels of social capital present among regular
members of the cathedral congregation considered as a single group, the remaining
chapters focus on individual differences with relation sex, age, proximity to the
cathedral, personal prayer, social class and voluntary activity in turn. Individual
differences theory allows research to understand properly how individual factors, such
as those listed above, are related to the research question. Through exploring the
social capital of regular members of the cathedral congregation in such a way, it will
be possible to provide a more nuanced understanding of the key indicators of social
capital.

Chapter five investigates the relationship between sex and social capital among
regular members of the cathedral congregation. The literature review in the chapter
highlighted research suggesting that those who display higher levels of religiosity are also more likely to be women, or to display higher levels of psychological femininity. Further, it is shown that women are more likely to access social capital that is formed on intimate bonds, rather than the more businesslike instrumentally focused social capital of men. It is hypothesised that both men and women in the cathedral congregation are likely to record similar levels of social capital because of the presence of high psychological femininity.

Chapter six examines the relationship between age and social capital among regular members of the cathedral congregation. The literature review argued that social capital and age are complexly related, with those of older age more likely to attest to having smaller networks, but ties and connections with those who are long-term friends; thus they are more likely to display smaller bonded networks. At the same time, it is older people who are more likely to participate in voluntary associations, but they are also likely to have lower levels of trust when compared with younger aged cohorts. In relation to religiosity it is demonstrated that those who are in older age groups (that is middle age and above) record higher levels of religiosity than younger aged cohorts. The chapter compares the responses of those who are aged under 49-years and those who are aged 70-years or above.

Chapter seven explores the relationship between proximity to the cathedral and social capital among regular members of the cathedral congregation. It is argued that those who live within close proximity to a group or particular community will be better placed to generate and utilise social capital than those who do not live within such close proximity. Further, in terms of religiosity it is demonstrated that those who live
within closer proximity to a church are more likely to attend that church. It is hypothesised that those who attend the cathedral are most likely to live in close proximity to it, or if not, have made the conscious choice to attend, and thus may be more able (if not willing) to integrate into that community. The chapter compares the responses of those who are in close proximity to the cathedral (that is, those who travelled less than five miles) and those who were not in close proximity to the cathedral (that is, those who travelled 10 miles or above to attend the cathedral).

Chapter eight examines the relationship between frequency of personal prayer and social capital among regular members of the cathedral congregation. Prayer is taken to be a distinct form of religiosity that taps into the intrinsic dimension of religiosity and can thus help to understand those for whom religion is a personal commitment. It is argued, through the literature review, that those who record higher levels of personal prayer are also more likely to record higher levels of religiosity in terms of church attendance, denominational affiliation and religious belief. Further, it is suggested that private prayer is positively related to levels of the generation, and utilisation, of social capital. The chapter compares the responses of those with a low frequency of private prayer (that is those who stated that they never, occasionally or sometimes prayed) and those with a high frequency of private prayer (that is those who stated that they prayed nearly every day).

Chapter nine investigates the relationship between social class and social capital among regular members of the cathedral congregation. The literature review highlighted the positive association between religiosity and social class, with those in higher social classes recording higher levels of religiosity in terms of church
attendance, religious belief, and private religious practices. Further, it was generally found that differences exist between the social class groups in relation to social capital. Those who were members of the higher social classes were more likely to attest to having higher levels of social capital. It is suggested, however, that the ways in which research concerned with the connection between social capital and social class has been operationalised may miss out those for whom social capital is based upon personal, bonded ties. The chapter compares the responses of the sample who classified themselves as non-professional (that is those who stated that their occupations were, or had been, unskilled manual, semi-skilled manual, skilled manual and non-manual) and those who classified themselves as professional (that is those who stated that their occupations were, or had been, semi-professional and professional).

Chapter ten examines the relationship between volunteering and social capital among regular members of the cathedral congregation. Volunteering is taken as separate from social capital as understood by Bourdieu (1986) and Coleman (1990). The literature review suggests that there is a positive relationship between volunteering and religiosity, especially in terms of church attendance. Further, the relationship between social capital and volunteering was positive. The literature review failed, however, to establish the causality of the relationship, and so it is justifiable to seek to understand how social capital is related to volunteering. The chapter compares the responses of those who stated that they took part in some form of secular or church-based volunteering, and those that stated they took part in no form of volunteering.
The conclusion draws together the findings of this research and suggests some implications for congregational development within cathedrals in England and Wales. Issues concerning the quantitative research of social capital among similar samples are also considered.
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Introduction

The construct of social capital has gained much attention within the academic field (cf. Halpern, 2005), yet one of the major criticisms of it is a lack of conceptual clarity. This chapter will provide an overview of the main theoretical developments of social capital. A section outlining the more general criticisms of the construct will also be included to highlight the potential weaknesses.

Part One: The theories

Within research on social capital three scholars are accredited with founding the construct for contemporary use: Bourdieu, Coleman and Putnam. This section will explore the theories that each of these scholars brought to social capital.

Bourdieu (1986) is widely recognised as one of the first proponents of the contemporary construct of social capital (Field, 2003; Halpern, 2005). His first writings on the subject appeared in French in the early 1980s and were later translated into English to appear in Richardson’s *Handbook of Theory and Research in the Sociology of Education* (1986). The importance of Bourdieu’s construction of social capital for education has been highlighted elsewhere (McClenaghan, 2000).

For Bourdieu (1986) and Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) capital was perceived to be the labour accumulated by an actor that can then be used as a source of ‘social energy’, that is, the way in which an actor can take the resources presented to them and use them to facilitate action. Bourdieu referred to two main types of capital, other than the more commonplace economic capital, namely cultural capital and social capital. The latter is defined as:
The aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition. (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 238)

According to Bourdieu, economics is the base of all capital, and social capital, if required, could be exchanged for financial capital. It is through such an understanding of the multi-dimensional nature of capital, Bourdieu argued, that we are better able to explain the dynamics of society (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 119).

The resources of networks, Bourdieu argued, can exist in either material or symbolic form and, therefore, can be exchanged as such (be this in material form or through social institutions such as a family name). The exchange means that the social relations of two actors are able to produce some form of benefit and that this benefit applies to both individuals.

For Bourdieu (1986) and Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992), the amount of social capital available to a person was dependent on the size, and indeed strength, of that person's social network. Within such a network, strong and weak ties determined to what extent an actor was able to make use of, and develop, the types of capital outlined above. To this degree social capital must always exist in a reciprocal relationship between two or more actors (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 250).

However, for groups a different type of 'bonding' agent is present, other than just what capital can be accrued and exchanged. Bourdieu argued that through collective activity, and the varying degrees of success that an action or activity has, a group is more able to develop an ethos of solidarity, which in turn leads to the development of
greater levels of social capital which can be utilised to expand the group and its work. However, as Field (2003, p. 19) has noted, the approach taken by Bourdieu to social capital is very one-dimensional and as such ignores the more negative aspects of group social capital, which could be used to argue that groups are not held together so much by success of an action, but rather by fear and intimidation.

Coleman (1988) developed his construct of social capital through an analysis of economic and sociological literature which discussed the motivations of an actor within society. For Coleman there was a dichotomy of opinion concerning an actor’s function in decision making, and what he termed a ‘fiction in modern society’ (1990, p. 300) that was perpetuated by the world of economics, especially in the form of Adam Smith’s ‘invisible hand’ (1993 [1776]). In Coleman’s view, economics expounded the belief that society was made up of independent actors possessing the ability to achieve goals that had been independently arrived at. This mass of independent actors, according to the economic literature, was the totality of social systems (1990, p. 300) and left little room for the influence of societal motivation in decision making. Earlier work by Coleman (1988) also saw a divergent opinion forming in the sociological literature. Coleman noted that the sociological literature saw the actor as being shaped by his or her environment, without the actor necessarily having an ‘engine of action’ (1988, 896): that is without the actor being attributed an independent purpose or direction in his or her shaping. However, by 1990 Coleman was convinced by the literature which combined the influence of societal motivation and independent decision making (for example, in the work of Ben-Porath, 1980; Lin, 1982; and Granovetter, 1978, 1985) to suggest that these could form the basis of understanding social capital. Coleman’s aim was:
to import the economist's principle of rational action for use in the analysis of social systems proper...and to do so without discarding social organization [sic] in the process. (1988, S97)

Coleman's construct of social capital was interested in the way in which relationships between actors, and the changes in these relationships, could engender some form of common action. His aim was to do this while being mindful of the role of both the actors' societal and cultural shaping and the actors' development of self-determined goals. Coleman (1988) sums up his construct of social capital in this way:

Social capital is defined by its function. It is not a single entity but a variety of different entities, with two elements in common: they all consist of some aspect of social structures, and they facilitate certain actions of actors - whether persons or corporate actors - within the structure. Like other forms of capital, social capital is productive, making possible the achievement of certain ends that in its absence would not be possible. (S98)

For Coleman, six forms of social capital were evident. These forms of social capital both help to explain the 'different entities' he talks of and go some way to highlight the 'achievement of certain ends'.

The first form of social capital highlighted by Coleman (1990) argued that obligations and expectations are part of what is social capital. Obligations and expectations, for Coleman, are the ways in which people can gain 'credit', that is the ability to invest the expectations of a relationship with others for favours given or work done. Rational people, he argued, will create obligations and expectations as part of an 'insurance policy' to ensure that in the future, if the actor needs help, there are sufficient 'credit slips' that can be exchanged for work, aid, or societal and economic favours. For Coleman, there are two essential elements critical to effective social capital in the form of obligations and expectations. The first element is the level of trustworthiness within a given social environment. That is, the level of trust present
provides a binding agent for people to enlist appropriate obligations and expectations. The second element is the extent to which obligations are held, that is the more obligations that are held the higher the level of social capital.

The second form of social capital that Coleman (1990) highlighted is that of information, and the potential for the exchange of information within a social structure with high levels of social capital. Coleman noted the importance of information acquisition within networks, but highlighted the price that can be involved in such a process, say, between two expert companies in terms of time, money, and human resources. However, when high levels of social capital are present within networks, information can be transferred easily between actors along pre-existing social connections, or contacts can be formed quickly through a third party.

The third form of social capital that Coleman (1990) noted highlights the importance of norms and sanctions, and argued that structurally closed communities are important for the development of these. To take Coleman’s analogy of parents and children, in a closed community responsibility for childhood societal education is shared out among the adults of that community. That is, if children were to do wrong (that is, transgress the norms of that society) in an area with high levels of social capital, they are likely to receive appropriate and effective sanctions from any adult in the vicinity. Coleman (1990) provides an example of such an incident in two countries, one with high social capital, one with low social capital:

A three-year-old child, walking with its mother on a sidewalk in Berlin, unwraps a small piece of candy and drops the cellophane on the sidewalk. An older woman who is passing by scolds the child for dropping the cellophane and admonishes its mother for not disciplining the child. A three-year-old child, walking with its mother on a sidewalk in New York City, unwraps a piece of
It is the lack of a social capital in the forms of norms of behaviour, Coleman argued, that is indicative of a society lacking in social capital.

The fourth form of social capital Coleman (1990) explored is that of social capital as a form of authority relationship. In this an actor can invest social capital in the form of power over another person. If several people have transferred power to such a person (as Coleman argued can be seen with charismatic leaders) then they will have an increased social capital and will enable the person in authority to utilise the large amount of 'credit-slips' to achieve certain ends.

The fifth form of social capital highlighted by Coleman (1990) makes reference to the 'appropriable' social organisation of social capital. This is exemplified in the creation of groups to fit one purpose that then continue to exist and aid others in similar ways despite the original creational need having been met. In this way, the social capital of the original group is transferred to meet the needs of the emergent group.

The sixth form of social capital highlighted by Coleman (1990) points to intentional organisation. This is distinct from the fifth form of social capital, for the actors are already placed within a group. It is from this group that the actors are able to form another group for the benefit of others. Coleman provides the example of a group of parents developing a parent teacher association that can be of benefit for the teachers, parents and pupils alike.
For Coleman (1990) social capital is a public entity that can benefit an actor's social milieu rather than just being a possession of an individual that can easily be exchanged; this he terms the 'practical inalienability' (p. 315) of social capital. The possession of social capital as a public entity can also be seen in the way it affects an individual actor. Coleman (1990) used the example of a mothers' group in a school; if mother A chooses to leave the group (B) the loss of the group to her may not necessarily affect her greatly. However, her departure may be a troublesome move from B's perspective; this is even more so if A has entered into a series of favours with other members of group B which shifts the onus of obligation from B to A. However with A's departure the onus is transferred back to B. In Coleman's (1988) construct of social capital, this public entity component places social capital in a social space wholly different from that occupied by other forms of capital that are generally invoked for self-interested reasons.

Another aspect of social capital that is important for Coleman (1988, 1990) is the closure and cohesion of the networks, rather than the structural hole approach taken by other scholars (Burt, 2005) as will be shown below. By network closure, Coleman (1990) referred to individual actors in a group being sufficiently interconnected to allow each member to communicate effectively with others. Through such highly connected relationships norms, obligations, and sanctions can best be developed. An example, adapted from Coleman (1990, pp. 314-5), will better demonstrate this. If actor A transgresses the norms of actor B, B can only bring limited sanctions against A. However, if A and B are networked to C (with A having an obligation to both B and C) then a more severe form of sanction (but not to its total extent) can be enforced. If actors A, B and C are in a mutually reciprocal relationship with each
other that is based on a series of obligations, full network closure can be achieved and the most adequate form of sanction can be bought against A (that is both the immediate sanction of B, and then the more removed sanction of C).

Coleman (1990) also highlighted the importance of trust for networks, relationships and norms of reciprocity to be fully developed. For Coleman, trust is what comes about during relations that involve some element of risk, that is when the trustor places trust in the trustee out of goodwill and previous knowledge of how the trustee works, or places trust in the trustee through a third party recommendation (p. 91). Coleman (1990) provided three examples of trust situations, but one will suffice here to expound his model:

A farmer was baling hay, and he had broken the needle on his baler. The weather looked unpromising, with rain likely. He did not know what to do. He had just bought the farm, this was his first crop of hay, necessary to winter his cattle, and now it appeared that this field of hay would be ruined. A neighbour who was helping proposed a solution. “I’ll go down and ask (name of second farmer), who has a baler and could bale the field for you.”

The farmer wondered at this, assumed it would cost him something in hay or money, but anxious to save his hay, readily assented. The neighbour did as he had proposed, and a little while later the second farmer arrived with tractor and baler. He proceeded to bale the hay, and all the hay was in the barn when the rain finally came.

The first farmer, who had not even known the farmer who baled his hay, was puzzled, and asked his neighbour what was due the second farmer for baling the hay in this emergency. The neighbour replied, “Oh, all he wants is the gasoline it took to bale the hay.” (p. 93)

This passage demonstrates two main points. First, it can be seen that trust has been placed by all of the actors involved. The first farmer has trusted the neighbour to have a reliable friend who will be willing to take on this type of work. The neighbour, and to a certain extent the second farmer, has trusted that the first farmer really is in trouble, and is not merely trying to trick someone into finish a job that he is no longer interested in on his new farm. Second, and moving away from Coleman’s analysis,
the paragraph shows the relationship between thick and thin trust (Putnam, 2000); in
the bonding and bridging elements of social capital the first farmer having a bonded
thick trust with the neighbour which facilitated a bridged thin trust with the second
farmer. How then do we decide to place trust in a person? Coleman (1990), argued
that each individual will place trust in a formulaic way and devised the formula:

\[ t = (G \times p) - (L \times pl) \]

Coleman noted that the trustor is not likely to place trust if ‘the ratio of the chance of
gain to the chance of loss is greater than the ratio of the amount of the potential loss to
the amount of the potential gain’. That is the trustor is likely to place trust if the
chance of receiving gain \((p)\) is greater than the potential loss \((L)\). The trustor is likely
to be indifferent to placing trust if \(p\) is equal to \(L\), and will refuse to place trust if \(p\) is
less than the potential for gain \((G)\) (p. 99).

According to Coleman, an actor has a need to place trust, regardless of what the
outcome \((p)\) of that trust may be (p. 107). In essence, Coleman saw trust as having
four main components. First, trust allows an action to be taken by a trustee that
otherwise could not be taken. Second, the trustor is in a better position if the trustee is
trustworthy than if the trustee is untrustworthy. Third, the action of placing trust
involves the trustor voluntarily placing resources at the disposal of another party,
without any real commitments from them. Fourth, each trust relationship involves
some time-lag, meaning that trust is placed for some future event (pp. 97-99). These
analyses led the way for Putnam (1993, 1995, 2000, 2002) to publish his work on
social capital.
In 2000 Putnam published his book *Bowling Alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. This book soon became a popular hit, and exclaims clearly on the cover that it is an 'International Bestseller'. Indeed a critic of Robert Putnam, Simon Szreter, admits that this book, as well as an earlier work by Putnam (1993), are 'the two most influential and substantial empirical studies [of social capital]' (Szreter, 2002, p. 573). Putnam's work breaks from the normal convention of social capital research prior to his writing by taking analysis from a micro to a macro level. His book is ambitious, seeking to analyse and record membership levels in America since the 1950s.

Putnam viewed social capital as being the expansion of the idea that networks have some value to them and that this value can be assessed. For Putnam, social capital is closely related to civic virtue, that is the way in which social networks within a community can be used to better the community. Putnam argued that the main drive of social capital was the reciprocity needed for networks to be maintained. He distinguished between two types of reciprocity, specific (I do this for you, you do that for me) and generalised (I do this for you without expecting anything specific from you, but know that you will provide some service for me in the future).

These two types of reciprocity can be seen to work in four dichotomous groupings of social capital: informal and formal, thick and thin, inward-looking and outward looking, and bonding and bridging. By informal social capital, Putnam (2002) referred to those encounters between people that are without a clear and objectified set of norms and sanctions, and that may only be based loosely on meeting times, social boundaries and physical locations; such groups can include friends meeting in a
By formal social capital, Putnam referred to groups that have clear formal codes of practices, agendas, and positions of authority brought together for instrumental outcomes; such groups can include parent teacher associations.

By thick social capital, Putnam (2000, 2002) highlighted the tight networks of people who will spend the majority of their time (both work and recreational time) in each others company, for example very close knit families and colleagues who are also friends outside the working environment. By thin social capital, Putnam focused on the brief transitory connection with a stranger whom one regularly encounters in the street; the social capital link is weak but can be called on in times of extreme need (cf. Berne 1968).

Inward-looking social capital verses outward-looking social capital (Putnam, 2002) describes the difference between networks that are concerned with maintaining the interests and needs of members (such as gentlemen’s clubs) and those that are interested in promoting their works for the public good, for example the Red Cross and other charitable organisations.

Of all these groupings it is perhaps bridging and bonding social capital that has generated the most academic interest, as will be highlighted below. These constructs are properly developed in the book *Bowling Alone* with the acknowledgement that they originate in the work of Gittell and Vidal (1998). Bonding social capital refers to the exclusive make-up of a group. The bonding group will often have a shared set of norms that helps to maximise their solidarity. Often members of a bonded group will be homogenous in terms of race, gender, age, social class, and religiosity (Putnam,
It is those homogenous groups that are best able to understand and support their members, often while excluding outsiders (Putnam, 2000, pp. 22-23). Bridging social capital refers to inclusive and heterogeneous groups. Such groups may serve a better function in business situations as they are able to facilitate more productive means of information transference. Along with this, bridging social capital can enable people to broaden their own identities through interaction with the diverse membership of a group (Putnam, 2000, p.23). Bonding and bridging social capital often happen simultaneously, but can appear in different quantities. Putnam (2002, p. 12) noted that an overdependence on one form of the social capital can be detrimental to the other, and to the overall wellbeing of a group or society.

Putnam's (1993, 1995, 2000, 2002) work sought to measure the associational activity of American society. As mentioned above this methodology is a break-away from the more traditional individual level research of Bourdieu and Coleman. Putnam's analysis revealed a general decline in associational membership in American society since the mid-1970s which has led to a decline in the strength of the community. Putnam argued that this decline in social capital has four main causes. First, this decline is attributed to greater pressure of time and money facing people in contemporary society. Although working hours have decreased since the start of the twentieth century, people today, Putnam (2000) contended, still work long hours with high-level businesses perpetuating a norm of overtime that restricts associational membership. Second, the increase in mobility and commuting has led to a decrease in the establishment of social roots in the area in which a person lives. This in turn results in a decline in attendance at local groups, which exacerbates the decline in associational membership, and ultimately the decline in social capital. Third, Putnam
suggested that the increase in the use of technology and mass media restricts associational membership. However, others have argued that media such as the internet are creating a new type of membership and social capital (Wellman, 2001; Franzen, 2003). Fourth, Putnam (2000) suggested that the current generation are less likely to be community orientated and are, therefore, less likely to be involved in community and voluntary groups.

These four aspects, Putnam (2000) argued, result in the basis of community being removed from American society, for if one is not able to participate in groups, one is restricted in the societal connections available in the local vicinity. This then can lead to groups of people who may share a close geographical space but whose social network space is spread over a large disparate area.

Putnam (2000) contended that trust and reciprocity are the decisive criteria for the creation and maintenance of social capital. For Putnam, trust can be a way of reducing the time, effort and money that is often spent in making sure that business and commercial transactions are able to take place in a safe and productive manner. In places with low trust, and therefore with low social capital, these transaction costs are constrained by the cost and time of producing contracts. Putnam argued that in places with high trust these economic and legal constraints are surplus to requirements as both parties involved have sufficient reciprocal trust in each other to know that contracts will be fulfilled, and transactions completed, to the best of their abilities. Transgressing trust that is based on legal contracts leads to the sanction of legal action taken against the party. However, breaking trust based on social capital will lead to a
break-down of that relationship and the possible loss of reputation with other members of the community.

Putnam (2000) extended the notion of trust to include two types: thick trust and thin trust. Thick trust is that which is tied up with relations that are strong, frequent, and nested in wider networks (those encountered in bonding social capital). Thin trust, on the other hand, is important in making connections with those with whom we have not had much contact, and with whom our relationships are fairly weak (those encountered in bridging social capital). For Putnam, it is not so much the trust in industries and government that is important, but rather the social trust displayed by people for other people. As he noted, those areas that have high social trust often have more favourable characteristics such as high employment, low social and economic deprivation, and a higher tendency to help to engender trust and social capital within the community. He further demonstrates that in America, trust and social trust have been in general decline since the 1970s, and he puts this down to the erosion of social capital.

Putnam (2000) was the first of these foundational scholars to assess the negative side of social capital. Perhaps the biggest criticism for social capital, he argued, is the ability for liberty and tolerance to be restricted. Putnam's analysis suggested that as America's civic participation has dropped, so the level of tolerance has increased. This Putnam attributes to a high degree of bonding social capital in American society which has gone some way to aiding the segregation of communities.
Part Two: Theoretical developments

With the work of Bourdieu, Coleman, and Putnam firmly established within the social capital literature many scholars have sought to develop and improve on the ideas. This section will investigate some of those theoretical developments.

Fukuyama (1995) argued that trust is one of the ways in which we can assess if a nation has been truly successful in creating social capital. He states that countries such as France, Japan, Italy and Korea are low in social capital and social trust; this is reflected in their business dealings that are primarily on a familial level, with little trust for strangers in company decisions. However, he argued that countries like America and Germany are countries with high levels of social capital and social trust; here companies are more able to extend beyond the familial ties to include strangers within the company. This in turn leads companies in these countries to excel in business expansion compared with their neighbours in less trusting societies. But what is it to be a trusting society? Fukuyama (1995) argued that ‘trust is the expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest, and cooperative behavior [sic], based on commonly shared norms, on the part of other members of that community’ (p.26). In short, to trust is to have the expectation that those around you will adhere to what society prescribes as correct action, thought and content of life. However, not all analysts believe that trust is a helpful concept to study in relation to social capital, and point out that some people may be able to experience trust more readily than others, and that in reality relationships set up for instrumental ends will often function well without generalised social trust (Foley and Edwards, 1999).
Brehm and Rahn (1997) returned to the construct of social capital as defined by Coleman and Putnam to investigate the individual-level evidence for its causes and consequences among the respondents to the American General Social Survey between 1972 and 1994. They argued that social capital is linked to a person's perceived psychological involvement in communities and groups. Their results demonstrated that interpersonal trust and civic engagement were strongly related (p<.05), indicating that those who are more highly involved in community projects are more likely to demonstrate trust to in other people. This, Brehm and Rahn argue, constitutes a form of social capital.

Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) developed a three dimensional approach to social capital. First, they suggest that social capital may be understood through a structural framework in which individuals are able to access resources through their understanding of societal structures. Second, they highlight that social capital may be developed through cognitive abilities, where social capital is exchanged through the development of relationships social capital. Third, they advocated a relational social capital that is dependent on the norms that underpin exchange in relationships.

Portes (1998) traced the origins of social capital in sociological literature, and argued that the relevance of the construct is being put under pressure by the popularity it has generated among academics and policy-makers. Portes argued that there are four main sources of social capital described within the sociological literature. The first refers to the social capital produced when a person enters into a relationship with someone to complete a favour but does not expect any return, for example with charitable giving. The second source of social capital sees an actor entering into a
relationship of obligation and favour in the knowledge that they will be able to have a return at some point in the future. The third source refers to the social capital produced by actors who are in a similar social structure to support one-another in light of oppression. This Marxist (Marx, 1974 [1894]), based approach to social capital argued that an emergent class consciousness will enable a group of actors to develop a set of norms in a bounded solidarity. The fourth source of social capital is based on Durkheim’s theory of social integration (Durkheim, 1997 [1893]) which argued that a person will provide a payment or service in the certainty that they will receive benefits from it, be this financial remuneration, societal acknowledgment or official honours.

From these four sources of social capital, Portes (1998) noted that there are three main effects. The first has to do with the increase in the ability for societal control, the second sees social capital as a form of family support, and the third highlights the importance of social capital in providing benefits within networks outside of the home. Portes does note, however, that social capital will never be able to remedy the major inequalities which face contemporary society.

Fukuyama (1999, 2001) described social capital as 'an instantiated informal norm that promotes cooperation between two or more individuals' (p. 1). That is, social capital is the relationship that is produced by the representation of an informal norm (that is, an informal agreement of a model or pattern for the situation) that is able to get two individuals to communicate and network together for some common goal. The norms are only realised in actual human interaction, and therefore the issues of trust, networks, and civil society arise from social capital, without being a founding aspect.
of it. Indeed, Fukuyama goes on to argue that it is only really social capital if it is related to virtues such as 'honesty, the keeping of commitments, and reliable performance of duties, reciprocity, and the like' (p. 2).

In a development of his earlier sociological history of the concept of social capital, Portes (2000) argued that there are two main types of social capital that can lead to many theoretical differences. In essence, he argued, social capital can be defined as individual or collective. Portes noted that in the early development of the construct by Bourdieu (1986) and Coleman (1990) (see above) focus was placed on the individual, or on small groups. However, with the work of Putnam (2000) the construct moved to a more collective domain. However, Portes suggested that the lack of a clear conceptualisation of community-level social capital has led to confusion over the two concepts, especially when argued that an actor is able to use individual social capital to move beyond the social capital of the collective.

Gargiulo and Benassi (2000) examined the tensions that exist between network cohesion and structural holes, that is the weak ties formed between groups. For them, structural hole theory allows for the potentiality that connections can be best made through many bridged informal networks. To test for the plausibility of this hypothesis they conducted research among nineteen managers in a large computer company in Italy. The data revealed that a lack of structural holes in the manager's networks resulted in a reduced ability to co-ordinate work between different managers on a project (p< .05) thus suggesting that a manager without structural holes is less likely to be able to work effectively with people outside their immediate network.
Lin (2001) argued that there is a basic premise behind the construct of social capital which sees social relations as being able to bring about returns in social situations (p. 19). He develops this point by stipulating that 'social capital focuses on the resources embedded in one’s social network and how access to and use of such resources benefit the individual's actions' (p. 55). Lin suggested that, when using the construct of social capital, one must be aware of the assumptions it makes about micro, meso, and macro societal structures. In relation to macro-level structures, Lin argued that social capital assumes a ranked order of society in which those who are near the top of society will have a greater ability to use their social capital. However, Lin would goes on to contest that such a pyramidal view of society is limited as more people are now able to access such things as education, meaning that the pyramid will become inverse with fewer people who have received formal education at the bottom.

At the micro and meso levels Lin argued that the construct of social capital makes two main assumptions. First, people are likely to associate with people of a similar socio-economical background, a principle he refers to as homophilous interaction. Second, the construct of social capital assumes that people have two basic driving forces, the need to maintain valued resources and the need to gain valued resources.

Alder and Kwon (2002) offered a new understanding of what social capital should be. For them:

Social capital is the goodwill available to individuals or groups. Its source lies in the structure and content of the actor’s social relations. Its effects flow from the information, influence, and solidarity it makes available to the actor. (p. 23)

This concept of social capital arose out of Alder and Kwon’s reading of two distinct groups of social capital work: those that saw social capital in the realm of the individual and the individuals’ ties to others, and those that saw social capital as part
of the collective realm and the ties within that realm. The authors argue that this definition happily incorporates both sets of understanding of social capital as well as allowing for the social capital already available to an actor through pre-existing ties to forms of social capital. Adler and Kwon see social capital as having three major sources that must, in theory, all be present for social capital to be activated. First, they argue that the opportunity to create social capital must be present; therefore an individual must be in a situation that requires work and co-operation with others.

Second, Alder and Kwon (2002) argued that motivation is an important factor for the development of social capital. By this they want to ask why is it that people are ready to give up time to aid another person. They state that answers to this problem have fallen into two main areas of motivation: the consummatory and the instrumental. Consummatory motivations are those which take for their basis a shared destiny with others, and are formed through socialisation of the actor as a child. Instrumental motivation sees the actor as having more rational calculation in their decisions. Alder and Kwon find it unsurprising that most of social capital research, because of its basis in economic theory, views actors as involved in instrumental motivation, although, they argue that in certain situations consummatory motivation is in evidence.

Third, Alder and Kwon (2002) believed that there must be an element of ability on the part of the actors to enable social capital to work efficiently. They argue that without the need for resources on behalf of the actor, social capital cannot work, for there is no element of transfer and striving towards a common goal.
Szreter (2002) explored the ways in which social capital can be created and destroyed in liberal democracies on a meso and macro level (what he terms the state level), especially in the United States of America. His analysis revealed that there needs to be a fundamental relationship between the government and the state. He argued that bridging and linking social capital can only happen if there is ideological and political support from the government for the work of the state, and that in a liberal democracy this can often be hard to achieve.

Savage and Kanazawa (2004) suggested that social capital should be redefined to take into consideration evolutionary psychology. They argue that most of the current difficulties in reaching a consensus on the definition of social capital is due mainly to a lack of understanding as to what constitutes human goals. They believe that the theories surrounding evolutionary psychology can answer this and state:

Social capital from the evolutionary psychological perspective is any feature of a social relationship that, directly or indirectly, confers reproductive benefits to a participant in that relationship. (Savage and Kanazwa, 2004, p. 508)

Capital for them, then, refers to the ability for an actor to locate him- or herself in a network of relationships that enhance the ability to survive, to procreate and to ensure that offspring reach sexual maturity. Savage and Kanazawa argue that when our early ancestors were required to make the move from isolated forestry existence to a more communal lifestyle in the savannah they were forced to develop more precise social skills, for example the noises of communication inherited from apes were refined to forms of communication to enable congenial co-habitation. Savage and Kanazawa contest that this need for peaceful co-habitation has led to forms of interaction and cooperation in contemporary society. For example, in focusing in on sex roles, they note that men are more likely to appreciate larger numbers of weaker ties (something
akin to bridging social capital) because of their early ancestors' need to form similar ties for hunting in places far away from their homes. Women, however, are more likely to appreciate closer stronger ties (something akin to bonding social capital) because of their need to ensure that the family is cared for if anything should happen to the dominant female. The authors argue that these traits are visible in society today.

Colclough and Sitaraman (2005) argued that much of the social capital literature does not make adequate differentiation between the construct of social capital and the construct of community. They defined community as real social relationships that are founded on actors' comparable experiences. These relationships imply that the actors have an obligation of responsibility and reciprocity to each other. The authors defined social capital as distinct from community as it often has an instrumental purpose, that is there will be some expectation of return from a relationship. They believe that social capital and community can interact in five main ways. First, community can lead to social capital, where a community is focused on an action to receive a desired effect. Second, social capital can lead to community; for example when a group of similar people can work together to create a community. Third, communities can exist without social capital; for example, immigrants who enter a country to work but do not necessarily socialise outside of that place of work form a community void of strong network ties. Fourth, social capital can lead to the creation of inequalities between groups, and reinforces the differences between communities, making it less likely for groups to interact with each other. Fifth, social capital can exist without community being present; for example, a group may have a common goal, but will not actually form a community.
Burt (2005) continued the debate of structural holes over network cohesion in his work. He argued that a person who has high levels of bridging social capital (what Burt defined as the holes in people's networks that then allow them to make links with other networks) will have three main advantages over someone locked into a highly bonded structurally cohesive network. First, he argued that people located on the periphery of one network and connected with other networks will have greater access to a wider variety of social capital. Second, because of this access to more social capital they are likely to be able to possess information at an early advantage. Third, a person with high levels of structural hole bridging social capital is also likely to be able to control how they disseminate information. Burt goes on to argue that a distinction can be placed between the benefits of a network of tight network cohesion and more loose structural holes. On the one hand, network cohesion can be beneficial in family and community situations where high levels of norms and sanctions are preferable. On the other hand, structural holes can aid a person in the workplace, or who has an instrumental motivation for being in a group, to make use of the social capital around them.

Lazega, Mounier, Jourda and Stofer (2006) explored the dynamics of a newly developed offset of the social capital construct in the guise of organisational social capital and personal social capital. By organisational social capital they mean the resources that are in place provided by an organisation for all its members, for example the networks that occur between differing institutions. By personal social capital they refer to the resources an individual will put in place through personal relations. They conducted research among elite French cancer researchers in 1999. The results demonstrated that organisational social capital was more important for
selecting lines of research (p< .05) and for advice on manuscripts before submission and for contacts (p< .05).

Balkundi and Kilduff (2006) investigated the role of social capital as a cognitive process. Their results demonstrated the importance of a leader having access to cognitive understandings of their personal and organisational networks. When a leader has such a cognitive understanding they are better able to facilitate direct ties with other leaders and inter-organisational connections.

Vega-Redondo (2006) used the theory of the Prisoner Dilemma (Poundstone, 1993) to determine the theoretical economical basis of social capital. His analysis suggested that when a group of people work together (albeit with the economical notion that each actor will be a self-interested player who will, in line with the Prisoner Dilemma theory, always betray the other for maximum gain) and receive a high volatility rate (that is the rate at which a payoff between existing links are changed with a certain degree of probability after an action has taken place) their level of cohesiveness will strengthen. In other words, the more a group of people is able to facilitate action, the more likely it is that the group will work together.

Oh, Labianca and Chung (2006) developed a new construct of social capital in the guise of group social capital. They defined this as 'the set of resources made available to a group through group members’ social relationships within the structure of the group itself, as well as in the broader formal and informal structure of the organisation' (p. 570). This new construct of social capital presupposed that each group with have a social capital of its own, as well as the social capital of the
individual actors within it. It is through utilising the resources that the group has on a collective and individual level that a group is able to bond, bridge and link with other groups.

Côté (2007) advocated the development of social capital to be understood alongside the construct of identity capital. For Côté, a proper understanding of the term ‘capital’ is important in understanding how both social capital and identity capital is manifested in society. Capital, Côté argued, refers to those resources that can be accrued and exchanged in society. Identity capital is, then, the set of skills and resources an individual acquires during his or her life-course which enables the individual to accrue social skills within reciprocal exchanges without the need to invest in pre-existent extended familial or friendship ties, so that an identity is developed. As Côté noted identity capital enables people to:

Cognitively understand and behaviourally negotiate the various social, occupational, and personal obstacles and opportunities that they are likely to encounter throughout an individualised life-course. (p. 65)

In this way, Côté argued, a person will be able to acquire high levels of personally, socially or occupationally specific social capital without having to lose out on their identity capital. The example of a student from a working class background leaving university as a middle-class citizen is offered. The student will be able, if the social and occupational conditions are in place, to develop links with other middle-class people and will need to adopt the socially accepted norms of behaviour and etiquette. Similarly, at the same time, the student will also encounter people from his or her working-class background, but will not necessarily wish to respond to these people with middle-class behaviours. It is here that identity capital is able to supersede social
capital and allow a link of connections, norms and obligations to be kept with one's identity.

**Part Three: Bonding, bridging and linking social capital**

This section will explore in greater depth the theoretical developments that have occurred concerning Putnam's (2000) expansion of the constructs of bonding social capital and bridging social capital.

It is perhaps Granovetter (1973) who is mostly widely held as initiating academic interest in the construct of ties in network analysis. For Granovetter it is weak ties, or bridging social capital as it later came to be known, that are the most important as they facilitate quick and effective communication between a large number of individuals.

Woolcock (2001) developed his construct of linking within social capital after analysing the over-reliance social capital has on horizontal relationships. Woolcock believes that there are opportunities for actors to connect with those from higher and lower social strata that allow for the exchange of ideas, information and resources; this has come to be termed linking social capital. This development has enabled research to begin to map how social capital ties change with social mobility.

Leonard (2004) conducted research among 150 households in the western area of Belfast, Northern Ireland, to test for bonding and bridging social capital as rehearsed by Putnam (2000). In concluding the research Leonard noted how bonding social capital and bridging social capital is a much more dynamic and complex construct
than Putnam suggested. Leonard highlighted the fact that Putnam’s analysis of these two constructs misses the point that both altruism and reciprocity may have elements of self-interest that mean that both these types of social capital are not easily developed. Leonard also argued that Putnam fails to recognise the inequalities that are present within communities that display high levels of bonding social capital.

Widmalm (2005), through analysis of Indian society and various political movements, suggested that bonding social capital, and bonding trust, are able to produce positive results for society, rather than being detrimental for the economy. Widmalm saw three potential benefits arising out of bonding social capital. First, he argued that social capital can be seen as an important prerequisite for successful campaigns. It is only through people joining together in a collective that they are then able to move toward a common goal. Second, he contended that, although bonding is important, unless some elements of bridging social capital are present, that is the ability to speak to, say, leaders of opposing parties, nothing could ever be properly achieved. Finally, he argued, that not only does bonding social capital facilitate co-operation, it can also stop group exploitation. Widmalm maintained that in societies that are fragmented and weak it is easier to get in and exploit in comparison to those societies that have high levels of bonding social capital.

**Part four: Criticisms of social capital**

Although social capital has experienced a wide array of approval from both the academic and policy-making communities, it has also received wide-ranging criticism.
Portes and Landolt (1996) have argued that social capital, as it is most commonly taken by many researchers and policy-makers, is a corruption of the construct put forward by Coleman (1990). They argued that Coleman’s construct has been stretched in three main ways. First, they noted that Putnam (2000) has allowed social capital to become the property of groups and nations (that is a move away from micro-social capital to meso- and macro-social capital); however, Portes and Landolt wish to maintain that such group social capital cannot just be the combination of individual social capital. Second, they maintained that, because of this lack of theoretical clarity, there is now confusion over the sources and benefits of social capital; an example of this may be in arguing the relationship of trust to the construct. Does trust enable social capital, or is trust a benefit of social capital? Third, they suggested that the construct of social capital often negates the negative aspects of the construct and that such a one-dimensional approach to it ignores the potential inequalities it has.

Portes (1998) developed the work by Portes and Landolt (1996) to argue that there are four main negative aspects to social capital. The first concerns the ability for social capital, especially in highly bonded form, to exclude outsiders. Authors such as Putnam (2000) have also noted that this is a potential problem in those groups with highly interconnected exclusive networks. Second, Portes (1998) contended that social capital can stop people from making the connections that they need for business situations. Third, Portes (1998) argued that involvement within a group or community event necessitates a certain degree of conformity and this in turn can lead to a scenario in which individual freedom is limited. Fourth, Portes suggested that there can be a propensity for ‘downward levelling norms’ (p. 17); in this situation
societal tradition and folklore are used to generate a norm of inferiority to other social
groups. For example, a person entering college or university in the United Kingdom
from an underclass background (Murray, 1994; Buckingham, 1999) may be
considered a traitor, and thus other young people in a similar situation comprehend
that attending higher education is not acceptable.

Lin (2000) noted that those who invest in social capital will not always receive a
return, creating an inequality. He argued that such an inequality can occur when
groups are clustered in disadvantaged socio-economic areas, and when these groups
associate with groups of a similar background. One particular area of inequality
highlighted by Lin was that of gender. His literature review suggested that women’s
networks are more likely to contain kin ties, while men’s networks are more to be
made up of diffuse bridged ties; women are less likely to have ties with large
economically orientated organisations but are more likely to be tied to community
organisations. In relation to child-bearing, Lin argued that this will have a negative
effect on women’s overall social capital, but is likely to increase men’s kin-based
networks.

Adler and Kwon (2002) list three risks of social capital based on the three
perspectives of information, influence and power, and solidarity. They noted that
while all three of these are benefits of social capital, they can also act as potential
risks. First, in relation to information, they suggested that high levels of social capital
can slow down the process of information generation and distribution. They
highlighted that in more extended, or ‘bridged’, relations information is transmitted at
a faster pace. Second, in terms of social capital as a source of influence and power,
they suggested that this can mean a move away from the independence of the focal actor; thus, once power and influence are achieved, the social capital generated can simply be abandoned. Third, although Adler and Kwon argued that solidarity is a benefit of social capital, they contended that an abundance of social capital can embed an actor within a relationship. This would then limit the flow of information and ideas.

Schuller (2001) suggested that there are three main risks to dealing with the concept of social capital. First, he noted that social capital, as of yet, has no agreed definition and this makes it problematic to operationalise. From this, Schuller developed his second argument that the measurement of social capital is problematic because it does not have an agreed definition. Third, he highlighted that much of the research done with social capital is conducted in context-specific ways, thus ensuring that the more general principles presented in findings are not easily replicated in other studies.

Navarro (2002), in his critique of social capital, especially of the form offered by Putnam, argued that much of the research has an absence of power, politics and purpose. He suggested that without properly understanding the differences in individual-level social capital along these three lines, one cannot understand properly how social capital is working. For example, he noted that the power, politics and purpose of a charity group (where one can imagine power being derived from an altruistic ethos, for the politics of understanding the disadvantaged in society, to the purpose of helping those people) will be very different to the power (individual leaders), politics (a capitalist ethos) and purpose (to gain notoriety and capital) of the Mafia.
Endelman, Bresnen, Newell, Scarbrough and Swan (2004) believe that social capital is important to life, especially to work life, but there are certain instances in which it fails. Following Nahapiet and Ghoshal’s (1998) three dimensional approach to social capital, Endelman, Bresnen, Newell, Scarbrough and Swan developed three propositions concerning the equal benefits and pitfalls of social capital. Through interviews with workers at two British companies, one concerned with the ever evolving world of telecommunications and the other concerned with the more stable world of construction, the research was able to examine the role of social capital.

Three main findings emerge from the data provided by Endelman, Bresnen, Newell, Scarbrough and Swan (2004). First, in relation to structural social capital, the authors concluded that while relying on an individual’s intellectual capital was important and advantageous in a company, it would become problematic if the company was going through organisational changes, or if one individual with certain knowledge left. Second, in relation to cognitive social capital, the authors argued that cognitive social capital can become a barrier between groups of people with specialised knowledge because of the shared cultural capital of groups (that is the shared language, customs, behaviours) making it harder for groups to inter-relate on projects. Third, they contend that in respect to relational social capital, while bonds can be built up which enable the proper sharing of knowledge and skills, if this social capital is abused (i.e. a senior manager taking credit for a junior’s work) the bonds and networks will break down. Social capital, then, is a highly volatile entity that requires stability, honesty and respect to work in a proper way. The authors argue that scholars and policymakers who perpetuate a ‘more is better’ approach to social capital should take note of these findings.
Adkins (2005) argued that much of the literature surrounding social capital reinstates ideas of society against which feminists have been fighting for many years. In particular she noted that many of the actors portrayed in the literature have strong masculine identities, for example through being driven, purposeful and abstract. Further, it was suggested that social capital is associated with familial links for women. Adkins highlighted that one of Putnam’s (2000) arguments for the decline in associational membership is the women’s move away from the household to the world of work, thus extended familial links are unable to be maintained. Adkins argued that feminists should disengage from the construct of social capital as it ‘traps women in industrial society...and cuts them adrift from postmodernity’ (p. 208).

Warr (2006) has noted the gender and socio-economic limitations to the construct of social capital. Through attendance of workshops in two economically disadvantaged suburbs in Victoria, Australia, she noted that three distinct groups of social capital were attested to by women in the suburbs. First, it was highlighted that much of the women’s social capital was of the bonding dimension in the arena of family and friends, that is, networks would be in close proximity to the actor (in the same suburb, even in the same street) and would either be relatives, or very close friends. Second, Warr suggested that some members of the workshops had no form of social capital and were reliant on formal support in times of need. Third, Warr noted that those women who had high levels of both bonding network ties and social capital, in respect to their suburb, were more likely to be a part of local community centres and were also more likely to volunteer their time in the local community, though the networks did remain family orientated and informal.
Conclusion

This chapter has explored the theories surrounding the construct of social capital.

Two main conclusions can be drawn.

First, the construct of social capital is rooted within the academic frameworks of sociology and economics. Traditionally held by Bourdieu to be resources people can exchange for other societal resources, or for economic gain, it was developed by Coleman's understanding of the socially nuanced thought processes of individuals. Latterly, it was expanded by Putnam to be understood on a meso and macro level through levels of voluntary participation. Social capital can be defined, in line with Coleman's understanding, as the set of resources, ties, norms, obligations, sanctions and trust that is developed between two or more individuals. Often there will be a common goal or an instrumental action for the group to work towards, be this on a large scale (such as fund-raising) or on a smaller personal scale (such as supporting a colleague or friend). Recent developments of the construct have tried to deepen the validity and robustness of the concepts, while trying to operationalise it effectively. For example, bonding and bridging social capital, as expanded by Putnam, have been further developed into network cohesion and structural hole theory. This dissertation will take the view of social capital advocated by Coleman to be understood on a micro or individual level, and will seek to understand how ties with others are influenced by personal and individual characteristics.

Second, despite the wide-held interest of both policy-makers and academics in the construct of social capital, the chapter has highlighted the criticisms and concerns raised in it. The criticisms may be divided into two main groups. On the one hand,
there are those academics and writers who are concerned with the very validity of the construct. This group argued that social capital has become a construct void of a firm definition and operationalisation. Some in this group would point to the work of Putnam as a case in point, stating that his work has stretched the construct of social capital too widely, to a point where it is no longer valid. On the other hand, there are those academics and writers who highlight the practical difficulties a construct such as social capital gives to sociological reflection. Such critics would argue that social capital allows for gender, economic and social inequalities, and that such inequalities are often not recognised in the literature. They would call for a more nuanced reading of the construct of social capital to ensure that the mindset of ‘more social capital equals good social capital’ is not strongly endorsed. Despite these criticisms of the construct, it is clear that social capital can play an important role in the academic understanding of social networks, trust and reciprocity.

The current chapter has explored the theoretical underpinnings and development of the social capital construct. The next chapter will go on to explore in depth one of the offshoots of social capital research, that of religious and spiritual social capital.
Chapter Two

Religion as social capital and spiritual capital

Introduction

Part One: Religion as social capital

Part Two: Spiritual capital

Conclusion
Introduction

Having, in the previous chapter, explored the theoretical basis of social capital, this chapter will proceed to examine one of the generators of social capital. Attention will be given to research concerning the social capital of religious communities. The chapter will first investigate religion as social capital, and the construct of religious capital, before considering the more recent construct of spiritual capital.

Part One: Religion as social capital

The majority of articles to be explored utilise Putnam's (2000) conceptualisation of social capital which links higher levels of social capital to greater participation in associational organisations and, particularly for the purposes of this chapter, to participation in voluntary organisations. The weaknesses of this approach, as outlined in Chapter One, should be borne in mind when reviewing the subsequent literature.

Greeley (1997) re-examined the role of religious structures on the levels of civic participation in the United States of America. Drawing on a sample of 5,398 American respondents to the World Values Study, the data demonstrated that those who classed themselves as highly religious were more likely to volunteer in secular organisations than those who did not consider themselves to be religious. The data suggest, therefore, that there is present within religious organisations a norm of volunteering, for both religious and secular organisations, that may not be as prevalent within secular organisations.

Cameron (1999) investigated the relationship between religious capital and frequency of attendance at services, where religious capital was defined as connections to others
in church. Drawing on a sample of 4,548 respondents to the National Survey on Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles conducted in the United Kingdom in 1990 and 1991, the data demonstrated that social capital, operationalised here as the intensity of religious beliefs, was related to frequency of church attendance. Further, the data revealed that the social capital ties that respondents made with other religious people through the respondents’ parental church attendance, and through the respondents’ own beliefs as an adolescent, strongly influenced levels of church attendance. These data, therefore, demonstrate that those who were able to mix with other religious people at a young age, and thus to develop a strong religious capital are more likely to attend church on a frequent basis as an adult. This research, however, did not test for the presence of current religious ties to understand fully the relationship between the effects of old ties and new ties.

Candland (2000) explored the role of social capital in the workings of Southern Asian Buddhist and Muslim faith communities. His qualitative assessment of four such communities revealed how, through the development of programmes and initiatives that reflect a specific religious worldview, a community’s social capital (seen here as trust, communication, and reciprocity) could be developed. For example, one Buddhist community entered Sri Lankan villages in order to run camps to help develop a greater sense of community among the villagers. The work went some way to transforming the way the villagers worked together by developing trust, norms, sanctions, and an attitude of reciprocity. When viewed through a Buddhist frame of reference, the camps secured a ‘mutual interconnectedness’ (p. 370) between the villagers that is reminiscent of both healthy social capital and the Buddhist philosophy.
Wuthnow (2000) examined the promotion of forgiveness by religious groups among 1,379 respondents in the United States of America. Wuthnow employed four measures of personal capital: social capital (eating together, singing together, holding home parties), cultural capital (discussing books, discussing art), emotional capital (discussing personal problems, providing emotional support, following a 12-step programme), and spiritual capital (studying the bible, praying together, sharing problems through prayer, confessing sins through prayer, asking for forgiveness through prayer, thanking God through prayer). The data demonstrated that 61% of those who said that they belonged to a religious group stated that belonging to this group had helped them forgive someone, and that 71% had experienced the healing of a relationship through involvement in the group. Moreover, the data demonstrated that emotional and spiritual capital increased the odds ratio of helping to forgive someone (p<.01) and the experience of healing in a relationship (p<.01).

Ammerman (2001), through a sociological analysis of churches and communities in America, investigated the theoretical dynamics of congregations as generators of social capital. This analysis concludes that for both the 'theologically well-versed and the theologically inept, congregational membership has been consciously sought as a way to support virtuous living' (p. 368). Ammerman states that although congregations do not really contribute something unique with their social capital, they seem to be the most effective generators of it. It is suggested that this high level of production is possible through the location of church communities in social life, and the acceptance they are granted, especially within the context of contemporary American society. The author argued that the most abundant form of social capital provided by the church is for those communities who may lack a strong voice and
identity in society, such as immigrant groups and those in poverty. It is in church congregations, she argued, that these people can be accepted (bonding social capital) and start to make the connections necessary to find, say, employment, better education and health care (bridging and linking social capital).

Finke and Dougherty (2002) examined the way in which both social and religious capital are acquired in seminaries. Finke and Dougherty defined religious capital through two components. The first component of religious capital deals with the mastery of religious culture and training, through instruction in religious doctrine, history and the performance of rituals. The second component of religious capital refers to the emotional attachment an individual has to their religious tradition. This component is operationalised by an individual’s willingness to sacrifice for the faith, to live by a moral code, and to participate in outward signs of their religious faith and piety. Employing data from two surveys of clergy in the United States of America, the data demonstrated that religious mastery was well demonstrated in both samples. However, the picture concerning emotional attachment was slightly more complex. The data demonstrated that those clergy who had received no seminary training placed more emphasis in the emotional attachment to their religion, through a greater amount of time spent in prayer and meditation per week, than those clergy who had received seminary training. Further, it was demonstrated that the emphasis on religious formation during clergy training remained important during ministry life. Thus, clergy who had received high levels of training on spiritual formation displayed higher levels of trust in God, a more deeply held faith and a stronger ability to practise private prayer.
Wuthnow (2002) utilised data from 5,602 respondents in the American Religion and Politics survey to explore two distinct forms of bridging social capital: identity-bridging and status bridging. Identity-bridging capital refers to the use of connections between social sub-groups (for example based on race, sexual orientation, or national origin) present within congregations. These divisions, Wuthnow argued, focus on highlighting the differences between intra-congregational groups, and can often lead to a mentality of division defined by ‘us’ and ‘them’. However, used correctly identity-bridging capital can lead to opportunities for the congregation to develop ways, and knowledge, of working with diverse groups. Status-bridging capital, Wuthnow (2002) argued, ‘span[s] vertical arrangements of power, influence, wealth and prestige’ (p. 670). This is the bridging capital that sees members of congregations using the connections they are able to forge within church to increase their social standing, be it in terms of education, in terms of business or for narcissistic reasons.

To investigate further the presence of status-bridging capital Wuthnow employed a questionnaire survey among the 5,603 American Religion and Politics survey respondents. The data demonstrated that a significant positive relationship, when tested by odds ratios, was present between respondents having a friendship with an elected public official and: age (p<.001), being male (p<.001), having a high level of education (p<.001) and having a leadership role in the church (p<.001). The data suggest, therefore, that a specific group of people are more likely to use opportunities in church to make status-bridging connections.

Bruce (2002) instigated a debate regarding the relationship between Putnam's thesis (Putnam, 2000) and the state of churchgoing in the United Kingdom. Bruce
suggested that there are five main aspects of the religious decline-in-association thesis (that is, Putnam’s view that membership in voluntary organisations is in decline) that point to an unwillingness among the general public to associate with the church. The first four of these relate to the decline-in-association debate, the fifth concerns levels of religious belief. First, Bruce argued that to see the decline in churchgoing as a general decline in association we should investigate any necessary pre-requisites. Bruce argued that unlike the decline in association in miners’ clubs caused by miners being made redundant, the decline in church buildings and professionals has been caused by members of the congregation voluntarily ceasing to attend church. This, Bruce argued, indicates a sufficient pre-requisite for the decline-in-association thesis.

Second, Bruce (2002) argued that the presence of a functional equivalent (that is another way of receiving the same type of experience), such as religious television programmes, can still take the form of some type of participation. Although Bruce acknowledges that religious programmes have been popular, he noted that this is no longer the case, thus indicating that there is no real functional equivalent to church attendance. Third, Bruce focused on differential impetus to associating. This point argues that, if people choose to use a functional equivalent, they have not necessarily lost the passion once held for the original activity, and will retain the beliefs of that original pursuit. However, Bruce argued that those who attest to believing without belonging may be forgoing some of the more central teachings of orthodox Christianity which places great emphasis on attendance. Fourth, Bruce considered the importance of re-constituting the activity. That is, if people are still interested in churchgoing, why not simply join another church. The re-constitution of the activity combined with Bruce’s fifth strand focusing on the declining level of religious belief
in Britain, seems to indicate that people are choosing to disassociate from the church fully, rather than just refraining from participation while still retaining some religious belief.

In her response to Bruce (2002), Davie (2002) focused primarily on the fifth strand of his argument, the decline of belief in contemporary society. Davie agrees that the decline in association may have had an impact on church attendance, but argues this can lead to two possible eventualities. First, both belief and practice will go into decline, or, second, while practice is in decline, belief does not necessarily experience a similar fate. As Davie argued, belief for young people today is a much more personal and multi-dimensional aspect of their lives. Indeed as studies by Williams, Francis and Robbins (2006), Francis, Robbins and Williams (2006), and Francis and Williams (2007) have demonstrated both non-traditional belief and Christian belief are used by young people simultaneously to form their worldviews.

In his response to the Bruce (2002), Gill (2002) argued that there are several physical and social factors that can be seen as playing a part in the decline in churchgoing, such as the increase in commuting to work and the development of social networks outside of one’s neighbourhood. One of the consequences of this decline in churchgoing, however, has been that people have been less exposed to Christian teaching, which is what (according to Gill) is reflected in the opinion polls documented by Bruce (2002). Gill believed this lack of traditional belief was a consequence rather than a cause of church decline.
Lam (2002) conducted a re-evaluation of the 'God and Society in North America' survey conducted by Queen's University in 1996 among an undisclosed number of respondents testing for the relationship between religious affiliation and volunteer associational participation. The results demonstrated that membership on a committee of a religious organisation significantly increased the likelihood of membership in a voluntary association (p<.01). Further, it was demonstrated that private religious activities, such as prayer and religious reading, have a positive effect on volunteering (p<.01).

Ozorak (2003) conducted a study among 224 students in an American college testing for the relationship between religious belief and motives for volunteering. The data demonstrated that women were more likely to be involved in voluntary work than men, and it was women who had more experience of such work in the past. Further, it was found that a perception of spiritual closeness to God through prayer was highly significant as an intrinsic motivation for voluntary work (for men p<.01; for women p<.001), and that thanksgiving prayers were also highly correlated with an intrinsic motivation (men p<.001; women p<.001). In terms of volunteering options it was demonstrated that men who held a high belief in God were more likely than women to be actually involved in voluntary work (p<.001). Women who hold a high belief in God were significantly more likely to be interested in such work (p<.001).

A major contribution to understanding the relationship between religion and social capital has been provided by a collection of essays edited by Corwin Smidt (2003a) under the title Religion as Social Capital. This collection, that focuses primarily on religion and social capital in American society, brings together 13 essays that are
worthy of closer examination. Smidt (2003b) himself begins the volume by introducing the concept of social capital as explained by the Putnam thesis; it is against this background that the remainder of the essays are focused.

Cnaan, Boddie and Yancey (2003), speaking about church congregations in the United States of America, believe that volunteer associations are important in the generation of social capital. They state that, if a congregation can adopt into their norms the belief that active participation and volunteering in organisations is important, the congregation can successfully generate and maintain social capital. The authors suggest that there are five main ways in which a church can contribute to building up high levels of social capital. First, they state that the church needs congregants that are willing to become highly involved in both the internal life of the congregation, through participation in the number of smaller groups that are often created (and thus leading to an internalization of norms and shared group experience, that is bonding social capital) and to the social work performed by the church (thus leading to the congregants meeting people outside of their religious community, that is bridging social capital). Second, they draw attention to the historical importance of disestablishment for the church in American society. Basing this view on the history of the church in America they suggest that in colonial America, when the church and clergy received state support, there was less informal involvement in the church, and that the clergy were less concerned about increasing the size of the congregation. However, since the removal of state support, the authors argue, both clergy and congregations have become more active in starting and funding projects to attract new members to the church, and consequently this has resulted in an increase of social capital. Third, the authors suggest that in a country dominated by a norm of
competition, in which one's identity and meaning can be attributed to one's social status, it is important to have a reasonably homogenous congregation, in order to create a willingness to participate in the work of the church. Fourth, the authors state that it is important to emphasise the teachings of a religious community regarding social responsibility to ensure that it becomes part of the mindset of the church. When the norm of social responsibility has been established greater development of bridging social capital can be achieved. Fifth, the authors suggest that the changing role of the American church in becoming one of the strongest institutions will enable the development of social capital.

Coleman (2003) focused on the nature and limits of social capital. In seeking to understand social capital he calls for a move away from the traditional congregational-focused research to a research agenda that is concerned with para-church organisations. His analysis of six para-churches organisations reveals how such groups work in conjunction with more traditional congregations to create an effective public church in American society. Coleman noted how the para-church organisations make inter-church connections (and therefore bridging social capital) easier to facilitate, providing the congregations are in a position to exploit existing intra-congregational connections to work with the para-church groups. With reference to the nature of social capital Coleman noted three points. First, emphasis is placed on the way in which the social capital generated by religious groups is, due to faith and conviction of beliefs, more likely to endure than the social capital generated by secular groups. In addition, because of the demands of faith, religious social capital is more likely to receive greater commitment than secular social capital. Second, unlike other organisations, religious groups are able to keep generating and
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acting on their social capital by keeping faith and achievement in tension. This ensures that religious groups are unlikely to become complacent about their role. Third, Coleman noted the way in which religious groups are able to focus on both local and global citizenship issues, thus ensuring their work has a real impact on society. However, Coleman noted that religious groups are likely to remain limited in what they can achieve. The author argued that the perennial tension between works and faith will result in religious groups not striving toward developing more corporate styles of work.

Hollander, Kahana and Lecker (2003) developed an economic model for what they termed ‘religious human capital’. They defined holders of religious human capital as those individuals who have high levels of belief in God and who are more likely to adhere to moral codes through religious principles. Hollander, Kahana and Lecker demonstrated that both religious human capital and secular human capital interact well, but that those with high levels of religious human capital are likely to devote more time to religious studies, such as bible reading, private prayer and attendance at worship.

Warren (2003) examined how social capital and civic participation were related to religious institutions by exploring the work of two religious organisations: the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), a faith-based community organisation that seeks to engage religious groups in political action, and Mexican-American Catholic Communities. The data revealed that the intervention of such groups as the IAF, which function on building on the social capital already found within a congregation, does significantly expand the civic participation of religious groups, and therefore
increases their ability to generate social capital with other secular and religious groups.

Wood (2003) explored the modes of civic involvement in congregational organisations (such as the Pacific Institute for Community Organisation, PICO) and in multiracial organisations (such as the Centre for Third World Organising, CTWO). His analysis revealed that religious institutions are well positioned to integrate political power into public life. Wood suggested that the horizontal social composition of religious groups allows organisations such as PICO and CTWO to use the trust and reciprocity present within a church to move beyond the tensions normally associated with hierarchical organisations, enabling them to concentrate fully on putting energy into political advance. However, Wood (p.85) also noted that without the 'hard democratic' work that is generated by non-partisan political agendas, social capital among religious groups can be fruitless.

Campbell and Yonish (2003) assessed the relationship between volunteering and religiosity in America through data generated among 9,620 respondents in the Gallup Giving and Volunteering Survey between 1989 and 1995. The data revealed that 51% of the sample had volunteered in the last year and that 52% of their volunteering was with religious organisations. In terms of denominational differences, the data demonstrated that mainline Protestants had the highest level of volunteering (59%) and the highest rates of donations to religious charitable organisations (33%). Finally, the data revealed that 35% of all recruiting for voluntary services was facilitated by churches. The results clearly demonstrate the importance of congregations in providing social capital through volunteering.
Nemeth and Luidens (2003) used the same Gallup Giving and Volunteering Survey dataset as Campbell and Yonish (2003) to explore the relationship between charitable giving and religiosity. Their results demonstrated that the vast majority of charitable donations made by American households went to religious organisations; indeed such donations totalled double those given to the health-care sector. The data also demonstrated that over the period between 1989 and 1995 there was an increase in donations to religious organisations at the same time as an increase in church participation.

Harris (2003) examined the relationship between politics and society in order to investigate how religion endows social capital in African-American politics using data generated in the Citizenship Participation Survey. The data demonstrated that religion does indeed produce the practice of reciprocity which, as Harris noted, is an aspect of religion as social capital that is often ignored. Further, the data demonstrated how motivation generated by religious convictions is likely to be different from motivations generated by non-religious convictions; this may be due to the altruism and social motivations experienced in African-American communities.

Curry (2003) examined the relationship between social capital and societal vision in six farming communities in Iowa to discern if differing world-views influenced how the communities generated social capital. The survey revealed that, although communities were mixed in terms of their levels of social capital, those communities that had high levels of bridging social capital were less able to sustain groups and organisations. Further, the intra-denominational bridging that is experienced among
some hierarchical religious communities may prevent links being made with other groups.

Smidt, Green, Guth and Kellstedt (2003) utilised a survey of 3,000 Americans and 3,000 Canadians to determine the relationship between religious involvement, social capital, and political engagement. The data demonstrated that both countries have high levels of associational membership, of which the majority was within religious or church-related groups. Further, the data demonstrated that levels of group membership increased with levels of attendance to church regardless of the country.

Williams (2003) employed discourse analysis to investigate the relationship between religious discourse and public politics. His analysis demonstrated how language reflects social reality, and within a religious context the language used by leaders can become an important aspect of generating social capital. He argued that religious language should be present in both civic and political society to enable greater collaboration.

Wuthnow (2003a) examined the extent to which religion could revitalise society, and argued for a much wider reading of social capital than that provided by Putnam (2000). Wuthnow argued that, although religion can be seen as a force in revitalising communities, there could be many dangers, such as the over-reliance on a charismatic leader or a desire to achieve goals without engaging the often necessary help of outside agencies.
Concluding on the collection of essays *Religion as Social Capital*, Smidt (2003c) sees five ways in which religious social capital differs from general social capital. First, religious social capital is likely to be more plentiful than other forms of social capital, due, in part, to the number of people in the pews of American church who are willing to donate their time. Second, religious social capital may be more durable, due, in part, to the motivations that religious people bring to the work. Third, religious social capital has a much wider range than regular social capital, due, in part, to the diverse mix of people in American congregations. Fourth, through developing norms of trust and reciprocity in congregations, religious social capital can bolster and sustain social capital in the community. Fifth, religious social capital provides people in American society with advantages not normally so accessible through other agencies, such as skills developed through church-related courses.

Wink and Dillon (2003) investigated the relationship between religiousness and spirituality in young age, and psychosocial functioning in older age, among a sample of 182 respondents, now in late adulthood, who have been part of a longitudinal study conducted by University of California, Berkeley since the late 1920s. The results demonstrated that religiousness, rather than spirituality, was related to levels of perceived well-being based on social capital criteria (namely, positive relationships with others, social involvement and involvement in community services). Spirituality was positively related to greater well-being in relation to knowledge-building life tasks, personal growth and wisdom. In concluding the study, Wink and Dillon suggest that these data provide longitudinal evidence in support of religious capital, by demonstrating that those respondents' who recorded higher levels of religiosity at an earlier age were more likely to display stable levels of psychosocial functioning in
later adulthood. From these data, then, it could be suggested that religious capital can play an important role in the lives of individuals who have had a basic socialisation in religious beliefs, morals and values.

Flint and Kearns (2004) conducted research to investigate the role of Church of Scotland congregations in developing social capital. A questionnaire was sent to 454 Church of Scotland congregations, followed by 19 case-studies. A further four detailed case-studies, unrelated to the original 19 case-studies, of congregations were conducted, these comprised focus groups with ministers and church elders, a postal survey of 336 congregation members and 148 non-church local residents.

The data of the Flint and Kearns' (2004) survey revealed that 25% of the ministers and elders surveyed felt that their congregations were representative of the social milieu of the local neighbourhood. Moreover, the data demonstrated that 49% of the congregational members surveyed identified themselves as being involved in activities that could generate social capital. In contrast to research highlighted by Campbell and Yonish (2003), the vast majority of Scottish congregants were involved in voluntary work outside of the church; indeed only 43% stated that they volunteered for a religious organisation. In relation to bridging capital, 43% of the ministers stated they had made formal partnerships with other churches; the majority of these partnerships (28%) were focused on community events, with only 25% aimed at tackling community development, and 8% for campaigning activity.

Flint and Kearns (2004) conclude that the relationship between the spiritual and secular dimensions in the Church of Scotland were linked and complementary.
Despite both church members and non-church members being open to churches developing greater participation within the community, the actual churches remained relatively bonded, with the vast majority of partnerships being made with other churches. Flint and Kearns conclude that it is the actions carried out by individual actors within the church congregations in informal voluntary schemes, rather than formal church-developed programmes, which make the biggest contribution to social capital.

Yeung (2004) explored the responses of 1,038 adults in Finland to investigate the relationship between religiosity, volunteering and social capital. The data demonstrated the 96% of those who belong to a church take part in some form of volunteering. Further, it was demonstrated that churchgoers were more likely to state that they were concerned for elderly people (p<.01), immigrants (p<.001) and children and youths (p<.001). Those who volunteer in church groups are also more likely to help local people (p<.001), the elderly (p<.01), immigrants (p<.001), and the sick and handicapped (p<.001) when compared to those in non-church organisations. The results highlight the important relationship between churchgoing and being an active member of a church volunteering group.

King and Furrow (2004) explored the relationship between social capital and religion in the moral development of adolescents. In this context social capital was measured as the opportunity for young people to mix with parents and non-parental adults, and to have a shared vision with these adults. Drawing on a sample of 937 13- to 19-year-olds in one Los Angeles high school, the research investigated the role of altruism and empathy on measures of religiosity, social capital, social interaction, trust and shared
vision with parents. MANOVA tests demonstrated a positive relationship between social capital and three measures of religiosity: importance of being religious, frequency of church group participation, and the importance of this participation (p<.01, partial eta squared = .05). Further, active participation in church activities lead to greater bridging capital with another adult in terms of shared vision (p<.001, partial eta squared = .02), and in relation to trust (p<.001, partial eta squared = .02). Pearson product moment correlations revealed that trust in parents was related to the importance of religion in the person's life (p<.01), attendance at religious activities (p<.01) and the importance of attendance at these activities (p<.01). In addition to this, social interaction with parents correlated with the importance of religion (p<.01), attendance at religious activities (p<.01) and the importance of attendance at religious activities (p<.01). Shared vision with parents correlated positively with moral concern (p<.01), moral perspective (p<.01) and moral altruism (p<.01). The findings suggest, therefore, that the influence of religion and social capital (operationalised here by contact with adults and shared vision) can significantly impact a young person's moral development for the better.

Swart (2005) investigated the church's potential stock of social capital in communities on the Western Cape of South Africa via a wide range of techniques, including Global Positioning Satellite assessment of the location of churches in relation to townships, surveys of people's perceptions of the degree of help they had received from secular authorities, people's attitudes towards the church, people's concern over the most pressing social issues in their community, and information on the programmes and ministries already in place. The data demonstrated that the churches on the Western Cape have a significant advantage over any non-
governmental organisations (NGO) and governmental agency in contributing to the social capital of a town or community, because of the presence of churches in most towns and villages. Further, the analysis revealed that members of the sample investigated (10% of all the households on the Cape) wished for church involvement to help tackle societal problems. However, Swart noted that, although churches in this region have a great potential supply of social capital, they have few programmes running which actually realise it.

Loveland, Sikkink, Myers and Radcliff (2005) examined the relationship between private prayer and civic involvement among an undisclosed number of people who took part in the God and Society in North America Survey conducted in 1999. Using negative binominal regression that predicted the number of secular voluntary memberships they found a positive correlation (p<.05) with private prayer, indicating an 8% increase in voluntary membership. Allowing for frequency of prayer to interact with religious voluntary association, the binominal regression correlation found a positive correlation with voluntary membership (p<.05), indicating an estimated increase of 18%. The data clearly demonstrate how civic involvement is influenced by frequency of prayer.

Ineson and Burton (2005) investigated the role that the rural church has in the generation of social capital. Interviews were conducted with four lay-leaders from a rural Roman Catholic church, and four lay leaders from a Methodist/Baptist church located in the same community. Their data revealed that local religious communities function as effective generators of social capital. They note, however, that there are some denominational differences between how this capital is generated. On the one
hand, in the Roman Catholic sample much of an individual’s voluntary work takes place under the auspices of the church, and their volunteering hours are given to projects run within the church structure. Ineson and Burton argue that this reflects Roman Catholic self-understanding in England and Wales. On the other hand, the work provided by members of the Methodist/Baptist church is much more likely to occur outside the structure of the church – that is individuals contribute to projects that may not necessarily be affiliated with their church. However, Ineson and Burton suggested that the main reason for each member’s involvement in the different projects was due to their faith.

Lam (2006) explores the relationship between religiosity and voluntary association in 29 countries by drawing on the World Values Survey, leading to a sample of 31,911. The data revealed that being part of a Catholic country was negatively associated with voluntary membership (p<.001) thereby indicating that Protestant dominant countries had higher levels of membership (p<.001). Denominational differences, therefore, have an important and significant impact on social capital generated through voluntary association.

Burton (2006) used qualitative methods to reanalyse interview data collected in one English Methodist church in the mid-1970s to look at the potential presence of social capital networks. The data demonstrated that at this time six major networks of social capital were present within this one Methodist church: the worship network, organisational network, leadership network, kinship network, friendship network, and neighbourhood network. Such networks would have made up a significant part of the social capital produced by the congregation.
Farnell, Hopkinson, Jarvis, Martineau and Hien’s (2006) project, sponsored by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, published in conjunction with the Arthur Rank Centre, was concerned with the contribution made by worshipping communities to the social capital and community vibrancy of rural areas. Using qualitative data from six rural communities around England the authors noted a wide range of evidence regarding social capital, in terms of bonding, bridging and linking capital. The ways in which these forms of capital were deployed by individual members of a community led to the increase of community vibrancy, which is defined as communities working ‘towards creating and maintaining active, caring, welcoming and influential communities’ (p. 14).

Farnell, Hopkinson, Jarvis, Martineau and Hien’s (2006) came to five main conclusions. First, it was concluded that worshipping communities make a significant impact on the social capital and community vibrancy of rural areas. These contributions can take many forms, ranging from the networks created with other church members to work with secular voluntary organisations. Second, it was concluded that the ageing profile of many worshipping communities in rural areas will impact the contribution churches are able to make. Farnell and his colleagues suggest that the influx of retired affluent people to rural areas will ensure the continuation of the contribution of worshipping communities. Third, the research highlighted the high levels of bonding social capital present in the communities studied. This was especially true among the worshipping communities of larger villages, where the church provided the main source bonding capital. The study also noted the importance of the church building, and often its leaders, to the development
of bonding capital. Fourth, the study reached similar conclusions about the contribution made by worshipping communities to bridging social capital, noting also that more attention needs to be given to the role played by church in the wider community, especially among schools, young and old people, those with economic hardship, and those from ethnic groups. Fifth, the research noted the important role played by worshipping communities in the generation of linking social capital, but calls for such communities to become more actively involved in both local and national government to ensure that their voice is heard and their linking social capital is utilised in a more effective way.

The Commission on Urban Life and Faith (2006) has published a report focusing on the ‘faithful capital’ of urban areas. Coming twenty years after Faith in the City (Archbishop of Canterbury’s Commission On Urban Priority Areas, 1985) this report sought to understand how urban areas can produce ‘faithful capital’ which is defined as the gift provided by congregations to a community that ‘inspires the commitment to personal and collective transformation, love for neighbour and care for “the stranger”’ (paragraph 1.16). The report recommended closer links between church, local authorities, and national government to help improve the quality of living for those in urban areas.

Cohen-Zada (2006) linked religious capital with the construct of identity capital, that is a form of cultural capital which forms identity through affiliation with external sources, such as family name and institution. Cohen-Zada argued that education, especially in the form of private religious schools, is used to preserve an individual’s identity formed through affiliation with religious organisations. To test this argument,
a sample of 3,017 counties in America was employed to test for the number of Catholic schools in the area, and the overall number of self-defining Catholics. The results demonstrated that, using the economic model of empirical estimation, parents who recorded high levels of Catholic religiosity, and displayed high levels of wishing to pass that religious background on to their children were less likely to send their children to public schools with low levels of Catholic students. Cohen-Zada suggested that these data highlight the wish for Catholic parents to retain their religious capital in the form of identity.

Isham, Kolodinsky and Kimberly (2006) conducted research in the state of Vermont in the United States of America with a sample of 677 individuals. Their data suggest that one of the main predictors of receiving benefit from social capital is being part of a voluntary religious or social service organisation.

Alexander (2007) explored Putnam's thesis, that membership levels of churches had been in general decline, to test for the presence of religious social capital. Drawing on state-level survey data, such as the United States of America Census, the Bureau of Economic Analysis and the Bureau of Labour Statistics, the data demonstrated that as church membership increases, so the level of societal social capital decreases, that is membership of other organisations. Alexander suggested that the reason for this relationship may be attributed to the type of church individuals attend. It could be suggested that some church traditions, especially within the United States of America, call for members to provide voluntary work to organisations run by the church, and therefore will limit the number of associations a person can make outside that institution. If this is the case, then it is important to understand the workings of social
capital not at a meso- or state-level, but rather at a micro- or individual-level, for levels of intra-community social capital may be high, while levels of inter-community social capital may be lower.

Kuusisto (2007) analysed the role of religious identity-based social networks for the creation of adolescents’ social capital. Drawing on a sample of 55 Finish Adventist parents whose children were interviewed for a subsequent paper, the data suggest that the Adventist congregations to which both parents and adolescents belonged provided a strong source of social structure and support. Thus, young people and parents alike were able to generate social capital from the congregational support they received.

Presser and Chaves (2007) used Putnam’s conceptualisation of social capital to assess whether weekend religious attendance in the United States of America was in decline, and therefore if the potential religious capital of church organisations would be diminished in any way. The data demonstrated that there has been a very small decline in religious attendance during the period from 1990 to 2006. The results, therefore, suggest that religious organisations are in an adequate place to produce religious capital.

This section has highlighted research concerning religious capital. It has been demonstrated that religious capital is perceived to be a development of social capital, through an understanding of the effects religious teaching may have in societal relations. The literature review has further highlighted that religious capital is generally concluded to be both a personal and a social benefit. The next section will
go on to explore a development of the religious capital research tradition: spiritual capital.

Part Two: Spiritual capital

Innaccone (1990) provided an account of religious practice through the lens of capital theory. Focusing on human capital, which later developed into the construct of spiritual capital (Dahles, 2007), it is suggested that through an understanding of denominational mobility, religious intermarriage, the influence of religious upbringing, and the rate of church attendance, it would be possible to investigate the impact that religious groups make on society at large.

The creation of the Spiritual Capital Research Network, a centre primarily funded by the John Templeton Foundation, has produced much interest in the construct of spiritual capital, and the role it plays in society. A number of papers have now dealt with the subject for the network and will be outlined below.

Woodberry (2003) suggested that spiritual capital is distinct from social capital, cultural capital or economic capital because of the stress it lays on the relationship with God, and sees that participation within a religious group is focused on deepening such a relationship. Woodberry is the first author to talk explicitly about spiritual capital as being manifested within a relationship with God. Such a view of spiritual capital (especially linking capital) helps social researchers to understand better the networks present within a religious person’s life. Woodberry argued that by using this ‘metaphor’ of spirituality one can see religion as an investment that has a distinct end, as a resource that people draw on to meet challenges in their lives, and also as a
spur for research on the consequences to individuals and society of increasing or decreasing investments in social capital.

Woodberry (2003) noted, however, the limitations that the metaphor of spiritual capital may bring. First, he suggested that the metaphor may place too much stress on the notion of religion as a means-to-an-end, although he acknowledges that religion is also involved in shaping an individual, and that religious institutions provide resources for facilitating personal development. Second, he suggested that the metaphor of spiritual capital may also present religion as a means of personal gain, be this in terms of money or social status, although he acknowledges how religions focus on losing self in order to develop spiritually.

Iannaccone and Klick (2003) note that spiritual capital is a term that has come into popular use within academic and popular spheres, but bemoan the way in which spiritual capital has no concrete definition. At the same time, they see distinct advantages in the fluidity of the construct:

One may imagine “spiritual capital” catching on precisely because it blurs traditional distinctions between that which is religious and that which is secular...[t]he term is sufficiently elastic and popular that it can be applied to all traditional religions, all new religions, and a wide range of non-religious activities deemed virtuous or therapeutic (Iannaccone and Klick, 2003, p. 2).

Finke’s (2003) work on spiritual capital focused on the way in which a person accrues, and becomes adept in, a particular religious culture, and the emotional attachments developed from that culture. Finke’s analysis speculated on the way in which the construct of spiritual capital can be used. At the micro-level, he noted how people will want to share their spiritual capital in a homogenous group, for example marrying within their own religious and denominational affiliations and thus securing
the future of the spiritual capital. Ultimately at a micro-level, Finke argued, all spiritual capital will be lost on re-affiliation to a different religious group or denomination. On a meso-organisational level Finke argued that spiritual capital can be the glue that binds people to a particular denomination or religion, although it can also act as a way of fostering divisions and schism.

Finke’s (2003) work is, however, constrained by one major conceptual deficiency. While Finke has titled his paper ‘Spiritual Capital: definitions, applications, and new frontiers’, the paper only explicitly refers to spiritual capital once, and this is then equated with religious capital. It is on religious capital that the remainder of his paper is focused, without Finke considering the possible divergent points between the two concepts.

Berger and Hefner (2003) link spiritual capital to the protestant ethic of Weber, but note that the changes that have transpired within capitalism mean that Weber’s analysis of capitalism needs to be re-conceptualised and re-operationalised. This, they argue, can be done through the notion of spiritual capital. For them, spiritual capital ‘might be thought of as a subspecies of social capital, referring to the power, influence, knowledge and dispositions created by participating in a particular religious group’. Though they do not go on to expand on the terms power and influence, there seems to be a clear link between Berger and Hefner’s (2003) spiritual capital and Bourdieus’s (1986) cultural capital, albeit in a religious environment.

Malloch (2003) argued that the role of spiritual capital is fundamental to the way in which countries are able to develop. Seeing spiritual capital as the third aspect of the
conceptual framework that houses both human and social capital, Malloch argued that spiritual capital is the way in which people are able to come together with the need to develop themselves in areas other than the economic and material. Spiritual capital, Malloch argued, is a way of promoting ‘trust, stewardship and a sense of purpose that come from religion and spiritual sentiments’ (p. 8).

Alongside the work presented by the *Spiritual Capital Research Network*, other researchers have also begun to explore the construct of spiritual capital. For example, Verter (2003) employed the construct of religious capital, seen here through the framework of Bourdieu’s social capital, as the basis from which to conceptualise spiritual capital. According to this theory, as reported by Verter, religious capital is the religious accumulated labour, be this money, property or knowledge. For Verter religious capital has two major forms: religious symbolic systems (that is the myths and ideologies of a religious tradition) and religious competences (that is the mastery of specific practices or bodies of knowledge).

In moving away from this idea of religious capital in which, Verter (2003) argued, the layperson in a religious tradition is denied primary agency, Verter defined spiritual capital as a derivative of cultural capital (that is the traits, knowledge and habits passed down the generations). The construct of spiritual capital can be understood in terms of an embodied, objectified and institutionalised state. The embodied state sees spiritual capital as ‘the knowledge, abilities, tastes, and credentials an individual has amassed in the field of religion’ (p. 159). This is capital embodied in the habitus of a religious community. The objectified state includes the capital generated by the use of material and symbolic artefacts within a religious context, such as texts and ritual
dress, and can include theologies, ideologies and theodicies. The objectified state can only really come about after the full development of the embodied state. Finally, the institutionalised state includes "the power that churches, seminaries, and other religious organisations exercise to legitimate an arbitrary array of religious goods" (p. 160). Verter argued that by understanding what the dominant institutional religion of a society is, we can better understand the spiritual capital present.

Zohar and Marshall (2004) argue that in contemporary society, and particularly within the contemporary business world, there has been a growing lack of meaning. The authors see this lack of meaning as stemming from the abundant capitalist perspective of modern society. Zohar and Marshall (2004) even go as far as to equate modern capitalist society with Erysichthon from Ovid's Metamorphoses (VIII, 738-878), a king so consumed with the hunger for food that he sells all in his store to have enough money to purchase food, but eventually ended up eating his wife, daughter, and ultimately himself. The authors argue that contemporary capitalist society makes two basic assumptions about humanity. First, humans are primarily economic beings. Second, humans will always act out of a sense of rational self interest. This, they argue, has led to a situation where a person is labelled as consumer, customer or employee (without the categories necessarily being mutually exclusive). Such a way of viewing life, they argue, has led to an increase in stress and loss of meaning for people today. They argue that with spiritual capital, generated through spiritual intelligence, contemporary society can regain some of the meaning it has lost.

Zohar and Marshall (2004) defined spiritual capital somewhat differently to other writers in the field. For them, spiritual capital is related to their construct of spiritual
intelligence, which states that by observing and measuring our motivations for performing individual or specific actions we are able to determine how we can improve ourselves, and the way in which we work. Spiritual capital is the way in which individuals are best able to understand the motives, and possibly the effects of their actions, on a large scale. Zohar and Marshall argue that for society to turn away from the self-destructive capitalist mindset that is already in place people need to become more reflective, using the framework of spiritual intelligence.

McDonald and Hallinan (2005) examined the relation between spiritual capital and Japanese rowing. McDonald and Hallinan defined spiritual capital as cultural capital through membership of the rowing club. Akin to the notion of implicit religion (Bailey, 1998, 2002), being a member of a Japanese rowing club calls for members to have a high level of commitment (spending four-years training in residence), to have high levels of integrating foci (that is to be totally committed to the sport at the cost of other areas of social and personal lives) and intensive concerns with extensive effects (that is the desire to compete at high levels and to achieve the best one can). Further, McDonald and Hallinan noted that in joining the Japanese rowing club various religious and secular rituals (for example, the daily preparation of breakfast for the managers by the players) result in a deepening spiritual capital.

Unruh and Sider (2005) believe that the church is one of the best places for the promotion of social and spiritual capital. They stated that the ‘benefits from membership of a religious community do not derive from any single member, but from the structured relationships that facilitate exchange of valued services within the congregation’ (p. 219). That is, the church must be looked at as a whole to appreciate
the impact it can have on spiritual capital. An offshoot of the way in which social capital can be seen as part of spiritual capital is the ability for regeneration within it: Unruh and Sider believe that, as new members benefit from their involvement in the congregation, they are more likely to become committed and active within the community and thus will provide the links for other new members. Importantly for Unruh and Sider there are three main ways in which spiritual capital can be transferred into civic benefits. First, the group dynamic can help to engender corporate social action. Second, it can help to encourage the civic engagement of individual members. Third, it can facilitate the sharing of resources within and beyond the network.

Baker and Skinner (2005a) see religious capital as important in community development, especially within their area of interest, central Manchester. For Baker and Skinner (2005a) religious capital and spiritual capital are linked, but it is spiritual capital that drives and energises religious capital. The authors see ‘religious capital as the public interaction of faith-based groups with wider society rather than the creation of a more “efficient” religious person (p. 12). Religious capital is more often found to be at work, they argue, in the wider societal arena than on a more personal level. Baker and Skinner (2005b) see spiritual capital and religious capital as split into eighteen different components.

Spiritual capital, that Baker and Skinner (2005b) defined as the ‘values, ethics, beliefs and vision which faith communities bring to civil society’ (p. 12), contains seven of these components: focusing on transforming people in both a personal and spiritual way; valuing the personal stories a person has; seeing God at work in all things;
accepting strong emotion prevalent in communities; introducing to social capital the constructs of self-emptying, forgiveness, transformation, risk-taking and openness to learning; accepting those who have been rejected elsewhere; valuing people's inner resources. It is these that help to energise religious capital and can spur community regeneration.

In relation to religious capital, Baker and Skinner (2005b) note eleven strands: aiding people to communicate emotion, creating means for residents to have a voice in local change; being counter-cultural enabling the continuance of justice; committing to education, providing the physical space to allow community engagement to occur, providing leadership for local projects, providing Christian norms, seeing people in church as a resource, committing to investment in local people, and using a language of theology flexibly to benefit the wider community. The combination of these two main areas of capital, Baker and Skinner (2005b) argue, allow churches really to begin engaging with the community in a way that is mutually beneficial.

Furby, Dinham, Furnell, Finneron, Wilkinson, Howarth, Hussain and Palmer (2006) explored the social capital of religious people and institutions through an undisclosed number of case studies throughout the United Kingdom. Their research suggested that faith communities contribute substantial amounts of social capital to the community. However, they note that often the ability to generate social capital was hampered by such things as financial restriction, inappropriate buildings, and the lack of the proper use of people's skills and talents.
Davies and Guest (2007) conducted quantitative surveys among 95 bishops, 66 bishops’ wives and 87 bishops’ children. In addition to this, 50 extended interviews were conducted with bishops and their children who completed the questionnaire survey and were happy to be interviewed. The book analyses how spiritual capital is formulated and passed down from generation to generation. For Davies and Guest, spiritual capital is based on Bourdieu’s (1977) notion of religious capital, that is what the church authorities deem as pathways to salvation, be it through religious language, belief, ritual or knowledge of doctrine. For Bourdieu those who are truly able to access religious capital are those who are able to master it and to practise it, that is the clergy.

Wortham and Wortham (2007) provided a literature review concerning spiritual capital and its perceived personal and societal benefits. They note that spiritual capital is a multidimensional construct that goes beyond traditional measures of affiliation and attendance to include spiritual experiences and subjective beliefs. They suggest that spiritual capital is correlated positively with a numbers of personal and pro-social measures indicating that higher spiritual capital can result in what they term ‘the good life’.

This section has explored the issue of spiritual capital. It has been demonstrated that spiritual capital tries to develop research that explores the intrinsic religious motivations of individuals’ social and personal networks.
Conclusion

This chapter has explored literature concerning the relationship between religion and social capital, and investigated the more recent constructs of religious capital and spiritual capital. Three main conclusions can be drawn out of this literature.

First, in relation to religious capital, it can be noted that two distinct forms of research are emerging. On the one hand, there is the research tradition that seeks to explore the relationship between the religious congregations and the community at large. This tradition has demonstrated the role of religious groups in promoting pro-social and volunteering behaviours, in developing societal links, and in developing programmes and schemes open to those outside the religious tradition. On the other hand, there are those studies that examine the development of individuals within the church congregation. This tradition has informed knowledge concerning the endorsement of forgiveness, the promotion of morals in young people and the opportunity for personal development of those in the pews. Both of these traditions have highlighted that religious capital has a positive effect on both the societal and personal domains.

Second, in relation to spiritual capital, three research agendas have emerged. First, there are those studies that seek to engage debate in the reciprocal relationship between a person and a transcendent being. This research tradition has informed debate through expanding the notion of capital from a purely horizontal societal construct, to a vertical societal-divine construct in which the perceived relationship with a divine or transcendent being can be taken seriously as a way of understanding fully an individual’s social network. Second, research has sought to investigate the societal workings of spiritual capital. This research tradition has highlighted the way
in which the construct can be understood as the working of religious capital. Through the lens of spiritual capital, variously defined, it has been demonstrated that religious communities can have a positive effect on society. Third, research has investigated the role of spiritual capital in giving identity and meaning to individuals. This research tradition, informed by debates surrounding cultural capital, has suggested that religious working, rituals and memberships provide people with a way of forming personal identity. All three research traditions have suggested that spiritual capital has positive effects in terms of the personal, social and transcendental domains.

The third conclusion concerns the definition of both constructs. As with social capital, no singular conceptualisation or operationalisation has yet been adopted to ensure that research into this field can properly inform debate. This has led to a lack of conceptual clarity when trying to distinguish between religious capital, religious social capital, spiritual capital, and the social capital of religious groups. As has been demonstrated above, the terms listed are often used interchangeably in research. Future research should conceptualise and operationalise these constructs appropriately so that a systematic series of research can be developed.

The next chapter moves on to highlight the difficulties in measuring social capital and introduces the research methods for this dissertation.
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Introduction

This chapter explores the methodology for the dissertation. Part one investigates the reason for studying cathedrals. Part two focuses on the methodological considerations concerning the measurement of social capital. Part three introduces the questionnaire. Part four describes the method of analysis used.

Part One: Why study cathedrals?

Within recent years the amount of scholarly interest about cathedrals has increased (cf. Williams, 1964; Mackenzie, 1996; Platten and Lewis, 1998, 2006, and Williams, 2006). This section seeks to outline briefly the main areas of cathedral research in order to demonstrate the continuing importance of understanding these institutions in contemporary society. The most significant work to arise out of this interest was *Heritage and Renewal* (1994) the report of the Archbishops’ Commission of Cathedrals. The Commission, and report, focused on the potential roles of cathedrals as “shop windows” of mission, education, music and tourism (p. 17). In addition to this, the report sought ways to develop the general and financial governing of cathedrals.

Integral to the work undertaken by the Archbishops’ Commission (1994) was the notion that cathedrals were both independent and autonomous. Although English cathedrals come under the general governance of the Church of England, it was argued that, in order for cathedrals to become centres of excellence, they must be granted the freedom to develop effective models of operation. What this meant, in general, was the development of secular, managerial-led, business-like modes of work. Indeed, as Danzinger (1989) and James (2006) have highlighted, in
interpreting the narratives of lay workers in the cathedral, the cathedral clergy are rarely mentioned by those involved in cathedral life. This restructuring of cathedrals saw a recommendation for the homogenisation of leadership by the re-designation of Provosts as Deans.

Following on from this investigation into the role of cathedrals, two distinct areas of research have developed. The first area deals with the economic and social impacts of cathedrals, the second area deals with the role of tourism.

In terms of the first area, concerning the social and economic impacts of cathedrals, the report *Economic and Social Impacts of Cathedrals in England* (English Heritage, 2004) utilised both economic and social analysis to assess what impact cathedrals were having on the local and national economy. In terms of monetary value, through an assessment of the flows of expenditure within individual cathedrals, it was suggested that cathedrals collectively contribute some £91 million to the local spend. In relation to the social impact of cathedrals, the report focused on the increasing number of congregational members, the increasing number of weekly services (at that time an estimated 20) and the number of people who provide unpaid voluntary work (at that time an estimated 12,000) and concluded that cathedrals have both an important economic and social role to play within society.

Williams (2006) conducted research to assess the role of Bangor cathedral within the local community. Based on theoretical extrapolations of published empirical data (for example Census returns), the research demonstrated that this cathedral would be able
to play a role in many aspects of community life, including education, volunteering, business and tourism.

The second area highlights the importance of tourism to cathedrals. A call for the professionalisation of cathedral tourism came in with Dean Bennett’s (1925; cf Bruce, 2000) vision of making cathedrals open to all who wished to enter them as pilgrims. By the late twentieth century this mindset was firmly established in the report by the English Tourist Board (1979) on cathedral tourism. This report made recommendations that cathedrals should improve their provision of tours, shops, and publicity to ensure that they make themselves realistic competitors to other tourist attractions.

Research by Gasson and Winter (1994) began to provide demographic data for visitors in Coventry, Ely, Lichfield and Wells cathedrals. The data demonstrated that visitors to these cathedrals were mainly from Europe (25%) and were generally visiting out of interest in the architecture (65%), but less than a quarter considered themselves to be pilgrims. There are, however, two serious limitations with this study. First, Gasson and Winter do not provide full information regarding the sample size on which the study is based, with this information only recorded for two of the four cathedrals. Second, the data were based on interview research conducted by participants in the Cathedral Camp scheme, a programme whereby teenagers are invited to participate in unpaid work in the cathedral. The response of those visiting the cathedral to be invited for interview by teenagers was not made explicit in the study.
Voase (2007) has demonstrated, through interview data with frequent visitors to cathedrals, that the visit to cathedrals was often not the main reason for being in the city, but rather acted as supplemental activity. Voase's (2007) research also demonstrated that frequent visitors to cathedrals were not welcoming of, what they termed, 'conscience pricking', that is being approached for donations, for entrance fees or for contributions to charitable organisations. The interviewees went on to state that they often left cathedrals feeling emotionally empty.

This research seeks to expand the current research into cathedrals in two main ways. First, it will provide an insight into the characteristics of members of congregations within cathedrals; so far much research has just focused on the highly lucrative visitors to cathedrals. However, through an examination of those who worship there a different picture of people within the cathedral may emerge.

Second, this research will also examine the extent to which social capital is generated from the worshippers. This will add to the knowledge of how social capital works within religious institutions by exploring a unique part of the Anglican Communion, namely cathedrals, and add to development of the academic field of religious social capital.

It is important, however, that the construct of social capital is operationalised for the purposes of this study. When used here, social capital will refer to the networks in which people are located and the resources that they have available to them. From this perspective an understanding is sought as to the ways in which congregation members benefit from being a member of the cathedral community beyond the liturgy.
and worship provided. For example, do people join the cathedral community to increase their contact with important people? Or are people worshipping the cathedral community because they feel that it is a homogenous group?

This section has highlighted previous research concerning cathedrals and proposed a new line of research with which this dissertation is interested. The next section goes on to explore the measurement of social capital that can be employed in the present study.

Part Two: Measurement of social capital

Although social capital theory has been well developed by scholars, it remains problematic in terms of conceptualisation and operationalisation for quantitative study. Indeed Durlauf (2002) goes as far as to claim that:

> The empirical social capital literature seems to be particularly plagued by vague definition of concepts, poorly measured data, absence of appropriate exchangeability conditions, and lack of information necessary to make identification claims plausible. (p. F474)

In an attempt to solve this problem scholars have set about defining distinct areas that are useful indicators of social capital. Two main groups emerge. The first advocates study of social capital as defined by voluntary participation at a macro-level with longitudinal data. For example, Putnam (2000) suggested that the best indicators for social capital can be gained from longitudinal trend data on philanthropy and voluntary organisation. Similarly, Keele (2005) advocated longitudinal measures of social capital as measured in civic participation and interpersonal trust.
Although a supporter of the longitudinal voluntary association approach advocated by both Putnam (2000, 2001) and Keele (2005), Paldam (2000) suggested that there are three main disadvantages with this approach. The first has to do with the understanding of voluntary organisation. Paldam argued that voluntary organisations fall somewhere along a continuum that includes both business groups and governmental organisations, and suggested that there are times when institutions within these final two extremes of the continuum will market themselves as voluntary organisations. When looking at voluntary participation, therefore, it is important to understand and operationalise correctly what is meant by the term. Second, Paldam argued that measures of voluntary participation on the macro-level cannot assess for the 'intensity of contact' (p. 674) a person has with an organisation. Macro-level studies often ask organisations to provide details of their membership lists that may inflate figures. However, micro-level studies, which are then analysed on a macro-level, often ask people to self-determine their membership intensity, although 'many people do not remember they are members' if the organisation does not demand high levels of input (p. 647). Third, Paldam (2000) argued that there can be a 'benignness-weight' issue. In this he is referring to the existence of voluntary groups who are violent, criminal or racist (one may think of the British Nationalist Party as such an example) which will have a negative weight on an area's social capital. Macro-level analysis of voluntary participation may not necessarily highlight which groups fall into such a category.

The second group of studies advocates social capital as a micro- and meso-level phenomenon that can be understood through questioning people about various aspects of their lives and dealings. This second group, however, can be further split into two
groups. On the one hand, there are those scholars who advocate qualitative research methods. On the other hand, there are those scholars who advocate quantitative research methods. It should be noted, however, that many social capital scholars now advocate a combination of both research methods; indeed as De Silva, Harpham, Tuan, Bartolini, Penny and Huttley (2006) have demonstrated a combination of both research techniques can allow one to assess both the psychometric and cognitive validation of measurement tools. However, as Dudwick, Kuehnast, Jones and Woolcock (2006) noted, the expertise, expense and time needed to utilise both research methods effectively can often mean that it is beyond the scope of an individual researcher (p. 2).

In terms of the positive aspects of qualitative data Dudwick, Kuehnast, Jones and Woolcock (2006) highlighted the way in which such data can make best use of experiential knowledge of the respondent so that data interpretation is (potentially) less researcher-driven than quantitative research methods. Indeed, they argue that research based on focus groups can help to develop a more nuanced understanding of the causality, process, and context of social capital (p. 4). Further to this, Svendsen (2006) argued that it is only through qualitative research methods that the more negative aspects of social capital can be highlighted because such aspects fall outside of the researchers’ understanding of the social context in which the respondents’ are located.

Dudwick, Kuehaust, Jones and Woolcock (2006) noted, however, that qualitative research methods have a number of drawbacks. First, the samples tend to be small and thus make extrapolations of findings to the wider community harder. Second,
because of the way in which participants are chosen for interviews (for example through the snowballing technique), it can be difficult to replicate the study. Third, they noted that the interpretation of qualitative data can be highly subjective.

These difficulties in qualitative research have led some scholars to argue that a more quantitative approach should be taken. A number of scholars have begun to develop measures of social capital to be used within quantitative research. For example, Krishna and Shrader (1999) developed the Social Capital Assessment Tool (SCAT) which examines social capital on both a qualitative and quantitative, micro- and macro-level axis along three domains of community, household and organisation.

Recently, SCAT has been developed by Harpham, Grant and Thomas (2002) as an 18-item scale (SCAT-A) for use in health surveys. The scale measures social capital in terms of structural social capital (for example, participation in organisations) and cognitive social capital (for example, harmony, sense of belonging, social support). The authors of SCAT-A claim that the scale has good face-validity and construct validity but they have not yet tested for construct validity (p. 110).

Grootaert, Narayan, Jones and Woolcock (2004), working on an integrated questionnaire for the World Bank, believe that six dimensions should be included in any quantitative study of social capital. These are: groups and networks, trust and solidarity, collective action and co-operation, information and communication, social cohesion and inclusion, and empowerment and political action. This tool is designed for use in larger household surveys in developing countries.
Working within the context of the United Kingdom, Babb (2005) suggested that there are five main areas for inclusion in any quantitative study of social capital. These are civic participation, social networks and support, social participation, reciprocity and trust, and views about the area. This is part of the Office of National Statistics' plan to achieve a harmonised set of questions that can readily be used within household surveys throughout the country. This process was started by the call of Harper and Kelly (2003) for a more consistent approach for the conceptualisation and measurement of social capital and has resulted in the Social Capital Question Bank (Ruston and Akinrodove, 2002), an extensive list of questions concerning social capital that have appeared in 15 major government and non-government surveys.

In the same tradition of quantitative micro-level research, Harper (2001) argued that to understand social capital fully one must first understand how people interpret norms. To this end, he proposed that an attitudinal set of items should be developed that asks 'people about their sense of identity, sense of belonging, belief systems and ideologies' (p. 17). Further, Harper suggested that demographic data such as age and sex, should be placed alongside information about participation in social networks (from the formal to the informal, cf. Spellerberg, 2001) to allow for a three model understanding of social capital.

Factor analytical modelling has been employed by van Oorschot, Arts and Gelissen (2006) to assess the dimensionality of social capital using data from 23,021 respondents in the European Values Survey. The second-order factor analysis revealed that three dimensions mapped onto the theory of social capital: namely networks (p< .01), trust (p< .01) and civicism (p< .01).
Kouvonen, Kivimäki, Vahtera, Oksanen, Elovaainio, Cox, Virtanen, Pentti, Cox and Wilkinson (2006) developed a short measure of social capital for use in the work environment. The 8-item scale was used on data derived from the Finnish Public Sector Survey on a total sample of 48,952. The data demonstrated that the scale had acceptable internal reliability consistency (alpha = 0.88). The results also demonstrated that the scale was associated with similar constructs of procedural justice and job control.

Such quantitative approaches to social capital are now becoming numerous within the literature. As has been highlighted in chapter two, numerous studies have now utilised questionnaire surveys to assess the level of social capital within church communities. However, since the vast majority of these have been focused and shaped within American culture, it was therefore necessary to develop a set of items that could be used not only within a British context, but also within a cathedral context.

At this point, however, it is important to note the difficulties in using quantitative measures within social capital research. The first weakness concerns what can in fact be measured by questionnaire surveys. Even within attitudinal questions one will only be able to assess certain areas of information at a level of detail presented within the questionnaire. Such survey materials do not allow for the researcher to ask 'why?' or to probe an issue at greater depth. As Dudwick, Kuehnast, Jones and Woolcock (2006) have noted, this lack of ability to interact with the respondent can mean that the researcher may not be able to discover wholly new pieces of information, as the questions asked have been pre-defined and therefore are not able
to expose new areas of research. A second weakness is that the need for large samples to achieve meaningful results can also be problematic when dealing with social capital. Often researchers in this field are interested in how social capital is working in small communities, where the numbers are not available to achieve large sample sizes, or in developing areas where it can be expensive to administer and code questionnaires.

However, quantitative methods have many advantages in the study of social capital. For example, Durlauf (2002) argued that quantitative data has greater controls for the idiosyncrasies of people's networks, thus ensuring that an 'individuals heterogeneity' (p. F476) does not skew results. Second, Durlauf argued that attitudinal surveys of social capital extend knowledge beyond the more basic descriptive studies of people such as Putnam (2000). Such an approach acknowledges the importance of differential psychology in understanding people's motivations, behaviours and opinions (Chamorro-Premuzic, 2007). Third, Durlauf suggested that the level of detail that can be achieved within a quantitative survey can help to characterise the formation of social capital.

**Part Three: The questionnaire**

A total of 432 respondents in five cathedrals in England and Wales completed the 'Cathedral and You' questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed at the beginning of services by the Cathedral attendants, along with the Order of Service. A member of the clergy introduced the topic of the questionnaire during the sermon and invited the respondents to complete it during the service. Participants had the option not to complete the questionnaire or to opt out of analysis; none chose explicitly to
The questionnaire is divided into three main parts. Part One explores the demographic details of the respondents. This part comprises six sections. Section one deals with the respondents’ sex and age. Section two explores the respondents’ relationship to the cathedral. The first question in this section explores whether the respondent is a regular member of the cathedral or is here as a visitor, on holiday or on business. The second question in this section then explores the distance the respondent has travelled to attend the service, with responses ranging from less than one mile to ten miles or more. Section three deals with the respondents’ private religiosity. The first question in this section asks respondents to rate their frequency of attendance at public acts of worship, with responses ranging from ‘never’, through ‘at least once a year’, ‘at least six times a year’, ‘at least once a month’, ‘nearly every week’, to ‘nearly every day’. The second question in this section asks respondents to assess their frequency of private prayer, with responses ranging from ‘never’, through ‘occasionally’, ‘sometimes’, ‘at least once a week’, to ‘nearly every day’.

The fourth section of part one deals with the respondents’ employment. The first question in this section asks if the respondent currently has a job, with responses ranging from ‘no’, through ‘retired’, ‘housewife/househusband/carer’, ‘yes, part-time’, to ‘yes, full-time’. The second question in this section asked respondents to complete what their current, or previous, occupation was. The responses were then coded to the groups of ‘unskilled manual’, ‘semi-skilled manual’, ‘skilled manual’, ‘non-manual’, ‘semi-professional’ and ‘professional’ using the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys (1980) classification definition schema. This version of social class assessment has been used so that cross-referencing can be made more easily.
with earlier work using similar trends (cf. Francis, 2001, p. 131). The fifth section deals with respondents’ level of voluntary participation in both church and non-church contexts. The sixth question in this section deals with respondents own reasons for worshipping in the cathedral by asking them to rate on a five-point Likert-type scale the importance of eighteen factors in choice of cathedral.

Part two of the questionnaire deals with the respondents’ attitudes towards social capital. This part comprises seven sections. The first section deals with the respondents’ ideas concerning the social capital of being a member of the cathedral congregation. The second section deals with outward reciprocity within the cathedral. The third section deals with inward reciprocity within the neighbourhood. Section four asks respondents to rate how welcoming the cathedral is to different social groups. Section five ask the respondents to rate their general happiness on seven different domains. Section six explores the instrumental help the respondents provide to others on a weekly basis. Finally, section seven explores the respondents’ religious orientation by means of the New Indices of Religious Orientation (Francis, 2007; Williams, 2007).

Part three of the questionnaire is for completion by regular members of the cathedral congregation. The first section of this part explores inward reciprocity in the cathedral, that is others turning to the respondent. The second section explores the issues of experiencing and building community within the cathedral.
Part Four: The sample

As stated above, a total of 432 individuals completed the ‘Cathedral and You’ questionnaire, but for clarity of interpretation, only those respondents who stated that they were regular members of the cathedral were included in the analysis. This, therefore, left an overall effective sample of 361 individuals. Just under half of the respondents (46%) were regular members of Exeter Cathedral, 28% were from Chester Cathedral, 13% from Bangor Cathedral, 8% from St Davids Cathedral and 6% from St Asaph Cathedral.

Just under two-thirds (63%) of the reduced sample respondents were female, while males comprised 38% of the total sample. In respect of age, 7% were aged under 20; 6% aged 20-29-years; 5% aged 30-39-years; 7% aged 40-49-years; 17% aged 50-59-years; 24% aged 60-69-years; and 34% aged 70-years or over. As can be seen, the age demographics are skewed towards the older generation, reflecting a trend within the Church of England for the congregations to be ageing (Francis, Robbins and Astley, 2005).

In relation to religiosity, respondents in the reduced sample were asked to indicate their frequency of private religious practice. In relation to private religious practice, 2% stated that they never prayed, 11% stated that they occasionally prayed, 12% stated that they sometimes prayed, 11% stated that they prayed at least once a week and 64% stated that they prayed nearly every day.

When asked to record the distance they had travelled to attend that service at the cathedral, 25% stated they had travelled less than 1 mile, 29% stated they had
travelled 1 to 2 miles, 12% had travelled 3 to 4 miles, 9% had travelled 5 to 9 miles, and 26% had travelled 10 miles or more.

Reflecting the statistics regarding the respondents' age, 37% of the reduced sample stated that they were retired, 27% stated that they were in a full-time job, 12% stated that they were in a part-time job, 6% stated that they were a house-wife, house-husband or a carer, while 19% stated that they had no job.

When asked to indicate their current or last occupation, 10% of the reduced sample stated that they were employed in unskilled manual jobs, 1% were employed in semi-skilled manual jobs, 5% in skilled manual jobs, 15% in non-manual jobs, 25% in semi-professional jobs and a further 25% in professional jobs. Just under a fifth (19%) of the sample declined to answer this question.

In relation to voluntary participation, 74% of the reduced sample participated in some form of secular or church-based activity, while 26% of the sample stated that they did not. Overall 20% had some voluntary contact with children, 11% with teenagers, 4% with young parents, 2% with the elderly, 12% with the sick and 10% with the disabled. In relation to more community-based activities, 7% provided voluntary work for lunch clubs, 7% for charity shops, 27% for fund-raising activities, 13% for advisory groups, 10% for self-help groups, 14% for community regeneration, 27% for cultural activities and 21% for educational activities. A further 47% provided some other form of voluntary work.
Part Five: Data analysis

To establish and contextualise the individual difference associated with social capital within the cathedral congregation, the data are divided to test for the relationship between social capital and demographic data such as sex, age, proximity to the cathedral, levels of personal prayer, social class and voluntary participation. Such comparisons, focused on in individual chapters, will provide a socio-psychological understanding of social capital that has not yet been developed within the literature. The data were entered and analysed on SPSS for Windows Version 14 using the chi-squared cross tabulation routines (Field, 2005). The data were divided into two groups.

Age

Those who checked that they were aged under 20, 20- to 29-years, 30- to 39-years and 40- to 49-years were collapsed into one group called the younger cohort (N = 87). Those who checked that they were aged 70 years or over are referred to as the older cohort (N = 121). Those who checked that they were aged 50- to 59-years and 60- to 69-years were not included in the final analysis; this is in the tradition of Francis, Robbins and Astley (2005) who noted that the Anglican Church is often made up of a ‘peculiar’ array of age groups (p. 82). Omitting the two middle groups allows for comparison to be made between two very different demographic groups.

Proximity

In order to understand fully how distance from place of worship impacts on levels of social capital among the sample a question on proximity to the cathedral was included. In terms of the analysis, those respondents who checked that they had
travelled to the cathedral ‘less than 1 mile’, ‘1-2 miles’, and ‘3-4 miles’ were grouped together (N = 189), and compared to those who had travelled ‘10 miles or more’ (N = 75). Those who had travelled ‘5-9 miles’ were omitted from the comparison.

**Prayer**

In order to assess the impact of prayer on levels of social capital among the sample, the frequency of personal prayer will be included in the analysis. Those respondents who checked that they ‘never’, ‘occasionally’ or ‘sometimes’ prayed were grouped together as ‘low frequency of prayer’ (N = 88). Those who checked they prayed nearly every day were classed as ‘high frequency of prayer’ (N = 219). Those who stated that they prayed at least once a week were omitted from this analysis.

**Professional Status**

In order to assess the impact of professional status on levels of social capital among the sample, the self-assessed status of the respondents is included in the analysis. Those respondents who checked that their current or previous job was ‘unskilled manual’, ‘semi-skilled manual’, ‘skilled manual’ and ‘non-manual’ where grouped together as ‘non-professional’ (N = 105). Those who checked that their current or previous jobs were ‘semi-professional’ or ‘professional’ were grouped together as ‘professional’ (N = 176).

**Volunteering**

As has been demonstrated in the previous two chapters many scholars link social capital with voluntary associational membership. In order to assess the impact of volunteering on the levels of social capital among the sample, a question on
volunteering was included. Those respondents who checked that they had some involvement, either secular- or church-related, were grouped together as ‘Yes’ (N = 267). Those who checked that they had no involvement in voluntary organisations were grouped together as ‘No’ (N = 92).

Conclusion

This chapter dealt with the methodological concerns in relation to the study of social capital. It has been demonstrated that cathedrals hold a unique position within contemporary society, straddling the divide between places of heritage and places of spirituality. Previous research has sought, primarily, to understand one group of people within the cathedral: the visitors. This dissertation furthers this exploration to include those who choose to visit the cathedral regularly as worshippers and members of the cathedral congregation. The question posed is how much are these self-selecting people (for they may travel passed several parish churches to attend the cathedral) alike, and how much do they differ? The theoretical filter through which this question is explored is that of social capital. Chapter one of this dissertation has explored the general development of this construct. Chapter two has explored the more specific area of spiritual and religious capital. This chapter has highlighted the methodological issues surrounding measuring social capital through quantitative routines. Following the argument of Durlauf (2002) an attitudinal questionnaire has been developed, following the tradition of Francis and Kay (1995), Francis (2001) and Francis, Robbins and Astley (2005) an individual differences approach is taken to understand fully on the micro-level the differences and similarities between members of the cathedral congregation. To fully explore this, cross-tabulations will be
employed using the chi-square routine. In line with this, the independent variables have been dichotomised for use in a 2X2 grid.

The next chapter goes on to explore the general statistics on the dependent variables, before the statistics are explored in greater detail.
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Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the responses of the respondents to the 'Cathedral and You' questionnaire. The chapter will explore and explain the major themes presented in the questionnaire, identify the individual items within each theme and explain their relevance, and display and discuss the responses of the cathedral congregation (taken as a whole) to the major themes. The chapter will be split into two main parts. Part One will deal with the theme of respondents' motivation for worshipping within the cathedral. Part Two will deal with the theme of respondents' attitudes towards, and experiences of, social capital, both within the cathedral and within the neighbourhood. Throughout the chapter, literature will be introduced to contextualise the research questions.

Part One: Reasons for worshipping in the cathedral

As part of the larger questionnaire respondents were asked, on a five-point Likert-type scale, to assess the reasons contributing to their decision to worship in the cathedral. It has been noted, through discussions with members of cathedral and through the Archbishops' Commission on Cathedrals (1994), that often those who worship in a cathedral choose to do so for many different reasons that can be categorised as follows: atmosphere, music, the style and content of worship, and the social status accrued through attendance at a cathedral. Table 4.1 presents the results, examining these four categories of reason in turn.

The first domain of reasons for choosing to worship within a cathedral concerns the atmosphere. As Arnold (1996) noted, cathedrals are places in which members of the public are able to experience feelings and emotions that may not be as well expressed
in the secular world. The data suggest that this emotional experience is important for many people to choose to worship in the cathedral. The point is made by their responses to questions concerning four areas: a friendly atmosphere, a spiritual atmosphere, a contemplative atmosphere, and a feeling of peace. Just under three-quarters (74%) of the respondents stated that peace was an important factor and a similar proportion (73%) agreed that the spiritual atmosphere was an important factor in worshipping in the cathedral. In relation to the contemplative atmosphere of the cathedral, 69% stated that this was an important factor in their choice of the cathedral. Over three-fifths (66%) of the respondents stated that the friendly atmosphere was an important factor in worshipping in the cathedral.

The reverse perspective confirms the findings that the atmosphere is an important reason for choosing to worship within a cathedral. Only a little over a fifth (22%) disagreed that a friendly atmosphere was an important reason for choosing to worship in a cathedral. Only around a fifth disagreed that the spiritual atmosphere was an important factor (21%), disagreed that the contemplative atmosphere was an important factor (21%), and that the feeling of peace was important in their choice to worship in the cathedral (21%).

The second domain of reasons for choosing to worship in the cathedral concerns the role of music. As Shearlock (1996) noted, cathedrals are able to provide a traditional Christian-based music that may be lacking in other Christian institutions. The survey demonstrates the importance of both music and the choir in choosing to worship in the cathedral, reflected in the responses of the sample. Nearly three-quarters (74%) stated that music was an important factor in their choosing to worship in the cathedral.
Similarly, 72% stated that the choir were an important factor in their decision-making. Exploring the reverse perspective on this domain highlights the importance of these two items in choosing to worship in a cathedral. Only a fifth disagreed that the music was an important factor (20%), and disagreed that the choir was important in their choice to worship in the cathedral (20%).

The third domain of reasons for choosing to worship in the cathedral relates to the style and content of worship. As the Archbishops’ Commission on Cathedrals (1994) noted, it is often through the televising of cathedral services that those who do not currently attend church are introduced to the format and style of worship within the Church of England, and are, therefore, potentially attracted to join local churches or cathedrals. Conversely, Stancliffe (1998) argued that for outsiders, cathedral worship can seem alien and impenetrable, while for those who are familiar with ways of ‘doing’ church, it provides a familiar, if not traditional, formulation of religious worship. While the respondents displayed similar opinions regarding the importance of the atmosphere of the cathedral, and the music, a more complex picture emerges regarding the domain of worship. Although 67% stated that preaching was an important factor and 63% stated that style of worship was an important factor in their choosing to worship in the cathedral, fewer respondents were convinced about the importance of rituals and liturgy. Thus, just over half (51%) of the respondents stated that the ritual of services was an important factor in choosing to worship in the cathedral and only 38% of respondents stated that the liturgy was an important factor.

Exploring the reverse perspective on this domain confirms the complex picture. Nearly half (47%) did not believe the liturgy to be an important factor in their
choosing the cathedral, while a little under a third (31%) did not view the ritual of the services as important. Conversely, a little over a fifth disagreed that the style of worship (25%) and preaching (22%) were important factors in choosing the cathedral.

The fourth domain of reasons for choosing to worship within the cathedral concerns community. The Archbishops' Commission on Cathedrals (1994) stated that there are five main communities found within the cathedral (p. 12). Anderson (1998) acknowledges that part of the interest of the community of worshippers is the connection to history and the importance of the building itself that can act as an important factor in drawing people into the cathedral. Cathedrals, as buildings, act as places to which civic dignitaries, social groups and others are drawn to worship. For the purposes of this dissertation it is the second listed community that is of most importance: ‘the gathered congregations, the regular worshippers – those whose loyalty and support link the cathedral with the local community’. The survey demonstrated that while respondents were convinced about the importance of the atmosphere and music in choosing to worship within the cathedral, they were less convinced regarding the importance of community. The data demonstrated that 53% of the sample stated that a connection with history was an important factor but that the other items were not considered as important. Thus, four-tenths (40%) agreed with the statement that friendship was an important factor in choosing to worship in the cathedral. Similarly, slightly over a third (36%) stated that the opportunity to worship in a grand building was an important factor. Just one-fifth (20%) agreed that the social status of worshipping within the cathedral was an important factor. Finally, slightly over a tenth (13%) agreed that connecting with important people was an important factor.
Exploring the reverse perspective confirms the importance of the connection with history and the opportunity for friendships. The responses of the respondents demonstrated that 72% stated that the opportunity to connect with important people was not an important factor while 68% disagreed that the social status of worshipping in cathedral was an important factor. By way of contrast, only around four-tenths (39%) of the sample stated that friendship was not an important factor in choosing the cathedral, while only around a third (34%) disagreed that the opportunity to connect with history was an important factor.

Contrary to popular opinion (recorded by Lewis 1998), it would seem that anonymity and distance from parish activities is not an important factor when choosing to worship within the cathedral. Just a fifth (16%) stated that being anonymous to other worshippers was an important factor. Around one-tenth agreed that not having to take part in parish activities was an important factor (11%), and that being anonymous to the clergy was an important factor in their choice (10%).

Exploring the reverse perspective confirms the findings that anonymity is not widely held as an important factor in choosing to worship in the cathedral. Around two-thirds (67%) of the sample disagreed that being anonymous to the clergy was important while 66% disagreed that not having to take part in parish activities influenced their decision. Finally, 62% disagreed that being anonymous to other worshippers was important.

By way of summary, the data provide a profile of cathedral worshippers who are attracted to the cathedral for the feeling of peace it provides, and for the music
provided. Contrary to anecdotal evidence, those who choose to worship in the cathedral do not wish to be anonymous to either their fellow worshippers or to the clergy, neither are they shunning activities that are located within parishes, although respondents are less likely to attest to the importance of community in their motivation to worship within the cathedral.

Part Two: Social capital

This section will now introduce the general statistics relating to social capital among regular members of the cathedral congregation. The data are divided into the areas of social capital in the cathedral, reciprocity in the cathedral, reciprocity in the neighbourhood, experiencing community and building community.

Social capital in the cathedral

Table 4.1 presents statistics concerned with the perceived social capital of being within the cathedral congregation. The statistics are divided into the areas of trust, personal positive impact and perceived benefit.

As noted in Chapter One, trust is often regarded as one of the founding principles of social capital (Fukuyama, 1995); the first domain of social capital in the cathedral taps into this construct. As Morisy (2004) noted it is through inter-personal relationships that are based on trust that a group can go forward in God’s mission. The survey divided trust into three categories, trust in God, trust in oneself and trust in others. The data demonstrated it was trust in God that was most likely to be built up through membership of the cathedral congregation, with trust in others and trust in self being slightly less well endorsed. The results are reflected in the responses given. Nearly
seven-tenths (69%) of the sample stated that being in the cathedral congregation had been built up their sense of trust in God. Further, three-fifths (60%) stated that their sense of trust in others had been built up through involvement in the cathedral, and just over half (55%) stated that their sense of trust in themselves had been built up through membership in the cathedral.

However, while the majority of respondents are certain that their sense of trust in the three different areas had been built up through their involvement in the cathedral, a large proportion remain uncertain on the issue. Nearly three-tenths (29%) were unsure if their sense of trust in themselves had been built up, while just under a quarter (24%) were unsure if their sense of trust in others had been developed, and a fifth (20%) were unsure if their sense of trust in God had been developed.

The second domain relates to the positive impact being a member of the cathedral congregation has on a person's life. In line with wider social capital theory, those who are highly involved in a community will experience some form of positive impact upon their lives (Putnam, 2000, p.20). The survey asked participants to assess the benefits of being a member of the cathedral congregation in terms of their spiritual life, their personal life and their social life. The responses suggest that respondents had mixed opinions regarding the positive impacts of the cathedral on their lives. While 84% stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation was good for their spiritual life and 62% stated that it was good for their personal life, only 44% stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation was good for their social life.
Exploring the reverse perspective confirms the positive impact upon the respondents' spiritual and personal lives, and the lesser impact upon their social lives. Slightly under a third (29%) disagreed that being a member of the cathedral had a positive impact on their social lives, while only around a fifth (18%) disagreed that the cathedral was good for their personal lives. Finally, only 5% disagreed that the cathedral had a positive impact on their spiritual lives.

Smidt (2003b) argued that religious social capital will provide religious participants with more benefits than can be gained from instrumental ties and weaker connections. The survey asked respondents to assess the benefits they perceived they had gained from being a member of the cathedral community. While respondents were certain that the cathedral had a positive impact on their levels of trust, and on their spiritual and personal lives, fewer respondents were certain of the benefits of being a member of the cathedral congregation. Although three-fifths of the sample stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation had helped them to meet people (58%), and had helped them to mix with those with whom they would not normally mix (58%), 51% stated that it had helped them to make a contribution to community life and 47% stated that it had helped them to make friends. Only slightly over a third (36%) stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation had helped them to establish their place in the community, and only 20% stated that it had helped them to get on in their work.

Exploring the reverse perspective confirms this dual finding. Over half (55%) disagreed that being in the cathedral congregation had helped them to get on in their work, while 40% disagreed that it had helped them to establish their place in the
Less respondents disagreed that being a member of the cathedral congregation had helped them to make friends (27%), to make a contribution to community life (26%), to mix with those with whom they would not normally mix (24%) and to meet people (20%).

Exploring the uncertain category reveals that on all but one item, that of mixing with those with whom the respondent would not normally mix (17%), around one in four of the respondents had not yet made up their minds on the benefits of cathedral memberships. Around a quarter of the respondents were unsure if being a member of the cathedral congregation had helped them to make friends (26%), to get on in their work (24%), to establish their place in the community (24%), to make a contribution to community life (23%) and to meet new people (22%).

By way of summary, the data provide a profile of members of the cathedral congregation who are able to build up their sense of trust in God, themselves, and others through membership of the cathedral congregation. Further, members of the cathedral congregation are able to state that being a member of the cathedral has been beneficial for their spiritual and personal lives. However, it has been demonstrated that being a member of the cathedral congregation has not helped respondents to get on in their work or to establish their place in the community.

Reciprocity in the cathedral

This section will explore the outwards and inwards reciprocity in the cathedral, that is the respondents turning to others in the cathedral, and others in the cathedral turning to the respondents respectively. Reciprocity is another foundational aspect of the
construct of social capital. As Putnam (2000, p. 134) noted, it is generalised reciprocity that is important with social capital formation. Within the cathedral it is important to assess both the ways in which the respondents help others, and the way in which the respondents are helped by others. As Ammerman (2001) noted, it is within the religious community that people are most able to access effective reciprocal relationships. Table 4.2 presents the statistics, examining each item in turn.

In relation to the first domain of personal help, the respondents display greater endorsement of one item. Thus, 74% agreed that there were people in the cathedral to whom they could turn for spiritual help, compared with 52% who stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn for emotional help.

Exploring the reverse perspective confirms this finding. Only 14% disagreed that there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn for spiritual help, while 26% disagreed that there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn for emotional help. Regarding this last item within the uncertain category, over one-fifth (22%) of the respondents stated that they were unsure if there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn.

On the second domain of practical help, a slightly different pattern emerges. While a large proportion of respondents were certain for outwards reciprocity on the personal domain, fewer respondents are as convinced of such reciprocity on the practical domain. Thus, just under a three-tenths (28%) stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn for practical help, while less than a tenth (6%) stated that there were others to whom they could turn for financial help.
Exploring the reverse perspective confirms the lack of certainty regarding outwards practical reciprocity. Thus, large proportions of the sample disagree that there are people in the cathedral to whom they could turn for financial help (71%) and for practical help (44%).

Regarding the third domain of instrumental help a mixed picture emerges. While a larger proportion of respondents were convinced of the levels of outward instrumental reciprocity than outward practical reciprocity, fewer respondents endorsed this domain than the domain of outward personal reciprocity. While large proportions stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn with problems with their faith (55%), with problems with family relations (50%) and with a physical illness (49%) fewer respondents stated that there were people to whom they could turn for help on the remaining items. Thus, just under four-tenths (39%) stated that there were others to whom they could turn with a psychological problem, while just under a third (31%) stated that there were others to whom they could turn to borrow something urgently. Only around a quarter stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn for help with an elderly relative (26%) and for help with transport (26%), while just one-fifth had others in the cathedral to whom they could turn with work problems (20%).

Exploring the reverse perspective confirms the above findings. While around half disagreed that there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn for help with an elderly relative (49%), for help with work problems (49%), for help with transport (48%) and to borrow something urgently (46%), fewer respondents disagreed with the remaining statements. Thus, only three-tenths disagreed that there
were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn with a psychological problem (34%), with a physical illness (29%), with problems with family relations (29%) and with problems with their faith (26%).

Table 4.4 presents the statistics relating to inward reciprocity, that is, others in the cathedral turning to the respondent for help. This section will explore the three reciprocity domains of personal help, practical help, and instrumental help.

In relation to the domain of inward personal reciprocity fewer respondents stated that others had turned to them for personal help, than they had stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they would turn. Thus, 38% of respondents stated that others in the cathedral had turned to them for emotional help, while only 26% stated that others had turned to them for spiritual help.

Exploring the uncertain category on this domain reveals that large proportions of the sample remain uncertain as to the place of inward personal reciprocity in the cathedral. Over three-tenths (31%) stated they were unsure if others had turned to them for spiritual help, while over a quarter (26%) stated they were unsure if others had turned to them for emotional help.

Larger proportions of the sample stated that they had experienced inward practical reciprocity than they had experience outward practical reciprocity, although in both cases it was practical help, rather than financial help, that was endorsed the most. Exactly three-tenths (30%) of the sample stated that others in the cathedral had turned
to them for practical help, while only 14% stated others had turned to them for financial help.

The reverse perspective confirms the pattern for inward practical reciprocity. Nearly three-fifths (58%) of the sample disagreed that others in the cathedral had turned to them for financial help, while 41% disagreed that others in the cathedral had turned to them for practical help.

The third domain concerns inward instrumental reciprocity. The responses within this domain demonstrate that the respondents were not convinced of the presence of such reciprocity on all the issues raised. Only slightly over three-tenths (31%) agreed that others in the cathedral had turned to them for help with transport, while slightly over a quarter stated that others had turned to them with a physical illness (27%), to borrow something urgently (26%) and with problems with their work (26%). Even fewer respondents, only around one-fifth, stated that others in the cathedral had turned to the respondent with problems with family relations (23%), for help with an elderly relative (22%), with a psychological problem (21%) and with problems with their faith (17%).

The reverse perspective on the issue of inward instrumental help continues to demonstrate the ambiguity respondents had towards this domain. While around half of the respondents disagreed that others in the cathedral had turned to them for help with an elderly relative (49%), with problems with their work (45%) and with problems with family relations (45%), fewer respondents disagreed with the remaining statements. Just around four-tenths disagreed that others in the cathedral
had turned to them with a physical illness (43%), to borrow something urgently (42%) and for help with transport (39%). Further, just around a quarter disagreed that others had turned to them with a problem concerning their faith (28%) and with a psychological problem (26%).

On two of the items with this domain, the sample was undecided about the presence of inward instrumental reciprocity. Over three-tenths of the respondents were unsure if others in the cathedral had turned to them with a problem with their faith (35%) and with a psychological problem (34%).

By way of summary, the data provide a profile of cathedral members who generally display high levels of outward reciprocity within the cathedral, but record slightly lower levels of inward reciprocity, except on four items – those relating to practical help, financial help, help with transport and problems with work.

Reciprocity in the neighbourhood

Table 4.5 presents statistics relating to neighbourhood reciprocity. It would be expected that social capital would present itself as both a personal good (for the individual and the immediate community, in this case the cathedral congregation) and as a public good (for the wider community). As Smidt (2003c) noted, under the correct conditions, social capital flowing from religious organisations can have a positive impact upon the society around them. As Ammerman (2001) contended, the religious social capital obtained within the church is easily transferable to civic capital to be used in the wider community.
In relation to the first domain of personal help, higher proportions of the respondents were convinced of the presence of inward reciprocity on both items. Thus 57% stated that others in the neighbourhood had turned to the respondents for emotional help and 38% agreed that others in the neighbourhood had turned to the respondents for spiritual help.

Exploring the reverse perspective confirms these patterns, with 34% of the sample disagreeing that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them for spiritual help, and 22% disagreeing that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them for emotional help. Regarding the final item, a similar proportion of the respondents (21%) remained unsure if others in the neighbourhood had turned to them for emotional help.

In relation to the second domain of inward practical reciprocity, a similar pattern emerges in the neighbourhood as in the cathedral. Over half (52%) of the respondents agreed that others in the neighbourhood had turned to them for practical help while 21% agreed that others in the neighbourhood had turned to them for financial help.

In relation to the third domain of inward instrumental reciprocity, higher proportions of respondents endorsed the items when compared with the same domain in the cathedral. Nearly three-fifths of the sample stated that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them for help with transport (59%). Further, around half stated that others in the neighbourhood had turned to them to borrow something urgently (53%), for help with an elderly relative (47%), with a physical illness (47%) and with
problems with their work (44%). Fewer respondents, however, stated that others in
the cathedral had turned to them with problems with family relations (38%), with
psychological problems (37%) and with problems with their faith (32%).

Through exploring the uncertain category of the instrumental domain, it can be seen
that on five of the eight items, larger proportions of respondents are unsure about
items than disagree totally. Thus, slightly over a third of respondents are uncertain if
others in their neighbourhood have turned to them with a problem with their faith
(36%), with a psychological problem (36%) and with a problem with their family
relations (34%). Further, slightly under a third of the respondents were uncertain is
others had turned to them with a physical illness (29%) and to borrow something
urgently (27%).

By way of summary, the data provide a profile of regular members of the cathedral
congregation who experience inward reciprocity in both the cathedral and, to a greater
extent, within the neighbourhood. This would seem to suggest, that in line with the
argument of Smidt (2003c), the experience of social capital felt by those within the
religious community is transferable between the secular and sacred domains of
society.

Experiencing community

Perhaps one of the most overlooked aspects of social capital is the way in which it is
felt by those who are involved in it. Cathedrals claim to be places in which people are
able to find place and identity, they are places in which a 'mask of inclusion' is
adopted (James, 2006), and congregations are places in which communities can bond
and unite (Ammerman, 1997). The domain of experiencing community taps into bonding social capital. It is therefore important to understand how people best feel about the community to which they belong before it can be understood how best to use the social capital present to build that community.

Table 4.6 presents statistics relating to the domain of experiencing community. The responses of the sample demonstrate that there are clear differences among the cathedral congregation regarding their attitudes towards, and experiences of, community within the cathedral. In relation to the sense of community within the cathedral, around three-fifths (58%) of the sample stated that they felt a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral. Exploring further this sense of belonging felt by members of the cathedral congregation reveals that nearly half of the respondents felt close to others in the cathedral (46%), close to the cathedral clergy (44%) and felt that they were really part of the cathedral community (43%). Conversely to this strong sense of belonging within the cathedral, around a quarter of respondents stated that a lot of their close friends go to the cathedral (27%) and that they feel rather lonely in the cathedral (23%). While a large proportion of the respondents record high levels of solidarity within the cathedral, this is not a community closed off from outsiders with 74% stating that it is good to see new faces in the cathedral and only 24% stating that too many visitors spoil their sense of community.

Exploring the reverse perspective confirms the pattern of experiencing community in the cathedral. Just over a tenth (13%) disagreed that they felt a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral, with around a quarter of respondents disagreeing that they felt close to others in the cathedral (26%), that they felt they are really part of the
cathedral community (26%) and that they felt close to the cathedral clergy (23%). Similarly, around half disagreed that they felt lonely in the cathedral (49%) and that a lot of their close friends go to the cathedral (48%). Finally, in relation to opening up the cathedral to others, just over half (54%) disagreed that too many visitors in the cathedral spoilt the sense of community, while only 8% disagreed that it was good to see new faces in the cathedral.

By way of summary, the data provide a profile of regular members of the cathedral congregation who have, on the whole, positive experiences of being members of that community. However, it should be noted around a quarter of the respondents may find the cathedral to be a place of loneliness, in which they may find it hard to develop ties with other people.

Building community

Following on from experiencing community, the domain of building community seeks to understand how best the cathedral community is being, and can be, built. Bridging social capital is an important aspect of the construct that the domain of building community taps into. As Unruh and Sider (2005) noted, religious organisations, and the people that make up such organisations, are able to offer both vertical relations (connecting to those who are of greater or lesser ‘social’ importance) and horizontal relations (through the sharing of resources, skills and knowledge, with other groups, organisations and individuals. Through these vertical and horizontal relationships, the cathedral community can be built both internally and externally.
Table 4.7 presents statistics relating to building the cathedral community. The data demonstrate that respondents have a mixed opinion to the subject. While 63% of the respondents stated that people from all walks of life worship in the cathedral, and 49% stated that they have become friends with people in the cathedral they otherwise would not have met, fewer respondents endorsed the remaining items. Thus, only around a third stated that they had helped out with community work undertaken by the cathedral (36%), or that they had met different community leaders (34%) and different religious leaders (33%) through their involvement in the cathedral. Slightly over a fifth stated that they had met important people through their involvement in the cathedral (23%). Further, slightly over a tenth stated that they had made business contacts through their involvement in the cathedral (11%). Finally, in relation to the negative aspect of social capital, and the way in which groups can coerce people into action, 11% of the respondents stated that they often felt pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral. The potential for others to pressurise people into action may result in communities being led, and built, through coercion and bullying. As noted in Chapter One, this negative aspect of social capital would seem to disregard the concept of two or more individuals working together on a common goal.

Exploring the reverse perspective confirms the pattern of building community. In relation to the negative aspect of social capital over three-fifths of respondents disagreed that they often felt pressurised into doing things by other members of the cathedral (66%). On the remaining items, respondents were split in their opinions. While over three-fifths disagreed that they had made business contracts through their involvement in the cathedral fewer respondents disagreed with remaining items (63%), half of all respondents disagreed that they had met important people though
their involvement in the cathedral (50%). Only around four-tenths disagreed that they
had met different religious leaders (38%) and different community leaders (37%)
through their involvement in the cathedral, and that they had helped out with
community work undertaken by the cathedral (37%). Further, 27% disagreed that
they had become friends with people they otherwise would not have met. Finally, just
over a tenth (11%) of the sample disagreed that people from all walks of life worship
within the cathedral.

Exploring the uncertain perspective highlights that, on four of the items within this
domain, many of the respondents remained uncertain in their views. Around a quarter
were uncertain if they had met important people through their involvement in the
cathedral (27%), if they had made business contacts through their involvement in the
cathedral (26%), if people from all walks of life worshipped within the cathedral
(26%) and if they often felt pressured into doing things by other members of the
cathedral (23%).

By way of summary, the data provide a profile of regular members of the cathedral
congregation who are able to build their personal communities through making new
friends with the people, from all walks of life, who worship within the cathedral.
However, it would seem that in terms of wider community involvement, in terms of
linking social capital, and in terms of private business contacts, the cathedral does not
enable individuals to build their communities and contacts.
Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the general data concerning why the respondents chose to worship in the cathedral, and concerning their general levels of social capital. Two main conclusions emerged.

The first conclusion concerns reasons for worshipping in the cathedral. It was demonstrated that by far the most important factors for worshipping in the cathedral were the feeling of peace and the music. The least important reasons for choosing the cathedral are the social status of worshipping in the cathedral, and, contrary to anecdotal evidence, the opportunity to be anonymous to the clergy and to other worshippers. It would seem, therefore, that those who opt to worship in a cathedral are doing so for reasons other than not wanting to be involved in the community of clergy and congregation that typifies parish church worship. Further research is needed to understand fully the reasons why people choose to worship in a cathedral. This research should seek to assess whether cathedrals act as places for those despondent with parish life, for those coming to faith, or for those who appreciate the style of worship in the cathedral.

The second conclusion concerns the levels of social capital among the congregation. In general it has been demonstrated that members of the cathedral congregation have access to a wide range of social capital. The data suggest that being a member of the cathedral congregation has a positive impact upon the respondents' level of trust in God, and on their spiritual life. Further, the respondents have turned to others for spiritual help, and others have turned to the respondents for emotional help. The pattern continues in the neighbourhood with others turning to the respondent for
emotional help. Respondents were also likely to state that it was good to see new faces in the cathedral and that they felt a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral. However, in both the cathedral and the neighbourhood, few participants stated that others had turned to them for financial help. Nearly a quarter of the sample stated that too many visitors spoilt the sense of community in the cathedral, and just over a tenth stated that they often felt pressured into doing things by other members of the congregation. While the last two items have suggested that there may be areas of negative social capital being perpetuated with the cathedral, general levels of social capital reflect a healthy community.

This chapter has explored the general levels of social capital for regular members in the cathedral congregation. The next chapter goes on to explore the levels of social capital in respect to sex differences.
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Introduction

This chapter will deal with the issue of sex differences within the sample. It will be argued that, although sex differences are to be expected within the realms of both religiosity and social capital, the high psychological femininity of religious participants does not mean that the expected differences can be found within cathedral congregations. The data demonstrate that for both men and women, cathedrals provide equal opportunities for the creation and use of social capital within and without of the cathedral walls.

Part One: Literature review

This section will briefly explore the literature relating to sex differences. The section will be further divided into two parts. The first part will deal with sex differences in relation to religiosity. The second part will explore sex differences in relation to social capital.

Before beginning the literature review, it is pertinent to explore the differences in usage between the two terms ‘sex’ and ‘gender’. As Francis (2001) noted both terms are normally used to refer to different constructs, with sex being linked to the biological differences between men and women, and gender being linked to the psychological differences (p. 81). Archer and Lloyd (2002) noted that within the development of children, there is often an awareness of the physical characteristics of boys and girls, followed by a greater conformity to the gender stereotypes perpetuated by family and/or society (p. 61). Diamond (2002) noted that it is important for scholars to understand the differences between the two constructs, but noted that those based largely in biological sciences are likely to see sex as a fixed construct. In
distinguishing between the two constructs, Diamond (2002) noted that gender is often socially and culturally defined, and has a stronger impact on a person's personality and functioning than biological sex.

**Sex differences and religiosity**

Gender orientation, as operationalised by Bem (1981), argued that the psychological constructs of masculinity and femininity are present within a person's personality. Thus it is possible for a woman to display signs of high masculinity (for example, in terms of Ben's conceptualisation: independence, athleticism, assertiveness and aggression), while a man will be able to display signs of high femininity (for example, in terms of Bem's conceptualisation: gentleness, gullibility, warmth and loyalty).

Francis and Wilcox (1996a) conducted research among 159 students in Wales to test for the influence of gender orientation in religiosity. The data revealed, through multiple regression routines, that psychological femininity was a key indicator of individual differences in religiosity ($p < .01$). In concluding the paper, Francis and Wilcox assert that 'both men and women who possess a feminine, rather than a masculine outlook tend to be more religious...[this finding] is consistent with a body of research which suggested that male clergy tend to reflect a feminine personality profile' (p. 120).

Francis (1997) conducted a review of empirical literature relating to sex differences in religion by exploring two varying groups of research. The first group deals with social and contextual influences, which is then further divided into gender role socialisation theories, and structural location theories. The second group deals with
individual psychological differences, which is then further divided into depth psychology theories, personality theories, and gender orientation theories.

In concluding this literature review, Francis (1997) argued that gender orientation theory can provide the best model for understanding individual gender differences in religiosity. Gender orientation theory argued that masculinity and femininity are aspects of psychological characteristics within personality. As Francis states 'According to this conceptualisation, masculinity and femininity are not bipolar descriptors of a unidimensional construct, but two orthogonal personality dimensions (pp. 87-88). That is, the psychological traits of masculinity and femininity are to be found among both men and women. Women will be able to record characteristics of psychological masculinity as well as psychological femininity. Men will be able to record characteristics of psychological femininity as well as psychological masculinity.

Francis and Wilcox (1998) tested for the role of psychological gender among a sample of 687 of younger adolescents (13- to 15-year-olds) and among a sample of 292 older adolescents (16- to 18-year-olds) in the United Kingdom. Correlation matrices demonstrated that for both groups psychological femininity was a greater predictor of individual differences in religiosity than masculinity or sex in general. Multiple regression routines supported this conclusion for both samples.

Francis (2005b) utilised a sample of 469 older men and women in England to test for the theory of gender orientation and religiosity. Multiple regression routines
confirmed that among the sample psychological femininity was key to levels of religiosity in men and women (p<.001).

In theorising gender differences in religiosity Argyle and Beit-Hallahmi (1975) noted that within the social psychology of religion many differences are apparent between the religiosity of men and women, with women generally thought of as being more religious than men. They explain the greater level of religiosity of women by making reference to the guilt feelings more evident in women than in men; the projection of God as a father figure; the more subservient characteristics of women; the differences in socialisation between boys and girls; the greater likelihood of women being more influenceable than men; the level of social and economic depravation suffered by women; and the low rate of work force participation of women.

Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle (1997) in their analysis of literature dealing with the psychology of religion, again report a general trend within studies to confirm the preconception that women are more likely to display religious behaviour (such as prayer and ritual performance), religious belief, religious experience, and service attendance than displayed by men. As with their earlier work they explain these differences in terms of personality, socialisation and employment.

In relation to personality and socialisation, Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle (1997, pp. 142-144) noted that early literature on the subject reported that boys were socialised to be more aggressive and ‘manly’, whereas women are more likely to be socialised to express emotions and feelings. They argue that women are subject to two experiences in early life that play an important part in socialisation. The first is the social desire
for women to be submissive, dependent, and passive. This leads to women performing (Butler, 1990) the role of the submissive agent in society. Second, they argue that women are socialised with the relation-self at the core of their psyche. This leads to women being more concerned with relationships and interpersonal harmony than men are. The combination of a submissive identity with the pressure of relationship maintenance can often lead women to have high levels of guilt, and this in turn can be soothed by religious practice.

With reference to employment differences, Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle (1997, p. 144) noted how scholars such as Luckmann (1967) suggest that the low employment status of women could lead them to have more time to participate in religious activity. However, they noted that similar studies involving religiosity and employment status among men have demonstrated that men become less religious the longer they are out of work, and so the argument of free-time can not fully explain the inflated presence of women in religion.

This section has briefly highlighted the psychological and sociological literature relating to the gender differences within religiosity. It has been demonstrated that women are seen as having higher levels of religiosity than men, and several reasons have been posited for why this may be so, including a women’s vulnerability, the lack of women’s involvement in the work force, and the impact of child-bearing and rearing. Although these factors may certainly be central to the gender differences, they fail to account for the continued male interest in religiosity. The reasons posited portray women as submissive with little impact or influence in business world, whose main role is to raise children. For these reasons women are said to be more religious.
A clearer understanding of gender differences in religiosity has been formulated through the understanding of individual differences. Although, as Francis (2005b) noted, this understanding may only raise more questions than answers as to why those with high femininity scores are attracted to religiosity, this area of research has been able to shed light on the presence of the highly feminised environments in which people worship.

**Sex differences and social capital**

From the above overview, and from Chapter One, there are differences in the type of social capital, and the way this is used, between men and women. This section will focus on this literature in more detail.

Many empirical studies have begun to assess any potential sex differences in social capital generation and use. For example, Sagas and Cunningham (2004) conducted a study among 213 athletic administrators to determine the gender differences in social capital. The data demonstrated that men with high levels of social capital were more likely to benefit in terms of promotions within jobs than both women and men with low levels of social capital. However, it was noted that women with high levels of social capital were also as likely to receive promotion as men.

Westermann, Ashby and Pretty (2005) explored how sex influenced the dynamics of groups working in natural resource management. Their analysis of six men's, eight women's and 32 mixed groups from 33 rural programs in 20 countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa found that significant differences were present between the groups on the basis of gender. For example, the analysis revealed that the women's
groups had higher frequency of collaboration than the men’s and mixed groups. Half of the eight women’s groups studied met more frequently than once a week, in comparison to five of men’s groups and 23 of the mixed groups who met only bimonthly. The analysis revealed that women were more likely to collaborate outside of the group, with half of the women’s groups stating they met informally on a daily basis, compared with two of the male groups and twelve of the mixed groups. The data also revealed that women’s groups displayed higher levels of group maturity (based on the ability for change and self-reflection) than both the male and mixed groups, and in the ability to reduce any conflict that may be present.

Concluding the results Westermann, Ashby and Pretty (2005) state that, although their data do not reveal that women are more likely to form informal networks of social capital, women may depend on the more relational aspect of network ties because they are excluded from male-dominated formal networks in which institutionalised social capital is formed (p. 1795). They further conclude that norms of reciprocity, which as demonstrated in chapter one is a fundamental aspect of social capital, are more likely to be achieved and supported in groups where women are present, and that this may be the result of women’s work duties that emphasise norms of reciprocity.

Van Emmerik (2006) suggested that among a sample of 838 faculty members in one university in the Netherlands, significant differences in social capital formation were present between each sex. Three main premises were generated. First, it was suggested that women would be more effective at creating soft social capital (that is social capital based on resources that are used for social and emotional support; this is
normally found with the ties one has with intimate others where there are high levels of trust and reciprocity) and that men would be more adept at generating hard social capital (that is social capital based on instrumental ties with significant others. These ties are normally goal-orientated and performance driven, and most often found within the workplace). The data revealed that women are not significantly more adept at creating soft social capital, but that men will create more hard social capital than women (p<.01). Thus within this group of academic faculty, the male participants were better able to create ties with others for specific tasks, rather than for social and emotional support.

The second hypothesis by Van Emmerik (2006) was divided into two theses. The first thesis stated that strong ties are positively associated with the creation of soft social capital. That is soft social capital will aid the actor to form close, highly bonded ties with other people. The second thesis stated that strong ties aid the creation of hard social capital. That is hard social capital will benefit from an actor having close acquaintances with whom goals can be achieved. The data revealed that both of these theses were supported. Further, it was demonstrated that hard social capital was related to high levels of emotional intensity.

From the second hypothesis, Van Emmerik (2006) was able to hypothesise that women would be more effective in creating soft social capital from strong ties, and that men would be more effective at creating hard social capital from strong ties. The data revealed that women are better able to discern emotional intensity and soft social capital from their strong ties (p<.01). However, the data do not support the
hypothesis in relation to men. Van Emmerik does note that men are better able to use emotional intensity with strong ties to generate hard social capital (p<.01).

These data, then, seem not to suggest that women are the better generators of soft social capital, but that men, in highly bonded groups, are able to utilise emotional intensity in the generation of hard social capital. In concluding, van Emmerik (2006) states that when studying the role of women in male dominated environments it will be important to focus on the different needs of men and women in social capital formation. The suggestion that women, within the professional sphere of academia at least, are not able to generate soft social capital is a significant result that goes against much popular thought about the role of social capital in women's lives.

Healy, Haynes and Hampshire (2007) conducted analysis into the gender differences of social capital in four locations in New South Wales. There data revealed that women's social capital is often hidden and found in more community-focused activities, in comparison to men's more civic-based work. They suggest that women are more likely to be highly involved in emotional care work, whereas men will take on formal roles within organisations. The research also demonstrated that other factors influenced women's perception of their social capital creation, such factors including age, income and geographical location.

At the same time as developing evidence-based research concerning sex differences in social capital, scholars have begun to develop theoretical reasoning. For example, Burt (1998) using the theory of structural holes in a person's network, argued that those who are able to make links with varying social groups will be able to place
themselves in better positions for employment and promotion. Burt suggested that the promotional ties that men use to secure future employment are not functional for women in similar situations. It is argued that within the workplace women are not seen as legitimate actors, and are, therefore, not able to access the links available to men. Burt noted that women are only able to achieve promotion through an understanding and appropriation of a business or personal partner knowledge of network ties. This study suggested that there are some aspects of social capital that are not readily accessible for women, and only become available through ties with men who are able to penetrate and utilise such group links.

Hall (1999) in his analysis of social capital in the United Kingdom focused on the role of women in social capital formation. He noted first that, while other voluntary groups have not been significantly eroded in their memberships, traditional women’s groups have suffered large losses in associational membership. In line with the population at large, women’s level of social trust dropped by over 10% from 1959 to 1990. From this he speculates that the increasing levels of education for women since the mid-twentieth century have led to more women being able to be involved in community work, and states ‘in short, social capital has been sustained in Britain largely by virtue of the increasing participation of women in the community’ (p. 437).

In a comment on this bold statement, Lowndes (2000) argued that, in looking at the social capital of women, research often ignores those areas in which women are more often located. Focusing on research in the field, Lowndes highlighted that, in looking at membership rates between men and women in groups, the majority of groups studied are male in nature, such as sports clubs, public houses, or political groups. It
is argued that this split, in which the aforementioned groups are characterised as public groups, and groups such as child-care class, mother and toddler playgroups are characterised as private groups, is unfairly representing the level of social capital generation that women have on society, with research focusing predominantly on the public rather than the private sphere. It is only through an understanding of the structure of women’s private groups that research will be able to properly tap into the dynamics of social capital.

Lowndes (2004) explores the role of gender and social capital in political participation among women. She argued that women’s social capital is more likely to be embedded in the neighbourhood domain and is usually defined by high levels of informal social ties. Indeed, Lowndes argued that the way in which men and women use their social capital is also different. For men, social capital is a resource by which they are able to ‘get on’, that is social capital allows men to move between different social spheres and to develop business and instrumental links. For women, however, social capital can be seen as more a resource for ‘getting by’, that is, social capital can allow women to make the balance of work and family commitments easier to manage through the connections they have.

Conclusion

This section has briefly reviewed literature concerned with gender differences in religiosity and social capital. It has been demonstrated that, in relation to religiosity, women are consistently seen having higher levels of religiosity than men. Work by Francis (1997, 2005b) sharpened theory accounting for this gender difference by noting that it is the psychological characteristic of femininity that is fundamental to
individual differences in religiosity. The second part of this section demonstrated that women are perceived to be better able to create interpersonal social capital based on strong links with equals. It was noted that women's social capital was often hidden as it took on this more emotionally based connection with others, being personal in nature rather than formal like many men's voluntary work. It is against this background of sex differences that the remainder of the chapter is structured.

Part Two: Social capital in the cathedral

This part will explore the responses of men (N = 134) and women (N = 223) to the 'Cathedrals and You' questionnaire. Table 5.1 (appendix two) presents the data concerned with the social capital present with being part of the cathedral community. The differences between men and women in percentage endorsement of items in this table failed to reach statistical significance.

In relation to how being part of the cathedral community can affect levels of trust, a key indicator of social capital, male and female experiences are similar. For example, both are likely to feel that the cathedral is positive for their spiritual capital, with 75% of men, and 69% of women stating that being a member of the cathedral congregation increased their sense of trust in God. Both men and women are likely to state that being a member of the cathedral congregation affected their interpersonal trust. Thus, 57% of women stated that being in the cathedral built up a sense of trust in themselves, as did 55% of men. Further to this, 62% of women stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation increased their trust in others, as did 59% of the males. These three items, failing to reach statistical significance, suggest that both
males and females may be experiencing similar types of social capital, as defined by trust, within the cathedral.

In terms of what aspects of life the respondents thought being a member of the cathedral congregation was good for, both groups reach similar conclusions. When asked if they feel that being a member of the cathedral congregation was good for their spiritual life, over four-fifths of both men and women state that it is (88% of men and 82% of women). On the interpersonal side, both groups are likely to feel that being a member of the cathedral congregation is good for their personal life (63% of women and 60% of men) and for their social life (46% of women and 40% of men).

These three items reinforce the theme that emerged from the items that dealt with trust, that men and women seem to have similar relationships within the cathedral congregation. Although, as the introduction has highlighted, it is men who are traditionally understood to be the better generators of social capital, within the feminised environment of the cathedral men and women are equal in this respect. Both men and women are able to use the cathedral for developing religious and spiritual capital through building a sense of trust in God and feeling that the cathedral is good for their spiritual lives. On the interpersonal side of social capital, where theory suggested women have a foothold over men, similar proportions of both men and women state that being in the cathedral has built up a sense of trust in themselves and in others, and that the cathedral is good for both their personal and social lives.

In relation to the benefits of being a member of the cathedral congregation, nearly a quarter of men (24%) and 18% of women stated that being a member of the cathedral
congregation helped them to get on in work. In respect to the cathedral providing opportunities to mix with people with whom one would not normally mix, 61% of women stated that being part of the cathedral had helped them to do this as did 54% of men. Around a third (39% of women and 31% of men) of both groups stated that being part of the cathedral helped to establish their place in the community and that being part of the cathedral helped them to make a contribution to community life (54% of women and 47% of men). Over half of each group (58% of men and 59% of women) stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation helps them to meet people. Further, nearly half (46%) of men and 48% of women stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation helped them to make friends.

Part Three: Reciprocity in the cathedral

This section will explore the issue of reciprocity in the cathedral by examining statistics presented in tables 5.2 and 5.3 that deal with the respondent turning to others and others turning to the respondent respectively.

Table 5.2 presents those statistics dealing with the respondent turning to others (outwards reciprocity). The differences between men and women in percentage endorsement of items in this table failed to reach statistical significance. In relation to more personal domains of help, similar numbers of both men and women stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they would turn for spiritual help (74% of women and 73% of men), or emotional help (54% of women and 49% of men). Equally in the domain of applied help, similar numbers of both groups stated that there are others in the cathedral to whom they would turn for practical help (28% of women and 27% of men) and for financial help (7% of women and 5% of men).
In relation to more specific types of applied help the results are similar, with both men and women experiencing similar outward reciprocity. Thus, comparable numbers of men and women stated that there was someone within the cathedral to whom they would turn if they needed help with an elderly relative (27% of women and 25% of men), help with transport (27% of women and 24% of men) and if they needed to borrow something urgently (32% of men and 31% of women). In relation to more personal matters, similar numbers of both groups stated that there was someone in the cathedral to whom they would turn if they had a physical illness (49% for both men and women), a psychological problem (43% of men and 37% of women), a problem with family relations (52% of women and 46% of men), a problem with their faith (56% of women and 53% of men), and a problem with work (21% of women and 18% of men).

Within the highly feminised environment of the cathedral, then, men and women are able to use the ties they have developed with other members for both instrumental needs (those with a practical goal) and for more inter-personal problems. Listening to the literature on social capital, it would seem that men are equally able to make strong bonds within the cathedral, without the need for a predetermined goal.

Table 5.3 examines the question of inward reciprocity, of others turning to the respondent for help. Within this group significant differences can be seen between men and women. Significantly more women than men reported that someone had turned to them for help with transport (31% for women and 25% for men, p<.05). Similarly, significantly more women than men stated that others within the cathedral had turned to them to borrow something urgently (31% for women and 19% for men,
The fact that more women than men had others turning to them for help may be a reflection of the greater development of the interpersonal relationships within the cathedral by women.

However, in the other areas of this table, men and women did not significantly differ. In terms of asking for help, similar numbers of both men and women stated that others have sometimes turned to them for spiritual help (27% of women and 25% of men), for emotional help (40% of women and 34% of men), for practical help (30% of both men and women), and for financial help (15% of men and 14% of women).

In relation to the more instrumental types of help, similar patterns emerge. Both men and women stated that others had sometimes turned to them for help with an elderly relative (24% of women and 19% of men). In relation to more personal matters, both men and women were likely to have been asked for help for a physical illness (28% of women and 24% of men), a psychological problem (23% of women and 16% of men), a problem with family relations (25% of women and 21% of men), a problem with faith (18% of women and 17% of men), and a problem with work (27% of men and 24% of women).

These two tables demonstrate the differences between men and women in their levels of inward and outward reciprocity within the cathedral. In two of the items it has been demonstrated that women are significantly more likely to be subject to inward reciprocity in relation to transport and being able to provide something urgently. However, on the other items on this table men and women experienced similar levels of inward reciprocity. When combined with table 5.2, these data begin to provide
clear evidence for the fact that gender differences are not key to individual differences in social capital in a cathedral environment.

**Part Four: Neighbourhood reciprocity**

Following on from the analysis of inward reciprocity in the cathedral, the next section explores inward reciprocity in the neighbourhood. The statistics are presented in table 5.5.

Within the neighbourhood domain, two items reach levels of statistical significance. The first item related to the extent to which others in the community would turn to the respondent if they had a psychological problem. Over two-fifths (42%) of women stated that someone in the neighbourhood had turned to them with such a problem, compared with 28% of men (p<.01). The second item deals with members of the community asking the respondents for financial help. Just over a quarter (28%) of men stated that others in their neighbourhood turned to them for financial help, compared with 18% of women (p<.05). Within these two items it is possible to see the potential differences between how men and women have been approached for social capital help. For men, the call for financial help is not one that would call for as much emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1996) as the call for dealing with psychological problems. The interpersonal skills prevalent with women are needed both within and without the cathedral walls.

In relation to others in the neighbourhood turning to the respondents for help, no clear differences emerge between men and women. Thus, similar numbers of men and women stated that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them for spiritual help.
(41% of women and 34%), for emotional help (61% of women and 53% of men), and for practical help (53% of women and 50% of men).

In relation to others turning to the respondents for instrumental help, similar patterns emerge. Comparable numbers of men and women reported that others within the neighbourhood had turned to them for help with an elderly relative (49% of women and 43% of men), for help with transport (62% of women and 55% of men), and to borrow something urgently (55% of women and 52% of men). In relation to more personal matters of reciprocity, similar numbers of both groups reported others turning to them with a physical illness (51% of women and 41% of men), a problem with family relations (41% of women and 33% of men), a problem with faith (36% of men and 31% of women), and a problem with work (47% of women and 38% of men).

Within the less highly feminised environment of the neighbourhood men and women are as likely to experience inward reciprocity as within the cathedral walls. Although it is difficult to argue if the social capital developed within the cathedral is replicated within the neighbourhood, or vice versa, it is interesting to note that the trends present within the cathedral are mirrored in the neighbourhood.

Part Five: Experiencing community

Moving away from exploring the trust and reciprocity of being a regular worshipper in the cathedral, this section explores the notion of community and the way this is felt and expressed among regular members. The statistics for this section are presented in table 5.5.
Within the experiencing community domain, two items reach levels of statistical significance. The first item deals with how close the respondent feels to other members of the cathedral congregation. Half of all women (50%) stated that they felt close to other members of the congregation in comparison to 39% of men (p<.05). The second item deals with belonging to the cathedral. Over three-fifths of women (63%) stated that they felt a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral community in comparison to 50% of men (p<.05).

From these data, the questions arise as to why men are less likely to state that they feel close to others in the cathedral, and as to why men do not feel as strong a sense of belonging when they experience similar levels of social capital. It may be concluded, from these data, that strong reciprocity and relationships within the cathedral do not necessarily mean an interpersonal warmth that can contribute to a sense of closeness to others and a sense of belonging to the cathedral.

On the other items within the table, men and women have similar experiences of community within the cathedral. In relation to belonging to the community, 44% of woman and 41% of men stated that they felt they were really part of the cathedral community, while a fifth of both men and women stated that they felt rather lonely in the cathedral (26% of men and 22% of women). Similarly, 47% of women and 41% of men stated that they felt close to the cathedral clergy.

In relation to the community being open to others, around a fifth (27% of women and 24% of men) stated that a lot of their close friends go to the cathedral. Similar
numbers stated that too many visitors spoilt the sense of community in the cathedral (25% of men and 24% of women). These two items may suggest that, for a minority within the cathedral, there are high levels of bonding social capital. While this is positive in the sense that it enables friends to worship together, it may mean that those who are only visiting the cathedral, or who are joining the cathedral congregation for the first time, are not as well placed to access the community. Conversely, a large proportion of both men and women (72% and 75% respectively) stated that it was good to see new faces in the cathedral, indicating that cathedral communities have high levels of bridging social capital.

This section has dealt with the experience of community for men and women within the cathedral congregation. The next section goes on to explore how members of the congregation build community.

**Part Six: Building community**

In chapter one the differences between community and social capital were discussed, and it was stated that community can only become social capital when it has a goal. This section explores how open members of the cathedral congregation are to expanding their community. The statistics for this section are presented in table 5.6. The difference between men and women in percentage endorsement of items in this table failed to reach statistical significance.

In relation to the personal domain of social capital within community building neither sexes differ significantly in their opinions. For example, 65% of women and 59% of men state that people from all walks of life worship in the cathedral. Similarly, just
under half of both groups (49% of women and 47% of men) state that being in the cathedral has enabled them to become friends with people they otherwise would not have met. These two items demonstrate that the cathedral is a place in which people from outside the respondents' own social context are able to come and form relationships with others. The cathedral is a community that encourages a bonded social network, but not at the exclusion of those who would wish to enter. However, as the literature in chapter one highlighted, such bonded communities can sometimes lead to negative experiences, such as feeling pressured to do things by other members. In answering this item, 11% of men and 10% of women stated that they often felt such pressure. Although this is a small percentage, it is worthy of note that a tenth of the cathedral congregation may be sensing some form of coercion.

In relation to community building through bridging and linking activities, both men and women have similar experiences. Comparable numbers of both men and women started that they helped out with the community work undertaken by the cathedral (38% of women and 33% of men). In relation to more formal modes of business, both men and women stated that they had been able to make business contacts through being a member of the cathedral congregation (13% of men and 10% of women). Similarly, the cathedral had provided both sexes with the opportunity to meet with important people as a direct result of the respondents' involvement with the cathedral (23% of both men and women). Both men and women also stated that the cathedral had provided them with an opportunity to meet specific dignitaries. For example, a third of both men and women (32% of men and 35% of men) stated that they had met different community leaders as a direct consequence of their involvement with the
cathedral. Along similar lines, 36% of men and 31% of men stated that their involvement with the cathedral had allowed them to meet religious leaders.

Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the extent to which sex differences are present among the sample on a range of social capital items. Four main conclusions can be drawn from these data.

The first conclusion concerns the general level of social capital felt by both men and women. For example, the majority of men and women felt that being a member of the cathedral congregation was beneficial in building up their sense of trust, developing aspects of their lives and for making links with other people. High levels of both men and women perceived the cathedral and neighbourhood to be places of inward and outward reciprocity. In terms of the more negative aspects of social capital, a minority of both men and women stated that they felt pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral, and that visitors spoilt the sense of community in the cathedral.

The second conclusion concerns the similarities that are present between men and women in the cathedral congregation. Following from the literature review, it was suggested that religious institutions could be described as highly feminised, with both men and women displaying high levels of psychological femininity. The results from the questionnaire have demonstrated that, on the whole, men and women have similar experiences of social capital generation and use within both the cathedral and the community.
The third conclusion to be drawn is that in a few areas men and women differ significantly in how they experience social capital within the cathedral setting. On the one hand, women are more likely to experience inward reciprocity in the areas of helping another person with transport and of lending them something urgently. Women are also more likely to experience people within the neighbourhood turning to them for help with psychological problems. In terms of experiencing community, women are also significantly more likely to feel close to others in the cathedral congregation and to have a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral. On the other hand, men are significantly more likely to have others in the neighbourhood turn to them for financial help. These items may support the literature which expects women to express an interpersonal relational-based social capital.

The fourth conclusion concerns the relationship between social capital within the cathedral and social capital within the neighbourhood. Though it is not possible to determine properly the causality of the relationship, it is interesting to note that the high social capital experienced in the cathedral is reflected in the neighbourhood. If we are to believe authors such as Hall (1999), British society has experienced a clear decline in social capital since the mid-twentieth century. Yet it is interesting to note that members of the cathedral congregation are able to experience high levels of social capital in both the cathedral and the neighbourhood.

This chapter has explored the relationship between social capital and one indicator of individual differences, namely sex. The next chapter goes on to explore this relationship with age as the key indicator for individual differences.
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Introduction

This chapter will examine the issue of age differences in social capital among the congregation sample. The literature review will highlight literature that explores the relationship between age and religiosity, and between age and social capital. The data will assess what impact age has on levels of social capital in the cathedral congregation.

Part One: Literature review

Age and Religiosity

It is generally assumed that with age, levels of religiosity increase. This section will explore the literature relating to ageing and religiosity.

Ulbrich and Wallace (1983) explored the relationship between church attendance, age and belief in the afterlife among 141 adults in the United States of America. The data demonstrated that for all denominations surveyed, age was related to religiosity, suggesting that those who were older were more likely to attend church than those who were younger.

Stolzenberg, Blair-Loy and Waite (1995) examined the relationship between religious participation and age among 19,001 respondents to the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972. Stolzenberg, Blair-Loy and Waite hypothesised that religion can impact on religiosity in four ways. First, they suggested that age may just result in a general decline in religious organisational membership regardless of other factors. Second, they noted that age may have a direct influence on religious participation, but may just be connected with other factors, for example, people with
children are more likely to attend church than those without. Third, they suggest that age may impact with other factors such as marriage and parenthood to influence religious participations. Fourth, they suggested that religious participation is seen as a socially conforming and conventional behaviour, since adolescents may be less likely to acquiesce to such behaviours and so religiosity would be seen as being related to older age. The results of the analysis suggested that age was not the sole factor affecting religious participation, but was linked to other age-related factors, such as marriage and parenthood.

Coleman, Ivani-Chalian and Robinson (2004) employed data generated by the Southampton Ageing Project, a longitudinal project following 342 respondents aged 65 or above since 1978, to test for the relationship between age and religiosity. The data demonstrated that as the respondents enter what Coleman, Ivani-Chalian and Robinson term the older age category (that is people aged 75-years or more) they are less likely to attend a place of worship than those in the younger age group (those aged 65- to 74-years). Further, it was highlighted that the older age group were more likely to state that they were unable, rather than unwilling, to attend church than those in the younger age group.

Voas and Crockett (2005) used data from the British Household Survey to explore the effects of age on religiosity. The data demonstrated that as age increases so do levels of religious affiliation, religious belief, and religious attendance. Employing data from wave nine of the British Household Survey (1999-2000), it was demonstrated that of the 6,731 respondents, 40% of those aged 23- to 30-years claimed religious affiliation, compared with 71% of those aged 55- to 62-years and 81% of those aged
Similarly, in relation to religious belief, 20% of those aged 23- to 30-years claimed some form of religious belief, compared with 41% among those aged 55- to 62-years and with 49% among those aged 71- to 78-years. In relation to religious attendance, 10% of those aged 23- to 30-years stated that they attended a religious institution, compared with 20% of 55- to 62-year-olds and with 27% of 71- to 78-year-olds.

Dixon (2006) utilised data from the International Congregational Life Survey among congregational members in Catholic churches in Australia (N = 78,255), New Zealand (N = 20,895) and the United States (N = 19,143) to assess the dynamic between religiosity and age. The data demonstrated that for congregation members born before 1955 there was consistent involvement in parish life, and therefore access to and use of religious social capital. However, for those born between 1956 and 1975 a consistent decline was present in parish involvement. Older people, therefore, are more likely to be involved in parish activities.

Wilhelm, Rooney and Tempel (2007) explored the relationship between age and religious service attendance among two age groups of respondents, those aged 35- to 49-years (N = 1,527) and those aged 62- to 76-years (N = 577), from the National Study of Philanthropy in the University of Michigan. The results demonstrated that those in the older cohort were more likely to attend church on a regular basis than those in the younger cohort. This suggested that there is a greater propensity among older people for religious activity.
Evidence-based literature thus points to the positive relationship between religiosity and age. Through the review of studies it has been demonstrated that older people have higher levels of religious belief, church attendance, and religious affiliation than younger people. Yet none of these studies have yet sought to understand why this may be the case. In theorising about the relationship between age and religiosity, Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle (1997) noted that after the teenage years there is a general decline in the level of religiosity as critical questioning becomes more apparent. By old age however, Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle noted that, even though many studies may confuse the religiosity of those who are old with the religion gained and maintained in more religious times, the church congregation acts as a source of support for older people. It is through the congregation that older people have access to friends and social support that may not be so readily available in the wider community. Moving away from the social benefits of church attendance, Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle suggest that the emphasis placed on life after death may be a source of support for older people.

Noncon and Pearson (2000) suggest how, when friend and family ties have been exhausted, older people are able to fall back on the social ties developed within church. They highlighted how, in times of great need, the resources used by older people do not necessarily conform to the patterns of obligations and reciprocity common to everyday relationships, but rather are based on trust and accessible support. Noncon and Pearson argue that the church provides one such place in which older people are able to approach a wide range of people in order to provide the care and support they need.
Warr, Butcher and Robertson (2004) argue that church attendance could be deemed as an activity beneficial to personal wellbeing among older people. They suggest three reasons for this positive relationship. First, activities can often allow a person to develop and complete personal goals. This will enable a person to develop a sense of accomplishment and competence. Second, activities that people invest time in are positive in nature, and therefore have the potential to yield positive contributions to wellbeing. Third, activities are likely to have primary and secondary outcomes. For example, church attendance may be primarily concerned with deepening the relationship with God, but may have associational benefits attached to it. Expounding on this theory it is possible to see how church can become an important aspect of many older people's lives. It is through such activity as attending religious services and church-run events that older people are able to contribute to the work and thus develop a sense of psychological wellbeing.

This section has reviewed the relationship between religiosity and aging. It has been seen that general trends point to an increased level of religiosity in older life, when compared with younger age cohorts. It has been suggested that this is the result of the need for social and spiritual support in later life. As will be seen below, the church can provide a much better source of this support than the neighbourhood.

*Age and social capital*

Empirical literature has begun to explore the relationship between age and social capital. For example, Ikkink and van Tilburg (1999) employed longitudinal data from 2,057 older adults in Holland to assess the longevity of relationships identified at time one (T₁). At T₁ the sample identified a total of 18,953 relationships, including family,
friends and other non-kin relations. By $T_3$, some three years after $T_1$, 4,042 of those relationships had been discontinued. The data revealed that for older adults it is the type of relationship which determines if it will continue. For example, in a relationship in which the older adult had an abundance of instrumental help, there was a significantly greater likelihood of the relationship being continued ($p < .001$). Conversely, if the relationship had an abundance of emotional support, the relationship was more likely to be discontinued. In comparison with the more emotional ties a younger person may make, the type of network, and therefore social capital, present to an older person is adaptable depending on the individual’s needs.

Putnam’s (2000) research demonstrated that, within the American context, it is the middle-aged and older-aged members of society who are more actively involved in organisational work than the younger people. For example, in the period 1993 to 1994 examined by Putnam, 25% of those aged 18- to 29-years attended church weekly compared with 32% of those aged 30- to 44-years, 37% of those aged 45- to 59-years, and 47% of those aged 60 or more. Similarly, 40% of those born in 1910 attended clubs regularly in comparison with 5% of those born in 1970. This research suggested that those in the middle part of their life, or older, are more likely to participate in civic society, and therefore, according to Putnam’s definition, have higher levels of social capital.

Curler and Hendricks (2000) make use of data from the National Opinion Research Center’s (sic) General Social Surveys in the United States between the years 1974 and 1994, leading to a total sample of 18,295 respondents. These data revealed that, on the aggregated sample, age was a significant indicator of gross membership to
voluntary associations, and thus, in the view of Putnam, to social capital. Those aged 40- to 44-years recorded the highest level of membership to voluntary associations. Rates of membership were lowest for those aged 18- to 24-years and those over the age of 70.

Arjouch, Antonucci and Janevic (2001) examined the main interactions between age and social capital among a sample of 1,283 respondents from the South Detroit area. These data revealed that older age was linked to smaller networks, with little contact to others in the neighbourhood, and low levels of geographical proximity, but high levels of contact with kin. That is, older people's social networks, and therefore their access to social capital, is highly linked to the contact they are able to make with other family members, many of whom are likely to live at some distance from them.

Litwin (2001) assessed the relationship between network type and morale among a sample of 2,079 older people in Israel. These data revealed that those respondents who reported high levels of close friendship networks were more likely to report high levels of morale. Those who reported high levels of contact with kin, at the expense of contact with friends and neighbours, reported the lowest levels of morale.

Lindström, Merlo, and Östergren (2003) investigated the influence of social capital on levels of self-reported insecurity in one town in Sweden among 3,001 residents in 68 different neighbourhoods. These data revealed that, as the respondents age, their sense of insecurity in the neighbourhood grows. Thus, men born in 1913 were six times as likely to feel a sense of insecurity than those born in 1973. Similarly, women were nearly twice as likely to feel a sense of insecurity when born in 1913 compared
with women born in 1973. This lack of a sense of security demonstrates that as people age they are less likely to trust those in the neighbourhood.

Taylor, Lincoln and Chatters (2005), in their analysis of 951 African Americans who took part in the National Survey of Black Americans during 1979 and 1980, highlighted the reciprocal relationship between respondents and other church members. Their data revealed a positive relationship between age and direct interaction with other church members \( (p<.001) \), and a positive relationship between age and levels of indirect support \( (p<.01) \). For older members of the church community, then, the church is a place for direct interaction and indirect support from other members of the church.

Ajrouch, Blandon and Antonucci (2005) explored the effects of age on social networks. Their data, from 840 participants (358 men and 482 women) between the ages of 40 and 93 years, revealed that age was an important predictor of individual differences in network variables. For example, respondents aged 75 years or older reported having smaller networks than those aged 40- to 64-years and 65- to 74-years \( (p<.01) \). However, it was the oldest cohort of men who reported having the longest established networks \( (p<.001) \). In concluding their findings, Ajrouch, Blandon and Antonucci argue that it is in later life that people are less likely to have family, especially children, close to hand for help, but it is also the time when access to resources and support is needed the most.

Lauder, Mummery and Sharkey (2006) conducted research to assess the level of loneliness and social capital in a random sample of 1,289 subjects recruited through
computer assisted interviews in Central Queensland, Australia. The data revealed that, using contact with another person as an indicator of loneliness, it was those in the older age brackets who recorded low scores on loneliness in comparison with those aged 40- to 49-years indicating that social ties are still in place for the older age groups.

Barr and Russell (2007) distributed a questionnaire to 103 senior residents in three areas along the coast of New South Wales, Australia. The sample was split into two age groups, those aged 60- to 64-years and those aged 80- to 84-years. In relation to social capital through the domain of trust, a third of the overall sample stated that they did not feel safe walking the streets alone after dark. In respect to age differences, 91% of males and 73% of females in the younger cohort stated that they felt safe after dark, whereas 54% of males and 36% of females did in the older cohort. In relation to close kin and friendship ties, 87% of the overall sample stated they could readily access help from family. Males in the older cohort were less likely to endorse this item, with only 82% checking it. The data demonstrate that the older cohort of the sample is less likely to experience social capital than the younger cohort.

Kruger, Hutchison, Monroe, Reishl and Morrel-Samuels (2007) explored the relationship between social capital, fear of crime, and assault injury rates among a general sample of 1,437 residents in the Michigan area. The data indicated that, as a measure of social capital, older residents in the sample had significantly less support from family and friends, but were more likely to perceive social support in the neighbourhood (p< .01) than their younger counterparts. The data also revealed that
older residents were more likely to trust people within their neighbourhoods than younger residents ($p < .001$).

In comparison with the relationship between age and religiosity, the relationship between age and social capital is seemingly more complex. In general it would seem that older people are more likely to have smaller social networks than younger people, but that the people in their social networks have been present for longer, that is, the person has known them for a longer time. This small cohort of stable ties can also lead to respondents stating that they have lower levels of loneliness than other age groups. In respect to membership ties, the picture is not clear. Some studies suggest that older people are more likely to be members of voluntary associations, while others suggest that it is those in middle-age who have the highest gross amount of associational membership. In relation to community living, it is older people who are more likely to feel insecure in their neighbourhoods, who are less likely to have family in close geographical proximity, but are more likely to perceive support from friends and neighbours. Indeed, some of this support is seen as stemming from church-related activity.

**Conclusion**

This section has explored the literature concerning age differences in religiosity and social capital. It has been demonstrated that, in relation to religiosity, it is the older age group that are more likely to display higher levels of religious participation and religious belief. It has been argued that this increase in religious practice may be part of a greater need for social support among older age groups. The second part of this section demonstrated that older people’s networks are complicated, but in general can
be said to be smaller than those of younger age groups, and more reliant on help and support from family and neighbours. It could, therefore, be suggested that within the cathedral congregation older people are less likely to experience inward reciprocity and community building, and are more likely to display greater outward reciprocity.

Part Two: Social capital in the cathedral

This part will explore the responses of those who indicated that they were aged under twenty, 20- to 29-years, 30- to 39-years and 40- to 49-years (grouped together as the younger cohort, \( N = 87 \)) and those who indicated that they were aged 70 years or over are referred to as the older cohort \( (N = 121) \). Those who indicated that they were aged 50- to 59-years and 60- to 69-years \( (N = 153) \) were not included in the final analysis.

Table 6.1 displays the data concerned with social capital present within the cathedral community by age. In the following sections, the younger age group will refer to those aged under 49-years, and the older age group will refer to those aged 70-years or above.

Within this table two significant differences are observed between the older age group and the younger age group. The first difference concerns the issue of trust. Significantly more respondents within the older age group than respondents in the younger age group, stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation had built up their sense of trust in God (75% of older people compared with 62% of younger people, \( p < .05 \)). The second difference concerns the cathedral as a place to promote working interests. Perhaps unsurprisingly, significantly more respondents in the
younger age group stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation had helped them to get on in work (29% of younger people compared with 16% of older people, \( p < .05 \)).

In relation to the other two areas of trust tested within this survey, neither group differs significantly in their opinions. Thus, over half (55% of the younger age group and 53% of the older age group) of the sample stated that being in the cathedral had increased their sense of trust in themselves. Similarly, over half (55% of the older age group and 51% of the younger age group) stated that being in the cathedral had increased their sense of trust in others.

In general, then, the development of trust within the cathedral community, a key indicator for the health of social capital, is equal between both the older and the younger age group. However, in relation to developing religious and spiritual capital, through trust in God, it is those in the older age group who feel that being a member of the cathedral is beneficial for this.

In relation to how being a member of the cathedral congregation has benefited aspects of the respondents' lives similar patterns emerge. In relation to the transcendent aspects of the cathedral, 88% of the older age group and 83% of the younger age group stated that being in the cathedral was good for their spiritual life. In respect of relational aspects of the cathedral congregation, 73% of the older age group and 62% of the younger age group stated that being a member was good for their personal lives. Further, 53% of the younger age group and 42% of the older age group stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation was good for their social lives.
In respect of the perceived benefits of the cathedral, the two age groups displayed no significant differences. Similar proportions of both age groups stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation had allowed them to meet people (69% of the younger age group and 58% of the older age group) and helped them to make friends (51% of the older age group and 49% of the younger age group). In terms of the community aspect of the cathedral, both age groups stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation had helped them to establish their place in the community (44% of the younger age group and 32% of the older age group), and to contribute to community life (55% of the older age group and 53% of the younger age group). With reference to the openness of the cathedral community, 62% of the younger age group and 55% of the older age group stated that being a member helps them to mix with those with whom they would not normally mix.

The statistics demonstrate that for both the older and younger age groups the benefits of being a member of the cathedral congregation for their social capital are similar. Both groups are able to develop interpersonal trust, to see the cathedral as good for their lives, and to make connections with others because of the community fostered within the cathedral.

Part three: Reciprocity in the cathedral

This section will explore the issue of reciprocity in the cathedral by examining statistics presented in tables 6.2 and 6.3 that deal with the respondent turning to others, and others turning to the respondent respectively.
Table 6.2 presents those statistics dealing with the respondent turning to others in the cathedral (outwards reciprocity). In three of these items significant differences can be observed between the two age groups, all within the instrumental help domain. First, in relation to borrowing something urgently, significantly more respondents in the younger age group stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they would turn if they wanted to borrow an item than respondents in the older age group; thus 41% of the younger age group checked this item in comparison with 24% of the older age group ($p < .01$). Second, significantly more people in the younger age group stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn if they had a problem with family relations; thus 66% of the younger age group checked this item in comparison with 37% of the older age group ($p < .001$). Third, significantly more respondents in the younger age group stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn if they had a problem with work; thus 28% of the younger age group checked this item in comparison with 14% of the older age group ($p < .01$).

The differences displayed between the two age groups in the remaining items in this section were not sufficient to achieve statistical significance. In relation to personal help, both groups reported similar findings. Just under three-quarters (73%) of the older age group and 64% of the younger age group stated that there were people in the cathedral to whom they could turn for spiritual help. Over half of both age groups (57% of the older age group and 53% of the younger age group) stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn to for emotional help. In relation to more applied aspects of help, 32% of the younger age group and 30% of the older age group stated there were others in the cathedral whom they could turn for practical
help. Similarly, 12% of the younger age group and 6% of the older age group stated there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn for financial help.

Although, as highlighted above, there are three areas of instrumental help on which the two age groups differ significantly, on the remaining items both age groups record similar findings. Over a quarter (26%) of the younger age group and 23% of the older age group stated that there were people in the cathedral to whom they could turn to for help with an elderly relative. Just under a third (30%) of the younger age group and 29% of the older age group stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn for help with transport. Over half (52%) of the younger age group and 47% of the older age group stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn to if they had a physical illness, and 44% of the younger age group and 33% of the older age group stated there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn if they had a psychological problem. Finally, 63% of the younger age group and 55% of the older age group stated there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn if they had a problem with their faith.

Table 6.3 presents the statistics dealing with inward reciprocity, that is, other people within the cathedral turning to the respondent. The differences between the two age groups on three of the items were large enough to achieve statistical significance.

First, in relation to applied aspects of help, significantly more respondents in the younger age group stated that others within the cathedral had sometimes turned to them for financial help (17% of the younger age group compared with 7% of the older age group, p< .05). Second, in relation to the instrumental help domain, more respondents in the younger age group stated that others in the cathedral had turned to
them with a problem with their faith (22% of the younger age group compared with 12% of the older age group, p< .05), and that more people had turned to them with a problem with their work (35% of the younger age group compared with 19% of the older age group, p< .01). These three items continue to demonstrate the age differences between the two age groups, especially in relation to instrumental help. It is the younger age group who seem to display more outward and inward reciprocity.

The differences present between the two age groups in the remaining items were not sufficient to achieve statistically significant differences. In relation to the personal domain the younger and older age groups achieved similar percentage endorsements. In terms of the spiritual aspect of being a member of the cathedral, just under a quarter (24%) of the younger group and 21% of the older group stated that others in the cathedral had sometimes turned to them for spiritual help. Similarly, 39% of the older age group and 35% of the younger age group reported that others in the cathedral had turned to them for emotional help.

In relation to the applied help domain, comparable proportions of both age groups stated that others had turned to them for practical help (31% of the older age group and 24% of the younger age group), for help with an elderly relative (21% of the older age group and 16% of the younger age group), for help with transport (28% of the older age group and 25% of the younger age group), and to borrow something urgently (25% of the younger age group and 21% of the older age group). In relation to more personal matters, similar proportions of both age groups stated that others had sometimes turned to them with a physical illness (25% of the older age group and 24% of the younger age group), a psychological problem (25% of the younger age
group and 16% of the older age group) and a problem with family relations (29% of the younger age group and 22% of the older age group).

These two tables have explored the level of reciprocity experienced by members of the cathedral congregation. In general it has been demonstrated that both the younger and the older age groups have similar experiences within this domain. However, on the items that reached statistical significance it was shown that the younger age group experienced higher levels of both inward and outward reciprocity. This was especially the case within the domain of instrumental help, with such items as borrowing something urgently, help with family relations, help with work, and help with faith highlighting the differences between the two age groups. It is worthy of note that, not only are those in the older category less likely to be asked for these kinds of help, they are also less likely to ask others for help in the first three of the items listed above.

Part Four: Neighbourhood reciprocity

Following on from the analysis of inward reciprocity in the cathedral, the next section explores inward reciprocity in the neighbourhood. The statistics are presented in table 6.4.

In relation to the personal domain of neighbourhood inward reciprocity, significant differences emerge between the two age groups. First, in relation to the personal domain significant differences emerged on both items. Thus significantly more respondents in the younger age group stated that other people in the neighbourhood had turned to them for spiritual help (52% of the younger age group and 25% of the
older age group, p< .001). Similarly more respondents in the younger age group reported that others in the neighbourhood had turned to them for emotional help (67% of the younger age group and 48% of the older age group, p< .01).

Significant differences were also present between the two age groups in relation to instrumental help. Thus, more respondents in the younger age group had people in their neighbourhood turn to them with a physical illness (53% compared with 40% of the older age group, p< .05), with a psychological illness (49% compared with 26% of the older age group, p< .001), with a problem with family relations (49% compared with 32% of the older age group, p< .01), and with problems with work (58% compared with 29% of the older age group, p< .001).

These items demonstrate the way in which the social networks of the older age group are not so well established within the neighbourhood. The lack of inward reciprocity within this group in terms of personal and instrumental help may be symptomatic of the highly bonded network of friends and family that one generates in old age, rather than the more disparate, loosely connected networks of the younger age groups.

On the remaining items within the neighbourhood domain, the differences between the older and younger age groups are not sufficiently large to be statistically significant. Thus, comparable numbers in both age groups stated that others in the neighbourhood had turned to them for practical help (55% of the older age group and 46% of the younger age group), for financial help (22% of the older age group and 15% of the younger age group), for help with an elderly relative (44% of the older age group and 43% of the younger age group), for help with transport (60% of the
younger age group and 51% of the older age group), to borrow something urgently (51% of the younger age group and 44% of the older age group), and for problems with the person's faith (39% of the younger age group and 30% of the older age group).

**Part Five: Experience community**

Moving away from exploring the trust and reciprocity of being a regular worshipper in the cathedral, this section explores the notion of community and the way this is felt and expressed among regular members. The statistics for this section are presented in table 6.6.

None of the items in the experiencing community domain are sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. Thus, comparable numbers of respondents in both age groups felt that they were really part of the cathedral community (47% of the older age group and 36% of the younger age group), felt lonely in the cathedral (22% of the older age group and 18% of the younger age group), felt close to the cathedral clergy (43% of the younger age group and 42% of the older age group), felt close to others in the cathedral congregation (49% of the younger age group and 43% of the older age group), and felt a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral (56% for both the younger and older age group).

Similarly, in relation to the openness of the community, comparable numbers stated that a lot of their close friends go to the cathedral (30% of the older age group and 25% of the younger age group), that it is good to see new faces in the cathedral (71% of the younger age group and 70% of the older age group), and that too many visitors
spoil the sense of community (25% of the younger age group and 17% of the older age group).

The data generated in this table highlight the equality in experiencing community between the two age groups. Thus, the cathedral is a place in which both the older cohort and the younger cohort are able to find good sources of community. The fact that no statistical significances were recorded highlights how the cathedral presents itself as a community environment in a society which, as highlighted above, older residents are left out of inwardly reciprocal relationships.

**Part Six: Building community**

This section explores the experience of building community among members of the cathedral congregation. The statistics for this section are presented in table 6.6.

The differences between the two age groups recorded in respect of two items within this table were sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. First, significantly more respondents in the younger age group stated that they had made business contacts through their involvement in the cathedral than respondents in the older age group (17% compared with 7%, p< .05). Second, significantly more respondents in the younger age group stated that they had met important people through their involvement in the cathedral than respondents in the older age group (26% compared with 16%, p< .05).

These two items highlight the role of the cathedral as a place for social progression for the younger cohort. The cathedral is the place in which the younger members are
able to develop their weak ties with people of influence in order to develop bridged social capital, and to reap the benefits of these ties at some point in the future.

On the remainder of the items, both groups recorded similar percentage endorsements. Thus, comparable proportions stated that people from all walks of life worship in the cathedral (60% of the older age group and 53% of the younger age group), that they have become friends with people they would otherwise not have met (49% of the younger age group and 48% of the older age group), that they had met different community leaders through their involvement in the cathedral (36% of the younger age group and 27% of the older age group), that they had met different religious leaders through their involvement in the cathedral (30% of the older age group and 26% of the younger age group), that they had helped out with community work undertaken by the cathedral (33% of the older age group and 30% of the younger age group), and that they often felt pressured into doing things by other members of the community (11% of the older age group and 10% of the younger age group).

Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the age differences present among the sample on a range of social capital items. Three main conclusions can be drawn from these data.

The first conclusion concerns the level of social capital present for the two age groups within the cathedral. The cathedral has been demonstrated to be a place in which people are able to turn to others for social support regardless of their age. This is even more striking when set in the context of the level of social capital experienced in the
neighbourhood. Here the younger generation were significantly more likely to experience inward reciprocity on half of the items assessed.

The second conclusion concerns the homogeneity of the cathedral congregation. The literature review demonstrated that, not only did older people have a greater propensity to display higher levels of religiosity, but they were also more likely to display smaller network groups, relying on the connections with family and close friends for support, more than younger people in society. The data demonstrate that within the cathedral both younger and older people are likely to have access to the same type of social capital and experience similar types of community. This suggested that the cathedral is an important source of social support for both the older members of the congregation and for the younger members. One draw back from the current survey is that it does not assess the importance of family and close friends within the respondents' life; it could be suggested that if it did, more differences may emerge between the two age groups.

The third conclusion concerns the differences between the two age groups. In general the differences between the two age groups favour the young over the old. Thus, more young people found that the cathedral helpful for progression in the work environment, more young people would ask others in the cathedral for instrumental help, and were more likely to be asked for similar types of help. Only one item of statistical significance was in favour of the older cohort of the sample, that concerning trust in God. It would seem, therefore, that the cathedral is a place for members of the older cohort to connect with God, while the younger cohort make more opportunities of the weak ties that can be developed.
This chapter has explored the relationship between social capital and one indicator of individual differences, namely age. The next chapter goes on to explore this relationship with proximity to the cathedral as the key indicator for individual differences.
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Introduction

This chapter will explore the differences between those members of the cathedral congregation who lived within a few miles of the cathedral and those who travelled a distance of 10 or more miles. The chapter will highlight the literature pertaining to social capital, religiosity and proximity, before going on to explore the statistics generated by the dataset.

Part One: Literature review

Religiosity and proximity

There exists a paucity of literature dealing with the relationship between religiosity and proximity. This section focuses on this issue.

As early as the 1950s Zimmer and Hawley (1959) had noted the relationship between religiosity, operationalised as church participation, and the issue of proximity. Their analysis of nearly 700 head-of-households (the authors did not include the actual number of respondents) in the Flint area of Michigan demonstrated that those who lived on the fringes of the city were significantly less likely to attend church than those who lived in the city centre (p<.001). Similarly, those who lived on the fringes were significantly less likely to participate in church groups than those who lived in the city centre (p<.001). It is reasonable to assume that those in the city centre would have had access to more places of worship than those who were living on the relatively new estates built on the fringes of the city and beyond. This early data would seem to suggest that, along with factors such as age and family commitment (for those living on the fringes were more likely to be young families), the lack of
proximity to an abundance of places of worship has a significant negative effect on church attendance.

Calhoun-Brown (1996) in her discussion of the relationship between African-American churches and political activity noted that, when choosing which church to attend in a new area, most individuals will place proximity at a high rate of importance. Other factors, including relationships with the church and a sense of community among the congregation, go some way to suggest that social capital and proximity are inter-related in church choice.

Brown and Brown (2003), in their discussion of political activism among African-Americans, argued that most people who choose to attend church do so through non-political factors such as proximity, denomination and congregational-type. This suggests that, if macro-level social capital (here operationalised as political activism) is to be achieved in church-based groups, proximity may not be the best way of choosing which church to attend. Rather, the importance of political activism should be placed alongside, if not before, other considerations. To this extent, it is possible to argue that religious social capital is not dependent on proximity to church, but rather on the instrumental actions requiring resolution.

The Archbishops' Council (2004) report *Mission-Shaped Church* highlighted that in the modern era of travel and mobility, in which virtually all families own at least one car, proximity to a church does not guarantee attendance. The Archbishops' Council terms this phenomenon 'church shopping' (p. 2) in which a family will travel to several churches to assess which one suits their needs best. In terms of religiosity and
proximity, this suggests that mobility outweighs proximity to access religious and social capital.

Leonard (2006), in his analysis of 100 telephone interviews relating to geography and church attendance in Wayne County, West Virginia, found that proximity was an important factor in church attendance. One-fifth (20%) of the respondents stated that they attended their church because of proximity. Just under a third of respondents (31%) stated that it took them 10-minutes or less to travel to their church, with only 9% travelling for 31 minutes or more. Using data from a postal survey of 464 residents and from 100 telephone interviews, further analysis on the mean travel time to church indicated that those who attended several times per week and those who attend on a weekly basis had the lowest mean travel time, whereas those who attended a few times per month had the longest mean travel time. This is a clear indication that there exists a positive relationship between church attendance and proximity. For those respondents who had recently switched church, proximity was the most important factor in their choice of a new church, but the data demonstrated that they ended up with a higher mean travelling time than those who had not switched.

Sinha, Hillier, Cnaan and McGrew (2007) analysed data from the Philadelphia Census of Congregations to assess the relationship between proximity to church and religiosity. In total 1,232 congregations were interviewed. The results demonstrated that among those congregations which were the longest established, typically those within the city centre, members were more likely to live within a one-mile radius of the place of worship. However, the newer congregations were more likely to attract people in from further away.
In theorising the relationship between proximity and social capital, Ebaugh, O'Brien and Chafetz (2000) suggest that immigrants, especially in this case Chinese immigrants, are more likely to settle in areas with close proximity to their churches. In doing so, the immigrants recreate a parish system, in which they are able to attract more immigrants to join both the created community and the parish system, through the use of social capital. It can be argued, therefore, that immigrant communities use the social capital of being in close proximity to a religious institution to expand their community.

This section has highlighted the relationship between religiosity and proximity. It has been demonstrated that those who live closer to their church are more likely to attend, but that people moving into a new area are more likely to ‘shop around’ for which church to attend and could end up travelling further than those who have not changed congregation. Similarly, in the rural context, more people will attend church if there is only one parish in the benefice.

The relationship between social capital, religiosity and proximity has been presented in this literature review. It could be hypothesised, from the studies above, that those who do not live in close proximity to the cathedral have, in some senses, been ‘church shoppers’ and chosen the cathedral as the best place for them to worship. As all respondents for this dissertation are regular members of the cathedral congregation it would be expected that solidarity has been well established, and that no differences would be found between those who live in close proximity to the cathedral and those who do not live in close proximity.
Social capital and proximity

This section will address the relationship between social capital and proximity. In order to understand fully the relationship it is not, at this point, important to define proximity to what, but rather to understand how proximity and social capital inter-relate.

Gladow and Ray (1986) explored the impact of informal support systems on low-income single parents in the United States of America. They hypothesised that close links (for example with friends, family, romantic others, and with institutions such as the church) that all were in close proximity to the respondent would greatly increase their levels of well-being. The results demonstrated that those low-income single parents who lived in close proximity to romantic others, friends and family were more likely to receive high levels of informal support, constituting personal social capital. Proximity is, then, an important factor in bonded communities.

Sampson, Morenoff and Earls (1999) employed data among 8,782 residents from 343 neighbourhoods in the city of Chicago. Their data demonstrated that a child who grows up in close proximity to an advantaged neighbourhood (measured by indicators of high rates of social closure, high levels of exchange and high levels of control) is more likely to be imbued with personal advantages (measured by concentrated affluence, residential stability and low population) than a child from a more disadvantaged neighbourhood (p< .01).

Tsai (2000) included the variable of geographic proximity in his analysis of social capital formation in a multinational company with expanding business units. His
analysis focused on the relationship between the pre-existing units (totalling 36) and a new unit over a two-year period, by use of both questionnaires and interviews with members of all units. The hypothesis generated stated that units working within a similar geographical proximity were more likely to generate social ties, through strategic relatedness, than those working at a larger distance. The data revealed that there was no relationship between geographic proximity and trustworthiness, strategic relatedness, employee transfer or the generation of new links.

Domínguez and Watkins (2003) examined the relationship between proximity and social capital among African-American and Latin-American low-income mothers in Boston. Their qualitative data demonstrated that an absence of proximity between the respondents and their families can have an impact on the level of familial support they receive. The respondents' social capital was reduced when family lived further away, and due to the low socio-economic status of those interviewed, trust and connections with neighbours was low. This research suggests that proximity to those one can trust is an important aspect of social capital formation.

McMahon, Singh, Garner and Benhorin (2004) explored the relationship between community involvement and well-being among a sample of 200 African-American adolescents in Chicago. The data demonstrated that, in relation to proximity, the presence of a role model in close proximity to the individual greatly increased the likelihood of church attendance and community involvement. That is, for young African-Americans, having someone close by to whom they can aspire and respect has a positive effect on their level of social capital through community involvement.
Middleton, Murie and Groves (2005) explored the generation of social capital in Bourneville, Birmingham. They hypothesised that, when low-income communities in close proximity to each other are in competition for resources (for example improved public transport, or access to medical help), those communities that display high levels of social capital will be better placed than those communities that display low levels of social capital. Thus, high levels of social capital in one group may have detrimental effects for those in another group within close proximity. The results demonstrated that high levels of proximity can help increase levels of bonding and bridging social capital. Further, it was demonstrated that those groups with high levels of social capital were more likely to receive resources than those groups with low levels of social capital.

Grängsjö and Gummesson (2006) explored the development of social capital in hotel networks in Sweden. Drawing on data generated through case-study research, the study demonstrated that social capital was developed best with other hotels in close proximity to the case-study hotel. It has highlighted that managers working in close partnership with other managers in close proximity were better able to generate high levels of trust, reciprocity, and commitment in action.

Yuan, Gay and Hembrooke (2006) conducted research among a sample of 32 students, through an assessment of their links with other members of a distance-learning class. The results demonstrated that within a fragmented community, such as a distance-learning class, the issue of proximity does not negatively impact on the way in which social capital is developed. Yuan, Gay and Hembrooke argue that as
more people become part of disparate communities such as this, the greater the chance of social capital being formed between groups.

Aslesen and Jakobsen (2007) investigated the role of proximity and knowledge interaction, on institutional level forms of social capital among head-offices and knowledge-intensive business services (KIBS) in Norway. Their analysis revealed that, among a sample of 123 head-offices and 600 KIBS, distance between the two organisations does not prevent social capital from being generated and used.

Hays and Kogl (2007) explored the relationship between the physical proximity of family and the amount of interaction with neighbours. They hypothesised that families of respondents who resided within the neighbourhood would lessen the need for the respondent to develop neighbourhood ties. A representative sample, of 70 residents from Waterloo, Iowa, was recruited from 29 neighbourhoods for interviews to assess neighbourhood attachment, social capital building and political participation. The data revealed that there was no relationship between proximity of family and neighbourhood interaction, indicating that close familial links, both geographically and socially, do not affect the ability for social capital building. The study did not test, however, for the ability to generate neighbourhood social capital among those respondents whose families lived at a great distance.

In theorising the relationship between social capital and proximity, Glaeser, Laibson and Sacerdote (2002) noted that the spatial proximity of an actor to other actors will have an effect on the way in which social capital can be invested. They noted that previous research by Glaeser and Sacerdote (1999) demonstrated that those who live
in close social proximity to each other are more likely to create social ties than those who live at a greater distance.

Urry (2002), in his discussion of the relationship between social capital, corporeal proximity and mobility, suggests that social capital is not affected by a person's proximity to an institution, friend or family member. Rather, he argued, that access to transportation is the most important feature, especially in a society in which urban planning is based on gated communities that are not easily accessible. Thus, those people who are unable to access transportation easily are more likely to have weakened social capital, whereas those who are able to access transportation easily will be in a better position to mobilise themselves to access different people and institutions, and, therefore, are more likely to have a strengthened social capital.

In theorising the relationship between proximity and social capital Lester and Cannella (2006) explore the issue of community-level social capital among family-run firms. They suggest that geographic proximity is an important factor in the development of community-level social capital, arguing that knowledge transfer is more likely to occur with those who have developed strong ties of trust and reciprocity. They hypothesise that those living in close proximity with each other will be more able to develop such ties and thus will be able to benefit more from social capital.

Rohregger (2006) noted that, in her analysis of the shifting boundaries of support in Malawi, social capital research must take into account the changing needs of those who live in a rural-urban divide. The distance and proximity of the urban and rural
localities, in both geographic and social terms, can have an impact on the way social capital, defined here through reciprocal support, is developed and used. She argued that in places with high levels of economic poverty, greater distance from the main sources of social (meso-level) support will have a negative effect on social capital. Those who are unable to travel to the city for help are unable to make the connections that are needed. Yet, as Urry (2002) argued, those who are able to travel are also able to access social capital.

Hauser, Tappeiner and Walde (2007) noted that, in relation to knowledge transfer, a form of institutional social capital, proximity plays an important role. They argue that physical proximity is 'the necessary prerequisite for continuous and meaningful social interaction', that is social capital can only be properly generated through face-to-face encounters by those who are within the same geographical location.

Lorenzen (2007) argued that certain types of social capital are dependent on proximity. He noted that, if institutions are concerned with developing dense networks, that is, highly bonded communities, then close physical proximity is essential. Without the immediate physical proximity, network connections can only be expected to be loose, bridged connections, as in those that typify networks created for one specific purpose.

This section has explored the relationship between social capital and proximity. It has been demonstrated that, on the one hand, there seems to be no negative relationship between social capital development and the absence of proximity. That is, even groups as divided as distance-learning classes, are able to generate social capital
between members. On the other hand, more theoretical understandings of the relationship would suggest that it is mobility, rather than proximity, that is essential to social capital formation. Those who are able to travel to meet people face-to-face are more likely to be able to generate social capital.

Conclusion

This part has been concerned with the relationship between religiosity and proximity, and between social capital and proximity. From the literature review presented, it could be hypothesised that those who live in close proximity to the cathedral would be presented with more opportunities to connect with those who also live in close proximity to the cathedral, than those who live at a greater distance. High levels of social capital should be experienced by both groups in relation to neighbourhood reciprocity, as it has been demonstrated that close proximity can foster bonded solidarity.

Part Two: Social capital in the cathedral

This part will explore the responses of those who checked that they had travelled to the cathedral 'less than 1 mile', '1-2 miles', and '3-4 miles' (grouped together as those who travelled the least distance, $N = 189$), and those who checked that they had travelled 10 miles or more (grouped as those who travelled the furthest distance, $N = 75$). Those who checked that they had travelled 5-9 miles were omitted from the comparison ($N = 97$). Table 7.1 (appendix two) presents the data concerned with the social capital present with being part of the cathedral community.
Within this section only two items had differences between the two proximity groups sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance, and both were linked to the perceived benefits of being a member of the cathedral. The first item was in respect to making friends in the cathedral. Nearly half (46%) of those who travelled the least distance to the cathedral stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation had helped them to make friends, compared with 32% of those who travelled the furthest distance (p< .05). The second item was in relation to community life. Half (50%) of those who travelled the least distance to the cathedral stated that being a member of the cathedral community had helped them make a contribution to community life, compared with 37% of those who travelled the furthest distance (p< .05).

In respect to the other items on this domain, the differences between the two proximity groups were not sufficient to achieve statistical significance. In relation to trust, both those who travelled the least distance and those who travelled the furthest distance stated that being in the cathedral congregation had built up their sense of trust in God (71% of those who travelled the furthest distance and 67% of those who travelled the least distance), in themselves (55% of those who travelled the furthest distance and 55% of those who travelled the least distance), and in others (59% of those who travelled the furthest distance and 52% of those who travelled the least distance).

In respect to assessing those aspects of their lives for which the cathedral had been beneficial, respondents in both proximity groups reached similar conclusions. Thus, both proximity groups stated that the cathedral was good for their spiritual life (82% of those who travelled the furthest distance and 82% of those who travelled the least
distance), for their personal life (61% of those who travelled the furthest distance and 55% of those who travelled the least distance), and for their social life (41% of those who travelled the least distance and 33% of those who travelled the furthest distance).

In respect to the perceived benefits of being a member of the cathedral congregation both proximity groups reached similar conclusions on the remaining items. Thus, both proximity groups stated that being a member had helped them to meet people (56% of those who travelled the least distance and 45% of those who travelled the furthest distance), to get on with their work (16% of those who travelled the least distance and 8% of those who travelled the furthest distance), to establish their place in the community (34% of those who travelled the least distance and 25% of those who travelled the furthest distance), and mix with those with whom they would not normally mix (57% of those who travelled the least distance and 55% who travelled the furthest distance).

This table has demonstrated that, in general, proximity to the cathedral does not have a bearing on the level of social capital experienced. Those who live further away, however, are less likely to state that the cathedral had helped them to make friends, and that the cathedral had helped them contribute to community life.

**Part Three: Reciprocity in the cathedral**

This section will explore the issue of reciprocity in the cathedral by examining statistics presented in tables 7.2 and 7.3 that deal with the respondent turning to others and others turning to the respondent respectively.
Of the items presented within table 7.2, six items have differences between the two proximity groups sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance with reference to outward reciprocity. In relation to personal help, significantly more respondents who travelled the least distance to the cathedral had other people to whom they would turn for spiritual help (76% compared with 63% of those who travelled the furthest distance, \( p < .05 \)). In relation to instrumental help, more respondents who travelled the least distance to the cathedral stated that there were people in the cathedral to whom they could turn for help with transport (25% compared with 12% of those who travelled the furthest distance, \( p < .01 \)) and to borrow something urgently (34% compared with 17% of those who travelled the furthest distance, \( p < .01 \)). Similarly, those who travelled the least distance to the cathedral stated that there was someone within the cathedral to whom they could turn if they had a psychological problem (43% compared with 28% of those who travelled the furthest distance, \( p < .05 \)), a problem with faith (58% compared with 43% of those who travelled the furthest distance, \( p < .05 \)), and with a problem with work (20% compared with 11% of those who travelled the furthest distance, \( p < .05 \)).

On the remaining items in this table the two groups did not differ significantly one from the other. In respect to personal help, similar proportions in both proximity groups stated that there was someone in the cathedral to whom they could turn for emotional help (53% of those who travelled the least distance and 41% of those who travelled the furthest distance). In relation to applied help, both proximity groups stated that there was someone to whom they could turn for practical help (26% of those who travelled the least distance and 18% of those who travelled the furthest distance), and for financial help (7% of those who travelled the least distance and 3%
of those who travelled the furthest distance). In relation to instrumental help, similar proportions of both proximity groups stated that there were people in the cathedral to whom they could turn for help with an elderly relative (27% of those who travelled the least distance and 21% of those who travelled the furthest distance), for help if they had a physical illness (50% of those who travelled the least distance and 40% of those who travelled the furthest distance), and if the respondent had problems with a family relation (52% of those who travelled the least distance and 42% of those who travelled the furthest distance).

Table 7.3 examines the issue of inward reciprocity among the cathedral respondents. Within this table only two items have differences between the two proximity groups sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance, and they both relate to instrumental help. First, those who travelled the least distance to the cathedral were more likely to state that people had turned to them to borrow something urgently (26% compared with 11% of those who travelled the furthest distance, p< .01). Second, those who travelled the least distance were more likely to state that others had turned to them with a psychological problem (24% compared with 8% of those who travelled the furthest distance, p< .01).

On the remaining items on this domain, the differences between the two proximity groups were not sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. In relation to personal help, both proximity groups stated that others had turned to them for spiritual help (28% of those who travelled the least distance and 18% of those who travelled the furthest distance) and emotional help (38% of those who travelled the least distance and 32% of those who travelled the furthest distance). In relation to applied
help, both proximity groups stated that others had turned to them for practical help (27% of those who travelled the least distance and 21% of those who travelled the furthest distance) and for financial help (12% of those who travelled the furthest distance and 11% of those who travelled the least distance). In relation to instrumental help, both proximity groups reported inward reciprocity in respect to: help with an elderly relative (22% of those who travelled the least distance and 16% of those who travelled the furthest distance), and help with transport (30% of those who travelled the least distance and 26% of those who travelled the furthest distance). Comparable percentages of both proximity groups stated that people had turned to them for help with a physical illness (26% of those who travelled the least distance and 18% of those who travelled the furthest distance), a problem with their family relations (24% of those who travelled the least distance and 15% of those who travelled the furthest distance), a problem with faith (17% of those who travelled the furthest distance and 15% of those who travelled the least distance) and a problem with work (26% of those who travelled the least distance and 21% of those who travelled the furthest distance).

This section has highlighted inward and outward reciprocity among regular members of the cathedral congregation. In relation to outward reciprocity (table 7.2) it would seem that those who travelled the furthest distance to the cathedral have less opportunity to make use of connections within the cathedral in relation to spiritual help, transport, borrowing something urgently, psychological problems, problems with faith, and problems with work. In relation to inward reciprocity (table 7.3) those who travelled the furthest distance to the cathedral have less opportunity to make use
of connections in respect of borrowing something urgently and psychological problems.

Part Four: Neighbourhood reciprocity

Following on from the analysis of reciprocity in the cathedral, the next section explores inward reciprocity in the neighbourhood. The statistics are presented in table 7.4.

Only one item in this table has differences between the two proximity groups sufficiently large to produce statistical differences. Just under a third (28%) of those who travelled the furthest distance to the cathedral stated that others in the neighbourhood had turned to them for financial help, compared with 16% of those who travelled the least distance (p<.05).

On the remaining items no statistically significant differences were recorded. In terms of personal help, both proximity groups stated that others had turned to them for spiritual help (41% of those who travelled the least distance and 32% of those who travelled the furthest distance), and emotional help (59% of those who travelled the least distance and 49% of those who travelled the furthest distance). In terms of applied help, just under half of both proximity groups stated that others had turned to them for practical help (49% of those who travelled the least distance and 46% of those who travelled the furthest distance).

In relation to instrumental help, equal proportions of both proximity groups had others in the neighbourhood who turned to them for help with an elderly relative (44% of
those who travelled the least distance and 41% of those who travelled the furthest distance), for help with transport (57% of those who travelled the furthest distance and 54% of those who travelled the least distance), to borrow something urgently (51% of those who travelled the least distance and 50% of those who travelled the furthest distance), with a physical illness (50% of those who travelled the furthest distance and 46% of those who travelled the least distance), with a psychological problem (39% of those who travelled the least distance and 32% of those who travelled the furthest distance), with a problem with family relations (37% of those who travelled the least distance and 32% of those who travelled the furthest distance), with a problem with their faith (32% of those who travelled the least distance and 29% of those who travelled the furthest distance), and with a problem in work (46% of those who travelled the least distance and 38% of those who travelled the furthest distance).

This section has explored inward reciprocity in the neighbourhood. Those who travel the furthest distance to the cathedral experience greater amounts of inward reciprocity in the neighbourhood than they experience within the cathedral. Yet generally, for this form of social capital, both groups experience similar levels of reciprocity.

**Part Five: Experience community**

Moving away from exploring the trust and reciprocity associated with being member of the cathedral congregation, this section explores the notion of community and the way this is felt and expressed among regular members. The statistics for this section are presented in table 7.5.
Only one item in this section had differences between the two proximity groups sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. In respect to belonging, 43% of those who travelled the least distance stated that they felt a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral, compared with 27% of those who travelled the furthest distance ($p < .01$).

None of the remaining items in the experiencing community domain were sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. Thus, comparable proportions of respondents in both proximity groups felt that they were really part of the cathedral community (41% of those who travelled the furthest distance and 28% of those who travelled the least distance), felt lonely in the cathedral (22% of those who travelled the least distance and 20% of those who travelled the furthest distance), felt close to the cathedral clergy (44% of those who travelled the least distance and 36% of those who travelled the furthest distance), and felt close to others in the cathedral congregation (45% of those who travelled the least distance and 41% of those who travelled the furthest distance).

Similarly, in relation to the openness of the community, comparable proportions stated that a lot of their close friends go to the cathedral (24% of those who travelled the least distance and 22% of those who travelled the furthest distance), that it is good to see new faces in the cathedral (74% of those who travelled the least distance and 67% of those who travelled the furthest distance), and that too many visitors spoil the sense of community (26% of those who travelled the furthest distance and 24% of those who travelled the least distance).
These data demonstrate that, other than feeling a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral, the two proximity groups experience being a member of the cathedral community in similar ways.

**Part Six Building community**

This section explores the experience of building community among members of the cathedral congregation. The statistics for this section are presented in table 7.6.

In two of the items presented in this table the differences between the two proximity groups were sufficiently large to be statistically significant. First, significantly more respondents who travelled the least distance stated that they had met different religious leaders through their involvement in the cathedral than those who travelled the furthest distance (35% compared with 20% respectively, p< .01). Second, more respondents who travelled the least distance stated that they helped out with the community work undertaken by the cathedral than those who travelled the furthest distance (43% compared with 26% respectively, p< .01).

The differences between the two proximity groups on the remaining items in this section were not sufficiently large to produce statistical differences. Thus, comparable proportions of both proximity groups stated that people from all walks of life worship in the cathedral (63% of those who travelled the furthest distance and 61% of those who travelled the least distance); that they had become friends with people in the cathedral whom they otherwise would not have met (47% of those who travelled the least distance and 42% of those who travelled the furthest distance); had made business contacts through their involvement in the cathedral (11% of those who
travelled the least distance and 8% of those who travelled the furthest distance); had met important people through their involvement in the cathedral (22% of those who travelled the least distance and 15% of those who travelled the furthest distance); had met different community leaders through their involvement in the cathedral (33% of those who travelled the least distance and 25% of those who travelled the furthest distance). In relation to the negative side of social capital, comparable proportions of each proximity group stated that they often felt pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral (12% of those who travelled the furthest distance and 8% of those who travelled the least distance).

The data demonstrate that, in relations to certain aspects of building community within the cathedral (meeting religious leaders, participating in community work undertaken by the cathedral) those who travel the furthest distance are at a disadvantage to those who are in close proximity to the cathedral.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored the relationships between social capital and proximity among members of cathedral congregations. Three main conclusions can be drawn from this chapter.

The first conclusion concerns the literature review. It has been demonstrated that there is a relationship between social capital and physical proximity, demonstrating that those who live closer to each other are more likely to develop bonded networks. Further, it was highlighted that there was a positive relationship between proximity and religiosity, in so much as proximity was positively related to church attendance.
It would seem, therefore, that proximity is an important indicator of both social capital and church attendance.

The second conclusion concerns the similarities between members of the cathedral congregation. The literature review presents a mixed picture concerning the relationship between social capital and proximity. On the one hand, Yuan, Gay and Hembrooke (2006) have suggested that informal personal connections can be sustained over large distances. On the other hand, Hauser, Tappeinier and Walde (2007) have demonstrated that more instrumental (knowledge transfer) social capital is less likely to be effective over great distances. The cathedral community is one in which both types of social capital can be exchanged. It could be argued that between members of the congregation personal connections are to be expected rather than business-based instrumental connections. The statistics presented above demonstrate that, in terms of social capital, both proximity groups record similar percentage endorsements. For both groups then, being a member of the cathedral congregation has developed their levels of trust, has had a positive impact on their lives and has provided them with a number of benefits. The data suggest that, for members of the cathedral congregation, similar levels of effective social capital are available regardless of proximity to the institution.

The third conclusion concerns the differences experienced between the two proximity groups. Most notably this is reflected in the answers relating to outward and inward reciprocity within the cathedral. The data demonstrate that on six of the items presented in relation to outward reciprocity, and on two items related to inward reciprocity, those who travelled the furthest distance recorded fewer instances of
turning to others, and others turning to them within the cathedral congregation. This creates an interesting paradox, especially when set beside the statistics demonstrating that, in terms of trust and benefits of being a member of the cathedral congregation, both groups record similar percentage endorsements. For the majority of those who travel over ten miles to the cathedral there are few people to whom they can turn for advice and help on various matters. In relation to the reciprocity experienced within the neighbourhood, few significant differences are present between the two proximity groups: those who are in close proximity to the cathedral and those who are not in close proximity to the cathedral experience similar types of inward reciprocity. Future studies would be well placed to examine the place of outward reciprocity within the community to assess whether those who commute into the cathedral have strong social and personal ties within the community in which they live, rather than just in the cathedral.

The next chapter goes on to explore the relationship between prayer and social capital among members of the cathedral congregation.
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Introduction

This chapter will explore the responses of those who stated that they had low frequency of prayer (those who checked that they never, occasionally or sometimes prayed) and the responses of those who stated that they had high frequency of prayer (those who checked that they prayed nearly every day).

Part One: Literature review

Prayer and religiosity

A great deal of literature investigates prayer and its correlates (cf. Francis and Evans, 1995). This section will explore the relationship between prayer and religiosity through an analysis of the relevant empirical literature. Prayer has been distinguished from religiosity as a whole within this chapter so that a more nuanced understanding may be gained between private religious practices (prayer), religious belief and public religious practices. Following the argument of Francis and Robbins (2004), a more precise picture will emerge of the relationship between private prayer and religious belief and public practice if the components are treated individually. The section will be split into five main parts focusing on the relationship between private prayer and church attendance, religious orientation, denominational differences, family influences, and religious belief.

Prayer and church attendance

Francis and Burton (1994) assessed the relationship between purpose in life and prayer among Catholic adolescents. Drawing on a sample of 674 12- to 16-year-olds the data demonstrated that 20% of the adolescents stated that they practised private prayer on a daily basis. Further, it was demonstrated that frequency of private prayer
was positively related to frequency of church attendance. That is, those adolescents who attended church at least every week were significantly more likely to state that they participated in private prayer.

Francis and Wilcox (1994) analysed the relationship between prayer and church attendance among a sample of 230 16- to 18-year-old girls in the United Kingdom. The study demonstrated a positive relationship between frequency of personal prayer and church attendance.

Gibson (1995) investigated adolescents' attitudes towards prayer by drawing on a sample of 900 12- to 15-year-olds in Dundee, Scotland. The data demonstrated that those who attended church nearly every week displayed a more positive attitude toward Christianity, as measured by the prayer sub-scale of the Francis Scale of Attitude towards Christianity, Form ASC 5B (Francis, 1989), and were less likely to state that they thought that people who prayed were stupid, and that saying prayers in school does no good. Further, the data demonstrated that those who never attended church displayed the most negative views towards prayer: this group was less likely to state that they believed God listened to prayers, that prayer helps them a lot, that most of their friends believe in prayer and that saying their prayers helps them a lot.

Francis and Evans (1996) explored the relationship between prayer and purpose in life among a sample of 1,640 12- to 15-year-olds who never attended church and among a sample of 669 young people of the same age who attended church most weeks. The data demonstrated that those pupils who attended church most weeks recorded a higher frequency of prayer than those pupils who did not attend church.
Francis and Wilcox (1996b) carried out a replication of their earlier study (Francis and Wilcox, 1994) among 236 16- to 19-year-old girls to test for the relationship between self-reported prayer and church attendance. The data demonstrated that a positive relationship existed between the two constructs, indicating that those young girls who attend church more frequently report higher levels of private prayer.

Francis and Bolger (1997) investigated the relationship between personality, prayer and church attendance in later life among a sample of 50 members of the Ex-Civil Servants Association in London. The data demonstrated that there was a positive relationship between church attendance and frequency of personal prayer among those in later life.

Francis and Johnson (1999) explored the relationship between mental health, prayer and church attendance among primary schoolteachers. Drawing on a sample of 311 primary schoolteachers, the data demonstrated that there was a positive correlation between church attendance and frequency of private prayer. Thus, those who attend church the most were more likely to participate in the private religious devotion of prayer.

McKinney and McKinney (1999) investigated the role of prayer in the lives of 127 undergraduates in the United States of America. Respondents were asked to keep a diary about their experiences of prayer, as well as completing paper and pencil surveys and telephone interviews. The data demonstrated that those young people who did not display high levels of commitment to a religious organisation displayed lower levels of frequency of prayer. Further, it was demonstrated that those who do
not attend church on a regular basis were also less likely to report incidences of private prayer.

Corwyn and Benda (2000) explored the relationship between religiosity, church attendance and hard drugs use among a sample of 532 adolescents from urban public high schools in the United States of America. The results demonstrated that there was a positive relationship between church attendance and a measure of religiosity that included frequency of private prayer.

Gunnoe and Moore (2002) analysed the predictors of religiosity among young people aged 17- to 22-years-old in the United States of America. Drawing on a sample of 1,046 respondents to the National Survey of Children the data demonstrated that frequency of church attendance as a child, being raised as a conservative Protestant and attending a religious school, all significantly correlated with frequency of private prayer.

**Prayer and religious orientation**

Hood, Morris and Watson (1987) examined the relationship between prayer and religious orientation among a sample of 86 people who claimed at least some religious affiliations. The data demonstrated that those who scored highly on the intrinsic religious orientation scale were more likely to interpret their prayer experiences in religious terms compared with those who scored highly on the extrinsic religious orientation scale.
Hood, Morris and Watson (1989), in a follow-up study to Hood, Morris and Watson (1987) explored the relationship between prayer experience and religious orientation among a sample of 189 people who reported high levels of personal prayer. The data demonstrated that those who scored highly on the intrinsic religious orientation scale were more likely to interpret their prayers in religious terms than those respondents who scored highly on the extrinsic religious orientation scale. The data would suggest that for those whose who score highly on intrinsic religious orientation, that is those for whom religiosity defines their worldview and way of being, are more likely to interpret prayers through a mystical lens and connect it with some transcendent power.

Laird, Snyder, Rapoff and Green (2004) developed a new inventory to measure prayer entitled the Multidimensional Prayer Inventory. Testing the new items on 314 undergraduate students in the United States of America, and among 162 adults with arthritis at a hospital in the same area, it was demonstrated that prayer was positively related to religious motivation. In relation to the frequency, duration, faith placed in the efficacy of the prayer, and the different forms of prayer tested (adoration, confession and thanksgiving) positive correlations were found with intrinsic religiosity among the college sample, and with all the above variables plus the supplicationary prayer among the adult sample. No significant correlations were found with extrinsic religiosity. This data suggests that prayer is an important part of life for those whose religiosity shapes their whole approach to life.
Prayer and denominational differences

Gruner (1985) investigated the relationship between private devotional religious activities and marital adjustment among a sample of church congregations in the United States of America. Drawing on a sample of 416 individuals it was demonstrated that those from sect congregations (for example, Pentecostal Churches) displayed the highest frequency of prayer, while those in the Liberal churches (for example the United Church of Christ, and the American Lutheran tradition) recorded the highest levels of infrequent prayer. This study would suggest that there are denominational differences to frequency of prayer, the data demonstrating that those church groups which demand a higher level of commitment from their members experience higher frequency of private prayer.

Gallup's (1996) report into the state of religiosity in America highlighted the importance of prayer. It was demonstrated that denominational differences were present with respect to frequency of prayer, with those who affiliated with the Protestant Church twice as likely to pray as those in the Roman Catholic Church. It was also demonstrated that those in the Protestant Church considered prayer to be a conversation with God, while those affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church stated that their prayers were much more formal expressions of belief, such as the Lord's Prayer.

Prayer and family influences

Francis and Brown (1990) explored the social influences on the predisposition to pray among a sample of 4,948 11-year-olds in the United Kingdom. The data demonstrated that there were positive correlations between the respondents'
frequency of private prayer and mother's church attendance and father's church attendance. Further, it was demonstrated that parental church attendance had a significant role to play in fostering a more accepting attitude towards prayer. On a denominational level, it was highlighted that affiliation to the Church of England was related to more positive attitude towards prayer, while affiliation to the Roman Catholic Church was related to a higher frequency of prayer.

Francis and Brown (1991) investigated the influence of home, church and school on prayer among a sample of 711 16-year-old pupils. The data demonstrated that parental and child church attendance significantly correlated with attitude toward prayer. Further it was demonstrated that the respondents' frequency of prayer was also positively correlated with those variables. This would suggest that parental influence in shaping a young person’s worldview has a positive effect on both their attitude to, and frequency of, prayer.

Prayer and religious belief

Baesler (2002) examined the explanatory framework of the Relational Prayer Model among samples of 77 young adults (aged 18- to 34-years) and 54 middle-aged individual (aged 35- to 65-years). Stepwise regression analysis revealed that, among the young adult sample, prayers of thanksgiving and prayers of supplication accounted for the variance in a relational intimacy with God. Among the middle-aged sample, these changed to prayers of adoration and prayers of thanksgiving. This study suggests that for different age groups, different forms of prayer can help deepen the respondents’ relationship with God.
Francis and Williams (2007) examined the relationship between social and religious factors and paranormal beliefs among a sample of 33,982 13- to 15-year-olds in England and Wales. Paranormal belief was operationalised through the question 'I believe it is possible to contact the spirits of the dead'. The data demonstrated that those who sometimes prayed were significantly more likely to agree that it is possible to contact the spirits of the dead, compared with those who prayed on a weekly basis and with those who never prayed.

This section has presented literature exploring the relationship between religiosity and prayer. Three main conclusions may be drawn from the analysis. First, it has been demonstrated that there are denominational differences in relation to frequency of prayer. The research suggests that those who are in Protestant or Anglican churches are more likely to record a higher frequency of prayer than those in the Roman Catholic Church. Further, those in the Protestant churches are more likely to perceive prayers as conversational relationships with God. Second, there is present a relationship between religious orientation and experience of prayers. The research highlights that individuals who score highly on the intrinsic religious orientation scale are more likely to interpret their prayer experiences through a religious frame of reference. The third conclusion concerns church attendance. The literature has suggested that higher levels of church attendance are positively correlated with a higher frequency of personal prayer. Further, the literature also suggests that higher levels of church attendance result in a more positive attitude towards prayer. Thus it would seem that religiosity is positively related to the practice, interpretation and experience of prayer.
**Prayer and social capital**

As Chapter Two has demonstrated, the issue of religious spiritual capital has begun to attract academic interest. As yet, the majority of the research has followed the Putnam (2000) thesis of membership as a form of social capital, and has focused on the relationship between voluntary participation and frequency of attendance. This section proposes to move the focus away from such studies to highlight the relationship between prayer and social capital.

Wilson and Musick (1997) investigated the relationship between volunteer work and various other indicators including religiosity and prayer. The data, drawn from a sample of 3,617 respondents to the Americans' Changing Lives survey, demonstrated that prayer was significantly correlated with volunteering (p< .001), indicating that a higher frequency of prayer was associated with a greater propensity toward volunteer work.

Black (1999) explored the importance of prayer among a case study sample of 50 elderly African-American women living in poverty in the United States of America. The results demonstrated that, for the respondents, prayer acted as a form of social capital with God. That is, through petitionary prayers with God, a form of reciprocity is created between the petitioner and God that constitutes an instrumental relationship. Such petitionary prayer can foster both societal connections, and more transcendental relations.

As noted in chapter two, Wuthnow (2000) examined the promotion of forgiveness by religious groups among 1,379 respondents in the United States of America. The data
demonstrated a positive relationship between frequency of prayer and forgiveness. The research suggests that frequency of prayer has a positive effect on how religious groups treat social capital, especially through such components of the construct as trust and reciprocity.

Ozorak (2003) tested for the relationship between religiosity and motivation for volunteering among a sample of 224 American students. The data demonstrated that closeness to God through prayer was highly significant as an intrinsic motivation for voluntary participation (for men, p < .01; for women, p < .001). Further, the data demonstrated that thanksgiving prayers were also highly correlated with an intrinsic motivation (for men, p < .001; for women, p < .001).

Jang and Johnson (2004) explored the relationship between religiosity and distress among African Americans. Drawing on a sample of 659 respondents to the National Survey of Black Americans, the data demonstrated that non-organisational religion, which included a measure of frequency of private prayer, was positively correlated with social support, which Jang and Johnson took to be a predictor of social capital. Thus, social capital is more likely to be found among those who have a high frequency of personal prayer.

Yeung (2004) employed data from the European Values Survey to test the relationship between volunteering (as a form of social capital) and prayer. The analysis of 1,036 Finnish adults revealed a positive relationship between prayer and social capital. The data demonstrated that those with a higher frequency of prayer were more likely to be involved in networks and ties that lead to social capital.
Loveland, Sikkink, Myers and Radcliff (2005) conducted an analysis of data derived from the ‘God and Society’ survey in North America, to assess if private prayer was associated with increased civic involvement. Logistical regression demonstrated that private prayer was associated with all four groups of civic involvement measured: social service groups, youth work, community associations and support groups \((p<.05)\). This research suggests, therefore, that private prayer will have a positive effect on levels of volunteering among individuals in America.

Javaheri (2006) investigated the place of prayer healing in contemporary Iran. Her analysis revealed that both patient and prayer healer were imbued with greater social capital as a direct result of the treatment. The data revealed that a connection is made between client and healer, with the healer being able to act as resource of knowledge with other clients. Thus, through a distinct form of prayer, that is prayer healing, a network of social capital is produced between two people. The suggestion here is not that prayer influences the societal beliefs and behaviours of an individual, but rather, that prayer can offer a way to meet others of a similar mindset. It could be imagined that prayer groups would offer a similar source of social capital, although no research has yet demonstrated this.

In their review of literature relating to the personal benefits of spiritual capital, Wortham and Wortham (2007) highlighted the important role played by prayer. Their analysis revealed that prayer has a positive relationship with personal happiness and pro-social attitudes. They conclude by saying that this positive relationship can have an impact on the society in which the respondents live, ‘the accumulation of spiritual capital can impact the “good life” and the “good society”’ (p. 449).
Welch, Sikkink and Loveland (2007) employed data derived from a sample of 2,989 respondents to the Religion and Public Activism Survey of 2002, a survey of English-speaking Americans over the age of 18, to assess the relationship between religiosity, public activism and trust. Ordered logistical models of the data predicting trust towards acquaintances and towards strangers demonstrated that frequency of prayer was not a significant predictor of the dependent variable.

This section has explored the extant literature concerning prayer and social capital; two main conclusions can be drawn. First, there is a positive relationship between social capital and frequency of prayer. This would suggest that those who pray more are more likely to develop networks of contacts to engage in some instrumental action. Second, it has been suggested that involvement in prayer groups, or in relationships with prayer healers, will have a positive effect on the level of an individual’s social capital. Thus, it would seem that prayer could act as both a personal and societal stimulus for this construct.

**Conclusion**

This part has explored the relationship between prayer and religiosity, and between social capital and prayer. It has been demonstrated that higher levels of religiosity are reflected in higher levels of prayer, and that prayer is related to higher levels of social capital. It can be hypothesised that a difference will be present between those respondents who state that they have a higher frequency of prayer and those respondents who state that they have a low frequency of prayer. It could be suggested that those in the higher frequency of prayer group will display higher levels of social capital compared with the lower frequency of prayer group.
Part Two: Social capital in the cathedral

This part will explore the responses of those who checked that they 'never', 'occasionally' or 'sometimes' prayed (grouped together as 'low frequency of prayer', \( N = 88 \)) and those who checked they prayed nearly every day (grouped together as 'high frequency of prayer', \( N = 219 \)). Those who stated that they prayed at least once a week were omitted from this analysis (\( N = 54 \)).

Table 8.1 presents data concerned with the social capital present with being part of the cathedral community within the two prayer groups. The differences between the responses between the two prayer groups on four items were sufficiently large to achieve statistical differences.

The first two items correspond to the respondents perception of how being a member of the cathedral congregation has been good for different aspects of their lives. Thus, significantly more respondents in the high frequency of prayer group (64%) felt that being a member of the cathedral congregation was good for their personal life, compared with those in the lower frequency of prayer group (51%, \( p < .05 \)). Similarly, significantly more respondents in the higher frequency of prayer group (46%) felt that being a member of the cathedral congregation was good for their social lives, compared with those in the lower frequency of prayer group (33%, \( p < .05 \)).

The second pair of items that achieve statistical significance relate to the perceived benefits of being a member of the cathedral congregation. On the first item in this pair, significantly more respondents in the higher frequency of prayer group (61%) stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation helped them to meet people
compared with those in the lower frequency of prayer group (48%, p< .05). On the second item, significantly more respondents in the higher frequency of prayer group (51%) stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation helped them to make new friends compared with those in the lower frequency of prayer group (36%, p< .05).

The differences between the two prayer groups on the remaining items on this table were not sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. In relation to the levels of trust explored in this table, comparable numbers of both groups stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation built up their sense of trust in God (72% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 61% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), their sense of trust in themselves (57% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 48% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), and their sense of trust in other people (59% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 58% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group). On the remaining item regarding how being a member of the cathedral congregation is good for aspects of the respondents’ lives, similar numbers in each group stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation was good for their spiritual lives (86% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 78% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group).

In relation to the perceived benefits of being a member of the cathedral congregation, similar proportions of both prayer groups stated that being in the cathedral congregation had helped them to get on in work (22% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 17% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), to establish
their place in the community (34% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group and 33% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group), to make a contribution to community life (52% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 49% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), and to mix with those with whom they would not normally mix (64% of those in the lower frequency prayer group and 58% of those in the higher frequency prayer group).

This part has highlighted the area of general social capital. It has been demonstrated that the two prayer groups differ on four items, namely that being a member of the cathedral congregation is good for the respondents' personal and social life, and being a member of the cathedral congregation enables the respondents to meet new people and make new friends. However, on the remaining items no significant differences were recorded.

**Part Three: Reciprocity in the cathedral**

This section will explore the issue of reciprocity in the cathedral by examining statistics presented in tables 8.2 and 8.3 that deal with the respondent turning to others and others turning to the respondent respectively.

Table 8.2 presents those statistics dealing with the respondent turning to others in the cathedral (outwards reciprocity). In this table two items within the instrumental help domain have differences between the two prayer groups sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. The first item relates to problems with a physical illness: 54% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group stated that there are people in the cathedral to whom they could turn with a physical problem compared with 38% of
those in the lower frequency of prayer group (p< .01). The second item relates to work: 23% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn if they had a problem with work, compared with 11% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group (p< .05).

On the remaining items in this table, the differences between the two prayer groups were not sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. With reference to personal help, comparable proportions of both prayer groups stated that there were people in the cathedral to whom they could turn for spiritual help (76% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 66% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), and for emotional help (53% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 47% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group).

In relation to applied help, similar proportions of both prayer groups stated that there were people in the cathedral to whom they could turn for practical help (30% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 21% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group) and for financial help (9% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group and 6% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group).

In respect of instrumental help, comparable proportions of both prayer groups stated that there were people in the cathedral to whom they could turn if they needed help with an elderly relative (27% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 19% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), help with transport (28% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 19% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), if they had a psychological problem (42% of those in the
higher frequency of prayer group and 31% of those in the lower frequency of prayer
group), if they had problems with family relations (49% of those in the higher
frequency of prayer group and 47% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group),
and if they had problems with their faith (56% of those in the higher frequency of
prayer group and 50% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group).

Table 8.3 presents the statistics dealing with inward reciprocity, that is, other people
within the cathedral turning to the respondent. The differences between the two
prayer groups on four of the items were large enough to achieve statistical
significance.

First, in relation to personal help, significantly more respondents in the higher
frequency of prayer group stated that other people in the cathedral had turned to them
for spiritual help (31% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group, compared
with 23% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group, p< .01). Second, in
relation to practical help, significantly more respondents in the higher frequency of
prayer group stated that others in the cathedral had turned to them for financial help
(16% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group, compared with 6% of those in
the lower frequency of prayer group, p< .01). Third, in relation to instrumental help,
significantly more respondents in the higher frequency of prayer group stated that
others in the cathedral had turned to them to borrow something urgently (29% of
those in the higher frequency of prayer group, compared with 15% of those in the
lower frequency of prayer group, p< .01). Fourth, also in relation to instrumental
help, significantly more respondents in the higher frequency of prayer group stated
that others in the cathedral had turned to them with a physical illness (29% of those in
the higher frequency of prayer group, compared with 18% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group, p< .05).

The differences between the two prayer groups on the remaining items were not sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. In relation to personal help, similar proportions of both prayer groups stated that others in the cathedral had turned to them for emotional help (39% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 30% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group). In relation to practical help, comparable proportions of both prayer groups stated that others in the cathedral had sometimes turned to them for practical help (22% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group and 21% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group).

In relation to instrumental help, corresponding proportions of both groups stated that others in the cathedral had turned to them for help with an elderly relative (23% of those in the higher frequency prayer group and 21% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), for help with transport (34% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 25% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), if they had a psychological problem (23% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 15% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), if they had a problem with their family relations (24% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 17% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), if they had a problem with their faith (20% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 11% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), and if they had a problem with their work (28% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 19% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group).
This section has explored the issue of reciprocity within the cathedral. In total, six items gained statistical significance. In relation to outwards reciprocity, the differences relate to the respondent turning to others if they had a physical illness, and turning to others with a problem with their work. In relation to inwards reciprocity, the differences relate to others turning to the respondent for spiritual and financial help, to borrow something urgently, and turning to the respondent with a physical illness. All of the differences reflect the hypothesis that those in the higher frequency of prayer group will record higher levels of social capital.

Part Four: Neighbourhood reciprocity

Following on from the analysis of inward reciprocity in the cathedral, the next section explores inward reciprocity in the neighbourhood. The statistics are presented in table 8.4.

On three items in this table the differences between the two groups are sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. First, in relation to personal help, significantly more respondents in the higher frequency of prayer group (41%) stated that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them for spiritual help, compared with those in the lower frequency of prayer group (28%, p< .05). Second, in relation to practical help, significantly more respondents in the higher frequency of prayer group (24%) stated that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them for financial help, compared to those in the lower frequency of prayer group (13%, p< .05). Third, in relation to instrumental help, significantly more respondents in the higher frequency of prayer group (42%) stated that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them with problems concerning family relations (28%, p< .05).
On the remaining items in this table, the differences between the two prayer groups were not sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. In relation to personal help, similar proportions of both prayer groups stated that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them for emotional help (58% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 53% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group). In relation to practical help, comparable proportions of both prayer groups stated that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them for practical help (56% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 46% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group).

In relation to instrumental help, comparable proportions of both groups stated that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them for help with an elderly relative (47% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 43% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), for help with transport (63% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group and 57% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group), to borrow something urgently (54% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 43% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), if they had a physical illness (48% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 42% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), if they had a psychological problem (37% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 34% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), if they had problems with their faith (34% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 26% in the lower frequency of prayer group), and if they had problems with their work (44% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 42% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group).
This section has explored the issue of reciprocity within the neighbourhood. It has been demonstrated that three items on this table achieved statistical significance, namely others in the neighbourhood turning to the respondent for financial help, spiritual help, and with problems concerning family relations. As hypothesised these differences are in the expected direction, with those in the higher frequency of prayer group recording higher scores.

**Part Five: Experiencing community**

This section explores the construct of community among members of the cathedral congregation. The statistics for this section are presented in table 8.5.

None of the differences in the items on this table are sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. In this respect, comparable proportions of both prayer groups state that they felt they are really part of a community in the cathedral (42% of both those in the higher frequency of prayer group and of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), felt rather lonely in the cathedral (22% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 21% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), felt close to the cathedral clergy (45% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 33% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), felt close to others in the cathedral congregation (48% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 36% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), and felt a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral (61% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 50% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group).
In relation to openness, similar proportions in both prayer groups stated that a lot of their close friends go to the cathedral (26% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 25% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), that it is good to see new faces in the cathedral (75% of those in the higher frequency prayer group and 66% of those in the low frequency prayer group), and that too many visitors spoil the sense of community in the cathedral (28% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group and 23% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group).

This section has explored the issue of experiencing community within the cathedral. It has been demonstrated that there are no significant differences between the two groups in relation to this topic.

**Part Six: Building community**

This section explores the experience of building community among members of the cathedral congregation. The statistics for this section are presented in table 8.6. The differences between the two prayer groups are sufficiently large on one item to achieve statistical significance. Significantly more respondents in the lower frequency of prayer group (14%) stated that they often felt pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral, compared with 6% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group (p< .05).

On the remaining items in this table, the two prayer groups do not differ significantly. Comparable proportions of both prayer groups stated that people from all walks of life worship in the cathedral (67% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group and 61% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group), that they have become friends
with people in the cathedral they otherwise would not have met (50% of those in the lower frequency prayer group and 47% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group), and that they have made business contacts through their involvement in the cathedral (13% of those in the lower frequency prayer group and 11% of those in the higher frequency prayer group).

In relation to linking social capital, similar proportions of each prayer group stated that they had met important people through their involvement in the cathedral (22% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 21% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), that they had met different community leaders through their involvement in the cathedral (26% of both the higher frequency of prayer group and of the lower frequency of prayer group), that they had met different religious leaders through their involvement in the cathedral (36% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 27% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group), and that they helped out with the community work undertaken by the cathedral (37% of those in the higher frequency of prayer group and 28% of those in the lower frequency of prayer group).

This section has explored the issue of building community within the cathedral. It has been highlighted that there is a possibility of negative social capital being experienced by those who record a lower frequency of prayer, with respondents in that group more likely to state that they often felt pressurised into doing things by other members of the cathedral.
Conclusion

This chapter has explored the relationship between social capital and prayer among a sample of regular members of cathedral congregations. Three main conclusions may be drawn.

First, it has been highlighted that, in general, the differences between the two prayer groups have been in the direction hypothesised. That is, those who claim a higher frequency of prayer record higher levels of social capital than those who claim a lower frequency of prayer. This seems to be the case in relation to the development of the respondents' social and personal life, with the cathedral providing opportunities to meet new people and to develop new friendships. It has also been demonstrated that those who record a higher frequency of prayer are also more likely to experience a reciprocal relationship with others, especially in relation to physical illness, a problem with work, spiritual help and financial help. This reciprocal relationship is reflected in the neighbourhood, especially in relation to spiritual help, financial help and problems with family relations. As the literature review highlighted, higher levels of prayer are reflected in higher levels of social capital.

Second, on one item, the differences between the two groups are in favour of those who record a lower frequency of prayer. In relation to building community, this group stated that they often feel pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral congregation. The 'dark side' of social capital is often an aspect of the subject that is not presented in the literature (Putnam, 2000), yet it is important to understand how relationships can be used for coercion as well as for good. The present research has highlighted that for some members of the community (when
viewed through the lens of frequency of prayer), a negative aspect of community may be experienced.

Third, despite both the positive and negative differences between the two groups, on the majority of items presented in this table significant differences do not emerge. This suggests that for those who have a high frequency of private prayer, and for those who have a low frequency of private prayer, the cathedral remains a place in which social capital can be developed equally.

This chapter has explored the issue of prayer; the next chapter goes on to examine the issue of social and professional class.
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Introduction

This chapter will explore the responses of those who stated that they were employed in non-professional occupations (those who checked that their jobs were unskilled manual, semi-skilled manual, skilled manual and non-manual categories) and the responses of those who stated that they were employed in professional occupations (those who checked that their jobs were semi-professional or professional) in relation to the social capital experienced in the cathedral and in the neighbourhood. The chapter will begin with a literature review exploring the relationship between social class and religiosity, and between social class and social capital, before examining the statistics.

Part One: Literature review

Social class and religiosity

One of the ways social class has been operationalised within the empirical literature has been through the construct of occupational status. This section will review literature pertaining to the relationship between social class and religiosity.

Azzi and Ehrenberg (1975), in a foundational study, explored the relationship between household allocation of time and church attendance. Their review of previous research highlighted that social class was generally weakly associated with frequency of church attendance. Operationalising social class as total family income, the data drawing on 2,102 respondents to a Gallop poll conducted in 1947 indicated that there was a positive relationship between family income and frequency of church attendance. The data indicated that those who were of a higher social class (that is
those with the higher family income) were more likely to record higher levels of church attendance.

Gibson, Francis and Pearson (1990) explored the relationship between social class and attitude towards Christianity among a sample of 2,717 14- to 15-year-old adolescents. The data demonstrated that those adolescents who were from upper class backgrounds were significantly more likely to attend church than those from lower class backgrounds (p< .001).

Francis, Pearson and Lankshear (1990), in their follow on study to Gibson, Francis and Pearson (1990), explored the relationship between social class and attitude towards Christianity among a sample of 5,288 10- to 11-year-olds in England. The data demonstrated that before controlling for parental church attendance, a significant relationship emerged between higher social class and church attendance (p< .001), demonstrating that those respondents from a higher social class were more likely to attend church. Further, there was a positive relationship between social class and attitude towards Christianity after controlling for parental church attendance (p< .001), indicating that those of a higher social class demonstrated a more positive attitude toward Christianity.

Davies, Watkins, Winter, Pack, Seymour and Short (1991) explored the relationship between social class and contact with ministers of religion among a sample of 489 parishioners in rural communities in England. The data demonstrated that those respondents from higher social classes were more likely to state that they knew their priest reasonably well or better, compared with those from the lower social classes.
Further, the data demonstrated that 76% of those in the non-manual group had not attended church over the past three years, while 54% of those in the upper-middle class group had not attended church in the same time period.

Francis (1992) examined the relationship between religiosity, gender and social class on attitudes toward school among a sample of 3,762 11-year-old pupils in England. The data demonstrated that, in relation to social class and religiosity, those children from higher socio-economic backgrounds also recorded higher scores in relation to religiosity.

Francis and Gibson (1993) explored the relationship between religiosity, television viewing and popular culture among a sample of 5,432 pupils aged 11- to 15-years in Scotland. As part of their analysis, they calculated for the relationship between social class and religiosity. The data demonstrated that there was a significant (p < .05) relationship between social class and attitude towards Christianity, indicating that those of a lower social class were more likely to have a more positive attitude towards Christianity.

Francis (2001) in his analysis of 33,982 young people in England and Wales demonstrated that, in relation to social class, those from higher social classes were significantly more likely to believe in God (p < .001) and that Jesus really rose from the dead (p < .001). Conversely, those from lower social class groups were more likely to believe that God punishes people who do wrong (p < .01) and to think that Christianity is the only true religion (p < .001).
Nooney and Woodrum (2002) assessed the relationship between religious coping and church-based social support. Drawing on a sample of 337 respondents to the National Opinion Research Centre’s General Social Survey in the United States of America, the results demonstrated that social class, measured as total annual income, was negatively correlated to two indicators of religiosity (church attendance and private prayer).

Wuthnow (2003b) employed data from the 2000 Social Capital Benchmark Survey among 29,233 respondents to test the relationship between religious involvement and social class. The results demonstrated that those who attended church on a weekly basis were significantly more likely to have friends from manual working homes than those who do not attend church, after controlling for the respondents own social status. It would seem, therefore, that members of congregations are likely to be of higher social status (Francis, Pearson and Lankshear, 1990), but are more likely to have made links with those from other social groups.

Abbotts, Williams, Sweeting and West (2004) explored the relationship between denomination and attendance among a sample of 2,586 11- to 16-year-olds in Western Scotland. In relation to social class, it was demonstrated that those children who recorded their parent’s occupation as being non-manual recorded a higher frequency of church attendance than those in other occupational groups. These data would suggest that those of lower social classes are less likely to attend church than those of higher social classes.
Fase (2005), in his general analysis of economics and religion, noted that social class does not have an impact on frequency of church attendance, but that educational achievement is related to higher levels of church attendance. This demonstrates the difficulty in the definition and operationalisation of the construct of social class. Within this dissertation social class will be taken to mean occupational status.

Paterson and Iannelli (2006) explored the link between social mobility, religion and education in Scotland among those who were interviewed for the Scottish Household Survey (a total of 14,663 respondents). The results demonstrated that fewer people from the higher-grade professional class were affiliated with a church, whereas more members of the skilled class claimed affiliation to both the Church of Scotland and the Roman Catholic Church. Further, the data demonstrated that 57% of the respondents who claimed affiliation to the Roman Catholic Church could be considered as upwardly mobile, compared with 51% of those in the Church of Scotland and 50% of those who claimed no religious affiliation.

Ecklund and Park (2007) assessed the relationship between religiosity and community volunteerism among a sample of 711 Asian-American respondents. The data demonstrated that there was a direct relationship between social class (measured by highest educational qualification and annual income), and religiosity (measured by affiliation). Significantly more middle-class respondents claimed affiliation to Catholicism than claimed no-affiliation.

Gallagher (2007) conducted interviews among 67 members of two Protestant congregations in America to explore the role of children in church life. It was
demonstrated that the two congregations surveyed were characterised by middle and upper-class values.

Güveli, Need and de Graaf (2007) explored the relationship between social class, education and socio-political, cultural and economic preferences among a subset of those who responded to the Family Survey of the Dutch Population (the exact respondent numbers were undisclosed). Their data revealed that, in relation to the expectation of gender-role attitudes, church attendance could not be used to explain the differences between those of the higher social groups (namely the high-grade technocrats and the high- and low-grade social and cultural specialists). That these groups have high levels of church attendance cannot be used as a predictor of their opinions of gender-equality.

O'Riagain (2007) examined the relationship between social class and religion in both the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. Drawing on a recorded sample of 2,000 interviews, conducted in both provinces of Ireland, it was demonstrated that denominational differences are recorded with relation to social class. In relation to Catholics, the majority of respondents recorded their social class as being middle, with the higher (professional and managerial) class being the least represented among the sample. In relation to Protestants, the higher class was the most represented group, with the middle class being the least represented group.

In theorising the relationship between social class and religiosity, Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle (1997, p. 155ff) state that there is a difference between the middle classes and the lower classes in terms of their religiosity. They highlight the similarities between
the affluent and stable life experienced by those in the middle class and the stability and recurrence of their worshipping habits. Finally, Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle suggest that there is a difference in approach to worship taken by the different social classes. They noted that those in the upper and middle classes are more involved in ritual activities, whereas those in the lower classes will often be more involved in the emotional attachments to the religion.

McCloud (2007) suggested that research has commonly found that there exists a pattern between social class and religious affiliation. He noted that those of higher social classes are more likely to claim affiliation to theologically liberal denominations, while those in the lower social classes are likely to claim affiliation to more conservative denominations. McCloud argued that class is used to maintain religious distinctions in three main ways. The first has to do with the externally ascribed characteristics of a group by those interested in social boundary marking. The characteristics that are placed on social groups are then transcribed to the churches and congregations. The second has to do with the self-ascribed social class of religious groups. Through a developing symbolic capital (cf Bourdieu, 1984; Baker, Brown and Williams, 2007) a religious group will ascribe itself a certain class boundary as part of identity formation. Third, McCloud noted that social classes will self-select into certain religious denominations. For example, during times of financial hardship, those in the lower social classes are more likely to join denominations that provide them with social status and social support so that individuals in that class are able to fulfil their need for status, networks and identity through religious affiliation that they are not able to obtain in society at large.
This section has explored the relationship between social class and religiosity. It has been demonstrated that those in the middle and upper classes are more likely to attend church, to display religious beliefs and to claim religious affiliation. It has also been demonstrated that those in the churches are more likely to have connections with those of lower socioeconomic groups and are more likely to be socially mobile. The next section will explore the relationship between social capital and social class.

**Social class and social capital**

This section will explore the relationship between social class and social capital. Kulis (1992) examined the relationship between social class and the locus of reciprocity in relationships with adult children among a sample of 4,477 respondents to the National Survey of Families and Households who indicated that they had a child aged 19 or above resident in the household. The data demonstrated that those parents in middle-class professions were more likely to state that they were in a reciprocal relationship with their children than those in lower-class professions. Further, it was demonstrated that those in the middle-class professions shared a mutual trust with their children. This study has demonstrated that those families from middle-class professions are more likely to demonstrate two key aspects of social capital, reciprocity and trust. It could be hypothesised from this study that those children who grow up in an environment of high social capital will be able to utilise familial links to generate social capital in the community.

Putnam (2000), in his analysis of associational membership in the United States of America, noted that all social classes have experienced a decline in social capital since the 1960s. However, the data demonstrated that those who are in the upper-
middle classes are more likely to be involved in sports related associational membership than those in the lower classes. In explaining the differences between the social classes, Putnam noted that educational level (which he defined as a proxy for social class, p. 241) has a positive impact on levels of associational membership, with those who have achieved a higher level of education being more likely to access social capital.

Horvat, Weininger and Lareau (2003) explored the effects of class differences on the relations between schools and parental networks. Their interviews with 88 third- and fourth-grade children and their families indicated that different social classes made different types of connections. For example, those respondents from lower social classes were more likely to make connections with other parents at children’s activities (especially during the time of waiting to collect the children). While middle-class parents also made connections in this manner, they were more likely to state that they knew the teacher, or another professional, through their contact with educational activities. Thus, seemingly a person’s social class corresponds to the level of social capital that can be engaged.

Hero (2003) analysed the responses to the Current Population Survey 1992, 1994 and 1996 of the United States Bureau (the total sample size was not included in the paper) to assess the racial inequalities in social capital formation. The data demonstrated that there was no clear relationship between social class (operationalised as level of income) and social capital. Both those residents in states that demonstrated similar levels of economic equality, and those residents in states that demonstrated great
diversity of economic equalities, produced relative levels of social capital over the three years analysed.

McCulloch (2003) explored the relationship between social capital and social disorganisation among 2,392 men and 2,807 women respondents to waves seven and eight of the British Household Panel Survey in 1991. The data revealed that men employed in skilled manual work, and women employed in semi-skilled and unskilled manual work, recorded higher levels of social capital than those employed in professional and managerial occupations. These differences may be explained by the way in which social capital was operationalised as neighbourhood informal ties rather than more formal business-related ties available to those in professional and managerial positions.

Perren, Arber and Davidson (2003) explored the influence of social class and marital status on informal group membership of men in later life. They suggested that those in the middle-class were more likely to be members of informal groups than those in the working-class. Perren, Arber and Davidson suggested that middle-class people were more likely to have access to a high disposable income and to a car, and were more likely to have good health than members of the working class, and thus would be better placed to form associational membership. It was further suggested that labour market experiences will affect the differences in social class informal participation. It is argued that, for middle-class people, the labour market was one of competition, in which the drive to be successful was paramount. However, on retirement such drive is no longer required by society, but may be an ingrained behaviour in the individual. Perren, Arber and Davidson suggest, therefore, that
informal participation can fill this need to be successful. Drawing on a sample of
1,109 men aged 65 years or over who responded to the British Household Panel
Survey, it was demonstrated that those who had been employed in middle-class
occupations (that is the professional and managerial occupations) were significantly
more likely to be involved in informal group work than those in unskilled manual
jobs. However, it was further demonstrated that those from lower-class backgrounds
were more likely to be members of social clubs. The research demonstrated,
therefore, that in general, social capital, as defined by Putnam, is related to social
class, with those in the higher classes more likely to claim affiliation to informal
groups, especially when those groups are other than general social clubs.

Warde, Tampubolon, Longhurst, Ray, Savage and Tomlinson (2003) investigated the
long-term trends of associational membership in Great Britain, 1991 to 1998. Their
data demonstrated that respondents from higher classes were more likely to be
members of voluntary groups. Further, the data demonstrated that over the period
examined, class had an important part to play in the membership patterns. Thus, it
was demonstrated that memberships for those in the lower classes had been rising,
while for those in the upper class they had remained constant.

Chin and Phillips (2004) examined the relation between social class and child-rearing
practices among a sample of 40 children from fourth-grade classes in the United
States of America. There analysis revealed that those children whose families were
upper or middle class (based on the parent’s occupation) were more likely to have
access to social capital (operationalised as opportunities to participate in holiday
activities) than those respondents of lower social class backgrounds. However, it was
demonstrated that those of lower class backgrounds were more likely to exploit their social capital in order to find discounts on food, clothes and lessons.

Berntsson, Köhler and Vuille (2006) explored the relationship between health, economy and social class by employing two cross-sectional population surveys in five Nordic countries. The first survey, carried out in 1984, achieved a sample of 10,291. The second survey, carried out in 1996, achieved a sample of 10,317. The data demonstrated that social class (operationalised by parent’s professional status) was not significantly correlated with social capital in either of the two studies. Therefore, in Nordic countries, a person’s social class does not determine the type of relationships they are able to build.

Jæger (2007) analysed the inequality of educational opportunities across three generations in Denmark. The data, generated through 2,386 interviews with young people in the Danish Youth Longitudinal Study, demonstrated that the respondents’ social capital (operationalised as connections to others) was positively related to the respondents’ parents’ social class (p< .001). The data indicate, therefore, that having a parent of high social class will enable a young person to have access to greater amounts of social capital than those young people whose parents are of a lower social class.

Ferlande (2007) investigated the role of different forms of social capital for health. She noted that within social capital generation, social class has an important part to play. The research highlighted that those who are from more socio-economically
advantaged areas are more likely to be able to access social capital than those who come from socio-economically deprived areas.

In theorising the relationship between social capital and social class, Muntaner (2004) noted that much social capital literature neglects to take into consideration the importance of social class. He suggested that those who are in lower social classes are often less able to access the social capital of those in middle and upper classes. It could be hypothesised that the differences in class acquisition of social capital are symptomatic of the inequalities of the construct explored in Chapter One. If Muntaner's analysis is to be given credence, it would suggest that social capital is only really readily available for those who have been able to move into the right social networks. Often, such social mobility is dependent on educational attainment, acquiring a professional job and having good levels of health. Those in the lower social classes may find it harder to access such things, and thus may never be able to attain the type of social capital that is often investigated in research.

Halpern (2005) noted that social class has often been linked to differences in social capital generation. Halpern highlighted that it is middle-class professionals who are more likely to have access to social capital. Further, it is suggested that those who are born into middle-class families are more likely to pass on their social capital to their offspring, and thus the class divides in social capital are perpetuated.

This section has examined the literature pertaining to the relationship between social capital and social class. It has been demonstrated that there is a positive relationship between social class and social capital, with those in the upper classes more likely to
be able to access and utilise social capital. However, the operationalisation of social class can be important in the measurement of relationships with social capital. It could be hypothesised, from an understanding of social capital formation highlighted in Chapter One, that those in the upper and professional classes are most likely to make connections within the workplace that form weak instrumental ties. Those surveys which ask only for strong informal ties will not be fully assessing the role of social class within social capital formation.

Conclusion

In attending to both sections within this literature review it can be hypothesised that those within the cathedral are most likely to be of the higher social classes and that high social class members of the cathedral congregation should record higher scores than those in the cathedral who are of the lower social classes.

Part Two: Social capital in the cathedral

This part will explore the responses of those who checked that their current or previous job was 'unskilled manual', 'semi-skilled manual', 'skilled manual' and 'non-manual' (grouped together as the non-professional group, N = 105) and those who checked that their current or previous jobs were 'semi-professional' or 'professional' (grouped together as the professional group, N = 176).

Table 9.1 presents data concerned with the social capital present with being part of the cathedral community within the two social class groups. The differences between the two social class groups on five items in this table were sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance.
The first item relates to how being a member of the cathedral congregation has impacted positively on the respondent’s personal life. Significantly more respondents in the non-professional group (69%) stated that being in the cathedral congregation was good for their personal life, compared with those in the professional group (56%, p < .05). The remaining items that achieved statistical significance all relate to the perceived benefits of being a member of the cathedral congregation. Thus, significantly more respondents in the non-professional group stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation helped them to meet people (67% of those in the non-professional group, compared with 55% of those in the professional group, p < .05), to make new friends (57% of those in the non-professional group, compared with 40% of those in the professional group, p < .01), to get on in work (27% of those in the non-professional group, compared with 17% of those in the professional group, p < .05), and to make a contribution to community life (61% of those in the non-professional group, compared with 46% of those in the professional group, p < .01).

On the remaining items in this table the differences between the two occupational groups were not sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. In respect of the domain of trust, comparable proportions of both groups stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation built up their sense of trust in God (71% of those in the professional group and 69% of those in the non-professional group), in themselves (57% of those in the professional group and 54% of those in the non-professional group), and in others (62% of those in the professional group and 61% of those in the non-professional group).
In relation to the positive impact on the respondent’s lives, similar percentages of both occupational groups stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation was good for their spiritual lives (86% of both the non-professional group and of the professional group), and was good for their social lives (50% of those in the non-professional group and 41% of those in the professional group).

In respect of the perceived benefits of being a member of the cathedral congregation, proportionate percentages of both groups stated that being in the cathedral congregation helped them to establish their place in the community (41% of those in the non-professional group and 33% of those in the professional group), and helped them to mix with those with whom they would not normally mix (62% of those in the non-professional group and 61% of those in the professional group).

This section has explored the general social capital of those in professional occupations and those in non-professional occupations. It has been demonstrated that on all the items that achieve statistical significance, those employed in non-professional occupations were more likely to benefit from being a member of the cathedral congregation than those in professional occupations.

Part Three: Reciprocity in the cathedral

This section will explore the issue of reciprocity in the cathedral by examining statistics presented in tables 9.2 and 9.3 that deal with the respondent turning to others and others turning to the respondent respectively.
Table 9.2 presents those statistics dealing with the respondent turning to others in the cathedral (outwards reciprocity). In this table, the differences between the two occupational groups are sufficiently large on six items to achieve statistical significance. First, in relation to personal help, significantly more respondents in the non-professional group (61%) stated that there were people in cathedral to whom they could turn for emotional help, compared with 46% of those in the professional group (p < .01). Second, in relation to practical help, significantly more respondents in the non-professional group (39%) stated that there were people in the cathedral to whom they could turn for practical help, compared with 23% of those in the professional group (p < .01).

The remaining four items to achieve statistical significance all refer to the domain of instrumental help. Thus, significantly more respondents in the non-professional group stated that there were members of the cathedral to whom they could turn for help with transport (34% of those in the non-professional group compared with 22% of those in the professional group, p < .05), to borrow something urgently (40% of those in the non-professional group, compared with 28% of those in the professional group, p < .05), if they had a problem with family relations (62% of those in the non-professional group compared with 48% of those in the professional group, p < .05), and if they had a problem with their faith (66% of those in the non-professional group compared with 50% of those in the professional group, p < .01).

On the remaining items in this table, the differences between the two groups were not sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. In relation to personal help, similar proportions of both occupational groups stated that there are others in the
cathedral to whom they would turn for spiritual help (80% of those in the non-professional group and 74% of those in the professional group). In relation to practical help, comparable proportions stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they would turn for financial help (11% of those in the non-professional group and 5% of those in the professional group).

In respect of instrumental help, equivalent proportions of both groups stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they would turn for help with an elderly relative (31% of those in the non-professional group and 26% of those in the professional group), if they had a physical illness (51% of those in the non-professional group and 50% of those in the professional group), if they had a psychological problem (46% of those in the non-professional group and 41% of those in the professional group), and if they had problems with work (22% of those in the professional group and 18% of those in the non-professional group).

Table 9.3 presents the statistics dealing with inward reciprocity, that is, other people within the cathedral turning to the respondent. None of the differences between the two occupational groups were sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance.

In relation to personal help, similar proportions of both occupational groups stated that others in the cathedral had turned to them for spiritual help (28% of those in the professional group and 27% of those in the non-professional group) and for emotional help (43% of those in the non-professional group and 38% of those in the professional group). Similarly, in relation to practical help, comparable proportions of both occupational groups stated that others in the cathedral had sometimes turned to them
for practical help (36% of those in the non-professional group and 30% of those in the professional group) and for financial help (15% of those in the professional group and 14% of those in the non-professional group).

In respect of instrumental help, similar proportions of both occupational groups stated that others in the cathedral had sometimes turned to them for help with an elderly relative (24% of those in the non-professional group and 23% of those in the professional group), for help with transport (36% of those in the non-professional group and 33% of those in the professional group), and to borrow something urgently (30% of those in the non-professional group and 28% of those in the professional group). Likewise, both occupational groups reported others in the cathedral turning to them if they had a physical illness (29% of both those in the non-professional group and in the professional group), a psychological problem (23% of those in the non-professional group and 22% of those in the professional group), a problem with family relations (27% of those in the non-professional group and 23% of those in the professional group), a problem with their faith (18% of those in the professional group and 16% of those in the non-professional group), and a problem with their work (29% of those in the professional group and 26% of those in the non-professional group).

This section has explored the inward and outward reciprocity of the two occupational groups. It has been demonstrated that those in non-professional occupations were more likely to state that they would turn to others for emotional help, practical help, help with transport, to borrow something urgently, for problems with family relations, and for problems with their faith.

Part Four: Neighbourhood reciprocity
The next section explores inward reciprocity in the neighbourhood. The statistics are presented in table 9.4. None of the differences between the two occupational groups were sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance.

In relation to personal help, similar proportions of both occupational groups stated that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them for spiritual help (47% of those in the non-professional group and 38% of those in the professional group) and for emotional help (60% of those in the professional group and 57% of those in the non-professional group). In relation to practical help, similar proportions of both occupational groups stated that others in their neighbourhood had sometimes turned to them for practical help (53% of those in the professional group and 51% of those in the non-professional group) and for financial help (22% of those in the professional group and 21% of those in the non-professional group).

In respect of instrumental help, similar proportions of both occupational groups stated that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them for help with an elderly relative (53% of those in the professional group and 44% of those in the non-professional group), for help with transport (66% of those in the professional group and 58% of those in the non-professional group), and to borrow something urgently (55% of those in the professional group and 53% of those in the non-professional group). Similarly, both occupational groups reported others in their neighbourhood turning to them if they had a physical illness (49% of those in the non-professional group and 47% in the professional group), a psychological problem (44% of those in the non-professional group and 37% of those in the professional group), a problem with family relations (41% of those in the non-professional group and 39% of those in the
professional group), a problem with their faith (35% of those in the professional group and 32% of those in the non-professional group), and a problem with their work (49% of those in the non-professional group and 47% of those in the professional group).

This section has explored neighbourhood reciprocity among regular members of the cathedral congregation. The data has demonstrated that the two groups do not differ significantly in this respect.

**Part Five: Experiencing community**

This section explores the construct of community among members of the cathedral congregation. The statistics for this section are presented in table 9.5. The difference between the two occupational groups was sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance on one of the items reported. Thus, significantly more respondents in the non-professional group (60%) stated that they feel close to others in the cathedral congregation (compared with 41% of those in the professional group, \( p < .01 \)).

On the remaining items presented in the table, the differences between the two occupational groups were not sufficient to achieve statistical significance. Both groups stated that they really felt part of the cathedral community (47% of those in the non-professional group and 42% of those in the professional group), that they felt rather lonely in the cathedral (26% of those in the professional group and 22% of those in the non-professional group), that they felt close to the cathedral clergy (46% of those in the non-professional group and 44% of those in the professional group), and that they felt a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral (59% of those in the non-professional group and 63% of those in the professional group).
In relation to the openness of the cathedral, similar proportions of both of the occupational groups stated that a lot of their close friends go to the cathedral (29% of those in the non-professional group and 25% of those in the professional group), that it is good to see new faces in the cathedral (79% of those in the non-professional group and 77% of those in the professional group), and that too many visitors spoil the sense of community in the cathedral (25% of those in the professional group and 22% of those in the non-professional group).

This section has examined the issue of experiencing community among regular members of the cathedral congregation. It has been demonstrated that those who are employed in non-professional occupations are more likely to state that they feel close to others in the cathedral congregation than those employed in professional occupations.

**Part Six: Building community**

This section explores the experience of building community among members of the cathedral congregation. The statistics for this section are presented in table 9.6. The differences between the two occupational groups on three items in this table were sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. First, significantly more respondents in the non-professional group (20%) stated that they had made business contacts through their involvement in the cathedral, compared with 9% of those in the professional group (p< .01). Second, significantly more respondents in the professional group (45%) stated that they help out with the community work undertaken by the cathedral compared with 32% in the non-professional group (p<
Third, significantly more respondents in the non-professional group (15%) stated that they often felt pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral, compared with 7% of those in the professional group (p< .05).

On the remaining items the differences between the two occupational groups were not sufficiently large to produce statistical significance. Comparable proportions of both groups stated that people from all walks of life worshipped in the cathedral (66% of those in the professional group and 64% of those in the non-professional group), that they have become friends with people in the cathedral they otherwise would not have met (59% of the non-professional group and 48% of the professional group), that they had met important people through their involvement in the cathedral (28% of those in the non-professional group and 23% of those in the professional group), that they had met different community leaders through their involvement in the cathedral (35% of those in the professional group and 33% of those in the non-professional group), and that they had met different religious leaders through their involvement in the cathedral (33% of both the non-professional group and of the professional group).

This section has explored building community among regular members of the cathedral congregation. It has been demonstrated that those who are employed in non-professional occupations are more likely to state that they had made business contacts through their involvement in the cathedral and that they feel pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral congregation. Further, it has been demonstrated that those who are employed in professional occupations are more likely to state that they have helped out with community work undertaken by the cathedral.
Conclusion

This chapter has explored the relationship between occupational status and social capital among regular members to the cathedral congregation. Three main conclusions can be drawn.

The first conclusion relates to the literature review. It was demonstrated that, in relation to religiosity and occupational status, those of higher social classes were more likely to record higher levels of church attendance and to record higher levels of attitude towards Christianity. Similarly, it was noted that those in the higher social classes were more likely to have access to, and to make use of, social capital.

The second conclusion concerns the differences between the two groups. Contrary to the hypothesis presented above, the majority of differences between the two groups favour those who are employed in non-professional occupations. Thus, it is this group who have found being a member of the cathedral congregation good for their personal life, has helped them to meet new people, to make new friends and to get on in work, and has provided them with an opportunity to contribute to community life. Further, they are more likely to turn to others within the cathedral for emotional and practical help, for help with transports, to borrow things urgently, to seek help for problems with family relations and for problems with their faith. The finding that it is those from non-professional backgrounds who record higher levels of certain types of social capital seem counter-intuitive. Yet, it may be argued that those in the professional groups are presented with more opportunities to create important social ties within the business environment. The finding that there is no difference between
the two occupational groups with regards to inward reciprocity within the cathedral and to neighbourhood reciprocity may go some way to supporting this view.

The third conclusion relates to the similarities between the two occupational groups. As indicated above, the groups did not differ in relation to inward reciprocity, neighbourhood reciprocity, and experiencing community. It would seem, therefore, that, in these areas and on the other items presented above, both those who are employed in professional occupations and those who are employed in non-professional occupations are equally able to experience and make use of social capital within the cathedral and within the community. This research may suggest that the cathedral can act as a place in which those who have not been able to access social capital at a community level are able to interact with those of both higher and lower social classes to redress the potential inequalities outlined above.

This chapter has examined the relationship between occupational status and social capital for regular members of the cathedral congregation. The next chapter will go on to explore the issue of voluntary activity.
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Introduction

This chapter will explore the statistics relating to social capital and voluntary participation. First, the literature review will highlight the relationship between religion and voluntary participation, before reviewing the relationship between social capital and voluntary participation. The chapter will then explore the data concerning regular members of the cathedral congregation.

Part One: Literature Review

Religiosity and voluntary participation

This section will explore the relationship between religiosity and voluntary participation. As has been seen in chapter two, it is expected that the literature will demonstrate that a positive relationship exists between the two variables.

Cnaan, Kasternakis and Wineburg (1993) investigated the link between religiosity and volunteerism. Drawing on a sample of 466 volunteers and 405 non-volunteers, the data demonstrated that the relationship is present, but complex. First, the link between volunteering and intrinsic religious motivation was tested. Although there was a significant difference between the two groups in relation to their intrinsic religiosity, Cnaan, Kasternakis and Wineburg posit that the mean differences between the two groups were not sufficiently large to conclude that those who were volunteers had higher levels of religious motivation. Further, it was demonstrated that those who spend the most time in voluntary work did not score highly on religious motivation. Second, the link between congregations and voluntary work was tested. The results demonstrated that those who are involved in church-related voluntary work record higher levels of religious motivation. This research has suggested that
there exist no real differences between those who do volunteer and those who do not volunteer in relation to intrinsic religious motivation; that is those who do volunteer are no more likely to hold religious beliefs as ways of shaping their lives than those who do not volunteer. However, the paper did not test for the relationship between extrinsic or quest motivations.

Smidt (1999) utilised data from 3000 Canadians and 3000 Americans to explore the relationship between religion and civic engagement. The data demonstrate that, in both countries, frequency of church attendance was an important predictor of civic engagement. Those who stated that they attended church frequently received higher scores in relation to civic engagement and social trust. Further, it was demonstrated that those who affiliated with evangelical Protestant Churches and those who affiliated with mainline Protestant Churches were more likely to be involved in voluntary work than black Protestants, Roman Catholics or others.

Youniss, McLellan and Yates (1999) examined the relation between religion and community service among youth in America. In exploring existing articles concerning the topic they come to four main conclusions. First, they argue that in general the youth of America are highly involved in voluntary work. Second, in relation to the topic of religion and voluntary association it is argued that personal attitude towards religion can have an important role in predicting propensity to volunteer. It is noted that those who state that religion is important to their lives are more likely to state that they are also involved in voluntary work. Third, involvement in church-sponsored voluntary organisations was demonstrated to lead youth to adopt the religious ethos of that organisation. Fourth, those youth who do participate in
voluntary work that is church-sponsored do not hold that as their primary civic concern. It is of note that the relationship between voluntary work and religiosity has been demonstrated to act in both directions, both leading the young people to voluntary work, and, through voluntary work, leading them to a deeper understanding of the religious values underpinning the organisation.

Mattis, Jagers, Hatcher, Lawhon, Murphy and Murray (2000) explored the relationship between religiosity, volunteerism and community among African American men. Drawing on a sample of 171 African American men, that data demonstrated that higher levels of church involvement were associated with greater likelihood for the sample to participate in voluntary work, also higher levels of church involvement predicted higher levels of membership in community-based organisations. Further, the data demonstrated that those men who were more likely to be involved in church-life activities reported a higher number of hours spent in voluntary work. This research suggests that those who are involved in religious life are more likely to be also involved in voluntary work.

Musick, Wilson and Bynum (2000) studied the effects of religion on formal volunteering by drawing on a sample of 6,484 adults in the United States of America. The data demonstrated that, for black Americans, the influence of the church is important in relation to levels of volunteering. Those black Americans who attended church on a regular basis were demonstrated to be more involved in community-based voluntary work than white Americans with comparable church attendance. Musick, Wilson and Bynum suggested that this religious and racial difference in volunteering may be due, in part, to the links each church makes with the community. It is argued
that black churches are more likely to be community orientated than white churches, and that this may be informing the differences presented.

Park and Smith (2000) investigated the relationship between religious capital and community volunteerism among churchgoing Protestants. The data, drawing on a sample of 1,738 respondents to the Religious Identity and Influence Survey, revealed that several factors influenced voluntary work within the sample. In relation to volunteering through a church-led programme, factors such as pre-existent ties with church activities, the extent to which the respondents’ parents were evangelical in their church-orientation and the presence of Christian family and friends all significantly influenced the extent to which volunteer work would be taken on. In relation to non-church-led programmes, different influences affected the extent to which a respondent would participate in voluntary work. Thus, a relationship emerged between volunteering and pre-existent ties with church activities, high levels of church attendance and the importance of the family’s faith. This research highlighted the importance of understanding the difference in motivation of volunteering in church-led and non-church-led programmes within a Protestant sample.

Becker (2001) studied the relationship between religious involvement and volunteering among a group of 1,006 residents in New York communities. The data demonstrated that, through employing logistical regression techniques, church attendance was positively related to higher levels of volunteering, as were levels of what Becker termed religious salience. Further, the data suggest that the respondents’ impression of the church’s mission strategy played an important role in their
voluntary activity; thus those respondents who believe their congregation is only a place for worship are less likely to participate in voluntary activities than those who consider their congregations to be more mission-led. As a follow-up to the survey, Becker conducted interviews with 38 people from New York. The qualitative data suggest that church-orientation is an important factor in volunteering activity, with those who would class themselves as liberal more likely to suggest that such work formed part of their civic duty, while those who would class themselves as conservative would see volunteering as part of their spiritual journey.

Uslaner (2002) explored the relationship between religion and civic engagement among a sample of 3,023 adults in the United States of America, and a reported 2,700 Anglophone Canadians and 700 adults in Quebec. The data demonstrated that what Uslaner terms as fundamentalist values (that is a high level of identification to Christianity, perceiving the bible to be the literal word of God) are significantly correlated with civic engagement. Further, while such fundamentalist views are an important predictor of secular volunteering, they prove to be even more important in relation to religious voluntary activity, with those who record high levels on the religious fundamentalism items more likely to donate time to causes related to the church.

Mutchler, Burr and Caro (2003) analysed the changing role of those in later life from being paid workers to unpaid volunteers. Their data, from the first two waves of the Americans’ Changing Lives Survey among 3,617 respondents aged 25 or over, demonstrated that attendance at religious services was positively related to formal voluntary activity (that is voluntary activity within an established organisation) during
later life. Further, those who reported high levels of attendance at church were also more likely to report a higher rate of hours involved in voluntary work. Thus, it can be concluded that, for older people in America, being a regular member of a church congregation can be a predictor of voluntary associational work.

Gronberg and Never (2004) investigated the relationship between religious networks and types of volunteer work among a sample of 526 residents in the American state of Indiana. Bivariate analysis employing the cross-tabular and Chi-square routines indicated that there was a relationship between religiosity and voluntary work. First, Protestants were significantly more likely to be engaged in voluntary work, compared with Catholics, other non-mainline Christian groups, and those with non-Christian religious preferences. Those who attended church on a regular basis (two or three times per week) were more likely to be involved in voluntary work, compared with those who attended church once a month or less frequently. Those who attended church on a regular basis also reported greater levels of involvement in fund-raising activities than those who attended church once a month or less frequently. Multivariate analysis, employing logistical regression, on the data indicated that church attendance was a significant indicator of volunteering above other indicators (such as education, socio-economic status and community attachment).

Mattis, Beckham, Saunders, Williams, McAllister, Myers, Knight, Rencher and Dixon (2004) explored the relationship between voluntary social participation and religiosity among a sample of 151 African American men. The data demonstrate that current church involvement was positively correlated with social capital, defined as solidarity with significant others, family and close friends. Similarly, higher levels of
subjective religiosity were also correlated with this aspect of social capital, as was early religious involvement. It can be concluded from these data that, for African American men, a continued relationship with religiosity has a positive effect on levels of social participation.

Schwadel (2005) analysed the individual, congregational and denominational effects on church members' civic participation. Drawing on data from 5,123 respondents to the Church and Community Planning Inventory survey administered in 1987, the results demonstrated that older church members hold the most memberships to non-church organisations compared with younger members, and that men belong to more non-church organisations than women. Further, it was demonstrated that that those who held more literal views of the bible belonged to fewer non-church organisations than those who interpreted the bible in a less literal way. From these data, it is possible to suggest that both individual differences within the church congregation, and levels of religiosity (as measured by biblical literalism) are important predictors of voluntary participation.

Ruiter and De Graff (2006) employed data from 53 countries to explore the relationship between volunteering and religiosity. Employing a sample of 117,007 respondents to the World Values Surveys the data demonstrated that in general those who attend church on a regular basis are more likely to be involved in voluntary work. The study presented three main findings. First, it was also demonstrated that Protestants were more likely to participate in voluntary work than Catholics, while non-Christians were as equally engaged in voluntary work. Second, it was found that those who attended church twice a week or more were more likely to participate in
voluntary work, indicating that high levels of commitment to a religious tradition can impact on participation in voluntary work. Third, in testing the relationship between country and volunteering, it was demonstrated that those respondents who lived in the most devout countries were more than four-times as likely to be involved in voluntary work compared with those respondents living in less devout countries. This difference provides a nuance to the understanding of the importance of church attendance, with those who live in devout countries, but who never attend church, more likely to participate in voluntary activities than those in more secular countries who never attend church.

Ecklund and Park (2007) investigated the relationship between religious diversity and community volunteerism among Asian Americans. Drawing on a sample of 711 respondents to the Social Capital Benchmark Survey conducted in the United States of America, the data demonstrated that those who claimed affiliation with Protestant and Catholic Christianity were more likely to state that they were members of a religious organisation than those in other religious traditions. Further, these two Christian denominations were also more likely to state that they took part in some form of religious volunteering. However, after demographics such as age, gender, education and social class were controlled for, it was those in the ‘other’ religious traditions (Hindus and Buddhists) who were more likely to participate in nonreligious voluntary organisations.

This section has explored the relationship between religiosity and volunteering. It has been demonstrated that generally there exists a positive relationship between the two variables, in which higher levels of church attendance lead to a greater propensity to
volunteer. Research has suggested, among American youth, that the relationship can work both ways, and that those who participate in church-led voluntary activities are more likely to take on the religious message and ethos of that group. Further, it has been demonstrated that there may be a denominational difference in volunteering, with Protestants presenting higher levels of this activity. However, these studies have generally been based on American samples, making extrapolation of results difficult into a British context. It may be hypothesised that congregations in the United Kingdom will have high levels of voluntary activity, as other congregations around the world demonstrate.

Social capital and voluntary participation

Putnam (2000) suggested that social capital and volunteering are synonymous constructs, and that a decline in volunteering can result in a decline in social capital. Yet other scholars have sought to understand the relationship between the two constructs before linking them as one. This section will explore the literature that seeks to understand the relationship between social capital and volunteering.

Robinson and Williams (2001) explored the relationship between social capital and voluntary activity in Māori and non-Māori society in Aotearoa (New Zealand). They highlighted the Muriwai Tournament, an annual sports tournament in the Opotiki district, as a place in which voluntary participation (through involvement in the competition) is deemed to lead to whanaungatanga (or kinship) among the different iwi (tribes), whānau (the immediate family) and the hapu (the extended family). Within Māori tradition, then, voluntary participation, on the micro-level, can lead to the generation of social capital among the different iwi and hapu. This in turn
suggests that such connections will ensure that the social organisations for voluntary participation are continued.

Price (2002) investigated how social capital, and other factors, impact on civic voluntary engagement. The interviews, with 32 statewide voluntary association leaders in Texas, revealed that volunteering was not necessarily in decline, and, therefore, neither were levels of social capital present in the organisations in decline. It is highlighted that the potential for social capital is present but that constraints on time and money can prohibit a person from entering into a volunteering role. However, contrary to Putnam’s (1995) argument, personal commitment was perceived as remaining high among those who would wish to volunteer but were unable to do so.

Wollebeak and Selle (2002) examined the extent to which the intensity (active or passive participation), scope (many or few affiliations) and type (non-political or political groups) of participation in voluntary associations contribute to social capital. The data, among 1,695 adults in Norway, demonstrated that the intensity, scope and type of participation do play an important role in the creation of social capital. Thus, those members who stated that they were only passive members with multiple affiliations reported higher levels of trust than those with active participation with only one affiliation. Further, the data suggest that multiple affiliations were more likely than fewer affiliations to increase levels of social capital. Thus, there is a positive relationship between voluntary participation and social capital.
Teorell (2003) explored the relationship between voluntary association and linking social capital in Sweden. The data, generated among a sample of 1,460 residents in Sweden aged between 16 and 18 years, demonstrated that in total seven active memberships and 13 passive memberships account for an increase of one contact, meaning that voluntary association does have a small positive impact on levels of social capital.

Parboteeah, Cullen and Lim (2004) investigated the relationship between social capital and formal volunteering through analysis of 33,119 respondents to the World Values Survey. The data revealed that social capital was positively correlated with higher levels of volunteering.

Bekkers (2005) analysed data from 1,587 respondents in the Family Survey of the Dutch Population to assess the relationship between social capital and voluntary associations. The data demonstrated that those who were more active in voluntary associations were more likely to have access to social capital than those who did not participate as much in voluntary associations.

Brettell (2005) examined the organisational lives of Asian-Indian immigrants who reside in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. Her analysis revealed that the voluntary organisational connections made by such immigrants have the potential to develop high levels of culturally-specific social capital. That is, the voluntary organisations provide a place in which immigrants are able to converse, socialise and develop connections with other immigrants. Such a bonded process is facilitated by similarities in religion, region of origin and nationality.
Mohan, Twigg, Barnard and Jones (2005) assessed the relationship between social capital, geography and health among the 7,578 English respondents to the Health and Lifestyle Survey. In respect to the relationship between social capital and voluntary associations, the data demonstrated that volunteering is positively associated with higher levels of social capital. Further, it was demonstrated that social, altruistic and political activities are also related in a similar manner.

Saxon and Benson (2005) explored data generated by the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey among 26,200 respondents to test the relationship between social capital and growth in the non-profit voluntary sector. The data demonstrated that voluntary organisations were found most in those areas that demonstrated high levels of social trust, high levels of political engagement and high levels of friendships. Further, it was demonstrated that pre-existing levels of giving and voluntary work had no bearing on the growth of the non-profit sector.

Welzel, Inglehart and Deutsch (2005) employed data from the European Values Survey to argue that it is not voluntary associational membership which is a significant predictor of social capital, but rather that this role belongs to elite-challenging behaviours, such as participating in petitions, strikes or unofficial boycotts. The data demonstrated that, although associational membership has not been in decline, the elite-challenging behaviours of petitions, boycotts and demonstrations have been rising since 1980. Further, it was demonstrated that being a member in three or more voluntary associations was likely to increase participation in elite-challenging behaviours. Welzel, Inglehart and Deutsch argue that a new definition of social capital may need to be considered to include such behaviours.
Son and Lin (2007) utilised data from the Social Capital Benchmark Survey to examine the relationship between social capital and civic action. The data demonstrated that both expressive and instrumental civic action, based on voluntary participation in groups, was positively related to social capital. Further, it was demonstrated that instrumental civic action was the best predictor of an embedded, or bonded, social capital.

In theorising the relationship between volunteering and social capital, Wilson (2000) noted that it is often high levels of social capital that can lead a person into volunteering. It is argued that those who take on such work are rarely recruited from mass media, but rather through the recommendation of those in their social networks. Wilson maintains that this causation can go to explain why those of higher socio-economic classes are more likely to be found in volunteering work as such social groups are more likely to have higher levels of network formation.

This section has explored the relationship between social capital and voluntary activity. It has been demonstrated that those respondents who stated that they were members of voluntary associations were more likely to demonstrate higher levels of social capital. Further, it has been suggested that those areas in which high levels of social capital are already present are more likely to attract groups to set up voluntary organisations.

Conclusion

This part has drawn together literature relating to social capital and volunteering, and to religiosity and volunteering. It may be hypothesised that those who participate in
voluntary activity will display higher levels of social capital than those in the cathedral who do not participate in voluntary activity. It may be expected, following on from the literature review above, that such differences may be highlighted most in relation to general social capital, trust and community.

**Part Two: Social capital in the cathedral**

This part will explore the responses of those who checked that they participated in some form of voluntary activity \( (N = 267) \) and those who stated that they did not participate in any voluntary activity \( (N = 92) \).

Table 10.1 presents data concerned with the social capital present with being part of the cathedral community within the two voluntary participation groups. The differences between the two voluntary participation groups were only sufficiently large on one item to achieve statistical significance. Just under half (46%) of those in the voluntary participation group stated that being in the cathedral was good for their social life compared with 35% of those in the no voluntary participation group \( (p < .05) \).

On the remaining items the differences between the two voluntary participation groups were not sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. In relation to trust, similar proportions of both voluntary participation groups stated that being in the cathedral congregation had built up their sense of trust in God (76% of those in the no voluntary participation group and 67% of those in the voluntary participation group), in themselves (55% of those in the voluntary participation group and 54% of those in the no voluntary participation group), and in other people (61% of those in
the no voluntary participation group and 60% of those in the voluntary participation group). In relation to the positive impact on the respondents' lives, comparable proportions in both voluntary participation groups stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation was good for their spiritual lives (85% of those in the voluntary participation group and 82% of those in the no voluntary participation group), for their personal lives (62% of those in the no voluntary participation group and 61% of those in the voluntary participation group), and for their social lives (46% of those in the voluntary participation group and 35% of those in the no voluntary participation group).

In relation to the perceived benefits, comparable proportions of both voluntary participation groups stated that being a member of the cathedral congregation had helped them to meet people (61% of those in the voluntary participation group and 50% of those in the no voluntary participation group), to make friends (49% of those in the no voluntary participation group and 46% of those in the voluntary participation group), to get on in their work (24% of those in the no voluntary participation group and 19% of those in the voluntary participation group), to establish their place in the community (38% of those in the voluntary participation group and 30% of those in the no voluntary participation group), to make a contribution to community life (52% of those in the voluntary participation group and 48% of those in the no voluntary participation group), and to mix with those with whom they would not normally mix (60% of those in the no voluntary participation group and 58% of those in the voluntary participation group).
This section has explored the general social capital of the regular members of the cathedral. It has been demonstrated that significant differences exist between the two voluntary participation groups on only one item, but in the expect direction. That is voluntary participation has a positive impact on the respondents' social life. However, on the other items presented within the table no differences emerge, suggesting that voluntary activity does not affect social capital among the cathedral congregation. Therefore the general hypothesis, that differences will emerge in relation to general social capital, is only partly upheld.

Part Three: Reciprocity in the cathedral

This section will explore the issue of reciprocity in the cathedral by examining statistics presented in tables 10.2 and 10.3 that deal with the respondent turning to others and others turning to the respondent respectively.

Table 10.2 presents those statistics dealing with the respondent turning to others in the cathedral (outwards reciprocity). The differences between the two groups on one item within this table were sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. In relation to instrumental help, significantly more respondents in the voluntary participation group (52%) stated that there are people in the cathedral to whom they would turn if they had a physical illness, compared with 42% of those in the no voluntary participation group (p< .05).

On the remaining items the differences between the two voluntary participation groups were not sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. In relation to personal help, similar proportions of both groups stated that there are people in the
cathedral to whom they could turn for spiritual help (75% of those in the voluntary participation group and 68% of those in the no voluntary participation group), and for emotional help (55% of those in the voluntary participation group and 44% of those in the no voluntary participation group). In relation to practical help, comparable proportions of both voluntary groups stated that there are people in the cathedral to whom they can turn for practical help (29% of those in the voluntary participation group and 26% of those in the no voluntary participation group), and for financial help (7% of those in the voluntary participation group and 4% of those in the no voluntary participation group).

In relation to instrumental help, similar numbers of both groups stated that there were others in the cathedral to whom they could turn for help with an elderly relative (29% of those in the no voluntary participation group and 25% of those in the voluntary participation group), for help with transport (29% of those in the no voluntary participation group and 25% of those in the voluntary participation group), and to borrow something urgently (34% of those in the voluntary participation group and 24% of those in the no voluntary participation group). Likewise, comparable proportions of both voluntary participation groups stated that there are people in the cathedral to whom they could turn if they had a physical illness (52% of those in the voluntary participation group and 42% of those in the no voluntary participation group), a psychological problem (41% of those in the voluntary participation group and 33% of those in the no voluntary participation group), a problem with family relations (51% of those in the no voluntary participation group and 49% of those in the voluntary participation group), a problem with their faith (55% of those in the voluntary participation group and 52% of those in the no voluntary participation group).
group), and a problem with work (21% of those in the voluntary participation group and 15% of those in the no voluntary participation group).

Table 10.3 presents the statistics dealing with inward reciprocity, that is, other people within the cathedral turning to the respondent. On two items presented within this table the differences between the two voluntary participation groups are sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. First, in relation to personal help, significantly more respondents in the voluntary participation group (29%) stated that others in the cathedral had sometimes turned to them for spiritual help, compared with 17% of those in the no voluntary participation group (p< .05). Second, in relation to instrumental help, significantly more respondents in the voluntary participation group (25%) stated that others in the cathedral had sometimes turned to them for help with an elderly relative, compared with 14% of those in the no voluntary participation group (p< .05).

On the remaining items the differences between the two voluntary participation groups were not sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. In respect of personal help comparable proportions of both groups stated that others in the cathedral had sometimes turned to them for emotional help (40% of those in the voluntary association group and 30% of those in the no voluntary association group). In relation to practical help, similar proportions stated that others in the cathedral had sometimes turned to them for practical help (32% of those in the voluntary participation group and 25% of those in the no voluntary participation group) and for financial help (14% of those in the voluntary participation group and 13% of those in the no voluntary participation group).
In respect of instrumental help, comparable proportions of both voluntary groups stated that others in the cathedral had turned to them for help with transport (32% of both those in the voluntary participation group and of those in the no voluntary participation group), to borrow something urgently (26% of both those in the voluntary participations group and of those in the no voluntary participation group), with a physical illness (28% of those in the voluntary participation group and 24% of those in the no voluntary participations group), with a psychological problem (21% of those in the voluntary participation group and 20% of those in the no voluntary participation group), with a problem with their family relations (25% of those in the voluntary participation group and 20% of those in the no voluntary participation group), with a problem with their faith (19% of those in the voluntary participation group and 13% of those in the no voluntary participation group), and with a problem with their work (26% of both those in the voluntary participation group and of those in the no voluntary participation group).

This part has explored the role of inward and outward reciprocity among the two volunteer groups. It has been demonstrated that those who participate in voluntary activity are more likely to have others turning to them for spiritual help, and for help with an elderly relative. In turn, they are more likely to turn to others for help with a physical illness. However, on the remaining items in this table, no statistically significant differences emerge between the two voluntary participation groups, suggesting that voluntary activity does not play an important role in reciprocity for regular members of the cathedral.
Part Four: Neighbourhood reciprocity

The next section explores inward reciprocity in the neighbourhood. The statistics are presented in table 10.4. The differences between the two voluntary participation groups on one item on this table were sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. Thus, in relation to instrumental help, significantly more respondents in the voluntary participation group (50%) stated that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them for help with an elderly relative, compared with 37% of those in the no voluntary participation group (p<.05).

On the remaining items on this table the differences between the two voluntary participation groups were not sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. In relation to personal help, comparable proportions of both voluntary participation groups stated that other people in their neighbourhood had turned to them for spiritual help (39% of those in the voluntary participation group and 35% of those in the no voluntary participation group), and for emotional help (60% of those in the no voluntary participation group and 57% of those in the voluntary participation group). Similarly, in relation to practical help, equal proportions of both voluntary groups stated that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them for practical help (53% of those in the voluntary participation group and 49% of those in the no voluntary participation group), and for financial help (22% of those in the voluntary participation group and 21% of those in the no voluntary participation group).

In relation to instrumental help, comparable proportions of both voluntary groups stated that others in their neighbourhood had turned to them for help with transport (62% of those in the voluntary participation group and 52% of those in the no voluntary participation group).
voluntary participation group), to borrow something urgently (54% of those in the voluntary participation group and 50% of those in the no voluntary participation group). Similarly, others in the neighbourhood had turned to members of both voluntary participation groups for help with a physical illness (49% of those in the voluntary participation group and 41% of those in the no voluntary participation group), with a psychological problem (39% of those in the voluntary participation group and 32% of those in the no voluntary participation group), with a problem with their family relations (40% of those in the voluntary participation group and 30% of those in the no voluntary participation group), with a problem with their faith (35% of those in the voluntary participation group and 26% of those in the no voluntary participation group), and with a problem with their work (44% of those in the voluntary participation group and 42% of those in the no voluntary participation group).

This part has explored neighbourhood reciprocity. As has been demonstrated, significantly more members of the voluntary participation group stated that others had turned to them for help with an elderly relative. On the remaining items, no statistically significant differences emerge between the two groups, suggesting that voluntary activity is not a predicting factor in neighbourhood reciprocity.

Part Five: Experiencing community

This section explores the construct of community among members of the cathedral congregation. The statistics for this section are presented in table 10.5. None of the differences between the two voluntary participation groups were sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. Comparable proportions of both voluntary groups
stated that they feel really part of a community in the cathedral (45% of those in the no voluntary participation group and 42% of those in the voluntary participation group), that they feel rather lonely in the cathedral (25% of those in the voluntary participation group and 19% of those in the no voluntary participation group), that they feel close to the cathedral clergy (45% of those in the no voluntary participation group and 43% of those in the voluntary participation group), that they feel close to others in the cathedral congregation (49% of those in the no voluntary participation group and 45% of those in the voluntary participation group), that they feel a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral (61% of those in the no voluntary participation group and 57% of those in the voluntary participation group).

In relation to the openness of the cathedral, similar proportions of both voluntary groups stated that a lot of their close friends go to the cathedral (27% of those in the voluntary participation group and 26% of those in the no voluntary participation group), that it is good to see new faces in the cathedral (74% of those in the voluntary participation group and 73% of those in the no voluntary participation group), and that too many visitors spoil the sense of community in the cathedral (25% of those in the voluntary participation group and 23% of those in the no voluntary participation group).

This part has explored the issue of experiencing community among regular members of the cathedral congregation. None of the items within this table reach statistical significance, demonstrating that for those who participate in voluntary work and for those who do not, there are no significant differences in how they experience community.
Part Six: Building community

This section explores the experience of building community among members of the cathedral congregation. The statistics for this section are presented in table 10.6. The differences between the two voluntary participation groups were not sufficiently large to achieve statistical significance. Thus comparable proportions of both voluntary participation groups stated that people from all walks of life worship in the cathedral (63% of both the voluntary participation group and of the no voluntary participation group), that they have become friends with people they would otherwise not have met (49% of those in the voluntary participation group and 48% of those in the no voluntary participation group), that they have made business contacts through their involvement in the cathedral (12% of those in the voluntary participation group and 11% of those in the no voluntary participation group), that they have met important people through their involvement in the cathedral (24% of those in the voluntary participation group and 19% of those in the no voluntary participation group), that they have met different community leaders through their involvement in the cathedral (35% of those in the voluntary participation group and 29% of those in the no voluntary participation group), that they have met different religious leaders through their involvement in the cathedral (36% of those in the no voluntary participation group and 32% of those in the voluntary participation group), that they help out with community work undertaken by the cathedral (38% of those in the voluntary participation group and 32% of those in the no voluntary participation group), and that they often feel pressurised into doing thing by other members of the cathedral (11% of those in the voluntary participation group and 9% of those in the no voluntary participation group).
This part has explored the issue of building community. As has been demonstrated, no statistical differences were present between the two groups, indicating that levels of volunteer activity do not play a significant role in building community with the cathedral.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored the relationship between volunteering and social capital among the sample of regular members of the cathedral congregation. Three main conclusions can be reached.

First, in relation to the literature review it has been demonstrated that there exists a link between voluntary activity and social capital. While some authors, such as Putnam (2000), have taken these two constructs to be synonymous, it is clear that to take them as individual constructs can enable a more nuanced understanding of social capital to be developed. Thus, from the literature review it can be seen that, while social capital is generally associated with higher levels of volunteer activity, levels of voluntary activity can be diminished due to time and monetary constraints without the levels of social capital being negatively affected. Further, it was also demonstrated that, often, voluntary organisations are found in areas with high levels of social capital, indicating that pre-existing networks are needed to develop groups with an instrumental purpose.

Second, in relation to the differences between the two voluntary participation groups it has been demonstrated that those who volunteer and those who do not volunteer only differ on five of the items: stating the cathedral was good for their social lives,
turning to others for help with a physical illness, others turning to the respondent for spiritual help and help with an elderly relative, and others in the neighbourhood turning to the respondent for help with an elderly relative. Therefore, in relation to being a member of the cathedral congregation, volunteer activity can have a positive relationship with some aspects of reciprocal relationships, especially in connections with helping an elderly relative. Further research is needed to explore fully how such a relationship is developed between those who volunteer and those who do not.

Third, contrary to the hypothesis posited above, significant differences do not emerge between the two groups on the remaining items presented. As seen in Chapter Three, respondents to this survey do not have high levels of voluntary activity, contrary to what may have been expected based on the literature review. Those who do volunteer do not significantly differ from those who do not volunteer in their opinions and attitudes towards social capital. Thus it may be concluded that, for regular members of the cathedral congregation, volunteering is not an effective way of generating social capital.

The findings are however subject to a number of shortcomings. First, a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between those who are involved in secular volunteering and those involved in church-based volunteering was not possible because of the low number of respondents involved in such activities. Future studies should build on this framework to develop strategies to understand and test this difference.
Conclusion
This dissertation has provided a systematic study of the social capital of regular members of five cathedral congregations in England and Wales through the use of quantitative research methodology. Significant contributions to knowledge have been made in two main fields by this study.

The first contribution to knowledge concerns the relevance of the study of cathedrals, and their communities, in contemporary society. It has been shown that much of the extant literature concerning cathedrals today has focused on understanding and developing the commercial aspects of tourism. Yet, it has been noted that cathedrals comprise much more than just this one specific, if not economically unimportant, area. It was suggested that the study of cathedral congregations may add another aspect of understanding to cathedral-based research. Indeed, as recent statistics produced by the Church of England have suggested, cathedral congregations are growing in number. As of yet, no systematic academic empirical research has focused on cathedral congregations. This dissertation contributes to knowledge by providing two main understandings of cathedral life. First, this dissertation has tested, empirically, the motivations of those who attend cathedrals as worshippers on a regular basis. The statistics demonstrate that the musical tradition and the atmosphere are important factors in drawing people into the cathedral. Contrary to anecdotal evidence, the cathedral is not the shelter of anonymity so often portrayed. Second, this dissertation has provided a unique insight into the community and solidarity within the cathedral, and more particularly, between members of the congregations. The statistics demonstrate that levels of trust, reciprocity and general levels of social capital were increased through the respondents' involvement in the cathedral.
The second contribution to knowledge concerns the conceptualisation and operationalisation of the construct ‘social capital’ used throughout this dissertation. Following the constructual developments of Bourdieu (1986) and Coleman (1990), this study has conceptualised social capital as a resource developed and maintained between two, or more, individuals. Following the work of Francis (2001), Francis and Kay (1995) and Francis, Robbins and Astley (2005) social capital was operationalised through quantitative methodology, and interpreted through an individual differences approach. This dissertation contributes to knowledge of social capital research in two main ways. First, it has added to the literature concerning the quantitative study of social capital. Moving away from national-level quantitative studies, this project has developed a set of items that can be distributed to samples to test for micro-level social capital. Second, this study has added to the field of research interested in the social capital of religious organisations in the United Kingdom. Through the use of a specific sample, that of the cathedral congregation, the research has sought to expand research tradition concerned with congregations within parish churches.

On the basis of these two broad contributions to knowledge, seven main conclusions can be drawn from the statistics. Conclusions will be drawn from each of the chapters to assess the relationship between social capital and individual differences. The general patterns to emerge from the chapters are presented. Implications will be discussed and recommendations offered for developing levels of social capital within the cathedrals.
The first conclusion concerns the general levels of social capital within cathedral congregations displayed in Chapter Four. In relation to reasons for worshipping within the cathedral, it was noted that the atmosphere and the music were important factors in the respondents' choice to worship within the cathedral. In relation to social capital, it was found that respondents felt that the cathedral was good for their spiritual lives, and good for developing their general sense of trust. It was also indicated that, in general, levels of outward reciprocity outweighed levels of inward reciprocity in both the cathedral and in the neighbourhood. This may present a profile of a group that is aware of turning to others for advice and support, but who are less aware of the intentions of those who may turn to them. In relation to experiencing community, it was demonstrated that high proportions of the respondents welcomed visitors to the cathedral, and that similarly high proportions felt that they belonged to the cathedral. However, it was found that fewer felt close to others in the congregation, or close to the clergy. Fewer still stated that their close friends went to the cathedral. Finally, in terms of building community, few respondents were able to state that they had made business contacts, or met religious and community leaders through their involvement in the cathedral. The results from this chapter suggest that, in general, the levels of social capital within the cathedral are strongest in relation to trust, outward reciprocity and experiencing community. Cathedral chapters that wish to develop levels of social capital within the cathedral may be advised to develop the links that are formed between individual members of the congregation, so that networks are developed both within and without the cathedral. This may be done through the development of social activities in which as many of the cathedral congregation can be involved as possible. This provides the opportunity for a diverse group of people to meet both in organising and participating in the activities.
The second conclusion concerns the level of social capital among men and women in the cathedral congregation. This chapter argued that men and women within the cathedral would record similar levels of social capital as a reflection of the high psychological femininity of churchgoers. The statistics demonstrated that, within many areas, men and women experience similar levels of social capital. However, differences were present in relation to inward neighbourhood reciprocity (with reference to finance and help with psychological problems) inward cathedral reciprocity (with reference to help with transport and borrowing something urgently) and experiencing community (with reference to feeling close to others in the cathedral congregation and feeling a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral). In relation to all of these differences, bar one, (inward neighbourhood reciprocity with reference to financial help), it is men within the cathedral who record lower levels of social capital on these items when compared to women. Cathedral chapters who wish to develop levels of social capital within their cathedrals may be advised to review the place of men within the congregation, especially in relation to experiencing community. If men are better integrated within the cathedral community, more bonded personal connections can be formed with other members of the congregation. This may be done through the development of groups concerned with the development of men's spiritual development, or more general social groups facilitated by the cathedral. Such a forum will enable men to connect with others in the congregation and provide the group with a target to work collectively towards.

The third conclusion concerns the differences experienced by older and younger members of the cathedral congregation. Chapter Six demonstrated that on the areas of trust in God, outward cathedral reciprocity within the cathedral (with reference to
needing to borrow something urgently, problems with family relations and problems with work), inward cathedral reciprocity (with reference to financial help, problems with faith and problems with work), inward neighbourhood reciprocity (with reference to spiritual help, emotional help, physical illness, psychological problems, problems with family relations and problems with work), and experiencing community (with reference to making business contacts and meeting important people through involvement in the cathedral) differences were present between the two age groups. While significantly more respondents in the older group stated that being in the cathedral congregation had increased their sense of trust in God, on the remaining items it was demonstrated that the younger group recorded higher levels of social capital. It could be extrapolated from these findings, and from the literature review presented within Chapter Six, that in general older people are less likely to have access to wide ranging networks and social support than younger people. Yet, the wide ranging similarities between the two groups within this study implies that those older people who attend the cathedral on a regular basis have access to networks and support, both in the cathedral and in the community. However, cathedral chapters wishing to increase the level of social capital within their congregation may wish to explore how personal connections can be developed between the older age groups and other members of the cathedral congregation so that support networks may be provided to those who may need it the most. This may be done through the development of social action groups concerned with the issues affecting both the younger cohort and the older cohort. Older members of the congregation may also be integrated into setting up events with younger members of the congregation so that the relevant connections can be formed.
The fourth conclusion concerns the differences between those who travelled the furthest distance to the cathedral, and those who travelled the least distance. In general, the two groups record similar attitude towards, and experiences of, social capital. However, some differences were present. Those who travelled the furthest distance were significantly less likely to endorse items concerning general social capital (being in the cathedral helps me to make friends and to make a contribution to community life), outward cathedral reciprocity (spiritual help, transport, borrowing something urgently, a psychological problem, problems with faith and problems with work), inward cathedral reciprocity (borrowing something urgently and psychological problems), experiencing community (I feel a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral) and building community (meeting different religious leaders and helping with community work). As the literature review in Chapter Seven suggested, those who are at a greater distance from a place or from another person are less able to develop social capital than those at a closer proximity. The data would suggest, on the items listed above, that this would seem to be the case. Cathedral chapters interested in increasing levels of social capital should consider providing greater opportunities for those who travel the furthest distance to the cathedral to connect with others and integrate into the congregational community. This may be done through providing opportunities for the whole cathedral congregation to meet socially after services, or through running a programme of monthly lunches straight after services where those who travel the furthest distance are able to meet socially with other members of the congregation.

The fifth conclusion concerns the differences between the two groups defined by their frequency of prayer. The data demonstrated that those who were in the low frequency
of prayer group recorded lower levels of general social capital (with reference to personal life, social life, meeting people and making friends), outward cathedral reciprocity (with reference to physical illness and problems with work), inward cathedral reciprocity (with reference to spiritual help, financial help, borrowing something urgently, and physical illness) and inward neighbourhood reciprocity (with reference to spiritual help, financial help and problems with family relations). The data confirm the literature review presented in Chapter Eight that those who have higher levels of personal religiosity are more likely to have access to social capital, and thus have access to religious and spiritual social capital. Those cathedral chapters interested in developing social capital within the cathedral may focus on increasing the connections possessed by those who, in this study, define themselves as having low frequency of prayer. This may be done through the development of mixed groups concerned with spiritual development, providing the opportunity for those who have a higher frequency of prayer to integrate and share spiritual capital with those who have a low frequency of prayer.

The sixth conclusion concerns the social capital differences in relation to social class. The data demonstrate that, in general, both social class groups have similar attitudes towards, and experiences of, social capital. However, on a number of items the two groups differ. Contrary to the literature review presented in Chapter Nine, which suggested that those who come from higher social class groups have higher levels of social capital, this survey has found that, where differences occur, those from lower social class groups display higher levels of social capital. Thus, those who defined themselves as non-professional recorded higher levels of general social capital (with reference to the cathedral being good for the personal life, for meeting new people, for
making friends, for getting on in work, and for contributing to community life), outward cathedral reciprocity (with reference to emotional and practical help, help with an elderly relative and transport, and problems with family relations and faith), experiencing community (with reference to feeling close to others in the cathedral congregation) and building community (with reference to making business contacts, helping with community work, and feeling pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral). The chapter suggested that the unexpected finding that those in non-professional occupations experience higher levels of social capital than those in professional occupations may be due to the conceptualisation of social capital employed in the present study. It was noted that within the dissertation, the construct was developed as a personal attribute that could be developed between two or more people, whereas literature on social capital and social class dealt with the construct on a more bridged instrumental basis. Cathedral chapters interested in increasing levels of social capital within the cathedral may wish to develop instrumental ties within the cathedral for those who are employed in professional occupations, and, where possible, facilitate personal connections between members of the cathedral congregation. This may be done through the development of forums concerned with business ethics and business development. This will allow those of the professional class to interact with others in the cathedral congregation.

The seventh conclusion concerns the relationship between social capital and volunteering. Chapter Ten explored the responses of those who do not participate in any volunteer activity and those who do participate in such activity. Volunteering was taken as separate from social capital to understand better the relationship between the two terms, which are often used interchangeably. The data demonstrated that, in
general, those who volunteered and those who did not volunteer experienced similar levels of social capital. However, differences emerged in relation to general social capital (with reference to social life), outward cathedral reciprocity (in relation to physical illness), inward cathedral reciprocity (with reference to spiritual help and help with an elderly relative) and inward neighbourhood reciprocity (with reference to help with an elderly relative). With all of these differences, those who stated that they did not take part in volunteer activity recorded lower levels of social capital. Cathedral chapters interested in developing levels of social capital within the cathedral should heed the importance that volunteer activity can make, and note that those who do not participate in such work may be less able to access social capital than others in the cathedral congregation. This may be done through workshops focused on voluntary work to generate interest in such work for those who are not currently involved. Such workshops will also allow for both those who are, and those who are not, involved in voluntary work to meet and create social ties.

A number of limitations surround this study. The first limitation relates to the restricted number of cathedrals used within this study. While only five cathedrals contributed to the overall sample, it can be argued that these five cathedrals are representative of cathedrals throughout England and Wales. The cathedrals used in the survey comprise both large and small congregations, in rural and urban areas. As a result of the geographical spread of the cathedrals, they also comprise cathedrals in both the North and South of the country, and within Wales, in areas in which the Welsh language is in the majority and areas in which the English language is in the majority. The use of these five cathedrals provides a good platform on which future studies can develop this area of research.
The second limitation relates to the sample size. The dissertation has been based on a small number of respondents that could make comparisons difficult. However, the sample used reflects those who choose to worship in the group of cathedrals selected for this study and provide a good indicator of both those who worship within cathedral, and of their social capital. Future research should seek to expand on this sample to ensure that robust comparisons can be made.

The third limitation relates to the range of items concerning social capital within the questionnaire. Due to space constraints within the questionnaire, and to practical difficulties in asking respondents to complete identical sets of questions, the survey only tested for certain aspects of social capital. Future research should include a greater range of social capital items, especially in connection with outward neighbourhood reciprocity, to understand further the relationship between cathedral and neighbourhood social capital. Further, future research may consider extending the range of items relating to the motivating factors for worshipping within the cathedral. An extension of such items would add the knowledge developed within this dissertation about such motivating factors.
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Appendix One

The Cathedral and You questionnaire
THE CATHEDRAL AND YOU

This survey explores the thoughts and feelings of worshippers in Cathedrals. Please be honest, we want to know your views. Please do not pause for too long over any one question, and try to answer every question.

Everything you tell us is completely confidential and anonymous.

Thank you for your help and cooperation

Emyr Williams
University of Wales, Bangor
Part One asks for some information about yourself, please tick (✓) the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you?</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How old are you?</th>
<th>Under 20</th>
<th>20-29 years</th>
<th>30-39 years</th>
<th>40-49 years</th>
<th>50-59 years</th>
<th>60-69 years</th>
<th>70 + years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you a regular member of this cathedral congregation?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, a visitor living nearby</th>
<th>No, a visitor on holiday</th>
<th>No, here on business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How far have you travelled to this service?</th>
<th>Less than 1 mile</th>
<th>1-2 miles</th>
<th>3-4 miles</th>
<th>5-9 miles</th>
<th>10 miles or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you attend public acts of worship?</th>
<th>Nearly every day</th>
<th>Nearly every week</th>
<th>At least once a month</th>
<th>At least 6 times a year</th>
<th>At least once a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you pray by yourself?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nearly every day</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have a job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, full-time</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, part-time</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife/househusband/carer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is, or was, your occupation?

Do you engage in any of the following areas of voluntary work through church or secular groups? (Tick as many boxes as apply in both columns. If you are not involved in any such activities, please tick 'none')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Non-church</th>
<th>Church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for teenagers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for young parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the elderly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the sick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in lunch clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in charity shops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in fund raising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in advisory groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in self-help groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in community regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in cultural activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in educational activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How important are the following factors in your choice of worshipping in the cathedral:

1 very unimportant  2 unimportant  3 not sure  4 important  5 very important

the friendly atmosphere  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the spiritual atmosphere  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the contemplative atmosphere  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the feeling of peace  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the music  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the choir  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the preaching  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the style of service  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the friendship  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the opportunity to be anonymous to other worshippers  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the opportunity to be anonymous to the clergy  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
not having to take part in parish activities  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the opportunity to connect with important people  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the opportunity to worship in a grand building  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the ritual of the services  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the liturgy  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the social status of worshipping in a cathedral  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
the connection with history  Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Part Two explores your views on the Cathedral. Read each item carefully and think ‘Do I agree?’

If you Agree Strongly put a ring around ............................................ AS A NC D DS
If you Agree put a ring around ......................................................... AS A NC D DS
If you are Not Certain put a ring around ......................................... AS A NC DS
If you Disagree put a ring around .................................................... AS A NC D DS
If you Disagree Strongly put a ring around ...................................... AS A NC D DS

Being in the cathedral congregation:
builds up my sense of trust in God ................................................... AS A NC D DS
builds up my sense of trust in myself ............................................... AS A NC D DS
builds up my sense of trust in other people ...................................... AS A NC D DS
is good for my spiritual life ............................................................. AS A NC D DS
is good for my personal life ............................................................. AS A NC D DS
is good for my social life ............................................................... AS A NC D DS
helps me to meet people ...................................... AS A NC D DS
helps me to make friends .................................... AS A NC D DS
helps me to get on in my work ................................ AS A NC D DS
helps me to link up with influential people ................ AS A NC D DS
helps me to establish my place in the community ........ AS A NC D DS
helps me to make a contribution to community life .... AS A NC D DS
helps me to mix with those with whom I would not normally mix AS A NC D DS

There are people in the Cathedral to whom I would turn:
to give me spiritual help ..................................... AS A NC D DS
to give me emotional help .................................... AS A NC D DS
to give me practical help .................................... AS A NC D DS
to give me financial help .................................... AS A NC D DS
if I needed to find a plumber/electrician .................. AS A NC D DS
if I needed to find a babysitter .............................. AS A NC D DS
if I needed help with an elderly relative ................... AS A NC D DS
if I needed help with transport ................................ AS A NC D DS
if I needed to borrow something urgently ................ AS A NC D DS
if I had a physical illness .................................... AS A NC D DS
if I had a psychological problem ............................ AS A NC D DS
if I had a problem with my family relations ............... AS A NC D DS
if I had a problem with my faith ............................. AS A NC D DS
if I had a problem with my work ............................. AS A NC D DS

Other people in my neighbourhood turn to me:
for spiritual help ............................................. AS A NC D DS
for emotional help .......................................... AS A NC D DS
for practical help ........................................... AS A NC D DS
for financial help ........................................... AS A NC D DS
if they needed to find a plumber/electrician ............. AS A NC D DS
if they needed to find a babysitter ......................... AS A NC D DS
if they needed help with an elderly relative ............... AS A NC D DS
if they needed help with transport ........................ AS A NC D DS
if they needed to borrow something urgently ............. AS A NC D DS
if they had a physical illness ................................ AS A NC D DS
if they had a psychological problem ......................... AS A NC D DS
if they had a problem with their family relations ......... AS A NC D DS
if they had a problem with their faith ....................... AS A NC D DS
if they had a problem with their work ...................... AS A NC D DS
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This cathedral would seem welcoming to:

children .................................................. AS A NC D DS
teenagers ................................................ AS A NC D DS
young adults ........................................... AS A NC D DS
middle-aged people .................................... AS A NC D DS
retired people .......................................... AS A NC D DS
first-time visitors .................................... AS A NC D DS
ethnic minorities ..................................... AS A NC D DS
gypsies and travellers ................................ AS A NC D DS
homeless people ....................................... AS A NC D DS

I am generally happy with my

social life ............................................... AS A NC D DS
spiritual life ......................................... AS A NC D DS
financial situation .................................. AS A NC D DS
home ..................................................... AS A NC D DS
locality .................................................. AS A NC D DS
leisure time ........................................... AS A NC D DS
church life ............................................. AS A NC D DS

Most weeks I:

visit someone who is housebound .................... AS A NC D DS
visit someone who is in hospital ................... AS A NC D DS
go shopping for a friend .............................. AS A NC D DS
do something practical to help others ............... AS A NC D DS
visit elderly or sick neighbours ..................... AS A NC D DS
visit elderly or sick relatives ....................... AS A NC D DS

In general:

A key reason for my interest in church is that it is a pleasant social activity .................. AS A NC D DS

There are many religious issues on which my views are still changing .. AS A NC D DS
I am constantly questioning my religious beliefs ................ AS A NC D DS
I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life ... AS A NC D DS
I pray chiefly because it deepens my relationship with God ............ AS A NC D DS
The church is most important to me as a place to share fellowship with other Christians ................ AS A NC D DS
I pray at home because it helps me to be aware of God's presence ..... AS A NC D DS
My religious beliefs really shape my whole approach to life ........... AS A NC D DS
What prayer offers me most is comfort when sorrow or misfortune strike AS A NC D DS
As I grow and change, I expect my religion to grow and change as well AS A NC D DS
For me doubting is an important part of what it means to be religious .. AS A NC D DS
I often read books about prayer and the spiritual life ....................... AS A NC D DS
I pray chiefly because it makes me feel better .............................. AS A NC D DS
I go to church because it helps me to feel close to God .................. AS A NC D DS
One reason for me going to church is that it helps to establish me in
the community ............................................................. AS A NC D DS
I was driven to ask religious questions by a growing awareness of the
tensions in my world .................................................... AS A NC D DS
Occasionally I compromise my religious beliefs to protect my social and
economic well-being .................................................... AS A NC D DS
I allow almost nothing to prevent me from going to church on Sundays AS A NC D DS
I value my religious doubts and uncertainties ............................ AS A NC D DS
My life experiences have led me to rethink my religious beliefs ...... AS A NC D DS
My religious beliefs really shape the way I treat other people ........ AS A NC D DS
Questions are more important to my religious faith than are answers ... AS A NC D DS
While I believe in my religion, there are more important things in my life AS A NC D DS
One reason for me praying is that it helps me to gain relief and protectionAS A NC D DS
I go to church because it helps me to feel at home in my neighbourhood AS A NC D DS
Religion only became very important for me when I began to ask questions
about the meaning of my life ........................................... AS A NC D DS
While I am a religious person, I do not let religion influence my daily life AS A NC D DS

Please only complete this section if you are a regular worshipper in this cathedral

Other people in the Cathedral have sometimes turned to me:
for spiritual help ......................................................... AS A NC D DS
for emotional help ....................................................... AS A NC D DS
for practical help ....................................................... AS A NC D DS
for financial help ....................................................... AS A NC D DS
if they needed to find a plumber/electrician ........................... AS A NC D DS
if they needed to find a babysitter .................................. AS A NC D DS
if they needed help with an elderly relative .......................... AS A NC D DS
if they needed help with transport .................................. AS A NC D DS
if they needed to borrow something urgently ......................... AS A NC D DS
if they had a physical illness ......................................... AS A NC D DS
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if they had a psychological problem ......................... AS A NC D DS
if they had a problem with their family relations .............. AS A NC D DS
if they had a problem with their faith ........................ AS A NC D DS
if they had a problems with their work ........................ AS A NC D DS

In general:
I feel I am really part of a community in the cathedral ........ AS A NC D DS
I feel rather lonely in the cathedral ............................. AS A NC D DS
I feel close to the cathedral clergy .............................. AS A NC D DS
I feel close to others in the cathedral congregation .......... AS A NC D DS
A lot of my close friends go to the cathedral ................ AS A NC D DS
I often feel pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral AS A NC D DS
Too many visitors spoil the sense of community in the cathedral .. AS A NC D DS
People from all walks of life worship in the cathedral ........ AS A NC D DS
It is good to see new faces in the cathedral ................ AS A NC D DS
I have become friends with people in the cathedral I would otherwise not have met ........ AS A NC D DS
I have made business contacts through my involvement in the cathedral AS A NC D DS
I have met important people through my involvement in the cathedral .. AS A NC D DS
I have met different community leaders through my involvement with the cathedral ........................ AS A NC D DS
I have met different religious leaders through my involvement with the cathedral ........................ AS A NC D DS
I help out with the community work undertaken by the cathedral .. AS A NC D DS
I feel a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral .................. AS A NC D DS

Thank you for filling in this questionnaire

Please add any further comments
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Table 4.1 Reasons for worshipping in the cathedral (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the friendly atmosphere</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the spiritual atmosphere</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the contemplative atmosphere</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the feeling of peace</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the music</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the choir</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the preaching</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the style of service</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the ritual of the services</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the liturgy</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the friendship</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the opportunity to be anonymous to other worshippers</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the opportunity to be anonymous to the clergy</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not having to take part in parish activities</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the opportunity to connect with important people</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the social status of worshipping in a cathedral</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the opportunity to worship in a grand building</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the opportunity to connect with history</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 361
Table 4.2: Being in the cathedral congregation (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being in the cathedral congregation:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in God</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in myself</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in other people</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my spiritual life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my personal life</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my social life</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to meet people</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to make friends</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to get on in my work</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to establish my place in the community</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to make a contribution to community life</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me mix with those with whom I would not normally mix</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 361
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are people in the Cathedral to whom I would turn:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to give me spiritual help</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me emotional help</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me practical help</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me financial help</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed help with transport</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a physical illness</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a psychological problem</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my family relations</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my faith</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my work</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 361
Table 4.4: Other people in the Cathedral have sometimes turned to me (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other people in the Cathedral have sometimes turned to me:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for spiritual help</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for emotional help</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for practical help</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for financial help</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with transport</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a physical illness</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a psychological problem</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their family relations</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their faith</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their work</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** N = 361
Table 4.5 Other people in my neighbourhood turn to me (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other people in my neighbourhood turn to me:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for spiritual help</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for emotional help</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for practical help</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for financial help</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with transport</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a physical illness</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a psychological problem</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their family relations</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their faith</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problems with their work</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 361
Table 4.6: Experiencing community (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In general:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am really part of a community in the cathedral</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel rather lonely in the cathedral</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to the cathedral clergy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to others in the cathedral congregation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of my close friends go to the cathedral</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is good to see new faces in the cathedral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many visitors spoil the sense of community in the cathedral</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 361
Table 4.7 Building community (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In general:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>？</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People from all walks of life worship in the cathedral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become friends with people in the cathedral I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would otherwise not have met</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have made business contacts through my involvement in the cathedral</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met important people through my involvement in the cathedral</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met different community leaders through my involvement with the cathedral</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met different religious leaders through my involvement with the cathedral</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help out with the community work undertaken by the cathedral</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 361
Table 5.1: Being in the cathedral congregation by sex (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being in the cathedral congregation:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in God</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in myself</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in other people</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my spiritual life</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my personal life</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my social life</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to meet people</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to make friends</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to get on in my work</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to establish my place in the community</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to make a contribution to community life</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me mix with those with whom I would not normally mix</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Male, N = 134; Female, N = 223
Table 5.2: There are people in the cathedral to whom I would turn by sex (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to give me spiritual help</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me emotional help</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me practical help</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me financial help</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed help with transport</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a physical illness</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a psychological problem</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my family relations</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my faith</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my work</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Male, N = 134; Female, N = 223
Table 5.3: Other people in the cathedral have sometimes turned to me by sex (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other people in the Cathedral have sometimes turned to me:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for spiritual help</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for emotional help</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for practical help</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for financial help</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with transport</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a physical illness</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a psychological problem</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their family relations</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their faith</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their work</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Male, N = 134; Female, N = 223
Table 5.4 Other people in my neighbourhood turn to me by sex (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for spiritual help</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for emotional help</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for practical help</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for financial help</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with transport</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a physical illness</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a psychological problem</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their family relations</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their faith</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problems with their work</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Male, N = 134; Female, N = 223
Table 5.5: Experiencing community by sex (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>( p&lt; )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am really part of a community in the cathedral</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel rather lonely in the cathedral</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to the cathedral clergy</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to others in the cathedral congregation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of my close friends go to the cathedral</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is good to see new faces in the cathedral</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many visitors spoil the sense of community in the cathedral</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Male, \( N = 134 \); Female, \( N = 223 \)
Table 5.6 Building community by sex (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In general:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People from all walks of life worship in the cathedral</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become friends with people in the cathedral I would otherwise not have met</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have made business contacts through my involvement in the cathedral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met important people through my involvement in the cathedral</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met different community leaders through my involvement with the cathedral</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met different religious leaders through my involvement with the cathedral</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help out with the community work undertaken by the cathedral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Male, N = 134; Female, N = 223
Table 6.1: Being in the cathedral congregation by age (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being in the cathedral congregation:</th>
<th>Younger</th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p&lt;$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in God</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in myself</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in other people</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my spiritual life</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my personal life</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my social life</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to meet people</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to make friends</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to get on in my work</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to establish my place in the community</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to make a contribution to community life</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me mix with those with whom I would not normally mix</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Younger (under 49), N = 87; Older (70 and over), N = 121
Table 6.2: There are people in the cathedral to whom I would turn by age (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are people in the Cathedral to whom I would turn:</th>
<th>Younger</th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to give me spiritual help</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me emotional help</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me practical help</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me financial help</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed help with transport</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a physical illness</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a psychological problem</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my family relations</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my faith</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problems with my work</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Younger (under 49), N = 87; Older (70 and over), N = 121
Table 6.3: Other people in the cathedral have sometimes turned to me by age (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other people in the Cathedral have sometimes turned to me:</th>
<th>Younger</th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>χ2</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for spiritual help</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for emotional help</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for practical help</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for financial help</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with transport</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a physical illness</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a psychological problem</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their family relations</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their faith</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problems with their work</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Younger (under 49), N = 87; Older (70 and over), N = 121*
Table 6.4 Other people in my neighbourhood turn to me by age (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other people in my neighbourhood turn to me:</th>
<th>Younger</th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>( p \leq )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for spiritual help</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for emotional help</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for practical help</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for financial help</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with transport</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a physical illness</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a psychological problem</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their family relations</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their faith</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problems with their work</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Younger (under 49), \( N = 87 \); Older (70 and over), \( N = 121 \)
Table 6.5: Experiencing community by age (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Younger</th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am really part of a community in the cathedral</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel rather lonely in the cathedral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to the cathedral clergy</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to others in the cathedral congregation</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of my close friends go to the cathedral</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is good to see new faces in the cathedral</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many visitors spoil the sense of community in the cathedral</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Younger (under 49), N = 87; Older (70 and over), N = 121
Table 6.6 Building community by age (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In general:</th>
<th>Younger</th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>χ2</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People from all walks of life worship in the cathedral</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become friends with people in the cathedral I would otherwise not have met</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have made business contacts through my involvement in the cathedral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met important people through my involvement in the cathedral</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met different community leaders through my involvement with the cathedral</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met different religious leaders through my involvement with the cathedral</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help out with the community work undertaken by the cathedral</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Younger (under 49), N = 87; Older (70 and over), N = 121
Table 7.1: Being in the cathedral congregation by distance travelled (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being in the cathedral congregation:</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>p &lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in God</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in myself</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in other people</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my spiritual life</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my personal life</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my social life</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to meet people</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to make friends</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to get on in my work</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to establish my place in the community</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to make a contribution to community life</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me mix with those with whom I would not normally mix</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Close (under 5 miles), N = 189; Distant, (10 miles and over), N = 75
Table 7.2: There are people in the cathedral to whom I would turn by distance travelled (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are people in the Cathedral to whom I would turn:</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to give me spiritual help</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me emotional help</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me practical help</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me financial help</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed help with transport</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a physical illness</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a psychological problem</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my family relations</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my faith</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problems with my work</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Close (under 5 miles), N = 189; Distant, (10 miles and over), N = 75
### Table 7.3: Other people in the Cathedral have sometimes turned to me by distance travelled (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other people in the Cathedral have sometimes turned to me:</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for spiritual help</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for emotional help</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for practical help</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for financial help</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with transport</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a physical illness</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a psychological problem</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their family relations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their faith</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problems with their work</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Close (under 5 miles), N = 189; Distant, (10 miles and over), N = 75*
Table 7.4 Other people in my neighbourhood turn to me by distance travelled (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other people in my neighbourhood turn to me:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for spiritual help</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for emotional help</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for practical help</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for financial help</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with transport</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a physical illness</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a psychological problem</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their family relations</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their faith</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their work</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Close (under 5 miles), N = 189; Distant, (10 miles and over), N = 75
Table 7.5: Experiencing community by distance travelled (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p&lt;$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am really part of a community in the cathedral</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel rather lonely in the cathedral</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to the cathedral clergy</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to others in the cathedral congregation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of my close friends go to the cathedral</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is good to see new faces in the cathedral</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many visitors spoil the sense of community in the cathedral</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Close (under 5 miles), $N = 189$; Distant, (10 miles and over), $N = 75$
Table 7.6: Building community by distance travelled (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In general:</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People from all walks of life worship in the cathedral</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become friends with people in the cathedral I would otherwise not have met</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have made business contacts through my involvement in the cathedral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met important people through my involvement in the cathedral</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met different community leaders through my involvement with the cathedral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met different religious leaders through my involvement with the cathedral</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help out with the community work undertaken by the cathedral</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Close (under 5 miles), N = 189; Distant, (10 miles and over), N = 75
Table 8.1: Being in the cathedral congregation by frequency of prayer (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being in the cathedral congregation:</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>( p&lt; )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in God</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in myself</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in other people</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my spiritual life</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my personal life</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my social life</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to meet people</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to make friends</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to get on in my work</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to establish my place in the community</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to make a contribution to community life</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me mix with those with whom I would not normally mix</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (never, occasionally and sometimes), \( N = 88 \); High (nearly every day), \( N = 219 \)
Table 8.2: There are people in the cathedral to whom I would turn by frequency of prayer (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p&lt;$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to give me spiritual help</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me emotional help</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me practical help</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me financial help</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed help with transport</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a physical illness</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a psychological problem</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my family relations</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my faith</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problems with my work</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (never, occasionally and sometimes), N = 88; High (nearly every day), N = 219
Table 8.3: Other people in the Cathedral have sometimes turned to me by frequency of prayer (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for spiritual help</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for emotional help</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for practical help</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for financial help</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with transport</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a physical illness</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a psychological problem</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their family relations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their faith</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their work</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (never, occasionally and sometimes), N = 88; High (nearly every day), N = 219
Table 8.4 Other people in my neighbourhood turn to me by frequency of prayer (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other people in my neighbourhood turn to me:</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for spiritual help</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for emotional help</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for practical help</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for financial help</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with transport</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a physical illness</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a psychological problem</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their family relations</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their faith</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problems with their work</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (never, occasionally and sometimes), N = 88; High (nearly every day), N =219
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am really part of a community in the cathedral</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel rather lonely in the cathedral</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to the cathedral clergy</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to others in the cathedral congregation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of my close friends go to the cathedral</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is good to see new faces in the cathedral</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many visitors spoil the sense of community in the cathedral</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (never, occasionally and sometimes), N = 88; High (nearly every day), N =219
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In general:</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People from all walks of life worship in the cathedral</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become friends with people in the cathedral I would otherwise not have met</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have made business contacts through my involvement in the cathedral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met important people through my involvement in the cathedral</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met different community leaders through my involvement with the cathedral</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met different religious leaders through my involvement with the cathedral</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help out with the community work undertaken by the cathedral</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (never, occasionally and sometimes), N = 88; High (nearly every day), N = 219
Table 9.1: Being in the cathedral congregation by professional status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being in the cathedral congregation:</th>
<th>Non Professional</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p&lt;$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in God</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in myself</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in other people</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my spiritual life</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my personal life</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my social life</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to meet people</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to make friends</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to get on in my work</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to establish my place in the community</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to make a contribution to community life</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me mix with those with whom I would not normally mix</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Non-professional (unskilled manual, semi-skilled manual, skilled manaul and non-manual), N = 105
Professional (semi-professional and professional), N = 176
Table 9.2: There are people in the cathedral to whom I would turn by professional status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are people in the Cathedral to whom I would turn:</th>
<th>Non Professional</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to give me spiritual help</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me emotional help</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me practical help</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me financial help</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed help with transport</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a physical illness</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a psychological problem</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my family relations</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my faith</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my work</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Non-professional (unskilled manual, semi-skilled manual, skilled manual and non-manual), N = 105
Professional (semi-professional and professional), N = 176
Table 9.3: Other people in the Cathedral have sometimes turned to me by professional status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non Professional</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p&lt;$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for spiritual help</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for emotional help</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for practical help</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for financial help</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with transport</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a physical illness</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a psychological problem</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their family relations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their faith</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problems with their work</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Non-professional (unskilled manual, semi-skilled manual, skilled manaul and non-manual), $N = 105$
Professional (semi-professional and professional), $N = 176$
Table 9.4 Other people in my neighbourhood turn to me by professional status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other people in my neighbourhood turn to me:</th>
<th>Non Professional</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for spiritual help</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for emotional help</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for practical help</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for financial help</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with transport</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a physical illness</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a psychological problem</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their family relations</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their faith</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problems with their work</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Non-professional (unskilled manual, semi-skilled manual, skilled manual and non-manual), N = 105
Professional (semi-professional and professional), N = 176
Table 9.5: Experiencing community by professional status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In general:</th>
<th>Non Professional</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am really part of a community in the cathedral</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel rather lonely in the cathedral</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to the cathedral clergy</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to others in the cathedral congregation</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of my close friends go to the cathedral</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is good to see new faces in the cathedral</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many visitors spoil the sense of community in the cathedral</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Non-professional (unskilled manual, semi-skilled manual, skilled manual and non-manual), N = 105
Professional (semi-professional and professional), N = 176
Table 9.6 Building community by professional status (%)

| Non professional (unskilled manual, semi-skilled manual, skilled manual and non-manual), N = 105 | Professional (semi-professional and professional), N = 176 |
|---|---|---|---|
| In general: | | | |
| People from all walks of life worship in the cathedral | 64 | 66 | 0.09 | NS |
| I have become friends with people in the cathedral I would otherwise not have met | 59 | 48 | 3.21 | NS |
| I have made business contacts through my involvement in the cathedral | 20 | 9 | 6.95 | .01 |
| I have met important people through my involvement in the cathedral | 28 | 23 | 0.90 | NS |
| I have met different community leaders through my involvement with the cathedral | 33 | 35 | 0.04 | NS |
| I have met different religious leaders through my involvement with the cathedral | 33 | 33 | 0.01 | NS |
| I help out with the community work undertaken by the cathedral | 32 | 45 | 4.50 | .05 |
| I often feel pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral | 15 | 7 | 4.45 | .05 |

Note: Non-professional (unskilled manual, semi-skilled manual, skilled manual and non-manual), N = 105
Professional (semi-professional and professional), N = 176
Table 10.1: Being in the cathedral congregation by voluntary participation (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being in the cathedral congregation:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p&lt;$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in God</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in myself</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds up my sense of trust in other people</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my spiritual life</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my personal life</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is good for my social life</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to meet people</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to make friends</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to get on in my work</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to establish my place in the community</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to make a contribution to community life</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me mix with those with whom I would not normally mix</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No (not involved in any voluntary work), $N = 92$; Yes (involved in voluntary work), $N = 267$
Table 10.2: There are people in the cathedral to whom I would turn by voluntary participation (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are people in the Cathedral to whom I would turn:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to give me spiritual help</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me emotional help</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me practical help</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give me financial help</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed help with transport</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a physical illness</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a psychological problem</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my family relations</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my faith</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I had a problem with my work</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No (not involved in any voluntary work), N = 92; Yes (involved in voluntary work), N = 267
Table 10.3: Other people in the Cathedral have sometimes turned to me by voluntary participation (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provided</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>( p &lt; )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual help</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional help</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical help</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial help</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with elderly relative</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with transport</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow something urgently</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical illness</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological problem</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem with family relations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem with faith</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem with work</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No (not involved in any voluntary work), \( N = 92 \); Yes (involved in voluntary work), \( N = 267 \)
Table 10.4 Other people in my neighbourhood turn to me by voluntary association (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other people in my neighbourhood turn to me:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for spiritual help</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for emotional help</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for practical help</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for financial help</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with an elderly relative</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed help with transport</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they needed to borrow something urgently</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a physical illness</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a psychological problem</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their family relations</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problem with their faith</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they had a problems with their work</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No (not involved in any voluntary work), N = 92; Yes (involved in voluntary work), N = 267
Table 10.5: Experiencing community by voluntary participation (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In general:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am really part of a community in the cathedral</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel rather lonely in the cathedral</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to the cathedral clergy</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to others in the cathedral congregation</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of belonging to the cathedral</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of my close friends go to the cathedral</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is good to see new faces in the cathedral</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many visitors spoil the sense of community in the cathedral</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No (not involved in any voluntary work), N = 92; Yes (involved in voluntary work), N = 267
Table 10.6 Building community by voluntary participation (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In general:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from all walks of life worship in the cathedral</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become friends with people in the cathedral I would otherwise not have met</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have made business contacts through my involvement in the cathedral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met important people through my involvement in the cathedral</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met different community leaders through my involvement with the cathedral</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have met different religious leaders through my involvement with the cathedral</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help out with the community work undertaken by the cathedral</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel pressured into doing things by other members of the cathedral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No (not involved in any voluntary work), N = 92; Yes (involved in voluntary work), N = 267