

NOTES

- 1 All analyses in this chapter use respondents from all three components of the ESC survey, described in detail in Appendix A. The variation across questions in number of cases was a result of CATI error. By the time this was discovered, it was too late to change the programming for the main sample. All respondents in the Vancouver, Toronto, and Montreal metropolitan oversamples and in the BC resource community sample, which went to field after the main sample, received all four questions.
- 2 Q3 and Q4 split Q1 into its components. In effecting this split, we hoped to shed light on an interesting feature of the split results that first appeared when Q1 and Q3 were asked of different halves of the 1983 US General Social Survey sample. As reported in Helliwell and Putnam (1999), men are significantly more trusting than women when asked Q1, while women are more trusting than men when asked Q3. Our supposition is that women were more inclined to be cautious, for a variety of possible reasons. We too find females to be less trusting when asked the balanced trust question (Q1), but more trusting than males when faced with the simpler question (Q3). Our survey also supports the US result that affirmative responses were much more likely to Q1 than to Q3 regardless of gender.
- 3 The indicators with the weakest link to an overall trust scale are Q2 and Q4, two of the unipolar agree-disagree items.
- 4 When the axes are rotated, the generalized and the wallet items load weakly on separate factors. The rotated solution does not obviously dominate the unrotated one, and it is natural to wonder how much of the separation is an artifact of response coding.