

The Study of Social Capital and Its Impact on Social Participation: Bandar Abbas, Iran

Hedayat Allah Nikkhah

Assistant Professor in Social Science, Hormozgan University

Mostafa Zhairinia

Assistant Professor in Social Science, Hormozgan University

Soheil Sadeghi

Master Student of Social Science, Hormozgan University

Maryam Fani

Master Student of Social Science, Hormozgan University

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n23p1712

Abstract

Today, social participation is an important factor in the development process. The main purpose of this study was to measure the social capital and its impact on social participation. Theoretical framework of this study is based on Putnam and Inglehart regarding social capital and Lipset and Rush regarding background variables. The method is survey and data was collected through questionnaire. Survey population consists of 18 year olds and older who have lived in the city of Bandar Abbas. Sample size of 271 was obtained by multistage cluster sampling method. Our findings show that formal participation in males is more than females. The mean of social participation is higher among married individuals compare to singles. Multivariate linear regression results also show that the independent variables entered into the equation, the highest and lowest levels of influence on dependent variable of total social participation is social trust (0.31) and the network of relations (0.14), respectively. Overall, the model explains about 22% of the variability of social participation.

Keywords: social participation, social capital, social trust, network of relationships

1. Introduction

The term of "participation" has a key role in development literature, sustainable development in particular, so that it constitutes one of the three pillars of sustainable human development and the other two elements, namely people and resources have become optimal activities in its framework due to participation's constructive role (Eftekhary and Soleimani, 2002: 12). Goatri defines social participation as a public, integrated, multi-dimensional and multi-cultural process that aims to bring all people together to play a role in all stages of development (Danesh Mehr and Ahmad Rash 2009: 135). Social participation can also include a variety of individual and collective actions in order to reach self-determination and social involvement in decision-making processes in public affairs (Mirtaher Mousavi, 2006: 77). Since 1970s, participatory approaches in development literature, have been seriously considered and discussed by experts in social sciences and the development and expansion of the concept to the modern era, particularly its connection to development has gained novel and broad aspects, to the extent that some scholars consider development synonymous to participation (Danesh Mehr and Ahmad Rash 2009: 130). Participation process is associated with functions of increasing social stability, boosting morale and reducing conflicts between groups, eliminating the marginalization cultures, talents and creativity boosting, expanding democratic values and sharing the power resources and enhancing responsibility morale as a macro, intermediate and micro level functional order. Participation has cognitive, social, political and instrumental functions. In terms of cognitive functioning, participation is the source of productive discourse and operations in development that are based on different ways of understanding the facts relating to the development. Therefore, the cognitive system that represents cultural heritage and their local knowledge is important to people.

Socially, participation has given a new life to the development discourse, with the ability to put institutions, groups and individuals involved in the development process into new structures to offer them the necessary capabilities to meet the main needs. Politically, participation can legitimize source development by empowering powerless and reticent people. Instrumentally, participation is aware of its strategic shortcomings of the traditional and conventional development methods and by taking empowerment process, calls vulnerable to take care of themselves (Vahida & Niyazi, 2004).

Participation is facing many problems in our society, which is currently becoming one of the most important issues especially in urban management, and urban planning process of realization.

The experiences of the last few decades has revealed that sustainable development will be achieved only through participation and involvement of subjects in their social life (Idrisi & Shojaee, 2012: 119).

Participation can be affected by many factors. Among the factors that can play an important role in social participation, is social capital. Social capital is social networks that are effective for the society as a function and combination of the economic impacts resulting from the development of social capital can improve the development process.

Social capital is one of the most prominent social science researches, an useful aspect to understand how individuals and groups can strengthen the social principles. Social capital enhances groups and community participation as well as group goals such as participatory democracy of social development.

Given the importance of social participation and social capital's impact on it, the purpose of this study was to evaluate the effects of social capital on social participation (formal and informal participation). It is actually trying to answer the question that what are the effects of social capital aspects (trust and network of relations) on social participation?

2. Literature Review

Ibrahimi et al (2012) in a study entitled "The relation between social networks and political participation among students of Isfahan University" explored the role of social networks on participation in elections and electoral behavior. The research method was a survey that consisted of all students of Isfahan University with the sample size of 167. Clustering was the method of sampling and a questionnaire was used to collect data. Social networks were divided into vertical networks, horizontal networks and properties of social networks, by considering the four-aspects of political participation namely mental, formal, informal and objective aspects has shown that the horizontal networks have the greatest impact and the properties of social networks have the least impact on students' political participation.

Nowrouzi & Bakhtyari (2009) conducted a study entitled "Social participation and social factors influencing it". The population consists of people aged from 30 to 60 living in the city of Khodabandeh and 400 individuals have been selected as the sample size.

Data collection tool was questionnaire based on interview. Research findings indicate that social-political participation in the city of Khodabandeh was moderate to low. Also there is a significant correlation at 99% confidence level between independent variables (age, gender, social class, location, universality, providence, political-social alienation, trust, family structure, education, and mass media) and the dependent variables (social-political participation). The coefficient of determination (R^2) of these variables is 0.39.

Azkiya & Hassani Rad (2009) in their study entitled "The role of social trust in people's participation in rural development projects" reviewed the role of social trust in rural development programs. In this study, a questionnaire survey method was used to collect data. A sample of 366 people from villages of Chaei Meidan, Tabriz in East Azarbaijan was selected using simple random sampling and then interviewed. Findings show that in multivariate analysis using regression model, the maximum direct impact goes for social trust variable, with 45%; social coherence, with 42%; and education, with 12%, respectively. Also indirect impact is more related to social participation, mental, practical and objective participation, sponsorship, age and gender with high impact of 36% show the high impacts of research variables.

Abbasi and Abbasi Ghadi (2008) finished a study entitled "Study on the relation between social capital and social participation of young people". The population consists of young people aged from 20 to 30 years in Tehran with the sample size of 1067. In this study as well, a questionnaire survey method was used to collect data. Research findings show that social capital, social trust, social ties, educational level, employment status, marital status, age and gender variables have shown significant levels of social participation from young people.

Skorik et al (2009) in an article titled "Social Capital and Political Participation in Singapore" have examined the relation between social capital and political participation. They have studied the issue that social networking can pave the path for the revival of political participation. They concluded that there is evidence that the social network is correlated

with political participation (quoting Ibrahimi et al, 2012).

In Taiwan, the issue of "Social participation and life satisfaction" was examined by Kovo et al (2008) and it was concluded that the optimal interaction from family influences on social trust and increased social participation.

Renee Becker (2003) in his article titled "membership in voluntary associations, social resources, character, or both" through analysis of secondary data examined the contribution of sociological factors such as education, income, religious affiliation, and social capital. He also examined psychological factors such as personality type in describing the activities of voluntary associations, and in the end concludes that psychological factors can only explain the problem when the impact of sociological factors is examined (quoted by Safirii & Sadeghi, 2009).

3. Theoretical Framework

According to Putnam, the main idea of Social Capital Theory is that networks of social relations are valuable and beneficial. As assets, financial, physical or human capital can increase productivity at the individual and collective level; social ties also affect the usefulness of individuals and groups. Social Capital has indicators such as networks of norms and social trust relations that facilitate coordination and cooperation for social benefits. Voluntary cooperation is better done in a society that inherited a vast Social Capital in forms of interactional norms and civil participation network. Putnam believes that by facilitating the measures, Social Capital improves social effectiveness and reduces the cost of local exchange and cooperation. Voluntary cooperation is facilitated by Social Capital (Safirii & Sadeghi, 2009: 9). According to Putnam, Social Capital plays a role in participative behavior. Social Capital consists of communications, social networks, norms and the resulted mutual trust. By facilitating coordinated actions, these features increase community's capability to create a variety of voluntary associations and improve the functionality of society, as well as encouraging cooperation among individuals. Furthermore, Putnam's theory considers Social Capital as a set of horizontal relations between people that strengthen cooperation for mutual interests in the community. Thus, according to Putnam, Social Capital is not collective action, but norms and assurances of trust and interactions among the Social networks (civil and religious groups, family relationships, informal social networks, friends, relatives, etc.). Putnam believes that these components reinforce each other so that they create social harmony with high levels of cooperation, trust, interaction, civic engagement, and social welfare (Ahmadvand and Sharif zade, 2011: 147). His explanation about the role of social trust and social networks is the following statement; what is causing high levels of participation is the trust that is created based on social and cooperative participations. Putnam believes that civic participation networks have spread strong norms of generalized give and take and encouraged the emergence of social trust therefore facilitated cooperation and communication, and so made the problem of collective action possible (Alipour et al, 2009: 118).

Putnam's believes that formal and informal networks of communication and exchange exist in every community, both modern and traditional, feudal or capitalist, etc. Putnam's views social networks as one of the essential forms of Social Capital. The density of these networks in a society, the more likely it is for citizens to cooperate for mutual benefit. He divides social networks into two parts: 1) Horizontal networks seeking equality as civil participations in the form of associations, clubs and etc. that are origin of the other two components. 2) Monopolistic or vertical networks that lack the capability to establish cooperative norms and trust, meanwhile horizontal networks strengthen the group cooperation.

He sees vertical or hierarchical network lacking in capacity to establish trust and social cooperation. Since, the flow of information on vertical networks is not transparent and effective compared to horizontal networks. The related norms of interaction and punishments for violations and impeding opportunity in vertical networks are less stipulated and run for high status officials (Ibrahimi et al, 2012: 273).

Axelrod emphasizes on voluntary, selective and nonprofit features of participation. Based on these features social participation in its institutional form is separated from government institutions, family community and the profit institutions (Axelrod 1950 14). The most important feature of participation is voluntary activities. In total, social participation implies those voluntary activities that members of a community are involved in. Through these activities, they can be involved in neighborhood, town and village affairs, directly or indirectly shaping their own social life therefore, formation of voluntary associations are considered the most important aspects of organizing social participation.

Goulet considers people's participation as a vital component of development strategies that possesses three functions. In his view, social participation, first, guarantees the non-instrumental way government behaves with people and gives them self-worth. Second, social participation is considered as a valuable tool for mobilizing, organizing and developing activities to uplift people as problem solvers of their social conditions. Third, participation is like a channel through which groups and communities can gain access to the realm of bigger decisions. Without participation, development strategies are non-public and fruitless. Regarding participation as an instrument or purpose, Osman & FF believe that any analysis and evaluation is difficult if participation is considered as both purpose and instrument.

Participation as an instrument or purpose is more based on Ideology than fact, because development is recognized by the instrumental and intrinsic values and wide participation of people in decision-making, implementation, evaluation and utilization (Ghaffari and Niyazi, 2007).

Wondersman knows participation as a process in which members participate in institutional decision-making, plans and also share the effects of this decision (Wondersman, 2000).

Oakley states three descriptions to define participation: 1) Participation as having a share, 2) participation as organizing, and 3) participation as empowerment (Oakley et al, 1991: 8-9).

“Arnstein considers participation as power-sharing process to influence the behavior of the government. In his opinion, participation is the redistribution of power that occurs at different levels. He separates eight levels of participation on a ladder known as the ladder of participation. This figure's steps includes: 1. Controlled citizenship, 2. Delegated power, 3. Participation, 4. Easing up, 5. Counseling, 6. Informing, 7. Treatment, 8. Manipulation and deception of the appearance” (Arnstein, 1971).

4. Levels of Participation

Different levels of participation: 1. Micro level (individual), includes voluntarily participation in firms and private companies; 2. Intermediate level (institutions and social organizations), this participation takes place in various sectors of society including organizations, institutions and their relations; 3. Macro level (society) this participation can be called a national or society participation which involves widespread and comprehensive participation of social members.

Types of participation based on regional levels: 1. Limited participation: the participation includes the rural participation and involvement of communities in the city. At the village level, it aims to provoke villagers to promote rural development projects and programs in cities and to solve neighborhood problems by residents of each neighborhood. 2. Regional participation includes the participation of several neighborhoods or towns to improve and enhance the economic, social and cultural status of the area. 3. National participation: this participation takes place at the level of the whole society and its goal is something that is needed by all members of society - and that does not depend on a particular place or region.

Types of participation based on the method of involvement: 1. Formal partnership, formal partnership includes “formal social contact and encounter in a variety of groups that encompasses membership in organizations, associations and clubs with activities scheduled at a specific time and place” (Yazdanpanah, 2007: 3).

2. Informal partnerships; this type of partnership includes unorganized kinds of social and group activities at uncertain time intervals. In other words, “a more informal forms of social participation and social impacts such as temporary and occasional phone calls with friends who we do not typically want to contact » (Zettel, 2008: 3).

Inglehart considers the relation between trust and participation. He believes that trust in each other is an effective factor in participation, since by trusting behaviors become predictable, thereby strengthening the scope of action and decision-making. This approach is somewhat similar to that of Almond and Reba that sees trust as an instrument of democratic culture and establishing secondary relations in civic culture. Inglehart also sees Social Capital equivalent to trust and argues that Social Capital is a culture of trust and tolerance and thanks to it, the extensive network of voluntary organizations are growing. He believes that networks are the results of people's trust in each other and that trust is not the product of people's associative actions. People, who trust each other, communicate with each other in various positions to form social groups from sports to workplace and they work together to build further trust (Alipour et al, 2009: 119).

Lipset's researches in political countries such as Germany, Sweden, Norway and Finland show that there are differences in rural and urban political participation in some countries.(E.g.elections). In countries with traditions of collective leadership, participation in rural areas is more than urban areas. Lipset concluded that this pattern of political participation in elections is the same in different countries. Men more than women, educated more than less educated, urban more than rural, middle-aged and elderly more than young, married more than singles, people with high status more than low-status individuals participate in elections (Golabi & Hajilo, 2012: 180-179). Robert Dahl showed that the more educated the individuals, the rate of their sense of political efficacy also increases and thus education indirectly affects the political participation. Education also affects the rate of access to information, and this makes fertile ground for political participation (Golabi & Hajilo, 2012: 184).

5. Research Hypotheses

It seems that there is a relation between social capital and social participation .

It seems that there is a relation between social network and social participation
There is a relation between the underlying variables and social participation.

6. Methodology

The central theme of this study was to determine the social participation and associated factors such as social capital and socio-economic variables. Thus, this study used quantitative approach in the inquiry process to understand and explain social participation which could be investigated and measured objectively. As has been reported somewhere that, quantitative approach is more objective and independent research biases (Punch, 2000) in comparison to qualitative approach .

Survey research design, is a procedure in quantitative approach which help the researchers to administer a questionnaire in order to identify trends in the attitudes, opinion, behavior or characteristic of population (Creswell, 2005). In this study since the social participation as a major issue of the study, is measurable and accountable with its elements, thus the survey technique using questionnaire was implemented. This method helps the researcher to answer the questions and research objective regarding the social participation, impact of social capital and socio-economic status on social participation.

The research population of this study consists of all individuals of 18 years and older living in Bandar Abbas. According to 2010 Iranian Census, Bandar abbas has a population of 588,288. Based on Cochran's formula, sample size is approximately (380) and in order to reduce the sampling measurement error, it was increased to (391). Data was collected by questionnaire. A multistage cluster sampling method was used, as well.

7. Validity and Reliability of Study

In the present study, the same questions that have been used in creditable researches and published articles were used. Cronbach's alpha was used to assess the reliability of the instrument.

Table 1: Cronbach's alpha coefficients of variables

Variable	Dimensions	Number of items	Reliability
Social participation	Formal participation	7	.83
	Informal participation	13	.82
	Total participation	20	.87
Social capital	Social trust	17	.70
	Network	6	.73
	Total of social capital	23	.76

7.1 Descriptive Findings

In this study, a total of 271 subjects responded, 41.3% (112) female and 58.7 % (159) male. The statistical results obtained on age also suggest that the average age of respondents is equal to 29.36 with the minimum age of 18 years and the maximum age of 64 years. Also, 60.7 percent of the total survey respondents are married and 37%, single and 2.2% were divorced. Distribution of respondents according to education suggests that 1.5% of respondents are illiterate, 6.6% elementary school, 14% middle and secondary school, 30.3% high school Diploma, 22.9% technician, 20.7% bachelor degree and 4.1% undergraduate, postgraduate and higher.

8. Descriptive Statistics Related to the Mean Score of Social Capital

Table 2: Mean score of social capital and its statistics

Social capital	N	Percent	Descriptive statistics	Amount
Very seldom	23	8.5	Mean	4.24
Seldom	64	23.6	SD	1.24
Moderate	13	4.8	Varians	1.55
High	130	48	Range	5
Very high	26	9.6	Skewness	-.81
Missing	15	5.6	Kurtosis	-.57

9. Descriptive Statistics Related to the Mean Score of Social Participation

Table 3: descriptive statistics of social participation

Social participation	N	Percent	Descriptive statistics	Amount
Never	21	7.7	Mean	3.25
Very seldom	60	22.1	SD	1.26
Seldom	74	27.3	Variance	1.58
Moderate	74	27.3	Range	5
High	30	11.1	skewness	-.51
Very high	13	4.4	Kurtosis	.15
Total	295	100		

10. Analytical Findings

Table 4: Compared Formal and Informal Social Participation by Gender

Variables	Gender	Mean	SD	T amount	Sig
Social participation(formal)	Female	2.31	.98	-3.86	.00
	Male	2.82	1.11		
Social participation (informal)	Female	3.10	.83	-1.63	.10
	Male	3.28	.90		
Total social participation	Female	2.83	.79	-2.78	.06
	Male	3.12	.88		

Table 4 shows that informal social participation between males and females is not significant. However, there is a significant difference in formal social participation between males and females, and males' social participation (2.82) is more than females' (2.31). Also, although the total average amount of social participation for males (3.12) is more than that of females (2.83), it is not statistically significant.

Table 5: Compared Formal and Informal Social Participation by Marital Status

Variables	Gender	Mean	SD	T amount	Sig
Social participation(formal)	Single	2.50	1.09	1.32	.18
	Married	2.68	1.09		
Social participation (informal)	Single	3.08	.85	1.99	.04
	Married	3.30	.88		
Total social participation	Single	2.87	.86	1.92	.05
	Married	3.08	.84		

Table 5 suggests that there is a significant difference regarding informal social participation of people with their marital status, and the average of informal social participation of married (3.30) is more than that of singles (3.08). Also, the

difference between formal social participation and total social participation between the singles and the married couples is not significant.

Table 8: Pearson correlation between Age and Social Participation

Dimensions of social participation	Age of respondents	Sig
Formal social participation	.24	.000
Informal social participation	.26	.00
Total of social participation	.26	.00

Table 6 indicates that there is a positive and direct significant relation between age and formal and informal social participation with close to the moderate intensity. This means that the older the people, the more formal the participation rate.

Table 7: The Correlation between Income and Social participation

Dimensions of social participation	Income	Sig
Formal social participation	.20	.00
Informal social participation	.05	.39
Total of social participation	.12	.04

The table above indicates that there is a positive and direct significant relationship between income and formal social participation. This means that the more the income, the greater the total amount of formal participation. Also, the findings suggest that there is no significant relationship between informal social participation and income.

Table 8: Pearson correlation between Social Trust and Social Participation

Dimensions of social participation	Social trust	Sig
Formal social participation	.30	.00
Informal social participation	.40	.00
Total of social participation	.40	.00

Above table data suggests that there is a positive and direct significant relationship (0.30) between social trust and formal social participation. This means that the more the social trust the greater the amount of formal participation. There is also a direct and positive relationship (0.40) between social trust and informal social participation. Also, coefficient of correlation between social trust and social participation is meaningfully significant. Thus, we can say that the more the social trust, the more the amount of social participation.

Table 9: Pearson correlation Coefficients of Social Network and Social Participation Aspects

Dimensions of social participation	Social networks	Sig
Formal social participation	.12	.06
Informal social participation	.33	.00
Total of social participation	.27	.00

Table 9 shows that there is a significant positive relationship between the network of social relations and informal and overall social participation (0.33), (0.27), respectively.

Table 10: The Correlation Coefficients between Social Capital and Social Participation

Dimensions of social participation	Social capital	Sig
Formal social participation	.70	.00
Informal social participation	.85	.00
Total of social participation	.87	.00

Table 10 indicates that there is a significant, direct and positive relationship between social capital and aspects of formal (0.70), informal (0.85) and total social participation (0.87). This means that the more the social capital, the greater the social participation

Table 11: Multivariate Linear Regression of Independent Variables with Formal Social Participation

	Unstandard regression coefficient	Standard deviation	Beta coefficient	T amount	Sig
Constant	.02	.40	--	.05	.95
Social trust	.45	.09	.28	4.70	.00
Age	.02	.007	.20	3.32	.01
Income	.11	.05	.13	2.08	.03

Table 11 shows multivariate linear regression of independent variables with formal social participation. Beta's comparison indicates the highest and lowest levels of influence of formal social participation were applied on trust and income dependent variables. The standardized coefficients of the variables are (0.28) and (0.13) respectively. Generally, the proposed model explains (0.16) percent of the change in informal social participation dependent variable.

Table 12: Multivariate Linear Regression of Independent Variables with Informal Social Participation

	Unstandard regression coefficient	Standard deviation	Beta coefficient	T amount	Sig
Constant	.55	.33	--	1.67	.09
Social trust	.36	.08	.28	4.55	.00
Age	.01	.00	.20	3.45	.00
Network relation	.19	.05	.20	3.33	.00

Table 12 shows multivariate linear regression of independent variables with informal social participation. Beta's comparison indicates that the highest and lowest levels of influence of informal social participation were applied on trust and network dependent variables. The standardized coefficients of the variables are (0.28) and (0.20), respectively. Generally, the model explains (0.22) percent of the change in the dependent variable of informal social participation. In fact, this research could determine 22% of factors influencing informal social participation by explaining and introducing research variables.

Table 13: Multivariate Linear Regression of Dependent Variables with Total Social Participation

	Unstandard regression coefficient	Standard deviation	Beta coefficient	T amount	Sig
Constant	.42	.32	--	1.28	.19
Social trust	.39	.07	.31	4.94	.00
Age	.2	.00	.24	4.14	.00
Network relation	.13	.05	.14	2.33	.02

Beta comparisons indicate that the highest and lowest levels of influence of dependent variables with total social participation were applied on trust and network variables. The standardized coefficients of the variables are (0.14) and (0.31), respectively. Generally, the model explained (0.22) percent of the change in the dependent variable of social participation. In fact, this research could determine 22% of factors influencing informal social participation by explaining and introducing research variables.

11. Discussion and Conclusion

The research has shown that there is a significant difference in formal social participation between males and females, with males' social participation (2.82) is more than in females' (2.31). However, the total mean of social participation for males (3.12) is more than that of females (2.83), it is not statistically significant. Based on the result, the difference in social participation between males and females in terms of population sizes (informal participation and total participation) is rejected and the (formal participation) is confirmed. Also, to match the used theory (Lipset's theory), these theories are rejected in terms of informal participation and total social participation but confirmed in term of formal participation.

The comparison between the participation of married and single participants suggests that among all the types of participation there is a significant difference regarding informal social participation and total social participation between married and single subjects. Married social participation (3.8) is more than that of singles (2.87). Therefore, the assumption that there is a significant difference between singles and married participants in terms of social participation is confirmed. Lipset theory says that married people participate more in social activities, the theory in terms of informal social participation and total social participation is confirmed but rejected in term of formal social participation.

Results of ANOVA social participation based on studies indicate that the difference is not statistically significant in term of education. Thus, we can say that the level of social participation in terms of education levels in the sample is almost identical. Also, Rush's theory of the extra social participation of more educated people than those with low education is not verified in the current study.

There is a positive and direct significant relation (0.30) between social trust and formal social participation. This means that the more the social trust, the greater the amount of formal participation. There is also a direct and positive relationship (0.401) between social trust and informal social participation. This means that the more the social trust, the greater the amount of informal participation. Therefore the research hypothesis that there is a relationship between social trust and social participation is approved. These findings are consistent with Alipour's (2009) research findings. Also, the intensity of the relationship between social participation and social trust is moderate.

There is a significant positive direct relationship between the network of relationship and formal, informal social participation and total social participation, (0.12), (0.33), and (0.27), respectively. This means that the more the level of the network of social relationships, the more the formal and informal social participation. Therefore, the research hypothesis that there is a relationship between the network of social relationships and social participation is confirmed. Also formal social network relationships' intensity is low but informal and total social participation of social participation are moderate.

There is a significant direct positive relationship between social capital and formal social participation (0.70), that the more the social trust, the higher the formal social participation. Moreover, there is a significant direct positive relationship between social capital and informal social participation. The association is also direct and positive. Therefore, the research hypothesis stating that social capital has a significant relationship with social participation is confirmed. The intensity of the relationship between social capital and social involvement is high.

Simple linear regression between social capital and social participation demonstrates the significant impact of social capital on social participation by 76 percent change. The impact is also positive. So, we can say that an increase (decrease) in people's social capital increases (decreases) their social participation. Beta's comparison in multivariate linear regression of total social participation with independent variables, indicates that the highest and lowest levels of influence are applied on trust and relationship networks. The standardized coefficients of the variables are (0.14) and (0.31), respectively. Generally, the proposed model explained 22 percentage changes in informal social participation. Therefore, regarding the hypothesis that social capital dimensions (social trust and networks of social relationships) affect the level of social participation, it can be said that the theory is confirmed. In sum, the results of the survey show that social capital (social trust and network relationships) affect the level of social participation (formal and informal). In other words, increased social capital leads to increased social participation, and that by itself confirms the theories used in this research (theory of Putnam & Inglehart).

References

- Abbasi, M. R. & Abbas Ghaderi, M. (2009). "Examined the relationship between social capital and social participation of youth". *First International Conference on Intellectual Capital Management*
- Ahmadvand, M. & Sharif-Zadeh, M. (2011). Determinants of rural women's social participation (city studied Boyer Ahmad). *Social and Psychological Study of Women*, Year 9, No. 3, 139-166.
- Ali Pour, P., Zahedi, M. J., & Shiyani, M. (2009). Trust and participation (the relationship between trust and social participation in

- Tehran). *Iranian Journal of Sociology*, No. 2, 109-135.
- Arnstein, S. 1971 "A ladder of citizen participation" in the USA Journal of the Town Planning Institute, 54, 4; W I P 2007.
- Axelrod, Morris (1950) , Urban structure and participation, American Sociological Review, vol. 21. Issue 1.
- Azkiya, M., & Hassani Rad, K. (2009). The role of social trust in people's participation in rural development projects. *The Social Science Research*, Second Year, No. 1, 82-87.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Pearson.
- Danesh Mehr, H. & Ahmad Rash, R. (2009). Study of rural social attitudes towards social participation (Case Study: Village Dasheh district of Pave county). *Journal of Rural Sociology*. First Year, (Issue 1), 130-155.
- Ghaffari, G. & Mohsen, N. (2007). *The sociology of Contribution*. Tehran: Nazdik Publication
- Golabi, F. & Hajilo, F. (2010). Examined the sociological factors affecting women's political participation (Case of East Azarbaijan province). *Social Studies*, No. 1, 174-200
- Hezarjaribi, J. & Safari Shali, R. (2009). Social factors affecting citizens. *Applied Sociology*, No. 4, 17-38
- Ibrahimi, S., Najafi, D., Mahmoud Ughli, R., & Sadeghi Nqdali, Z. (2012). *Journal of the Strategy*, year 22, No. 66, 264-284
- Idrisi, A., & Shojaee M. (2012). Factors influencing social residents' participation in implementing urban development projects (Case Study: Walking path building in the historic area of the city of Tehran). *Welfare and Social Development of the Region Planning*, No. 12, 117-160
- Mansourian, K., & Ghodrati, H. (2009). Social Trust and its determinants: a community-based or approach instructional-based approach? *Applied Sociology*, No. 2, 189-215
- Mousavi, M. T. (2006). Social participation component of social capital. *Journal of Social Welfare*, No. 23, 67-93
- Nowrouzi, F., & Bakhtiari, M. (2009). Social participation and social factors influencing it. *Strategies Quarterly*, Year 18, No. 53, 249-269
- Okely, P. & David, M. (1991). *Participatory approaches in rural development*. Translated by M. Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. Tehran: Center for Research and Rural Issues Jihad.
- Punch, K. (2000). *Developing Effective Research Proposal*. London: Sage.
- Roknoddin Eftekhari, A., & Mohammadi Soleimani, M. (2002). Factors influencing the participation of rural youth in development planning, with emphasis on place - space factors (Case study: city of Kerman), *Humanities*, Year 6, No. 27, 37-50
- Safiri K., & Sadeghi, M. (2009). Social participation of female students in Tehran University. *Faculty of Social Sciences and Social Factors Affecting the Applied Sociology*, Twentieth Year, No. 2-34
- Shiyani, M., Mousavi, M., & Madani Ghahgharkhi, S. (2010). Social capital for young people in Iran. *Iranian Journal of Sociology*, No. 3, 57-84 .
- Vahida, F., & Niyazi, M. (2004). A reflect on the relationship between family structure and social participation in Kashan. *Social Sciences letter*, No. 23, 145-175.
- Yazdan Panah, L., & Samadian F. (2008). The impact of individual and social characteristics of social participation in Kermani Women. *Women's Studies*, Year 6, No. 2
- Wandersman, A, & Florin, P. (2000), Citizen participation and community organizations. In J. Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of community psychology*, New York.
- Zettel, Laura Britton, Watson (2008) , "The impact of obesity on the social participation of older adults", *The journal of general psychology*, California state university. Pp. 409 – 423.