

# Measurement instruments for social capital of individuals

Henk Flap (University of Utrecht / ICS)  
Tom Snijders (University of Groningen / ICS)  
Beate Völker (University of Utrecht / ICS)  
Martin van der Gaag (University of Groningen / ICS)

Questionnaire items as used in the 1999/2000 nation wide study "Social relations and networks in the neighborhood and at the workplace: the Social Survey of the Networks of the Dutch" (SSND) - a joint project of the universities of Utrecht, Groningen and Amsterdam.

# Measuring the social capital of individuals - a brief introduction

## Choices in approaching social capital

This document contains sets of questions that can be used to measure the social capital of individuals, defined as the resources present in ego-centered social networks. All proceed from the consideration that they should be useful to measure the general distribution of social capital over a population, and be applicable in prospective research that aims to study the productivity and goal- and context specificity of social capital. To do so, the following choices were made (for a more elaborate discussion on these issues see Flap 1999, 2002; Lin 2001; Van der Gaag & Snijders, 2002).

First, all methods used concentrate on the *access* an individual may have to resources embedded in relationships with network members, and not their *use*. The resources are seen as potentially available to an individual as a result of investments done in relationships during a shared past. Social capital measurement instruments that focus on the mere *access* to resources are easier to use, and retrieve information that is more straightforwardly interpretable. Studying the use of social capital is an equally interesting, but involves a large number of additional questions on the psychological, psycho-social and macro-sociological level (Van der Gaag & Snijders, 2002).

A simple indication of the presence of social resources in the network is however not enough to characterise it as usable social capital. A second choice is therefore that social capital measurement instruments should include information concerning the availability of embedded social resources, for instance by making assumptions on the willingness of alters to give access to their resources (Flap, 1999, 2002).

Third, we choose to measure the general social capital of individuals in the general population, instead of resources tied to a certain life domain or subpopulation. When measuring social capital of the general population, measurement instruments should include a wide variety of social resource items, that comprises resource items that are considered both useful and agreeable resources to be exchanged. Substantial theory is needed to create a collection of items that applies to these requirements.

## Measurement instruments

In the 1999-2000 Social Survey on the Networks of the Dutch (SSND), three social capital measurement instruments were included: the *name generator / interpreter*, the *position generator*, and the *resource generator*. Although these instruments all focus on the same type of information – resource collections in social networks - they differ in the way these resources are approached, and in the way they retrieve this information from respondents.

### *the name generator / interpreter*

The oldest measurement method is the *name generator / interpreter* approach (McCallister and Fischer, 1978), which has been used by many other researchers. In this procedure the full ego-centered social network is mapped (the name generating part), as a starting point for the collection of information about each specific network member (the name interpretation part). This can result in very detailed and informative social capital descriptions, but it is expensive.

The collection of name generated data is a heavy burden for both interviewer and interviewee, as the number of data that are to be collected can become enormous, especially when many name interpreting questions are included, and larger social networks are encountered. Much of the data collected with this instrument can subsequently also be considered redundant for social capital measurement, as many alters in the network will give

access to the same resources. Although similar resources located at several alters can be seen as a way of help 'insurance', the presence of one alter giving access to a particular resource will usually suffice to solve a certain problem. For many issues only the information whether *at least one* alter can offer a certain social resource help is necessary (Snijders, 1999; Van der Gaag & Snijders, 2002).

There have been no strict guidelines for the inclusion of specific name generating or interpreting questions in this instrument. It has been used for widely varying research goals, which has led to many incomparable findings. Furthermore, the possibility of making corrections for the availability of social capital measured with name generators is almost entirely dependent on the name *interpreting* questions included.

Finally, there also has not been much consensus in the way name generator data should be aggregated into social capital measures. For social capital measurement, both the name generating and interpreting part can be a basis for measure construction, depending on the principle for measure construction that is followed (see *measure construction*). So far, most emphasis has been put either on indications of network size, or calculations of heterogeneity indices over the network. Also, fractions of weak vs. strong ties, or fractions of relationship origin domains such as the work domain, the family domain, friendships, etc. have been considered as indicators of some form of social capital. Not much has been done with actual resource information that could be retrieved in the name interpreting part of the questionnaire. In many cases the name generating questions themselves can also be seen as resource indicating items.

Summarised, use of the name generator interpreter is a very flexible, but also very open and possibly diffuse method of measuring social capital. It is especially recommended when detailed analyses of social network contents in specific populations are pursued.

#### *the position generator*

A second measurement instrument that has been used to collect access-type social capital data is the *position generator* (Lin and Dumin, 1986); this method measures access to network members' occupations, that are seen as representing job prestige-based social resource collections in an hierarchically modelled society, following Lin's theories of social resources and social capital (Lin, 1982; 2001). The availability of resources is checked by measuring the tie strength through which the occupations are accessed, indicated by the role of ties: family members, friends, or acquaintances.

The administration of this instrument is easy and quick, and its questionnaire can be systematically adjusted for different populations by using appropriate job prestige hierarchies. Retrieved information is also consistently modelled into theoretically argued social capital measures: the range of the accessed prestige, highest accessed prestige, and the number of different positions accessed (see e.g. Lin & Dumin, 1986; Lin, Fu, and Hsung, 2001).

However, these measures only contain indirect information about the actual resource content of the accessed social capital, as little or no specific information is supplied. Their interpretation almost completely hinges on the theoretical importance of job prestige, which is especially suitable for social capital investigations including instrumental actions, but not expressive actions (see Van der Gaag & Snijders, 2002, 2003b). The investigation of the goal- and context-specificity of social capital, for which multiple measures referring to separate subcollections of social capital are needed, is less well possible with this instrument.

Summarised, the position generator is a theoretically well-founded instrument that is especially useful for between-population comparisons. Currently the number of social capital studies that uses the position generator is rapidly growing.

### *the resource generator*

To overcome disadvantages of both the above described instruments Snijders (1999) proposed a measurement instrument combining the positive aspects of both the position generator (economic, internal validity) and name generator / interpreter (detailed resource information): the *resource generator*. This instrument asks about access to resources, and has the same basic questionnaire structure as the position generator: a fixed list of resources that each represent a vivid, concrete subcollection of social capital, together covering several domains of life. Similarly, the availability of each of these resources is checked by measuring the tie strength through which the resources are accessed, indicated by the role of these ties: family members, friends, or acquaintances. This instrument can be administered quickly, and also result in valid and easily interpretable representations of social capital. Because it is designed to lead to sets of multiple social capital indicators, it also offers possibilities for use in goal specificity research of social capital (see Van der Gaag & Snijders, 2003a). The SSND is the first instance of data collection with this instrument.

Since social interaction and social network formation are very culturally dependent, the composition of the resource generator requires quite some theoretical guidance. Within each population under study it should again be considered which collection of social resources comprises either valuable or agreeable social capital. There is no straightforward key or formula to solve this problem, but several theories can be helpful in the composition of collections of items (see Van der Gaag & Snijders, 2002). Therefore, the resource generator is especially useful for within-population studies and comparisons between population subgroups.

### **Social capital measure construction**

Social capital researchers have suggested several principles to construct measures from available data. Many notions are based on information about total networks (see Borgatti, 1998), which is mostly unavailable in data retrieved from either the name generator / interpreter (NG), position generator (PG), or resource generator (RG), because these methods measure ego-centered networks.

First, there is the notion of *volume*, suggesting that simply bigger, larger, or more social capital is beneficial for attaining individual goals (Bourdieu, 1981; Flap & De Graaf, 1986; Burt, 1992). This can be expressed into simple measures as total network size (NG), or a summation over all network members of any quantifiable resource (NG), such as the total of prestige accessed in the network (NG, PG). Because of its unspecificity, and the decreasing marginal returns of accessing extra alters providing similar resources, some scholars have argued that these measures only supply information of limited meaning.

Second, the notion of *variety* has been used, indicating that the more differentiation is present in social resources, the better social capital it represents (Lin & Dumin, 1986; Erickson, 1996; Lin, 2001). This can be expressed into measures as numbers of different exchange relationships present in the network (NG), various relationship heterogeneity measures (NG), resource heterogeneity measures (NG), the range of accessed prestige (PG), a total number of positions / occupations accessed (PG), or the total number of resource items (RG) accessed. Especially with the position generator this measure has been widely used.

Third, a *high upward reach* in accessing social resources, indicated by an hierarchical evaluation of resources (Lin & Dumin, 1986; Lin, 2001). This is only possible with social resources for which there is a common denomination, and has therefore mainly been applied to accessed prestige in the position generator.

Single measures for social capital are practical in statistical analyses, but have two main disadvantages. They are not suitable for investigations of goal- and context specificity,

because these by definition need multiple social capital measures. Furthermore, single social capital measures are less satisfactory because they leave a lot of interesting information unused: they can yield the same numerical values for very different collections of social capital. For this reason, in most research with the position generator combinations of at least two measures are used (Van der Gaag & Snijders, 2002).

To compose multiple measures for social capital, we need an argued basis to aggregate information; which subcollections of items should lead to separate measures? One method is to start from a theoretical basis, and group items by the effects they could have within a certain life domain: social resources that are additive in helping to attain the same goal (Snijders, 1999).

First, by 'adding up' items within domains of predetermined theoretical importance, as is customary from classical test psychology. This can be done with both name generator and resource generator items (there are no theoretical subdomains in position generator measures). Second, measures can be constructed from a set of questionnaire items by empirical analysis. The basic idea behind this is to explore dimensions in the set of items, and transform each separate dimension into a social capital scale. This method can be performed with name generator, position generator, and resource generator items, and is more elaborately explained elsewhere (Van der Gaag & Snijders, 2002, 2003a).

### **This questionnaire**

So far, uncovering the actual distribution of social capital over the general population is still an important research question. The unequal distribution over social subgroups of various subcollections of social capital can lead to a reproduction in equality (Flap, 1991; Lin, 2001). Besides sociodemographic categories, we are also interested in unequal distributions caused by individual personality characteristics. Collections of individual social capital are often seen as a function of the two main determinants of relationship formation: opportunity structure (see Van de Bunt, 1999) and homophily (Homans, 1950; Lazarsfeld & Merton; 1954; Lin, 2001:38-40; review in McPherson, Smith-Lovin and Cook, 2001). Recently, personality characteristics have begun to be considered as additional determinants in relationship formation, suggesting that some of the personality traits traditionally distinguished in psychology have considerable impact on personal network formation (e.g. Vodosek, 2003; Negrón & McCarty, 2003). In the SSND questionnaire, a set of questions covering such characteristics has been included that can be used as covariates in explaining distributions of social capital, and attached at the end of this document,

On the following pages, questions have been reproduced directly from the original SSND questionnaire. This means that all remarks referring to other topics that were included in the questionnaire have been left in. For reader convenience, accompanying remarks to the questions are set in Times Roman type (as is this introduction); the questions as read by the interviewer are set in Garamond type; instructions for the interviewer are set in *Garamond italic* type. We hope these instruments will be useful in your research, and the research team welcomes questions and suggestions for improvements.

Martin van der Gaag, ICS, University of Groningen, March 2003.  
e-mail: [gaag@xs4all.nl](mailto:gaag@xs4all.nl) homepage: <http://www.xs4all.nl/~gaag/work>

*The measurement instruments in this paper were constructed by Henk Flap and Beate Völker (ICS and University of Utrecht), and Tom Snijders (ICS, University of Groningen).*

## REFERENCES

- Flap, H. (2002) No man is an island. In: Lazega, E.; Favereau, O. (eds) "Conventions and Structures". Oxford: University Press.
- Flap, H. (1999) Creation and returns of social capital: a new research program. *La Revue Tocqueville* XX (1): 5-26.
- Flap, H. (1991) Social capital in the production of inequality. A review. *Comparative Sociology of Family, Health, and Education* 20:6179-6202.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F.; Merton, R.K. (1954) Friendship as social process: a substantive and methodological analysis. In: Kendall P.L. (ed.) "The varied sociology of Paul F. Lazarsfeld." New York : Columbia University Press.
- Lin, N. (2001) Social capital: a theory of social structure and action. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Lin, N. (1982) Social resources and instrumental action. In: Marsden, P.V and Lin, N. (eds.) "Social structure and network analysis." Beverly Hills, CA : Sage.
- Lin, N.; Dumin, M. (1986) Access to Occupations through Social Ties. *Social Networks* 8: 365-385.
- Lin, N.; Fu, Y.; Hsung, R. (2001) The Position Generator: Measurement Techniques for Investigations of Social Capital. In: Lin, N.; Cook, K.; Burt, R.S. (eds.) Social capital: theory and research. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, pp 57-81.
- McCallister, L.; Fischer, C. (1978) A procedure for surveying personal networks. *Sociological Methods and Research* 7: 131-148.
- McPherson, M.; Smith-Lovin, L.; Cook, J.M. (2001) Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*.
- Negrón, R.; McCarty, C. (2003) Personality and social network structure. Paper presented at the XXIII Sunbelt international Social Networks Conference; february 12-16, Cancun, Mexico.
- Snijders, T.A.B. (1999) Prologue to the measurement of social capital. *La Revue Tocqueville* XX(1): 27-44.
- Van de Bunt, G. (1999) Friends by choice: an actor-oriented statistical network model for friendship networks through time. Amsterdam (Ph.D thesis).
- Van der Gaag, M.P.J. & Snijders, T.A.B. (2002) An approach to the measurement of individual social capital. Forthcoming as 'Proposals for the measurement of individual social capital' in: Flap, H.D. & Volker B. (eds.) "Creation and returns of Social Capital". London : Routledge. Draft downloadable from <http://www.xs4all.nl/~gaag/work>
- Van der Gaag, M.P.J. & Snijders, T.A.B. (2003a) The Resource Generator: measurement of individual social capital with concrete items. Paper presented at the XXII Sunbelt international Social Networks Conference ; february 13-17, New Orleans, US. Downloadable from <http://www.xs4all.nl/~gaag/work>
- Van der Gaag, M.P.J. & Snijders, T.A.B. (2003b) Position Generator measures and their relationship to other social capital indicators. Slide presentation at the XXIII Sunbelt international Social Networks Conference; february 12-16, Cancun, Mexico. Downloadable from <http://www.xs4all.nl/~gaag/work>
- Vodosek, M. (2003) The role of personality in the formation of social networks. Paper presented at the XXIII Sunbelt international Social Networks Conference; february 12-16, Cancun, Mexico.

## POSITION GENERATOR

Before asking you more questions about your work and your daily activities, I would like to know what are the occupations you meet and have contact with. I have here a list of different occupations that people can have. Does anyone in your family have one of those occupations? Anyone among your friends? Among your acquaintances? With 'acquaintance' I don not mean the salespersons you come across in the shop, but somebody that you have a small talk or would have a small talk with if you meet him/her on the street and that you know by his/her name.

*Interviewer: Begin with asking whether Ego knows a family member in that occupation. If yes, move on the next question. If not, then ask about friends in that occupation. Only if not, ask about knowing an acquaintance in that occupation. If Ego says that somebody is both a family member and a friend he or she should be counted as a family member.*

Job/function	family	friend	acquaintance	no
1 Physician	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
2 Cook	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
3 Engineer	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
4 High ranking public servant	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
5 Construction worker	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
6 Director of a company	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
7 Manager	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
8 Teacher	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
9 Real-estate agent	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
10 Labor union executive	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
11 Lawyer	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
12 Mechanic/technician	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
13 Accountant	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
14 Scientist	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
15 Policy maker	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
16 Musician/artist/writer	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
17 IT worker	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
18 Police officer	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
19 Secretary	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
20 Insurance agent	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
21 Foreman/woman	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
22 Nurse	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
23 Farmer	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
24 Lorry driver	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
25 Postman	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
26 Engine driver	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
27 Salesman/-woman	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
28 Unskilled worker	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
29 Cleaning person	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
30 Hairdresser	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)

## **NAME GENERATOR / INTERPRETER**

The answers to the Name Generator questions were all coded onto a separate sheet ('list A') that accompanied each questionnaire. On this sheet, a matrix was printed into which all information could easily be written down systematically.

Initially, as the *name generating* part, only the names of network members that were supplied by respondents were recorded (at the choice of the respondents either full names, given names, or initials were also allowed as responses). Of each identified network member the question from which this name resulted was directly coded. If a certain person had been mentioned before as a response to an earlier question, just extra columns corresponding to these questions were marked on the sheet.

In a second stage of the questionnaire, the *name interpreting* part, a set of interpretative questions was asked for each network member identified on the list.



## ***name generating questions***

### **1: CONTACT-PERSON FOR CURRENT/LAST JOB**

Now we get to a question that is important to discover your personal relations. I would like to know who helped you getting this job. May I have the first name and the first letter of the family name of the person the helped you get your current/last job? We will come back to this person later.

*Interviewer: fill name on list A and mark column NG1.*

### **2a: ASKING ADVICE**

If you have a problem at work, whom do you go to for advice? May I again have the first name and the first letter of the family name of those persons?

*Interviewer: put the names on list A and mark column NG2a. If the name is already on the list because it has been mentioned before, **only** mark column NG2a. A maximum of 5 names can be mentioned.*

### **2b: GIVING ADVICE**

How is it the other way around? Are there also people who come to you for advice regarding problems that they have at their work? May I again have the first name and the first letter of the family name of those persons?

*Interviewer: put the names on list A and mark column NG2b. If the names are already on the list because they have been mentioned before, **only** mark column NG2b. A maximum of 5 names can be mentioned. If Ego has a job that involves giving advice, ask about advice giving that is not directly connected with his/her position.*

### **3: SOUR SOCIAL CAPITAL**

At work people not only cooperate, but also bother each other. How is that in your situation? Has any of your colleagues lately disturbed you in doing your job? May I again have the first name and the first letter of the family name of those persons?

*Interviewer: put the names on list A and mark column NG3. If the names are already on the list because they have been mentioned before, **only** mark column NG3. A maximum of 5 names can be mentioned.*

### **4: DIRECT COLLEAGUES/COOPERATION**

Who are the two colleagues with whom you work most often? May I again have the first name and the first letter of the family name (or initials) of those colleagues?

*Interviewer: put the names on list A and mark column NG4. If the names are already on the list because they have been mentioned before, **only** mark column NG4.*

(This question was followed by statements regarding the work relationships with these colleagues, to which the respondent was invited to react.)

### **5: BOSS**

May I have the first name and the first letter of the family name of your boss?

*Interviewer: put the name on list A and mark column NG5. If the name is already on the list because it has been mentioned before, **only** mark column NG5.*

### **6: HELP TO GET HOUSE**

I would like to know the first name and the first letter of the family name of the person that helped you get this house, or from which you directly bought the house.

*Interviewer: put the name on list A and mark column NG6. If the name is already on the list because it has been mentioned before, **only** mark column NG6.*

(This question was followed by a question asking *how* this person helped in getting the house.)

### **7: HELP WITH SMALL JOBS IN AND AROUND THE HOUSE**

If you are busy with a small job at home, and you need someone that gives you a hand - for instance if you need furniture moved or a ladder held, whom do you ask for help? May I again have the first name and the first letter of the family name of those persons?

*Interviewer: put the names on list A and mark column NG7. If the names are already on the list because they have been mentioned before, **only** mark column NG7. A maximum of 5 names can be mentioned.*

### **8: 'KEYS'**

Is there someone from outside your household that keeps a spare key to your house? May I again have the first name and the first letter of the family name of those persons?

*Interviewer: put the names on list A and mark column NG8. If the names are already on the list because they have been mentioned before, **only** mark column NG8. A maximum of 5 names can be mentioned.*

### **9: DIRECT NEIGHBOURS:**

Who are your direct neighbours? We mean the people that live closest to you; for instance people live directly right, left, above or under your house? I would like to have two names of the people living directly next to you. For clarity, can you also give me the numbers of their addresses?

*Interviewer: put the names on list A and mark column NG9. If the names are already on the list because they have been mentioned before, **only** mark column NG9.*

? Neighbours are from house number \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_

(This question was followed by several other questions regarding direct neighbours, involving their mutual contact, activities that were shared, annoyances, and actions taken in case of annoyances.)

### **10: VISITING OTHERS**

Many people sometimes visit others in their leisure time. Who do you go to for a visit? May I again have the first name and the first letter of the family name of those persons?

*Interviewer: put the names on list A and mark column NG10. If the names are already on the list because they have been mentioned before, **only** mark column NG10. A maximum of 5 names can be mentioned.*

### **11: 'CORE' NETWORK**

Life is usually not only about going out and enjoying company. Everybody needs someone to talk about important matters from time to time. With whom did you discuss important personal matters during the last six months? May I again have the first name and the first letter of the family name of those persons?

*Interviewer: check whether the names of those persons have been already mentioned. If they have been mentioned before **only** mark column NG11. Otherwise, record the names and mark column NG11. A maximum of 5 names can be mentioned.*

### **12: OPEN NETWORK QUESTION**

Let's go through the list of names we have made together. Is there anybody else who is important to you and whose name is not yet on the list? If yes, I would like to add this person to the list. What are the activities you usually share with this person?

*Interviewer: write the name or initials on list A and mark column NG12. Write the activities Ego shares with this person down below.*

## ***name interpreting questions***

The following questions all refer to network members identified with name generator questions 1-12, that were recorded on list A.

*Interviewer: answers to all of the following questions should be recorded on **list A**.*

I would like to go through the list of people we have made once again.

**1:** Which of these persons is a woman?

*Interviewer: in column 'Sex' in **list A**, mark every woman.*

**2:** How old are these persons?

*Interviewer: in column 'Age' in **list A**, record ages.*

**3:** How are you connected to these persons?

*Interviewer: hand over **CHART 'Role relationships'**, record the corresponding numbers in column 'Role' of **list A**. If Ego is connected to someone in more than one way (for example, as friend and neighbour), record this in adjacent columns (max. 3 role relations)*

- |                          |                                      |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1) partner               | 9) direct colleague                  |
| 2) parent                | 10) another colleague                |
| 3) child                 | 11) someone who is working for you   |
| 4) parent in law         | 12) someone from the neighbourhood   |
| 5) brother/sister        | 13) direct neighbour                 |
| 6) another family member | 14) a fellow club/association member |
| 7) friend                | 15) acquaintance                     |
| 8) boss                  |                                      |

**4:** Do you know the religion of these persons?

*Interviewer: record in column 'Religion' in **list A**.*

- 1) Roman Catholic
- 2) netherl. protestant
- 3) 'reformed'
- 4) other
- 5) none
- 97) I don't know

**5:** Which of these persons is married, or lives together with a partner?

*Interviewer: put marks in column 'Married' on **list A** for persons having a partner.*

**6:** Which of these persons has children that still live at home?

*Interviewer: put marks in column 'Children' on **list A** for persons having children living at home.*

**7:** How often do you usually have contact with these persons?

*Interviewer: record corresponding codes in column 'Freq' in **list A**.*

- |                |                             |
|----------------|-----------------------------|
| 1) every day   | 4) every three months       |
| 2) every week  | 5) less frequent            |
| 3) every month | 6) we rarely see each other |

**8:** How long have you known these persons?

*Interviewer: record the duration in years in column 'Duration' of **list A**.*

**9:** Where, and at which opportunity did you first meet these persons?

*Interviewer: record corresponding codes in column 'M1' on **list A**.*

- |                             |                         |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1) during my education      | 8) in the neighbourhood |
| 2) at a club or association | 9) at a place to go out |
| 3) at work                  | 10) in church           |
| 4) at kin's                 | 11) during holidays     |
| 5) at friends'              | 12) at a party          |
| 6) at my place              | 13) elsewhere           |
| 7) at their place           |                         |

**10:** Where, and at which opportunity do you usually meet each other nowadays?

*Interviewer: record corresponding codes in column 'M2' on **list A**.*

- |                             |                         |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1) during my education      | 8) in the neighbourhood |
| 2) at a club or association | 9) at a place to go out |
| 3) at work                  | 10) in church           |
| 4) at kin's                 | 11) during holidays     |
| 5) at friends'              | 12) at parties          |
| 6) at home                  | 13) elsewhere           |

**11:** Which of these persons lives within a radius of five kilometres from your house?

*Interviewer: put marks in column 'GeoDis' on **list A** for persons living within 5 km radius from Ego.*

**12:** On a scale from 1 to 5, can you indicate how much you like these persons? Mark persons you like very much with a 5, and persons you don't like with a 1.

*Interviewer: record corresponding marks in column 'Liking' on **list A**.*

- 1) don't like
- 2) don't especially like
- 3) quite like
- 4) like
- 5) like very much

**13:** Can you also indicate how much you trust these persons? Mark persons you trust very much with a 5, and persons you don't trust with a 1.

*Interviewer: record corresponding marks in column 'Trust' on **list A**.*

**14:** Do you think that five years from now you will still have a relationship with these persons? With whom do you think you will *not* have a relationship five years from now?

*Interviewer: put marks in column 'Future' on **list A** for persons Ego thinks there won't be a relationship with 5 years from now.*

**15:** How intensive is the relationship with these persons? Mark persons with whom the relationships is very intensive with a 5, and persons with whom the relationship is weak with 1

*Interviewer: record corresponding marks in column 'Intensity' on **list A**.*

**16:** What kind of education did these persons complete?

*Interviewer: record corresponding marks in column 'Education' on **list A**.*

- 1) basic, lower education (LBO/LHNO/VBO)
- 2) high school (MAVO/VWO)
- 3) higher vocational (MBO, HBO)
- 4) college, university

**17:** Which of these persons has a paid job at the moment?

*Interviewer: put marks in column 'Job' on **list A** for persons that have a paid job at the moment.*

**18:** What is the occupation of these persons? If they do not have work at the moment, I would like to know their last occupation.

*Interviewer: record the occupation of each person on **list A**. If the person is still in education write 'school' or 'study' instead of the occupation.*

**19:** Finally, I would like to know whether some people you know also know each other. How well do the following persons know each other? Do they know each other, and if yes, do they get along well or do they avoid each other?

*Interviewer: hand over **CHART 'network members among each other'**.*

- 1 = persons avoid each other
- 2 = persons don't know each other
- 3 = persons hardly know each other
- 4 = persons know each other well
- 5 = persons know each other well and get along well

*Interviewer: Select from **list A** the names first mentioned after name generator questions*

**2a: ASKING ADVICE**

**2b: GIVING ADVICE**

**3: SOUR SOCIAL CAPITAL**

**7: HELP WITH SMALL JOBS IN AND AROUND THE HOUSE**

**8: 'KEYS'**

**11: 'CORE' NETWORK**

*and record them in column 'name' of the matrix below.*

*If a person has already been mentioned, select the second or third name following from that name generator questions (etc). It is the intention that (if possible) 6 different persons emerge in the matrix below.*

Read the names like "does person no.1 know person no.2", also for no.1 and no.3, no.1 and no.4, and so forth, and record the codes specified on CHART 9 in the corresponding cells of the matrix below.

	How well do persons <b>no.1</b> to <b>no.6</b> ...		...know persons <b>no.2</b> to <b>no.6</b> ?				
<b>NG</b>	name	no.	no.1 and no.2	no. ... and no.3	no. ... and no.4	no. ... and no.5	no... and no.6
<b>2a</b>		<b>1</b>					
<b>2b</b>		<b>2</b>					
<b>3</b>		<b>3</b>					
<b>7</b>		<b>4</b>					
<b>8</b>		<b>5</b>					
<b>11</b>		<b>6</b>					

## RESOURCE GENERATOR

I have here a list with a number of skills and resources. Does anyone in your family have those skills or resources? And how about your friends? Are there any acquaintances mastering these skills? With 'acquaintance' I don't mean the sales persons you meet when going out for shopping, but somebody that you would have a small conversation with would you meet him/her on the street, and whose name you know. I would also like to know if you yourself have these skills, or own these resources.

*Interviewer: hand over **CHART 'resources'**. Begin with asking whether Ego knows a family member owning the resources or mastering the skill. If yes, move on the next question. If not, then ask about friends. Only if not, ask about knowing an acquaintance owning the resources or mastering the skill. If Ego says that somebody is both a family member and a friend he or she should be counted as a family member.*

I.	Do you know anyone who...	no	family member	friend	acquaintance	
II.	...and are you someone who...					yourself?
1	...can repair a car, bike, etc.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
2	...owns a car	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
3	...is handy repairing household equipment	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
4	...can speak and write a foreign language	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
5	...can work with a PC	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
6	...can play an instrument	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
7	...has knowledge of literature	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
8	...has VWO <sup>1</sup> education	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	====
9	...has an HBO <sup>2</sup> education	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	====
10	...reads a professional journal	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
11	...is active in a political party	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
12	...owns shares for at least Dfl.10,000 <sup>3</sup>	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
13	...works at the town hall	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
14	...earns more than Dfl.5,000 <sup>3</sup> monthly	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	====
15	...own a holiday home abroad	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
16	...is sometimes in the opportunity to hire people	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
17	...knows a lot about governmental regulations	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
18	...has good contacts with a newspaper, radio- or TV station	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
19	...knows about soccer	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
20	...has knowledge about financial matters (e.g. taxes, subsidies)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

<sup>1</sup> equivalent to senior high school.

<sup>2</sup> equivalent to higher vocational training.

<sup>3</sup> a Dutch Guilder was equivalent to about \$0,40.

**2.** Would you need someone for one of the following subjects, is there anyone you can easily ask for help?

*Interviewer: this question is coded similar to the previous one. If Ego cannot imagine needing help with these subjects, mark column 'no'.*

	Subject/help	family member	friend	acquaintance	no
1	Finding a holiday job for a family member	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
2	Advice concerning a conflict at work	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
3	Helping when moving house (packing, lifting)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
4	Helping with small jobs around the house (carpentering, painting)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
5	Doing your shopping when you (and your household members) are ill	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
6	Giving medical advice when you are dissatisfied with your doctor	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
7	Borrowing you a large sum of money (e.g. Dfl.10,000)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
8	Providing a place to stay for a week if you have to leave your house temporarily	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
9	Advice concerning a conflict with family members	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
10	Discussing what political party you are going to vote for	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
11	Giving advice on matters of law (e.g. problems with the landlord, boss, municipality)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
12	Giving a good reference when applying for a job	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
13	Babysitting for the children	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)



## PERCEPTIONS OF THE INDIVIDUAL SOCIAL NETWORK

The following questions were constructed to be used as personality covariates to explain distributions of social capital measures constructed from any of the preceding measurement instruments. As yet, we do not have developed a standard recipe to do so however, and we invite readers to respond with ideas.

In our data for the Netherlands, the 18 questions below can be summarised in 4 principal components (explaining 40.1% of the total variance): **1)** the desire for more social contacts or, reversely, satisfaction with the present network (items 8, 12, 14, and 15) **2)** integration of different types of relationships in the network (items 3, 5, 7, and 16) **3)** expectation and propensity to mobilise social resources (items 6, 9, 10, 11, and 18) **4)** propensity to make new contacts (items 1, 2, 4, and 13).

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

		strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
1	Sometimes I do things for others while I don't feel like doing it	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
2	Other people often call on me for help	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
3	Most of my friends know each other	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
4	On my friends' birthday parties there are many people I hardly know	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
5	My good friends also know my family members	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
6	At work I meet completely different people than during leisure time	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
7	My neighbours come to my birthday parties	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
8	My colleagues come to my birthday parties	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
9	I do not easily ask for help when I need it	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
10	You can't expect your neighbours to help you with serious problems	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
11	You can't expect your colleagues to help you with serious problems	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
12	I would like to have more friends	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
13	I easily make contact with others	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
14	I would like to have more contact with my neighbours	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
15	I would like to have more contact with my colleagues	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
16	I send my neighbours Christmas and holiday cards	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
17	I have experienced being disappointed in placing my trust in others	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
18	Before I trust someone I have to be sure of his/her intentions	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)