



Measuring Social Capital in the United Kingdom

Rosalyn Harper and Maryanne Kelly
Office for National Statistics
December 2003

This article outlines the process adopted by the United Kingdom (UK) for defining and measuring social capital. The main outcome of the process was the development of a set of harmonised questions for use in local and national surveys. This set of questions will bring greater consistency to the measurement of social capital, allowing for comparison between surveys and the aggregation of data from disparate sources. The measurement and definition of social capital are part of a wider research programme at the Office for National Statistics (ONS). More information can be found on the social capital website at www.statistics.gov.uk/socialcapital.

BACKGROUND

The need for a more consistent approach to the conceptualisation and measurement of social capital was a key conclusion of a joint ONS/Home Office social capital workshop held in November 2001. The literature review prepared for the workshop showed that many government surveys included questions on social capital but that a variety of approaches were being used to measure it. In addition, in some surveys the questions were explicitly intended to measure specific aspects of social capital; in others, though not explicitly labelled, they were in fact measuring different aspects of social capital.

These differing measurement approaches led to a lack of cohesion, with disparities arising in concepts and definitions. A more harmonised approach will make the interpretation and analysis of data easier, allow users of published sources to see a more coherent picture of British society, and help users plan surveys (e.g. at a local level) that can provide data comparable with other surveys (e.g. at a national level).

Within the UK, the ONS coordinated the cross government process of defining and measuring social capital. An inter-departmental Social Capital Working Group was established to oversee

this work. The overall aim of the group was to ensure a more harmonised approach to the measurement of social capital. Its specific objectives were to agree a definition of social capital for use across government departments, to develop a framework for its measurement, and develop a set of fully tested questions consistent with this definition and framework. The work was split into three stages:

1. Agreement of an operational definition
2. Development of a framework for measurement
3. Development and testing of questions

STAGE ONE: OPERATIONAL DEFINITION

The aim of this stage was to agree a definition of social capital. In order to be consistent in measuring the concept, it was important that there was a shared understanding of what is meant by social capital. This was not straightforward as it continues to be a contested concept within the academic community. This lack of conceptual clarity has contributed to accusations of over-versatility, in that social capital can end up meaning all things to all people.

There were many definitions to choose from, both within academia and from other national statistical institutions. Putnam, who popularised the concept of social capital, defined it as "networks, norms, and trust that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives" (Putnam 1996:56). The World Bank was more expansive and suggested that "social capital refers to the institutions, relationships, and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society's social interactions. Social capital is not just the sum of the institutions which underpin a society; it is the glue that holds them together." (World Bank website, 2001). The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) adopted the following definition: "social relations of mutual benefits characterised by norms of trust and reciprocity" (ABS, 2000). Statistics New Zealand considered social capital to be "relationships among actors (individuals, groups, and/or organisations) that create a capacity for mutual benefit or a common purpose". Further to this, they suggested that "social capital is the social resource that is embodied in the relations between people. It resides in and stems from contact, communication, sharing, co-operation and trust that are inherent in ongoing relationships" (Spellerberg, 2001).

However, there was convergence towards a definition which emphasises social networks and civil norms. Social capital is considered to involve social networks and support structures, community participation, civic and political involvement, trust in people and social institutions, and norms of reciprocity (Scull, 2001). Rather than invent a new definition, it was agreed by the

Social Capital Working Group that the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) definition be adopted for use across government departments. The definition is as follows:

"networks together with shared norms, values and understandings that facilitate co-operation within or among groups" (Cote and Healy, 2001:41).

Within the definition, "cooperation" refers to the resource aspect of social capital, with a resource being defined as a stock or supply that can be drawn upon. Other key elements of this definition are considered in more detail below in order to help clarify what is, and what is not, included within this definition of social capital.

Networks

Formal and informal networks are central to the concept of social capital. They are defined as the personal relationships which are accumulated when people interact with each other in families, workplaces, neighbourhoods, local associations and a range of informal and formal meeting places (ABS, 2000). Different types of social capital can be described in terms of different types of networks (Putnam, 2000):

- *Bonding* social capital – describes closer connections between people and is characterised by strong bonds. e.g. among family members or close friends; it is good for "getting by" in life.
- *Bridging* social capital – describes more distant connections between people and is characterised by weaker, but more cross-cutting ties e.g. with business associates, acquaintances, friends of friends; it is good for "getting ahead" in life.
- *Linking* social capital – describes connections with people in positions of power and is characterised by relations between those within a hierarchy where there are differing levels of power; it is good for accessing support from formal institutions. It is different from bonding and bridging in that it is concerned with relations between people who are not on an equal footing. An example would be a social services agency dealing with an individual e.g. job searching at the Benefits Agency.

The distinction between bonding and bridging social capital is important because the impact of social capital depends on the form it takes in different circumstances. For instance, in childhood and old age, bonding social capital is more important to health. However, as people seek

employment, bridging social capital is more important (PIU, 2002). It should also be noted that strong bonding social capital may serve to exclude, and this is often considered a downside of social capital. Linking social capital (Woolcock, 2001) grew out of a World Bank agenda looking at sustainable development in developing societies. It is important in the development context where those working in agencies and institutions play a major role in trying to engage local communities to facilitate access to information and resources.

Shared norms, values and understandings

Shared norms, values and understandings relate to shared attitudes about behaviour which are common in society and which are accepted by most individuals and groups as a "good thing" to do. For example, not parking in a disabled parking space at a supermarket or calling the emergency services at the scene of an accident. These norms of behaviour are understood by most members of society. The role of sanctions in underpinning shared norms is important in that fear of disapproval might compel individuals to comply with the shared values/norms and behave in an accepted way.

Groups

Groups in this context are very broadly defined and can refer to: geographical groups (e.g. people living in a specific neighbourhood), professional groups (e.g. people in the same occupation, members of a local association or voluntary organisation), social groups (e.g. families, church based groups, groups of friends) and virtual groups (e.g. the networks generated over the internet in chat rooms through common interest groups).

STAGE TWO: FRAMEWORK FOR MEASUREMENT

The aim at this stage was to agree which specific dimensions of social capital should be measured. Its purpose was to provide a framework for analysing the concept and for developing a harmonised set of questions (stage three). Social capital is generally recognised to be a multi-dimensional concept and that a single measure cannot provide a complete picture. It is important to distinguish between different dimensions of social capital, as some are more relevant to different policy areas than others. The framework built on the agreed definition, took account of approaches adopted elsewhere, and covered the dimensions most relevant to government policy.

The first step was to investigate frameworks, indicators and questions previously developed. Four frameworks for measuring social capital were identified. The most comprehensive of these was devised by Blaxter *et al* (2001) for the UK Health Development Agency. It consisted of the following dimensions:

- Participation, social engagement, commitment
- Control, self-efficacy
- Perception of community level structures or characteristics
- Social interaction, social networks, social support
- Trust, reciprocity, social cohesion

The other frameworks were for surveys designed to measure aspects of social capital - the 2001 General Household Survey (GHS), 2000 Health Survey for England and 2001 Home Office Citizenship Survey. These frameworks are specified in Annex A and contain dimensions similar to those outlined above. UK government and non-government surveys containing questions on aspects of social capital were also investigated; twenty-one were identified.

A survey matrix was then constructed (see www.statistics.gov.uk/scqb) using these surveys and the framework developed by Blaxter *et al* (2001). The purpose of the matrix was to highlight social capital questions used in surveys and group these according to social capital dimensions. The results were presented in tabular form for ease of reference and comparison.

The purpose of the UK measurement framework was not only to develop an agreed understanding of the key dimensions of social capital but also to develop a framework for its analysis. This is a recognition that social capital is not easily measured and that a variety of approaches are required to provide a comprehensive picture. The UK framework was therefore developed through:

- identifying the dimensions most commonly measured using the survey matrix and other frameworks;
- guidance from the Social Capital Working Group on the dimensions most relevant to government policy and programs; and
- identifying areas of measurement which have proved crucial in previous analyses.

One such area was views of the local area. In the GHS analysis views of the local area (e.g. local facilities) showed a higher association than selected socio-demographic factors with the social capital variables. Further to this, Blaxter *et al* (2001) in their review of 40 research studies looking at social capital, found satisfaction with living in an area was associated with high levels of social capital.

The Social Capital Working Group recommended that the UK Social Capital Measurement Framework have five dimensions including views of the local area. These are listed in Table 1, along with examples of indicators which may be used to measure each dimension. The indicators chosen were those most commonly used in UK government and non-government surveys and are in no way exhaustive.

The dimensions cover both sources (e.g. family) as well as outcomes of social capital (although for some indicators such as trust there is debate as to whether it is an outcome or source). Indicators for each dimension are both objective and subjective, as social capital covers both the behaviour and attitudes of individuals.

Table 1: UK Social Capital Measurement Framework

Dimension	Examples of indicators
Social participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of cultural, leisure, social groups belonged to and frequency and intensity of involvement• Volunteering, frequency and intensity of involvement• Religious activity
Civic participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Perceptions of ability to influence events• How well informed about local/national affairs• Contact with public officials or political representatives• Involvement with local action groups• Propensity to vote
Social networks and social support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Frequency of seeing/speaking to relatives /friends/neighbours• Extent of virtual networks and frequency of contact• Number of close friends/relatives who live nearby• Exchange of help• Perceived control and satisfaction with life
Reciprocity and trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Trust in other people who are like you• Trust in other people who are not like you• Confidence in institutions at different levels• Doing favours and vice versa• Perception of shared values
Views of the local area	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Views on physical environment• Facilities in the area• Enjoyment of living in the area• Fear of crime

Each of the dimensions are now considered in more detail.

Social participation. This is defined as involvement in, and volunteering for, organised groups. Some indicators are measuring sources of social capital (e.g. those related to the personal contacts and interactions that are made by meeting people through clubs, churches, organisations, etc). Others are measuring outcomes of social capital. For instance, voluntary work is an important indicator of people's willingness to undertake activity that benefits others and the wider community.

Civic participation. This is defined as individual involvement in local and national affairs, and perceptions of ability to influence them. It is considered to be a source of social capital.

Social networks and social support. This is defined as contact with, and support from, family and friends. These are seen as important sources of social capital. The number and types of exchanges between people within the network, and shared identities that develop, can influence the amount of support an individual has, as well as giving access to other sources of help.

Reciprocity and trust. This dimension measures the amount of trust individuals have in others, those they know and do not know, as well as trust in formal institutions. Trust is seen as being closely linked to social capital, either as a direct part of it or as an outcome. Reciprocity measures people's willingness to co-operate for mutual benefit and is a source of social capital.

Views of the local area. This dimension measures individual perceptions of the area in which they live. As stated earlier this dimension is included as an aid for analysis and is not considered an aspect of social capital. Positive views of the local area are a good correlate for how happy, safe and secure people are within their environment.

Theoretically social capital is considered both an attribute of the individual and community. The harmonised question set will only measure indicators of social capital at the individual level, not at the community level.

STAGE THREE: QUESTION DEVELOPMENT

The aim of this stage was to develop a harmonised set of questions for each dimension of the measurement framework (stage two). Questions were developed for only a small number of indicators in each dimension. The scope of indicators was limited because the harmonised question set was designed to take no more than 20 minutes to administer. Question development

and testing was guided by the general principles for the development of harmonised questions laid out in the National Statistics booklet, *Harmonised Concepts and Questions for Government Social Surveys* (see www.statistics.gov.uk/Harmony/Introduction/principles.asp)

The first step involved an assessment of questions already used in surveys. This was based on the survey matrix developed in stage two. As highlighted earlier the matrix allowed the questions most commonly used to be identified. The ONS also obtained the survey results for each of the questions listed in the matrix. This allowed for comparison between similar questions used in different surveys and illustrated which questions produced similar results in different survey contexts. Long established questions were also identified, which is important for maintaining a consistent time series (e.g. questions on trust). Potential gaps in the measurement framework were identified, in partnership with other government departments, and new questions were developed where necessary. In particular, questions on bridging social capital and involvement in groups were developed using questions from American and Canadian research organisations. Based on this assessment a draft set of questions was prepared which provided the basis for further testing.

A series of focus groups were then run to further examine how different groups of people understood different aspects of social capital. The term social capital was not used, but dimensions such as trust, and indicators such as volunteering, were examined. Given the cultural specificity of the concept (Robinson, 1997), the focus groups were composed of people from different backgrounds. The five groups were as follows:

- Urban based people, from a variety of age and ethnic groups
- Rural based people, from a variety of age and ethnic groups
- Urban based Black people, from a variety of age groups
- Urban based Asian people, from a variety of age groups
- Urban based young people aged 16 to 24 years, from a variety of ethnic groups

Each of the focus groups examined all five dimensions of the measurement framework. Discussions focused on people's understanding of various terms and concepts and the appropriateness of specific questions. For example, people's understanding of the terms volunteering and neighbourhood were explored. Issues such as how people kept in contact with friends and family and the kind of support they expected from them were examined. Specific questions were also discussed such as those on bridging social capital and trust in others.

Findings from the focus groups were analysed and changes made to the draft question set where necessary.

The revised questions were then piloted in structured interviews with 389 men and women with diverse socio-demographic characteristics from across Great Britain. Ten cognitive interviews were also conducted with respondents who had difficulties with the questions. In general, the questions were well received. However, the pilot (as well as the focus groups) highlighted two particularly problematic indicators: involvement in groups and bridging social capital. The first of these is an indicator of people's social participation. It is intended to measure active involvement in social, cultural, leisure or religious groups. The broad scope of such a concept as 'active involvement', and the variety of interpretations that go with it, is difficult and time consuming to measure. Secondly, bridging social capital proved difficult to measure. A number of questions were tested in the focus groups and pilot study. These asked if people had friends from different educational or ethnic backgrounds. Most respondents found the questions distasteful and irrelevant. To date, questions on involvement in groups have been included in the harmonised question set. However questions on bridging social capital have not. A full methodological report on the question testing and development process can be found on the ONS social capital website (Green & Fletcher, 2003).

FINAL PRODUCT: HARMONISED QUESTION SET

The main aim of the project was to ensure a harmonised approach to the measurement of social capital. The harmonised question set will contribute significantly to this aim. The social capital question set was endorsed by the National Statistics Harmonisation Working Group in October 2003. It covers all five dimensions of the measurement framework and is presented in Annex B. The question set is intended to take no more than 20 minutes and be appropriate for use in local as well as national surveys. Due to the time restrictions the set was confined to those indicators considered central to social capital. It can be used in its entirety or, if only one dimension is of interest, only the questions relating to that dimension may be used.

Not all surveys have the capacity to run the full 20 minute question set. Therefore a short set of core questions, covering each dimension, was developed. This was also endorsed by the Harmonisation Working Group. The selection of the core questions was based on several criteria. First, whether the questions were easy to administer e.g. taking account of respondent comprehension of the questions. Second, whether responses to questions were reasonably distributed e.g. it would have been problematic if the pilot indicated that no one was involved in group activity. Third, all the questions were entered into a factor analysis. This grouped the

questions according to key themes, e.g. the framework dimensions, and identified those questions which had the strongest relationship with each theme. Based on these three criteria, the core question set was chosen. The core question set is in Annex C. An annotated question set has been developed for both the core and full set of questions. This will assist users in administering and interpreting the questions and can be found on the social capital website.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

There are three important next steps. The first is to encourage the use of the questions in local as well as national surveys. Initially the question set was developed for face-to-face interviews using a computer assisted personal interview (CAPI). The question set is being revised to ensure it is appropriate for both telephone and postal surveys as this will facilitate use in local government where interviewers (and CAPI) are less likely to be available. The second is to develop questions that measure bridging social capital - an important element of any study of social capital. Governments in particular are interested in such measures as proxies for social cohesion. ONS will continue to investigate bridging social capital questions with the aim of including questions on the harmonised question set in the future. Finally, the harmonised question set will be included on the 2004 General Household Survey. This will allow for an in-depth analysis of social capital in Great Britain.

REFERENCES

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2000) Discussion Paper. *Measuring Social Capital; Current Collection and Future Directions*.

Blaxter, M. Poland, F. Curran, M. (2001) *Measuring Social Capital: Qualitative Study of how Older People relate Social Capital to Health*, Final Report to the Health Development Agency. London.

Cote, S. Healy, T. (2001) *The Well-being of Nations. The role of human and social capital*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.

Green, G. Grimsley, M. Suokas, A. Prescott, M. Jowitt, T. Linacre, R. (2000) *Social Capital, Health and Economy in South Yorkshire Coalfield Communities*. Sheffield Hallam University.

Green, H. Fletcher, L. (2003) *The Development of Harmonised Questions on Social Capital*. Office for National Statistics, London.

Performance and Innovation Unit (2002) *Social Capital, a draft discussion paper*. London

Putnam R (1996) 'Who killed civic America' *Prospect*, March: 66-72.

Putnam, R. (2000) *Bowling Alone - The Collapse and Revival of American Community* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Robinson, D. (ed) (1997) *Social Capital & Policy Development*, Institute of Policy Studies, Wellington, New Zealand.

Scull, S. (2001) *Social Capital. A briefing paper for Module Development*. West Morton Public Health Unit Queensland Health.

Spellerberg, A. (2001) *Framework for the Measurement of Social Capital in New Zealand*. Social Capital Programme team, Statistics New Zealand.

Woolcock, M. (2001) *The place of social capital in Understanding Social and Economic Outcomes*. ISUMA Canadian Journal of Policy Research 2 (1) 11-17.

World Bank Social Capital Website. <http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/scapital/index.htm>

ANNEX A. Frameworks for the measurement of social capital in the UK

General Household Survey 2000-01

The module on social capital, funded by the Health Development Agency, identified the following five dimensions of social capital:

- Views of the local area (e.g. perceptions of the physical environment, facilities in the area, feelings of safety)
- Civic engagement (e.g. influence over events in the community, knowledge of local affairs, taking action, involvement in local organisations)
- Reciprocity and local trust (e.g. how many people are known in the locality, can they be trusted, would people do favours)
- Social networks (e.g. frequency of seeing and speaking to relatives, friends or neighbours; how many close friends or relatives live nearby)
- Social support (e.g. who would provide help if needed)

Health Survey for England 2000

This identified the following dimensions of social capital for analysis:

- Perceived social support
- Contact with friends
- Trust
- Participation in organised activities
- Neighbourhood problems
- Ease of access to services

Home Office Citizenship Survey 2001

This included an “active community and social capital” module. Several sections relate to social capital. The module included the following sections:

- Social capital (e.g. neighbourhood, sense of others in neighbourhood, informal socialising, helping others)
- Participation in civic affairs (e.g. contact with public officials or political representatives; involvement with local action groups or rallies; frequency, perception of ability to influence political decisions, trust in institutions of the state)
- Participation in groups and formal volunteering (e.g. involvement with groups, clubs or organisations; frequency of participation, involvement in voluntary work; frequency and intensity of participation)
- Informal volunteering (e.g. type of unpaid help provided; frequency and intensity of involvement, barriers and incentives)

In addition to the above there are sections on voluntary schemes connected with work; former volunteering, barriers and incentives; and receipt of voluntary help.

ANNEX B. FULL HARMONISED QUESTION SET

Views about the area

(AreaLive) How long have you lived in this area?

1. Less than 12 months
2. 12 months but less than 2 years
3. 2 years but less than 3 years
4. 3 years but less than 5 years
5. 5 years but less than 10 years
6. 10 years but less than 20 years
7. 20 years or longer
8. Don't know

(SatLive) How satisfied are you with this area as a place to live?

SHOWCARD

1. Very satisfied
2. Fairly satisfied
3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4. Slightly dissatisfied
5. Very dissatisfied
6. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

Views about the neighbourhood

(NIntro) Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about your immediate neighbourhood, by which I mean your street or block.

(NeighTyp) In general, what kind of neighbourhood would you say you live in - would you say it is a neighbourhood in which people do things together and try to help each other, or one in which people mostly go their own way?

1. Help each other
2. Go own way
3. (SPONTANEOUS) Mixture
4. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

(Nbackg) To what extent do you agree or disagree that this neighbourhood is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together?

1. Definitely agree
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Definitely disagree
5. DON'T KNOW
6. TOO FEW PEOPLE IN NEIGHBOURHOOD
7. ALL SAME BACKGROUNDS

(NTrust) Would you say that

1. Most of the people in your neighbourhood can be trusted
2. Some can be trusted
3. A few can be trusted
4. Or that no-one can be trusted?
5. (SPONTANEOUS) Just moved here
6. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

(SLost) Suppose you lost your (purse/wallet) containing your address details, and it was found in the street by someone living in this neighbourhood. How likely is it that it would be returned to you with nothing missing?

1. Very likely
2. Quite likely
3. Not very likely
4. Or not at all likely
5. Don't know

(PbIntro) I am going to read out a list of problems which some people face in their neighbourhood. For each one, please can you tell me how much of a problem it is.

(Drunk) How much of a problem are people being drunk or rowdy in public places?

SHOWCARD

1. Very big problem
2. Fairly big problem
3. Not a very big problem
4. Not a problem at all
5. It happens but it's not a problem
6. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

(Rubbish) How much of a problem is rubbish or litter lying around?

(Vandals) How much of a problem are vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles?

(DrugUse) How much of a problem are people using or dealing drugs?

(Race) How much of a problem is people being attacked or harassed because of their skin colour, ethnic origin or religion?

(Teenhang) How much of a problem are teenagers hanging around on the street?

(AntiNgh) How much of a problem are troublesome neighbours?

Participation in local issues

(InfArea) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

I can influence decisions affecting my local area?

SHOWCARD

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't have an opinion
7. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

(InfNgh) By working together, people in my area can influence decisions that affect the local area?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't have an opinion
7. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

(SolvLP) In the last 12 months have you taken any of the following actions in an attempt to solve a problem affecting people in your local area?

SHOWCARD

1. Contacted a local radio station, television station or newspaper
2. Contacted the appropriate organisation to deal with the problem, such as the council
3. Contacted a local councillor or MP
4. Attended a public meeting or neighbourhood forum to discuss local issues
5. Attended a tenants' or local residents' group
6. Attended a protest meeting or joined an action group
7. Helped organise a petition on a local issue
8. No local problems
9. None of the above
10. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

Participation in national issues

(SolvNP) In the last 12 months have you taken any of the following actions to show your concern over a national issue?

SHOWCARD:

1. Contacted a radio station, television station or a newspaper
2. Contacted the appropriate organisation to deal with the problem
3. Contacted an MP
4. Attended a public meeting
5. Attended a protest meeting or joined an action group
6. Helped organise a petition
7. None of these
8. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

(Vote) Can I check, did you vote

1. ...in the last general election (national election)?
2. (Did you vote) ...in the last local council election?
3. DID NOT VOTE IN EITHER ELECTION
4. NOT ELIGIBLE TO VOTE IN EITHER
5. Don't know

Trust

(PTrust) Another topic we are interested in is trust. Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?

1. Most people can be trusted
2. Can't be too careful in dealing with people
3. It depends on people/circumstances
4. Don't know

(TrIntro) For the following, please can you tell me how much you trust them.

1. Can you tell me how much you trust the police? (Police)
2. Can you tell me how much you trust the courts (Magistrates Courts and Crown Court)? (Courts)
3. Can you tell me how much you trust Parliament? (Parlmnt)
4. Can you tell me how much you trust the Welsh Assembly? (Wales only)
5. Can you tell me how much you trust the Scottish Executive? (Scotland only)
6. Can you tell me how much you trust your local council? (LocC)

SHOWCARD

1. A lot
2. A fair amount
3. Not very much
4. Not at all

5. (SPONTANEOUS) NO EXPERIENCE
6. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

Social networks

The next few questions are about how often you personally contact your relatives, friends and neighbours. Not counting the people you live with, how often do you do any of the following?

1. Speak to relatives on the phone (Spkrel)
2. Write a letter or note to relatives (Wrtrel)
3. Text or email relatives, or use chatrooms on the internet to talk to relatives (Txtrel)
4. Speak to friends on the phone (Spkfr)
5. Write a letter or note to friends (Wrtfr)
6. Text or email friends, or use chatrooms on the internet to talk to friends (Txtfr)
7. Speak to neighbours (Spkng)

SHOWCARD

1. On most days
2. Once or twice a week
3. Once or twice a month
4. Less often than once a month
5. Never
6. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

(FreqMtR) How often do you meet up with relatives who are not living with you?

SHOWCARD

(FreqMtF) How often do you meet up with friends?

SHOWCARD

Social support

(SitIntro) I am going to describe two situations where people might need help. For each one, could you tell me if there is anyone you could ask for help?

(IF MORE THAN ONE PERSON IN HOUSEHOLD ADD: Please include people living with you and people outside the household)

1. You are ill in bed and need help at home. Is there anyone you could ask for help?
Yes/no (Illbed)
2. You are in financial difficulty and need to borrow some money to see you through the next few days. Is there anyone you could you ask for help? Yes/no (Money)

If Illbed = Yes then WhoHelp; If Money = Yes then WhoHelp2

(WhoHelp/WhoHelp2) Please can you look at this card and tell me who you could ask for help?

SHOWCARD

1. Husband/wife/partner
2. Other household member
3. Relative (outside household)

4. Friend
5. Neighbour
6. Work colleague
7. Voluntary or other organisation
8. Other
9. Would prefer not to ask for help
10. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

(PCrisis) If you had a serious personal crisis, how many people, if any, do you feel you could turn to for comfort and support?

(INTERVIEWER: IF MORE THAN 15, CODE AS 15)

(0-15, Don't know)

Involvement in groups, clubs and organisations

(GrpIntro) The next questions are about involvement in groups, clubs and organisations. These could be formally organised groups or just groups of people who get together to do an activity or talk about things. Please exclude just paying a subscription, giving money and anything that was a requirement of your job.

(Intro2) I am going to ask about 3 different types of groups:

First, in the last 12 months, have you been involved with any groups of people who get together to do an activity or to talk about things? These could include evening classes, support groups, slimming clubs, keep-fit classes, pub teams and so on.

(If Intro2 = yes) then:

(GrpInf) Please can you look at this card. Which of the categories on this card best describe the groups you have taken part in?

SHOWCARD

1. Hobbies/social clubs
2. Sports/exercise groups, including taking part, coaching or going to watch
3. Local community or neighbourhood groups
4. Groups for children or young people
5. Adult education groups
6. Groups for older people
7. Environmental groups
8. Health, disability and welfare groups
9. Political groups
10. Trade union groups
11. Religious groups, including going to a place of worship or belonging to a religious based group
12. Other group
13. (SPONTANEOUS) None of these
14. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

(Intro3) Second, in the last 12 months, have you taken part in any (other) group activities as part of a local or community group, club or organisation? These could include residents' associations, sports groups, parent-teacher associations, school or religious groups and so on.

(If Intro3 = yes) then:

(GrpLoc) Please can you look at this card. Which of the categories on this card best describe the groups you have taken part in?

(Intro4) And third, in the last 12 months, have you taken part in any (other) group activities as part of a national group, club or organisation? These could include pressure groups, charities, political groups, environmental groups and so on.

(If Intro4 = yes) then:

(GrpNat) Please can you look at this card. Which of the categories on this card best describe the groups you have taken part in?

Unpaid help to groups and individuals

(DoVolWk) During the last 12 months have you given any unpaid help to any groups, clubs or organisations in any of the ways shown on this card?

SHOWCARD

1. Raising or handling money/taking part in sponsored events
2. Leading the group/ member of a committee
3. Organising or helping to run an activity or event
4. Visiting people
5. Befriending or mentoring people
6. Giving advice/ information/ counselling
7. Secretarial, admin or clerical work
8. Providing transport/driving
9. Representing
10. Campaigning
11. Other practical help (e.g. helping out at school, religious group, shopping)
12. Any other help
13. NONE OF THE ABOVE
14. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

(VolFreq) Thinking about the unpaid help you have mentioned, would you say you give this kind of help...

CODE FIRST THAT APPLIES

1. at least once a week
2. at least once a month
3. at least once every three months
4. or less often?
5. Other
6. Don't know

(If Less Often or Other at VolFreq) then:

(VolOther) ASK OR RECORD

About how many times in the last 12 months have you given unpaid help through a group, club or organisation?

(Care) Some people have extra responsibilities because they look after someone who has long-term physical or mental ill health or disability, or problems due to old age.

May I check, is there anyone living with you who is sick, disabled or elderly whom you look after or give special help to, other than in a professional capacity. (For example, a sick or disabled (or elderly) relative/husband/wife/child/friend/parent, etc.)

1. Yes
2. No

(HlpGiv) Now I'd like to talk about any unpaid help you may have given people who do not live with you. In the past month have you given any unpaid help in any of the ways shown on the card. Please do not count any help you gave through a group, club or organisation.

SHOWCARD

1. Domestic work, home maintenance or gardening
2. Provision of transport or running errands
3. Help with child care or babysitting
4. Teaching, coaching or giving practical advice
5. Giving emotional support
6. Other
7. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

(HlpInt) Now I'd like to talk about any unpaid help you may have received. In the past month have you received any unpaid help in any of the ways shown on the card. Please do not count help from people who live with you or from an organisation or group.

SHOWCARD

1. Domestic work, home maintenance or gardening
2. Provision of transport or running errands
3. Help with child care or babysitting
4. Teaching, coaching or giving practical advice
5. Giving emotional support
6. Other
7. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

ANNEX C. CORE QUESTIONS

Problems in the neighbourhood (Views about the area)

(NIntro) Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about your immediate neighbourhood, by which I mean your street or block.

(SLost) Suppose you lost your (purse/wallet) containing your address details, and it was found in the street by someone living in this neighbourhood. How likely is it that it would be returned to you with nothing missing?

1. Very likely
2. Quite likely
3. Not very likely
4. Or not at all likely
5. Don't know

(Drunk) How much of a problem are people being drunk or rowdy in public places?

SHOWCARD

1. Very big problem
2. Fairly big problem
3. Not a very big problem
4. Not a problem at all
5. It happens but it's not a problem
6. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

(Rubbish) How much of a problem is rubbish or litter lying around?

(Vandals) How much of a problem are vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles?

(DrugUse) How much of a problem are people using or dealing drugs?

(Race) How much of a problem is people being attacked or harassed because of their skin colour, ethnic origin or religion?

(Teenhang) How much of a problem are teenagers hanging around on the street?

(AntiNgh) How much of a problem are troublesome neighbours?

Participation in local issues (Civic participation)

(SolvLP) In the last 12 months have you taken any of the following actions in an attempt to solve a problem affecting people in your local area?

SHOWCARD

1. Contacted a local radio station, television station or newspaper
2. Contacted the appropriate organisation to deal with the problem, such as the council
3. Contacted a local councillor or MP
4. Attended a public meeting or neighbourhood forum to discuss local issues
5. Attended a tenants' or local residents' group
6. Attended a protest meeting or joined an action group

7. Helped organise a petition on a local issue
8. No local problems
9. None of the above
10. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

Contacts with friends, relatives and neighbours (Social networks and support)

The next questions are about how often you personally contact relatives, friends and neighbours.
How often do you ..

Speak to relatives on the phone (Spkrel)

Speak to friends on the phone (Spkfr)

And how often do you speak to neighbours (face-to-face) (Spkng)

How often do you meet up with relatives who are not living with you? (FreqMtR)

How often do you meet up with friends? (FreqMtF)

SHOWCARD

1. On most days
2. Once or twice a week
3. Once or twice a month
4. Less often than once a month
5. Never
6. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

Unpaid help to groups (Social participation)

(DoVolWk) During the last 12 months have you given any unpaid help to any groups, clubs or organisations in any of the ways shown on this card?

SHOWCARD

1. Raising or handling money/taking part in sponsored events
2. Leading the group/ member of a committee
3. Organising or helping to run an activity or event
4. Visiting people
5. Befriending or mentoring people
6. Giving advice/ information/ counselling
7. Secretarial, admin or clerical work
8. Providing transport/driving
9. Representing
10. Campaigning
11. Other practical help (e.g. helping out at school, religious group, shopping)
12. Any other help
13. NONE OF THE ABOVE
14. (SPONTANEOUS) Don't know

Reciprocity and trust

SLost - this question also measures trust but is positioned earlier in the set because it relates to the neighbourhood.