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4. Collecting Social Capital Network Data

As I explained in Chapter 2, I consider social networks to be the most important pillar of social capital, ahead of trust and shared norms and values. Furthermore, I argued that the social capital of migrant organizations consists of the network of interlocking directorates and the contact network. The former reveals the formal connections between organizations, while the latter highlights the informal links. The networks of interlocking directorates are based on data gathered by my colleagues (Vermeulen, 2006; Slijper, forthcoming), and I will describe their methods and results at the end of this chapter. Firstly, however, I will explain how I gathered my data on the contact networks and why I used the selected method. The contact networks are reflections of the everyday connections that exist between organizations, and the most straightforward way of listing these is to simply ask respondents who they know. Indeed, the most common method of mapping social networks is the use of surveys or questionnaires. Other approaches, ranging from archival data to participant observation and even experiments, are much less frequently utilized or investigated. I will consider these in Chapter 7. In this chapter, however, I will focus on the (dis)advantages of using questionnaires to gather network data, as well as on the different kinds of this instrument that exist. In fact, the questionnaires about social capital and social networks that are available are all aimed at individuals, and not at any other entities that could be regarded as individual actors, such as organizations. Therefore, based on the findings and recommendations from previous research, I will present a questionnaire that I have designed which is tailored to the specific situation of migrant bodies. Furthermore, this chapter contains an overview of how the questionnaire was implemented, as well as the response rates in Berlin and Amsterdam. In the following two chapters (5 and 6) I will discuss the contact networks in the two cities.

4.1 Towards an appropriate questionnaire

Social capital research revolves around the number and type of alters, and in particular the resources that these can provide. There are several questionnaires available that emphasize one of these three elements.

The most well-known way of mapping social networks is by means of a question that is also included in the General Social Survey and the World Values Survey. It simply
asks the respondent about his/her most important alters. The exact phrasing in the GSS is: ‘Looking back over the last six months -- who are the people with whom you discussed matters important to you?’ (Burt, 1985). Up to five people can be named. The advantages of a simple question like this one are that it can easily be incorporated into a longer questionnaire and it takes little time and effort to answer. The disadvantage is that it does not yield an exhaustive picture of the respondent’s network because of the limited number of possible answers. But even if respondents did have the opportunity to name as many alters as they wished, a single question would still lead to a serious underestimation of a participant’s network and network size, simply because people tend to forget large sections of their circle of acquaintances. I will return to this subject later on in this chapter.

Marin (2004) has raised additional objections to this single question approach to assessing a social network. She compared the responses elicited by the free recall question from the GSS (‘name anyone you want’, without a restriction on the number of alters) to those generated by a number of questions and prompts (triggers to encourage respondents to think of people with particular features). It transpired that the latter approach yielded a longer list of acquaintances than the simpler query did. Her research also demonstrated that a single question leads egos to mainly name closer ties, alters who they have known for a relatively long time, and those about whom they know more. In other words, they tend to name their bonding social capital at the expense of their bridging social capital. This is an undesirable effect. The solution Marin suggests is to use multiple questions, although she appropriately remarks that even a more extensive questionnaire does not necessarily produce a correct representation of an actual circle of acquaintances, even though it does garner more information. Self-reported data, almost by definition, contains errors and lacunas. It is important for researchers, and network researchers are no exception, to be aware of this, but this knowledge should not prevent them from using this kind of information.

### 4.1.1 Multifaceted questionnaires

The alternative approach that Marin used to check the validity of the single query network measure was to ask people a series of questions about a number of contexts in which they would be expected to think of different acquaintances. This is an old and well-known trick in the social sciences, for example in psychology. Complex constructs are studied with a range of questions that ask, more or less, the same thing, but each one touches upon a slightly different aspect of the construct. For instance, instead of asking a general question: ‘are you happy?’ one could also ask: ‘are you happy at work?’, ‘… at home?’, ‘… with your friends?’ etc. This provides not only a more balanced, but also a...
more complete picture of the construct that the researcher is interested in, in this case happiness. The same applies to questions that ask about people’s networks. Instead of asking one general question (‘can you name everybody you know?’), several differentiated ones can be used; for example: who are your family members, who are your colleagues and who are your friends? By explicitly pointing respondents in several directions, it is likely that they will, spontaneously, come up with more alters. Depending upon the aim of the research, the questions can be even more focused on a specific domain. A study on work related support could ask ‘who are your direct colleagues?’, ‘who is your boss?’ etc. Similarly, in a study like the current one, it is possible to ask about the social capital that is relevant to organizations: ‘with which organizations do you share your accommodation?’ or ‘does your organization ever receive invitations to activities held by other organizations and, if so, which ones?’ The questionnaire used in the current study also relied on a series of questions that tapped into different aspects of the daily life of organizations. This led to the respondents coming up with a wider range of alters.

4.1.2 Type of questions: focus on resources or on network

There are two approaches that can be fruitful when it comes to mapping social capital from a network perspective. Given the definition of social capital as ‘resources embedded in a social structure’, one could focus on the network structure itself. Alternatively, the concentration could be on the embedded resources. Both approaches are accepted methods of research which yield interesting results, but there are some differences between them with respect to the conclusions that can be reached.

4.1.3 Resource and position generators

Research that focuses on the resources available to a respondent (ego) can use what is called a resource or position generator. Both types of questionnaire are used to ‘generate’ responses which indicate whether or not an ego possesses particular ‘expressions’ of social capital. As the name implies, the questions in resource generators are very clearly aimed at the (social) resources of ego. ‘Do you know anyone who ... owns a car?’, ‘... can give you medical advice?’, ‘... can speak a foreign language?’, and ‘... can borrow you a large sum of money?’ (van der Gaag & Snijders, 2003). The most important characteristic of this type of questionnaire is that it contains concrete references to particular assets. Position generators, on the other hand, are based on the idea that different professions are connected to a certain social status within a society, and these also provide access to particular resources. The social capital of a respondent is then deduced from the professions of his/her alters. Position generators include
questions such as: ‘Do you know anybody who is a doctor?’ ‘Do you know anybody who is postman?’ ‘Do you know anyone who is a manager?’ (Lin & Dumin, 1986; van der Gaag, Snijders, & Flap, 2008).

Resource and position generators are very direct measures with which to uncover social capital; they are instruments that get to the very core of the concept. In light of the aims of the current study, these tools, nevertheless, have two important disadvantages. Firstly, position (and to a lesser extent resource) generators are best tailored to the social capital of individuals (people). They include references to clear characteristics (namely professions) that can be easily connected to specific resources, although this is always based on assumptions, e.g. that a professor has more, or at least different, social capital to a road worker. However, my interest is in the social capital of organizations, and it is much more difficult to create a general typology of features that can be ascribed thereto. Secondly, position and resource generators yield information about whether the ego (whether it is a single person or an organization) has access to specific resources in general. What or who is the ‘source’ of these resources will remain unclear. So, if an attempt is being made to interpret a network of interlocking directorates and compare it to an everyday-life-network, position and resource generators won’t provide enough information, but a ‘name generator’ will. Van der Gaag et al. (2008) concluded likewise that ‘when specific questions about the influence of network structure on social capital outcomes need to be studied it [the name generator, LP] is ... the only measurement option, since it is the only method that identifies network members’ (p.45).

4.1.4 Name generators

The other approach to the network measurement of social capital, which focuses on the network structure, overcomes both of the drawbacks of the resource and position generators. Name generating questions can be used to map a network. These are like the question that is posed in the GSS (as referred to above), and they ask for the names of ego’s alters. Most questionnaires contain several name generating questions, and the literature on social capital measurement from a network perspective provides many examples. ‘Who have you socialized with in the last 6 months?’ (Moore, Shiell, Haines, Riley, & Collier, 2005), ‘Do you know anyone who you go to for social visits?’ (van der Gaag & Snijders, 2003), ‘With whom do you discuss work decisions?’ (McCallister & Fischer, 1978) are all questions that are part of name generator questionnaires containing between four (Moore et al., 2005) and thirteen (van der Gaag & Snijders, 2003) items.

McCallister and Fischer (1978), who also implemented a name generator questionnaire, concluded that the instrument they had developed was flexible; depending on the aim of the study, more or less emphasis can be placed on specific kinds
of ties. A study of neighborhood cohesion, for example, could use a name generator that contains more questions about (in)direct neighbors related to a range of activities that play an important role in that kind of relationship. The questionnaire used in the current study will, in a similar vein, include questions about the relationships that organizations maintain with other organizations instead of about the internal relationships between the organization and its members. Furthermore, as I have already explained, it is better to use multiple questions which each tap into a different part of an ego’s network. A name generator, therefore, should include questions that emphasize similar, yet distinct, aspects of a social network. This notion of covering a wide ranging network is also applied in the questionnaire utilized herein.

Name generators are often combined with name interpreter questions. These delve into the characteristics of the (ties to) alters that an ego has mentioned. Name interpreter questions are meant to shed light on the nature of the relationship between ego and his/her alters, as well as revealing some of the personal characteristics of the latter (see for example Kirke, 1996; Dodds, Muhamad, & Watts, 2003). These questions include: ‘how often do you meet [alter]?’ and ‘what is your relationship with [alter]?’ These are measures of the frequency or intensity of the relationship. Queries like ‘what is [alter]’s nationality?’ or ‘what kind of job does [alter] have?’ both establish the resources that are embedded in ego’s network. Sometimes, the respondent is also asked to indicate the nature of the relationship between the alters that he/she has mentioned: ‘are A and B: family, friends, colleagues, etc.? I have, therefore, used some name interpreting questions in the current study. The respondents were asked to indicate the ethnicity of (of the organization or the contact person) and the frequency of contact with (ranging from daily to almost never) their alters. The responses to these questions were not as clear cut as I had anticipated and, with the benefit of hindsight, I had to dismiss all of this kind of information because there was too much data missing to enable me to reach sound conclusions. Instead, I collected information about the alters after the questionnaires had been completed. The analyses of the bonding and bridging social capital required data about the location, ethnicity and type of organization to which all network actors belonged. This was found in the database of the Chamber of Commerce, on the websites of organizations themselves, and via the use of search engines on the Internet.

This overview of the measurement of social capital by way of questionnaires provided the framework for the development of the instrument that I utilized in the current study. The next paragraph, therefore, contains a detailed description thereof.
4.2 Current study: the questionnaire

The questionnaire is based on a range of situations and resources that a voluntary organization may encounter or need in its everyday practice. These concerned events in several domains, for example with respect to finances, social cultural issues and politics. Eventually, I selected 18 name-generating questions, most of which were posed during the first part of the interview, while some were interwoven throughout the questionnaire. The complete questionnaire can be found in Appendix 1, but I will now discuss the questions that were asked in more detail.

4.2.1 Name generating questions

The first seven queries in the questionnaire were the most direct name generating questions. Some were introduced with a closed question, in order to assess if a particular event to which it referred had ever taken place. If so, the respondent was asked to answer with this occurrence in mind. If not, the respondent was asked to think of the event as a hypothetical situation. The wording of the questions was slightly adjusted by the interviewer depending on whether the organization had ever experienced the particular circumstance or not. The seven questions were:

1. From which organizations did you receive an invitation to a New Year’s reception?
2. Which organizations invited your organization to any kind of Islamic celebration, for example an Iftar meal during Ramadan?
3. If you have questions about a construction permit when you plan to alter the building in which your organization is situated, who would you ask to help you with that?
4. If you receive an invitation to a participation meeting from the municipality or the city district council, which organizations would you pass that invitation on to?
5. When you notice that you are dealing with the poor attendance of your members, which organizations would you discuss this with?
6. When your organization is about to celebrate any kind of anniversary and you want someone to make you promotional material, who would you ask about where is a good place to have this done?
7. When you hear that the municipality is providing new opportunities for migrant organizations to receive funding, who else would you tell about this?

By formulating questions about receiving as well as providing help, I wanted to prevent the respondents from feeling overly dependent and always in need of assistance.
Four other questions were of a more general nature. The respondents were asked if they usually come into contact with national organizations or with associations abroad. Subsequently, they were asked to think about the city level again (Amsterdam or Berlin), and were invited to name the non-Turkish and Dutch/German (respectively) organizations that they are connected to.

After this, the respondents were asked a set of questions about political preferences. In reference to these, the interviewee was asked ‘With whom do you discuss your choice of political party during elections?’ This question tended to elicit the respondents’ personal networks, like ‘my brother’, instead of any organizational contacts, and was, therefore, later excluded from the analysis.

To get an idea of the professionalism of the organizations and, at the same time, pose yet another question with which to reveal the respondents’ networks, two further name generating questions were asked about sending and receiving annual reports.

The final name-generating inquiry asked the respondents to check their diaries and talk about all of the people with whom they had had meetings over the previous week. This approach comes closest to an unobtrusive measuring instrument, and thus provided relatively reliable information without any recall bias.

In the introduction part of the interview, the respondents were asked to keep two instructions in mind. Firstly, they were allowed to name as many alters as they could or wanted to. This runs counter to Snijders’ (1999) recommendation that this number should be limited to a maximum of four to lighten the respondents’ load and keep the amount of data within manageable proportions. Snijders’ point of view is that it is the diversity of resources that an actor has at his/her disposal that determines the ‘quantity’ of his/her social capital, and not the number of people (or organizations in this case) to whom one is tied. He demonstrated that it is enough to have between two and four alters with a particular resource, because with this number the ego is no longer dependent on one person (organization) providing access to these assets. Snijders would thus advise the use of name generating questions such as “Mention organizations that could help you with […], and would do so if you asked them to.” I, nevertheless, disregarded this suggestion and let the respondents mention as many alters as they could or wanted to. An important reason for this is that I wanted to tap into an as large as possible portion of the respondents’ networks, even if they only contained one type of resource. My objective was to map the organizations’ networks, and not just the resources embedded in them. This would allow me to later be able to determine which of all of the actors in these networks are mobilized. Since I expected that the organizations would not address all of their alters, it is all the more important to know which of them they would activate and which they would not. Accordingly, giving the respondents the opportunity to mention as many names as they wanted to is a necessary prerequisite of this approach. It also allows a distinction to be made between the organizations that maintain many contacts and those which do not. I assumed that
all associations have some ties to other associations, and allowing only a fixed, low maximum amount of names may have given the impression that each organization is as well connected as the others that also achieve this maximum number. Letting respondents name everyone they are connected to leaves room for more variation between organizations.

The second instruction was that the respondents were explicitly asked to name only those organizations with which they are actively acquainted and/or know by more than name only. In other words, if the respondent knows of the existence of a certain organization, but has never spoken to any of its board members, he/she was asked not to mention it.

4.3 Recall bias: problem and solution

I have already discussed the disadvantages of single question surveys, and have proposed multifaceted questionnaires as a useful alternative. Yet, the generators with several questions also have their downsides; the wording and the subject-matter of the questions posed can strongly influence the respondents' answers. Hammer (1984) concluded that the main characteristics that determine whether an alter is mentioned are the frequency of the contact (the more often ego and alter meet, the greater the chance that the latter is mentioned), how recent the last encounter was (people who were encountered more recently are remembered better) and how well ego and alter know each other. Hammer added that not all alters that meet these three criteria are actually named; people always forget to mention part of their circles of acquaintances. On the whole, people have a tendency to recall bonding social capital over bridging social capital. To keep this proportion of ‘forgotten friends’ to a minimum, Brewer (2000) demonstrated that a name recognition list should be included in the questionnaire.

Brewer reviewed studies on forgetting in recall-based elicitations of social networks, which, essentially, involve name generators. Among others, Bernard, Killworth and Sailer (1982, in Brewer), Freeman and Romney (1987), and Freeman, Romney and Freeman (1987) compared the recall of personal acquaintances generated by personal interviews to objective records, such as sent e-mails and the attendance lists of university classes. These latter sources provided the respondents’ ‘true’ networks. The studies showed that people forget a great deal of information about who they have been in contact with. For example, Brewer and Webster (1999) interviewed students living in a university hall of residence and found that they failed to mention about 20% of their acquaintances when they were asked to name the friends who lived in the same accommodation. Brewer (2000), therefore, concluded his review with the recommendation that more than multiple elicitation questions should be used when
studying personal and social networks; researchers should also use objective records or recognition lists. Objective recording methods, like checking attendance lists or tracking sent e-mails, are by no means always as useful or available, and the current study is an example of this. I did include the diary-question as an ‘unobtrusive’ measure, but the responses to it were low: often the organizations had not seen any other organization in the previous week. Name recognition lists on the other hand were within the bounds of the possible.

4.3.1 Name recognition lists

The name recognition list provides the respondent with a structured tool with which to remember his/her acquaintances. As the term implies, it is a list that contains names. In the aforementioned study by Brewer and Webster (1999), in which acquaintanceship relationships within a particular university hall of residence were scrutinized, the researchers tried to increase the number of recalled friends by listing the names of all of the students who lived there and asking the respondents about the people with whom they were acquainted. This strategy did have the desired effect; the respondents remembered more people. As my study is of Turkish organizations in Amsterdam and Berlin, I included the names of Turkish organizations in my name recognition list.

During the interviews, the name recognition list was presented to the respondent as a handout. The interviewer also read each name out loud. The respondent was asked to indicate, for each of the organizations on the list, whether he/she knew it. If the answer was in the affirmative, he/she was asked whether his/her organization keeps in contact with this other body, and if so, how often. The interviewees were free to give any answer they liked, but all responses were eventually coded into: daily, a couple of times a week, weekly, a couple of times a month, monthly, a couple of times a year and once a year.

Sudman (1985) demonstrated that recognition lists yield a considerably larger proportion of recalled acquaintances than free recall questions. This was an important reason for me to include this tool in my questionnaire. However, I could not burden my respondents with a list of about 200 organizations, and I therefore used a sample that was a quarter of this size\(^3\) (following the same sampling procedure and producing the sampled organizations as described below). The name generator questions complemented the name recognition list, and ultimately both provided the data upon which the contact network of the Turkish organizations was based.

\(^3\) In Amsterdam the name recognition list contained 45 organizations and in Berlin 50.
4.3.2 Further questions

The questionnaire also contained a query about representatives of the Turkish community. The respondents were asked whether there is any organization or person that they consider to be their proper representative in their city and whether they are directly connected to this, or these, organization(s) or people. The respondents were also asked if there are any organizations with whom they do not want to collaborate. The question about representatives in particular yielded useful information. In the case of unwelcome contacts, most respondents remained vague and named only general groups, such as 'Islamic extremists' or 'undemocratic organizations', without being specific.

The questionnaire also contained six questions about the functioning of the organization, which were indicators of the degree of professionalism thereof. The respondents completed these questions themselves on a separate form that was handed to them. The first question was about the way new board members were found, i.e. through formal or informal channels, or via a vote by members at a general meeting. Furthermore, the participants also indicated the number of times that the board members get together (ranging from more than once a week to less than once a month), the number of hours the respondent spends working for his/her organization (ranging from less than two hours a week to full-time), whether board members get paid (salary, allowance for expenses only, or nothing) and what the size of the membership was (from less than 25 to over 1001). The final question was: “Do you also take part in other organizational boards, and if so, how many?” This question functioned as a check of the network of interlocking directorates.

The questionnaire also included several queries about conventional and unconventional political participation of the organization, but the responses were ultimately not used in the analyses.

Sometimes, and not as a reply to a specific question, the respondents spontaneously started to mention the names of organizations with which they (had) collaborated. These responses are also included in the dataset.

4.4 Implementation of the questionnaire

4.4.1 What is the population?

The current research concerns Turkish organizations in Amsterdam and Berlin. The focus is on these communities because of their similar nature (Vermeulen, 2006). The members of both groups emigrated to their respective cities for similar reasons and over a comparable time frame. Moreover, the two Turkish communities are of the same
relative size compared to the total population (in absolute terms, the community in Berlin is much bigger). Furthermore, the organizing process of the Turks in both cities had started to become significant at about the same time (1970s). These similarities enable a useful comparison to be made, especially because the circumstances in which the two communities operate are markedly different (see Chapter 3).

In both Amsterdam and Berlin the number of Turkish associations amounts to about 200. As a starting point for determining the basis upon which I could produce a sample, I used the databases on the networks of interlocking directorates that had been compiled by my colleagues based on archival data (see below). A disadvantage of this data is that it can quickly become out of date because organizations are disbanded, or board members have handed their duties over to a successor. The databases used herein were collected in 2003 and 2004, while I held interviews in 2005, and so I did attempt to update them. In Amsterdam, because the Chamber of Commerce is an easily accessible institution with an electronic database that is kept up to date, it was possible to correct for changes of personnel and the closing down of organizations before taking a sample. This was not the case in Berlin. The Vereinsregister is a paper archive, and is completely unfathomable by anyone who has not worked for the institution for at least five years, even if one is admitted to its inner sanctum at all. In Berlin I could, therefore, only find out after sampling whether certain organizations still existed. Ultimately, I started out with 239 Turkish organizations in Amsterdam, and 195 in Berlin.

Organizations are regarded as Turkish when at least 50% of the board members are of Turkish descent. A board member is regarded as ‘Turkish’ when this individual, or at least one of his/her parents, was born in Turkey, or when the name of the organization gives reason to believe that it is serving an (exclusively) Turkish target group. The ‘ethnicity’ of other organizations was established in a similar fashion: their ethnicity is based on the ethnicity of the board members that make up at least 50% of the board. If there is no clear ethnic majority, because the board members all have different backgrounds, or the name of the organization does not give rise to a particular ethnic label, it is classified as ‘mixed’.

Sometimes, board members are classified as Turkish because of their place of birth, although they consider themselves and their organization to be Kurdish. As the Kurds do not have an acknowledged homeland, it would not actually be possible to qualify them as Kurdish. However, this group does not generally want to be referred to as Turkish, or any other nationality, because of political reasons. I do not want to go into this highly sensitive issue here, but for pragmatic reasons I decided to qualify the Kurdish organizations as a separate category. It is well known, and the analyses will show, that these organizations clearly separate themselves from the Turkish community. It was

For an overview of all categories, see Appendix 2.
Recognizing Kurdish associations is actually rather easy, since most of them are very explicit in their choice of name.

### 4.4.2 Sample

Due to issues of time, money, and manpower, it was impossible to interview all Turkish organizations in Amsterdam and Berlin. Accordingly, I had to produce a sample, which is difficult to achieve in network studies. The sampling process consisted of the following successive steps. Firstly, all organizations were categorized on the basis of their assumed nature. I deliberately use the word *assumed* since, after having spoken to these organizations, it transpired that some of them should have been classified differently. Each organization was assigned to a specific category based on its name and/or the description of its goals because this information was recorded in the databases. There were 27 categories, plus a residual one that contained the organizations about which it was unclear what their main area of concern was. Not every type of organization was found in either Amsterdam or Berlin. The categories are listed in Appendix 2. Simultaneously, I established the number of each organization's interlocks in their respective networks of interlocking directorates. The two characteristics, 'organizational type' and 'number of interlocking directorates', formed the basis of the sample selection. Within each category of organizational type, the organizations were rank ordered based on their connectivity. Depending on the range of the number of alters, this led to a number of groups of organizations of which the two at either end of the spectrum contained the associations that had the most and the least connections. Within every category, two organizations were then picked randomly, one from each group at the extremes. For instance, within the category of sports' organizations in Amsterdam, there were two with two connections, three with one connection and eight without any formal connection. In this example, one of the two organizations with two connections and one isolated organization were (randomly) selected.

### 4.4.3 Procedure: invitation

All selected organizations received a letter directed to its chairman. In this letter it was explained what the aim of the study was and that the addressee would be telephoned to ask about his or her willingness to participate. If there was no telephone number available, organizations were asked to contact the researchers. If there was a telephone number, but the organizations could not be reached, they received a second letter, making the same request. These requests lead to some responses in Amsterdam, but none in Berlin.
A week after the letters were sent, we (a research assistant and the author) phoned the addressees as we had promised. During the phone call, the caller inquired whether the respondent had received the letter and if the aim of the research was clear. If necessary, further explanations were provided. The respondents were then asked if they were willing to participate in the study. If they refused, we tried to find out why. This was usually related to a lack of time, or general fatigue when it came to (scientific) studies (see also the paragraphs on response figures below). If the respondent agreed to participate we arranged a date and place for an interview.

One month after the first letters were sent out, a new sample was produced because the number of participants was still fairly low. This sample was created following the same procedure as in the first round, except that before the selection took place the organizations that had already been chosen were left out.

4.4.4 Procedure: the interviews

The interviews took place at a location that was convenient for the interviewee. Most of the time this meant that it was held at the organization’s premises, but they also sometimes took place in a café or at a respondent’s home.

The interviewer had a paper version of the interview with her, upon which the respondents’ answers were noted. The interview started with a short introduction about the questionnaire and consisted of three parts. First, the interviewer asked the name generating questions and those about voting behavior and representatives of the Turkish community. Then, the respondents completed the part of the questionnaire that dealt with general information about the organization (size, salaries etc.) and its political activities. The final part of the interview contained the name recognition list. On average, the interviews lasted one hour.

On only two or three times did the interviewees’ poor command of the language (Dutch or German) pose a problem. In some instances, the involvement of a translator, which the interviewees had arranged themselves on their own initiative, resolved this issue. If there was no translator ‘at hand’, the interviewer simply tried to make the best of it.

The interviews took place in 2005 in both cities: in Amsterdam from February to April and in Berlin between April and July.
4.5  Response rates in Amsterdam

Based on the sampling procedure described above, I selected 101 organizations which I approached in two rounds (48 in the first, 53 in the second). The total response rate amounted to 37%, which is a very reasonable figure in the social sciences.

The main cause of the non-responses was the fact that we could not reach organizations, whether by telephone, mail, or e-mail. This applied to 45 organizations. Twenty-nine of them received a repeat invitation but to no avail. Two letters were returned to sender. The letters to fourteen organizations were still pending at the end of the interview phase. In spite of a thorough examination and consideration of the updated databases, five organizations turned out to have been dissolved after all, or soon would be.

Five organizations indicated that they were not willing to participate in the study. The reasons they gave were that: they "did not have the time to do so"; one stated that it "participates in so many studies that [it] doesn't have the time to do [its] core activities"; and another said that it is "not a part of the Turkish community (anymore)". Nine organizations were willing, but unable, to participate in the study because of issues such as time constraints.

Eventually, we arranged 36 interviews with organizations from the sample. One only agreed to participate if it could fill out a written questionnaire, which it subsequently received and completed. We encountered the 38th (not sampled) organization when we were trying to contact one that we had chosen to include. It transpired that the person we had addressed as the chairman was no longer active in this organization, but had become the secretary of another. We, therefore, then interviewed him in that capacity. Appendix 3A contains an overview of the organizations that were interviewed.

4.6  Response rate in Berlin

I applied the same sampling procedure in Berlin as I had in Amsterdam. Eighty-seven organizations were selected (53 in the first wave, 34 in the second), and 27 were eventually interviewed. This resulted in a response rate of 31%. This was slightly lower than in Amsterdam, but was still a satisfying figure.

The largest group of non-respondents, 22 organizations, was comprised of those that could not be reached by mail (thirteen of these also received a reminder) or any other medium. Nine organizations were unreachable due to incorrect address information at the Vereinsregister.
The second largest group consisted of 19 organizations that were willing, but unable, to take part in the study. One logistical problem was that the period of data gathering turned out to partly coincide with the summer holidays that were unexpectedly early that year. Some of the board members to whom I had intended to talk were already away. Other organizations did not want to participate because they did not think they had anything of value to contribute because they did not consider themselves to be Turkish. These groups instead regarded themselves as international or German, and they were not convinced by my argument that their participation would be much appreciated and that it would be very interesting to gain insight into their contacts anyway. Two other organizations did agree to engage in the study but did not show up on the agreed date. One remarkable response came from a (Diyanet) mosque: its board indicated that they were only willing to participate if they received permission from their umbrella organization (DITIB) and advised me to contact this organization first. Unfortunately, I was not able to do so. One mosque contacted me of its own accord to tell me that its board was not willing to participate in any way. They did not provide a particular reason why. Sixteen invitation letters were returned to sender. These organizations could also not be reached by any other means.

Of the 27 interviews that took place, one did not turn out well. It transpired that I had got in touch with the national umbrella organization of the local branch that I thought I had invited. This interview yielded interesting, yet inappropriate information, and was therefore excluded from the analyses. The organizations that were interviewed are listed in Appendix 3B.

4.7 Assessing networks of interlocking directorates

The emphasis in this study is on contact networks, because these contain new information when compared to the networks of interlocking directorates, which have already received considerable attention in studies by Vermeulen (2006) and Berger (2010). On the other hand, the networks of interlocking directorates are just as much a part of the social capital of voluntary organizations and, for that reason, cannot be ignored.

The networks of interlocking directorates of the communities at hand (i.e. the Turkish communities in Amsterdam and Berlin) are based on the information recorded in the registers of the Chamber of Commerce (Amsterdam) and the Vereinsregister (Chamber of Associations, Berlin). For a detailed description of the methods of data gathering, I refer to the publications of Vermeulen (2006), Berger (2010), and Slijper (forthcoming). Recall that an interlock between two organizations exists when a board member of one of them is simultaneously seated on the board of the other. The network
of interlocking directorates in Amsterdam also contains non-Turkish organizations which have an interlock with at least one Turkish organization. On the other hand, this network in Berlin does not contain any non-Turkish organizations as there was no relevant data available about them. As the Turkish network of interlocking directorates in Berlin was not very extensive anyway, I do not expect this to affect my interpretation thereof.

The network of interlocking directorates in Amsterdam includes 278 organizations (see Table 4.1), of which 239 are Turkish or Kurdish (but born in Turkey) and the other 39 are non-Turkish. Furthermore, of these 278 organizations, 156 had at least one interlocking directorate. The rest (122) did not have any formal connection to any other organizations. The network of interlocking directorates in Berlin contains 195 Turkish organizations. Only 51 of these had at least one interlock. The remaining 148 were not connected to any other organization by means of an interlocking directorate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amsterdam</th>
<th>Berlin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of organizations</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Turkish orgs.</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of unconnected orgs.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Basic figures on the networks of interlocking directorates in absolute numbers

4.8 Final remarks for the analyses

Overall, I concluded my fieldwork with two samples which form a solid basis for the subsequent analyses. There are, however, some relevant points to be made before I turn to the results. The questionnaire yielded the names of many organizations, yet occasionally respondents also mentioned the names of individuals or consultative/collaborative bodies. When it was unclear whether the individuals were affiliated with an organization, they were removed from the dataset.

With respect to the consultative and collaborative bodies (these are groups of collaborating organizations), there were two options available. Take as an example a consultative body about which a respondent says he has good relationships with ‘everybody there’. If the members of these bodies could be traced, they were each noted as alters of ego. If the members could not be found, the consultative body itself was marked as an alter. It is important to note that this could lead to considerable differences in the number of alters and, perhaps, even cause bias since consultative bodies often have at least ten members. Unfortunately, this cannot be prevented. The only consolation is that my experience is that consultative bodies about which no information is known are usually either inactive, or the respondent who mentioned
them is not practically involved with them anyway. This suggests that they would not make a contribution to an ego’s social capital anyway.

This brings me to some matters of terminology. Throughout this book I will distinguish between consultative bodies, collaborative bodies and working groups. The former are state initiatives to bring together (migrant) organizations, with the main aim being mutual information exchange. The consultative bodies of migrant organizations are often called migrant councils. With the term collaborative bodies I am referring to groups of organizations that form a collective on their own initiative. These organizations jointly arrange activities or discuss in regular meetings matters that are important to them. Working groups are also collections of organizations, but they are invited to participate by the main organization, which is a voluntary association itself, albeit one of a much greater size. Sometimes the organizers are umbrella organizations. Melville (1999) revealed that the terms peak bodies and umbrella organizations are used interchangeably in the literature. Following Hamilton and Barwick’s description of a peak body (1993, p.17), I define these as ‘an organization … with other organizations as members formed to represent the collective views of its members to government, to the community and to other bodies’. Finally, this definition also includes the organizations that present themselves as umbrella organizations (‘koepelorganisatie’ in Dutch, ‘Dachorganisation’ in German).

During the interviews, respondents often named alters that cannot be classified as voluntary organizations, but do appear to be important in their everyday practices and do contribute substantially to their social capital. I am referring here to political parties, governmental and semi-governmental organizations. The former are Dutch or German political parties. If a respondent stated that he/she ‘knows all political parties’ but was unable to specify them, no political party was noted. The governmental organizations refer to (departments of) the municipality or city districts, whereas semi-governmental organizations are those that either used to be a part of the local government or collaborate with it in such close harmony that it is difficult to see them as independent voluntary organizations.

4.9 The analyses and how the results are presented

I used the social network analysis software, UCINET 6.0 for Windows (Borgatti, Everett, & Freeman, 2002), to perform the analyses herein. The interviews enabled me to produce a series of ego-centered networks that I was able to combine into a single, larger network both in Amsterdam and Berlin. This means that I was able to perform ego-centered as well as socio-centered analyses, although the latter did entail some inferential limitations (see also Appendix 4).
I examined the in and out degrees of the network actors as indicators of the amount of social capital they have at their disposal. The in-degree is the number of times an organization is named by (other) respondents, while the out-degree is the number of alters a respondent named. Furthermore, I considered the centrality measures of betweenness and closeness. These are indicators of the extent to which actors are either ‘at the heart’ of everything, or are on the periphery of the organizational network. If an actor has a more central position, he/she/it is regarded to have more social capital. I also take into account the connectedness of the network, which refers to the degree to which all of the actors that are present are connected to each other. The number of components is an indicator of this connectedness. A component is a subgroup of actors that are all, in some way, connected to each other by means of more or fewer steps, but none of them are connected to actors outside the component. On a more individual level, I take into account which actors are cutpoints or bridges. An organization functions as a cutpoint when it is the only actor that connects two subgroups within a component and these would dissolve into two or more parts upon the cutpoint’s removal. Similarly, a bridge refers to the situation in which there is only one connection between two subgroups within a component, which would disintegrate upon the bridge’s removal. Furthermore, I examined the scores of the organizations on the E-I Index and the Index of Qualitative Variation (IQV), which reveal respectively the degree of bonding and bridging social capital of organizations and the diversity thereof. The E-I index reflects the relationship between the number of alters that are similar to an actor and the number that are dissimilar in terms of a specified characteristic (i.e. ethnicity, type of organization and locality). For example, with respect to the ethnicity of the actors, the E-I index reflects whether an organization has more ethnically bridging or bonding social capital. The IQV is a reflection of the degree to which the alters of a particular organization are different to each other. A higher score indicates more diversity. For example, an organization that has Moroccan, Ghanaian, Dutch and Moluccan alters has a more diverse circle of acquaintances than an association that has only Surinamese connections. In relation to social capital, this implies that the former has a greater likelihood of having a more diverse range of resources than the latter.

I performed the same analyses of the data on the networks of interlocking directorates as I did on the contact networks. I set out the results of the analyses in Appendices 6 and 7. The information that I present in the following chapters is the interpretation of these results and the general impressions I got about the two Turkish communities while doing the interviews.