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1. Social Capital: Analogy and Beyond
The concept of social capital is widely accepted in many academic disciplines and practical fields, particularly in the synthesized achievements of Ostrom and Ahn (2003) and Castiglione et al. (2008). Regardless of the competitive accumulation of studies, its definition remains ambiguous and its contribution to theoretical sociology is unclear. This confusion is mainly caused by its analogical property. On the other hand, theoretical sociology positively accepts this concept’s ambiguity for a variety of reasons. The merit of this analogy exists in that it highlights the mechanism of social structure that resembles the process of capital accumulation.

Two implications are noteworthy in this case. Firstly, social capital works mainly at the meso-level of social structure. The process of capital accumulation, including social capital, can be captured from individual and societal viewpoints. Lin (2001) proposes an extended framework of status attainment to analyze how actors utilize social resources owned by others and what benefits they obtain; in contrast, Putnam (2000) discusses the decline of capital accumulation in the United States by analyzing macro indices of social capital. These studies do not necessarily deny the importance of meso-level mechanisms. In addition to Coleman’s (1988) meso-level definition that focuses on the function of social structure, we need a clearer stance regarding the meso-level viewpoint that suggests that the main mechanism of social capital, which corresponds to the market for economic capital, exists in social structure. In other words, the aim of social capital research is theorizing intermediary
social processes between micro and macro.

Secondly, in explaining such capital-resembling processes, every sociological theory concerning social structure has some relevance, particularly relational theory. Relational theory includes sociological theories of social relations, social networks, and social structure and covers most of the discussions in social capital research. In a sense, social capital is ambiguous because of its relationship with almost all relational theory viewpoints. In addition, social capital is substantially linked with action theory because, as with the analogy of capital, it implies investment as rational action at the individual level. Thus, the concept of social capital has a strong synthesizing power not only in relational theory but also in sociology as a whole.

As an analogy, social capital has neither the conceptual framework to analyze its accumulation process within social structure nor the theoretical ability to synthesize relevant relational theories. To extract its analytical and synthesizing power, we need a theoretical device with which we can make inferences about the accumulation process of social capital without directly observing it. Our purpose in this paper is to introduce the conceptual framework of “net-base” in order to infer a capital accumulation process by which to develop a net-base theory of social capital.

2. Social Structure from the Viewpoint of Net-Base

Focusing on social structure at the meso-level, the concept of net-base specifically succeeds formal sociology in the tradition of relational theory. Specifically, we are indebted to Blau’s (1977; Blau and Schwartz, 1984) macro sociological study and social network analysis for its introduction. Extending Simmel’s (1908) insights about forms of socialization, especially the significance of numbers for social life, Blau presents a unique approach to social structure. According to Blau (1977: 4), social structure is “a multidimensional space of different social positions among which a population is distributed” and is described by its parameters. An important assumption is that “an attribute is a structural parameter and serves as a base for making social distinctions” (Blau, 1977: 6). While a graduated parameter indicates status, a nominal parameter indicates membership in a group. Suggestively, a group
means “any category of people who share an attribute that influences their role relations” (Blau, 1977: 7). In fact, net-base is theoretically very close to Blau’s concept of attribute.

Additionally, social network analysis gives us a technical hint. Succeeding Moreno’s sociometry, social network analysis focuses on the formal structure of socio-centric networks. Typically, a socio-centric network defined for a group is based on interpersonal relationships between its members. A large-scale socio-centric network that includes multiple groups could represent a formal aspect of social structure; however, it is difficult to measure in reality. An alternative method to approach social structure utilizes a bipartite graph and an affiliation matrix (Breiger, 1974). An affiliation matrix is composed of elements that indicate who belongs to what group and represents in algebraic operations how they are interrelated via the membership of individuals. In Blau’s terminology, this method is effective to extract configurations of nominal parameters.

Paying attention to Misumi’s (2008, 2013: Chap.5) technical discussion in applying an affiliation matrix to analyze the net-base affiliation of personal ties, instead of the group affiliation of individuals, lets us introduce the concept of net-base.

Definition 1: Net-base is a common attribute that provides a basis for personal ties between individuals.

Net-base includes being from the same town, graduating from the same school, working at the same company, having the same ethnicity, and so on. Generally, these types of attributes define membership to some degree and imply a boundary between “us and them.” In other words, a net-base attribute defines a relevant socio-centric network that consists of all the members who share this attribute. If an attribute concretely indicates group membership, the relevant socio-centric network is apparent and may have a relatively high density. On the other hand, existing personal ties are scarce and density can be quite low in an abstracted net-base attribute such as “Japanese.” Nevertheless, a socio-centric network that includes all
Japanese people exist in theory. 2)

Ordinary social network approaches, egocentric or socio-centric, require researchers to gather network data about a concrete set of people and the ties between them. On the contrary, the net-base framework treats social networks differently; it only postulates a socio-centric network’s existence corresponding to a given net-base and is not required to measure the network itself. The aim of introducing net-base is to make theoretical inferences about the configuration of socio-centric networks.

Inherently, researchers cannot get complete network information. If we are limitedly concerned with a single aspect of a small group’s network structure, sociometry is an effective method; however, any socio-centric network extracted in this way must be part of a larger socio-centric network because of interpersonal choices (i.e., the distributions of attributes that can be chosen) that necessarily extend the group in question. Making a sociomatrix is possible only by artificially limiting choices within a group. With personal networks, we can only observe a very fragmentary figure of the local sub-network surrounding an individual. Nevertheless, it is strongly expected that the sociological theory of social capital can refer to socio-centric networks. This is because socio-centric networks embedded in social structure are the primary means of social capital accumulation.

People in modern society have relations within various net-bases. When a person positively participates in multiple net-bases, we see that he/she acts as a bridge between them. More precisely, he/she connects those socio-centric networks that correspond to the net-bases he/she participates in. When different people share an attribute, we then see that they belong to the same socio-centric network that corresponds to a common net-base. Thus, the concept of net-base connects an individual’s attributes and net-base configurations at the meso-level. As net-base configurations imply social network configurations, they represent formal patterns of aggregation in social relations. In the net-base framework, social structure is defined as the configuration of net-bases.

Later, I will discuss how net-base conditions the accumulation of social capital.
The net-base framework will then represent more apparently the micro-macro link and explain how an individual’s attributes are aggregated as a net-base configuration, and under what conditions it creates (or fails to create) social capital. As a net-base attribute is the indicator of social networks, the aggregation of social relations rather than of actions, matter. Net-base thus provides a basic framework for a micro-macro link in relational theory.

The attributes of individuals (net-base participation) are much easier to measure than socio-centric networks. Statistically speaking, however, utilizing ordinary individual-based survey data in this way is second best. Ideally, an empirical net-base study should consist of two stages of random sampling: first, the extraction of net-bases, followed by the extraction of individuals from its membership. Unfortunately, it would be difficult to have a complete list of net-bases to make this sampling method possible. Then, what can we know? We assume that an individual’s attributes indicate a personal account of net-base investment. We can figure out societal net-base configurations through individual-based survey data as an aggregation of the respondents’ accounts of this kind.3)

3. The Net-Base Theory of Social Capital
Researchers of social capital ordinarily use the following elements to elaborate on the effects and outcome of social capital: volume and extension of personal networks, participation in voluntary associations, trust, norm of reciprocity, and so on. Though measurability is a crucial reason for the wide acceptance of this concept, more important thing is to ask what kind of ongoing capital accumulation can be observed beyond the effects of these elements. Since this is not directly observable, we need to make inferences based on analysis results.4) To fully utilize “social capital” as an analogy, we should keep in mind the following question: What mechanisms in social structure should determine the supposed capital accumulation process? Coupled with insights about such mechanisms, we can convincingly interpret the observed effects of social capital elements in the context of capital accumulation.

In fact, net-base configurations consist of a mechanism that is directly related to
the accumulation of social capital. We now can introduce key axioms. The first one postulates the conceptual relationship between net-base and the socio-centric network that we discussed in the previous section.

**Axiom 1:** An individual’s net-base attribute indicates a relevant socio-centric network.

Although net-base is unable to capture network structures, such as centrality, bridges, and cliques, it is possible to infer the sub-network structures of a whole network by analyzing net-base configurations. To make this analysis in the context of social capital, we need an additional device. The second axiom clarifies the relationship between socio-centric network and social capital in order that net-base works as the clue to inferring how network mechanisms in social structure condition the process of social capital accumulation.

**Axiom 2:** The accumulation of social capital takes place within socio-centric networks embedded in social structure.

In analyzing net-base configurations, the most important index is “net-base diversity.” An individual who participates in multiple net-bases works as a bridge to connect them. An ideal case is that of two overlapping, high-density, socio-centric networks in which a single person is the only one who participates in both net-bases (see Figure 1). In each socio-centric network (either A or B), active bonding capital accumulation might take place; individual X then becomes crucial in linking them and enhancing bridging capital accumulation. In general, when a person participates in a variety of net-bases, his/her net-base diversity is higher and the probability that he/she takes an advantageous bridging position should increase.

Strictly, the term “bridge” might not be adequate because it indicates the characteristics of an edge (tie) instead of a node (individual). We assume that an individual could identify himself/herself differently on different net-bases and therefore have multiple egos. In Figure 1, suppose that individual X has multiple egos, $X_A$ and $X_B$, and has difficulty unifying them. The flow of social resources between the net-bases then depends on his/her identity management and whether or
not he/she intends to internally bridge the two egos. The same discussion is applicable when a collective agent defines a node; it is generally reasonable to see a hidden bridge within a node.  

Even if a person has high net-base diversity, at the same time he/she might share some net-base attributes with many others. In this case, socio-centric networks are connected by multiple ‘bridges,’ some of which will be redundant (Burt, 1992). In extreme cases, the close similarity of net-base profiles prevents the stimulation of bridging capital accumulation regardless of high net-base diversity. A socio-centric network, however, generally includes a sub-network or clique structure and the structure must be complex for a large-scale (or abstracted) net-base. The net-base framework focuses on the configuration of the whole network that consists of all socio-centric networks relevant to salient net-bases. It is then reasonable to infer that the unit of bonding capital accumulation is a clique (sub-network) rather than a net-base and that bridging capital accumulation takes place between cliques rather than between net-bases.

Thus, net-base diversity generally indicates the probability that an individual works as a bridge. On a societal level, when we observe people’s high net-base diversity, we can infer that the society has a complex net-base configuration and that the relevant socio-centric networks are linked by the various net-base affiliations of the society’s members. In other words, high-level net-base diversity on average
indicates the probability that the society has a social structure that includes many structural holes (Burt 1992).

The idea of net-base diversity is very close to Coffé and Geys’s (2007) measurement of an association’s bridging social capital in terms of the diversity of its membership. In their study, diversity indicated an association’s latent ability to connect with bonding social capital that other associations are accumulating. On the contrary, net-base diversity focuses on latent connections between socio-centric networks, in terms of individuals with multiple memberships, by which it captures the ability of social structure to accumulate bridging social capital.6)

As I will illustrate later, net-base is easily measurable by questionnaires on personal networks and group participation in ordinary individual-based surveys. We need to pay attention that net-base information gathered in this way represents the respondents’ current salient net-bases. There could be an infinite number of latent net-bases, and we cannot measure them all; however, this does not necessarily create limitations because net-base salience has inherent theoretical significance. In analyzing network mobilization with regard to personal crisis in an African city, Boswell discusses a suggestive point.

“Generally speaking bonds of kinship are enduring but actual relationship may become dormant and only be resuscitated at certain stages in the life cycle or in particular situations….. Nevertheless, at any time, the members of the whole social network are in the potential position of being mobilized to deal with a crisis situation.” (Boswell, 1969: 288,295).

Along with Durkheim’s (1912) theory of religion, he suggests the importance of rhythm in managing social networks. Ties can be temporarily inactive and are more efficient if most remain latent, requiring minimum contact to reactivate them in case of emergency. In this respect, net-base works as a social device to greatly decrease the costs of recovering latent ties and makes it easier to control the rhythm of social network management.

There are two related points. Firstly, using a repeated survey (a panel survey is
better), we will be able to analyze changes in salient net-base configuration patterns. It will then be possible to refer to social structural change from the viewpoint of network dynamics at the societal level. Previous studies tend to straightforwardly focus on change in social capital. On the contrary, the net-base theory of social capital focuses on the construction and change of social structure from the viewpoint of network configuration by which social capital accumulation is determined.

Secondly, as Boswell suggests, in theory any latent ties can be activated (to be salient) when necessary; however, certain investments are required for that. At the individual level, managing personal networks and group membership can be interpreted as an investment because it requires spending social resources for some future purpose (even if expressive). In this respect, the net-base theory of social capital is consistent with the rational choice framework proposed by Flap (1999; Flap and Völker, 2004). Additionally, it proposes a new insight. We see that people invest in net-bases where personal ties are located. As we discussed previously, information derived from an individual’s personal networks is like a personal account of investment, enabling us to discuss the balance of investment and return of social capital at the individual level. Mechanisms that bring him/her returns exist in socio-centric networks corresponding to the net-bases in question. In other words, when a person spends much time and money to maintain an interpersonal tie, he/she invests in the net-base in which the tie is located, which might stimulate the accumulation of social capital within the relevant socio-centric networks to increase his/her return.

In this case, net-base again works as a social device to decrease the costs of managing personal ties. For example, to keep contact with old friends from high school, it is more efficient to utilize the alumni association than to directly manage each tie, as long as it is a salient net-base and your membership is in good standing. You may be required to contribute to the association; however, the entire cost is much smaller than controlling individual ties. Moreover, sharing a net-base attribute makes it easier for strangers to become acquainted. Thus, net-base reduces the cost of not only keeping and recovering old ties but also of extending new ones.
The previous discussion implies from the viewpoint of net-base management that social capital includes the free-rider problem. Many researchers point to types of social capital that appear as public goods (or joint goods [Hechter, 1987]); however, in our view the free rider is an inherent problem in generating social capital. In a sense, it is net-base rather than social capital that appears as joint goods. For a net-base to be a relevant socio-centric network that enhances the accumulation of social capital, a significant number of its members must invest in it, or it will be disorganized and lose its ability to generate social capital.

In summary, in the net-base theory of social capital, relational theory is linked with action theory, especially with rational choice theory. In other words, social capital is located at the intersection between micro-macro links in relational and action theories.

4. Empirical Evidence
If we accept social capital as an analogy, empirical proof is important. Using the framework of the net-base theory of social capital, we conducted a random sampling Internet survey in November and December 2012. The population consists of the web monitors of Rakuten Research, for age between 25 and 55, and living in Kyushu area, Japan. From this data, we inferred the accumulation of social capital in terms of net-base indices. The designed sample size was 6,000, and the total sample was equally divided in advance between male and female. The effective sample counts were 970 (the collection rate was 16.2 percent).

Net-base diversity is measured in two ways: The first index shows the number of net-bases related to intimate friends (with whom the respondents have meals or engage in leisure activities several times a year). The respondents chose as many corresponding net-bases as possible among the list of fifteen categories (see Figure 2 for the list). Of nineteen categories presented, the second index shows the number of groups and association gatherings in which the respondents participated in the past two years.

We also added fundamental daily neighborhood interactions. As neighborhoods
still have significance at the core of the community, specifically with regard to regional risk management, there is reason to see investment in bonding capital in this respect. The questionnaire included the frequency of neighborhood activities such as chatting, item exchanging, sharing tea or meals, consulting on various matters, and helping in times of illness. We constructed an index of neighborhood investment by rating each activity between four (“often”) and one (“never”) and summing up points of the four activities.

These indices demonstrate in what net-bases, how widely, and how much the respondents have invested. We then approached the configuration of salient net-bases with respect to investment. To measure return, we asked the respondents about their experiences receiving help (in the past five years from someone other than a family member) in the following two categories:

*Monetary returns:* Receiving monetary assistance (loans, guarantees, etc.)
*Informational returns:* Receiving important information or advice regarding the respondents’ or their family members’ life plans or occupational and educational progress.

Respondents who positively answered were additionally asked to choose net-bases they share with donors of money and information among the same list of net-base categories as Figure 2. This makes it possible to determine through what net-base the respondents received help and thus which net-base is more salient in the return phase.

At first, we focused on investment in friend net-bases. As the net-base categories for this index are the same as those for returns, we can directly compare the salience of net-bases between investment and return. In Figure 2, a solid line indicates the proportion of respondents who have friends (or investors) in each net-base. The fourteen net-base categories (except for “other”) are in order of investment rate. Two broken lines indicate the proportion of respondents who received monetary or information returns through each net-base respectively.

The “workplace” net-base is the most salient in the investment phase, showing a rate of investment by 51 percent of respondents. In the informational return phase,
“workplace” is the most salient net-base, in which 29 percent of the respondents received help, and the rate of 13 percent for monetary returns was the third highest. Investment in school-related net-bases, especially in the “high school” (38 percent) and “elementary/middle school” (32 percent) categories, follow “workplace.” The “high school” net-base indicates informational returns of 16 percent, while monetary returns in the “elementary/middle school” net-base represent 7 percent, both being the fourth highest. Regarding informational returns, “university” and “hobby circle” categories have a relatively high salience in both the investment and return phases. The “relative” net-base is noteworthy because it provides extremely high monetary returns (48 percent) and the second-highest returns for information (18 percent), while the investment rate is relatively low at 14 percent.  

Figure 2. The Salience of Net-Base in Investment and Return

Additionally, we introduced “efficiency of investment,” which is calculated based on the proportion of investors in the Xi net-base who obtained monetary or informational returns from this same net-base. Table 1 indicates efficiency of each net-base in connection to the two types of return. (Net-base categories are in order of the average.) We confirmed the saliency of the “relative” net-base in the return phase,
indicating a high rate of efficiency for monetary returns. In the informational return phase, work-related net-bases are highly efficient. In fact, the “occupational organization” category is the most efficient net-base, while “workplace” ranked third. “Business transaction” also indicated relatively high efficiency for informational returns.

In conclusion, the “relative” net-base efficiently produces high returns in both money and information phases, which suggests active bonding capital accumulation in that group. Conversely, the high level of informational returns in work-related net-bases implies bridging capital accumulation that is stimulated by the connections between various occupational groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. The Efficiency of Net-Base Investments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Occupational organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Introduced by relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Business transaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Hobby circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High-school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hometown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Resident organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elementary/middle school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Social activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To examine how investment generally affects returns, we conducted a logistic regression analysis. Whether or not the respondent obtained money or information is the dependent variable. For independent variables related to investment, we used the diversity indices for friends and association participation and the index of neighborhood investment. Controlled variables include some ascribed and socio-economic characteristics, namely, sex, age, and education (number of years in
The opportunity to obtain informational returns is greater for females than males, while the opportunity for monetary returns is related to education level. Overall, the effects of ascribed and socio-economic variables are weak. Controlling for these variables, investment variables show significant positive effects on returns. “Friend investment” consistently increased the opportunity of obtaining informational and monetary returns, and “association investment” indicates a strong effect specifically on informational returns. The effects of net-base diversity imply that the bridging accumulation of social capital is ongoing within friend and association networks and that people utilize various networks for different purposes.

It is noteworthy that “neighborhood investment” indicates weak but consistent positive effects on informational and monetary returns. Remembering its low rate of investment efficiency in Table 1, this result implies that the accumulation of bonding capital in the “neighborhood” net-base should have some extended effects on creating returns via other net-bases. In a sense, this bonding capital might be very close to moral bonds in Durkheim’s (1893) terminology.

**Table 2. Logistic Regression Analysis for Returns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Informational returns</th>
<th>Monetary returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Exp(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (1=male)</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend investment</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association investment</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood investment</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>1076.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox-Snell R²</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke R²</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5. Conclusion**

Social capital is an analogical concept that cannot be directly observed, which is why
we need a theoretical device to infer its accumulation process. Various theoretical frameworks could serve this purpose and social capital is an arena where theories of this kind compete. We are convinced that the net-base theory we have presented is a strong contestant that can contribute to constructing a synthesized theory of social capital.\textsuperscript{10} A purpose of this paper is to illustrate the general properties of social capital theory. Net-base theory consists of two axioms that connect the net-base framework with social capital by focusing on socio-centric networks as the capital accumulation mechanism. Technically, net-base makes it possible to utilize personal network data to grasp the functioning of socio-centric networks. Thus, a desirable theory of social capital should refer to the mechanism that conditions the accumulation process of social capital in a measurable way. Generally, theoretical assumptions are necessary to incorporate an analogical concept into a positive conceptual framework. Previous studies on social capital did not pay much attention to this point.

The goal of competition in the arena of social capital is cooperative—namely, to construct an integrated relational theory in sociology. As we discussed earlier, social capital is located at the intersection between micro-macro links in relational and action theories. It should work widely as a synthesizer and could make progressive breakthroughs in sociological theory. It is regretful that our paper’s discussion may not thoroughly represent the functioning of social capital as a synthesizer. In this respect, we expect the further development of the net-base theory of social capital and of competitive theories. For instance, Misumi (2010, 2013) explores the mechanism of solidarity as social capital by focusing on the functioning of net-base as a symbol. This study synthesizes two relational theories under the concept of social capital: Hechter’s (1987) rational choice framework for group solidarity and Schutz’s (1962) symbol theory. Depending on the context in which we explore the social capital accumulation process, what relational theory we utilize will be different. Possibly any relational theory could appear in this arena of theorization.

This paper’s shortcomings consist of a limited analytical focus on the direct benefits for social capital. As Bourdieu (1986) and Coleman (1988) emphasize,
form transformation of capital is an inherent property in the general capital accumulation process. At the macro level, this issue represents the relationship between economic system and social structure. This transformation may emphasize the significance of economy in society. Social capital is then “capital,” as long as it is finally transformed into economic capital. Conversely, it may suggest an economic system that is embedded in social structure (Granovetter, 1985). Parallel to Fukuyama’s (1995) discussion on trust, social structure should work similarly to infrastructure for a well-functioning economic system. To suitably examine this fundamental problem, we need to grasp the process of capital transformation as a whole by collecting data using a qualitative approach. Thus, social capital will open a dialog between quantitative and qualitative researches.
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Footnotes
1) The Japanese yen (緣) well represents this type of connection (karma in Buddhism) and its function in social life.
2) Should we say “in people’s imagination,” following Anderson (1983). The concept of a socio-centric network in the net-base framework is closer to idealism than realism.
3) Misumi (2008) illustrates how to capture the net-base configurations from individual-based survey data by applying the affiliation matrix method.
4) Investment and return can be measured while leaving the mechanism of capital accumulation in a black box. Depending on what mechanism we focus on, the measurement for investment and return will differ. For instance, many researchers treat trust as an element of the capital accumulation process; however, it could represent returns created by social networks for certain democratic problems.
5) It is reasonable to see this hidden bridge as a strong tie. Moreover, the entire graph in Figure 1 could consist of strong ties. The active participation of actor X in both net-bases, A and B, does not necessarily mean that every member of A and B become
friends, intermediated by strong ties with X, because social activity in each net-base might be completely separate. Thus, the net-base framework explains why researchers often find strong ties working in bridging capital accumulation, contrary to Granovetter’s (1974) assertion.

6) Coffé and Geys (2007) do not clearly discuss by what mechanism an association with high diversity can create bridging capital.

7) In the question of intimate friends, I directed respondents to exclude family and relatives, but included ‘relative’ in the list of net-base categories. As a result, in fact 111 respondents chose “relative” as a relevant net-base (104 out of these 111 respondents multiply chose it along with other net-bases). Presently, we include these cases for further analysis. For reference, “resident organization” includes the PTA, women’s and seniors’ associations, and “social activity” includes volunteer and co-op movements.

8) Marschall and Stolle (2004) emphasize the importance of neighborhood diversity in creating generalized trust. As they suggest, especially in heterogeneous communities, bonding capital is necessarily linked with bridging capital.

9) As I noticed in footnote 7), the low rate of investment for the “relative” net-base could include measurement errors. The same notice should be required for efficiency that I will introduce soon later.

10) Social network analysis is a strong contestant, too; moreover, its analysis is directly related to the net-base framework. However, they are not substitutable. While the former grasps the socio-centric network structures measured by sociometric methods, the latter focuses on the interrelationship between socio-centric networks based on individual-based survey data. It is an important task for us to synthesize these two frameworks.
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