

Summer 2012

Caregivers' Social Capital and Satisfaction with their Children's Service Providers

Joseph Galaskiewicz

University of Arizona, galaskie@u.arizona.edu

George Hobor

Colgate University, ghobor@colgate.edu

Beth Duckles

Bucknell University, bmd009@bucknell.edu

Olga V. Mayorova

American Sociological Association, mayorova@asanet.org

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/fac_journal



Part of the [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#), and the [Work, Economy and Organizations Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Galaskiewicz, Joseph; Hobor, George; Duckles, Beth; and Mayorova, Olga V.. "Caregivers' Social Capital and Satisfaction with their Children's Service Providers." *Sociological Perspectives* 55, no. 2 (2012) : 241-266.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Research and Publications at Bucknell Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Journal Articles by an authorized administrator of Bucknell Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcadmin@bucknell.edu.

CAREGIVERS' SOCIAL CAPITAL AND SATISFACTION WITH THEIR CHILDREN'S SERVICE PROVIDERS

JOSEPH GALASKIEWICZ
University of Arizona

GEORGE HOBOR
Colgate University

BETH M. DUCKLES
Bucknell University

OLGA V. MAYOROVA
American Sociological Association

ABSTRACT: *The authors examine children's access to and caregiver's satisfaction with organizations that provide leisure time activities for children on Saturdays. The authors argue that access and satisfaction are a function of families' financial, cultural, and social capital. Using data on 1,036 households in the Phoenix metropolitan area in 2003–04, the authors found that families' financial and cultural capital affected whether or not children participated in activities organized by organizations, but family ties to the organization directly (e.g., either worked there, volunteered, donated) resulted in caregivers being more satisfied with the services. The authors also found that the benefits of network closure (caregivers knowing the parents of the other children on site) were greater the riskier the activities of the child (e.g., sports or cheerleading). Contrary to the authors' expectations, having family or friends in the area did not affect caregiver's satisfaction with the child's provider.*

Keywords: social capital, leisure activities, children

Parents' success in finding quality organizational providers for their children's leisure activities depends upon their having financial, cultural, and social capital. While there is plentiful research on the importance of families' financial and cultural capital, research on parents' social capital is lacking. We look at children's extracurricular activities as a type of routine consumer choice made by families.

Address correspondence to: Joseph Galaskiewicz, Department of Sociology, University of Arizona, 1145 East South Campus Drive, Tucson, AZ 85721; e-mail: galaskie@email.arizona.edu.

Sociological Perspectives, Vol. 55, Issue 2, pp. 241–266, ISSN 0731-1214, electronic ISSN 1533-8673.

© 2012 by Pacific Sociological Association. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Rights and Permissions website, at <http://www.ucpressjournals.com/reprintinfo.asp>. DOI: 10.1525/sop.2012.55.2.241

We borrow from the work of DiMaggio and Louch (1998), Buskens and Weesie (2000), Warde and Tampubolon (2002), de Ruijter, van der Lippe, and Raub (2003), and Chang (2004) in looking at the role of social capital in helping families make these decisions.

We argue that parents and guardians who have more financial and cultural resources are more likely to find organized leisure time activities for their children; in addition, parents who have richer social resources or better social capital are likely to express greater satisfaction with the organizational provider. Furthermore, we expect that networks have special value when the risk of harm to the child is greater. That is, having network ties, when the activity could be harmful, will significantly increase the parents' confidence in and satisfaction with providers.

FINANCIAL, CULTURAL, AND SOCIAL CAPITAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN

There is considerable interest in what children do when not in school and not at home (for time-use studies, see Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006; Hofferth and Sandberg 2001; Medrich, Roizen, Rubin, and Buckley 1982; Timmer, Eccles, and O'Brien 1985). Research has focused on afterschool programs, tutoring, recreational sports, participation in school government, club activities, competitive sports, scouting, church attendance, and volunteering. Some of the beneficial outcomes associated with participation in organized activities include higher test scores and class grades (Cooper, Valentine, Nye, and Lindsay 1999), improved graduation rates (Kahne and Bailey 1999), higher levels of school engagement or motivation (Valentine, Cooper, Bettencourt, and DuBois 2002), higher self-esteem and educational and occupational aspirations (Marsh and Kleitman 2002; Zimmer, Duggan, Howard, and Sturmer 2001), lower levels of delinquency (Hoffmann and Xu 2002), and higher levels of political participation (McFarland and Thomas 2006).

Finding Organizational Venues

The literature has shown that not all families and children have access to the same opportunities. An important subfield in the sociology of childhood and family sociology focuses on inequality and how different children and parents have better or worse access to cultural resources. Corsaro (2005) labels these reproductive theories. Recently, research has demonstrated the importance of financial and cultural capital on children's access to high-quality extracurricular activities. For example, Lareau (2002; 2003; see also Adler and Adler 1994) found that social class is critical in explaining children's participation in organized leisure time activities outside the home. Those with more financial capital can pay for higher quality experiences. That is, they have the disposable income and wealth that enables them to pay premium prices and to absorb costs of finding those services for their children. Those who have more cultural capital, which often accompanies financial capital, can better sort out what will and will not benefit their children the most. According to Bourdieu, cultural capital includes acquired tastes and practices, formal education, and possession of valued goods

(Sallaz and Zavisca 2007). Education can be especially helpful in negotiating with those who administer and provide services. These cultural frames are rooted in the lived experiences of those who are upper, middle, and lower class and influence the tactics of parents as they seek out worthwhile experiences for their children.

Social Capital and Parental Satisfaction

There is less research on parents' use of their social networks to access high-quality, organizational opportunities for their children. Building on Granovetter (1985), we argue that some families are embedded in a set of social relations that present parents with options and opportunities and others are not. Sometimes these ties are to individuals who provide support and information; sometimes these ties are to organizations. Small (2009) calls the latter organizational embeddedness. Like the authors who do time-use studies, we examine children's extracurricular or leisure time activities, but we are interested in how parents' networks give them and their children advantages in finding quality providers. In the vast literature on education, day care/family care, consumer behavior, and leisure and recreational activities, there is surprisingly little research on how parents convert their network ties into social capital to find meaningful activities for their children (for an exception, see Brown and Reingen 1987). While social capital often accompanies cultural capital (Marsden 1987; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Brashears 2006), we expect that it exerts an independent effect on finding high-quality organized activities for children.

GETTING INFORMATION THROUGH FRIENDS AND FAMILY

When deciding on leisure time activities for a child, the first source of information is friends and family. These are reliable sources because they supposedly know the child and what she or he might value. They also know parents' preferences. Friends and family may also have children of their own who have used a provider in the past and thus can give a firsthand account of what the parent might expect. This assures the parent not only of the trustworthiness of a provider but also of its competence, costs, and how the provider might benefit the child. Not everyone, however, has family and friends nearby. Recent arrivals to the city may not have friends or family who preceded them. This could happen after a natural disaster like Hurricane Katrina, because of divorce or a "falling out" with one's family back home, or it could result because people move to improve their economic situation, as in the case of immigrant labor and professionals. Families without close ties nearby may be able to find venues, but they may have more difficulty finding high-quality venues and will have to settle for something less.

Hypothesis 1: Parents who have friends and/or family in the area are more likely to judge the management and staff of organizations their children use as competent, trustworthy, and excellent.

PRIOR TIES WITH PROVIDERS

In the economic sociology literature, research has shown that prior connections to prospective trustees are especially useful when deciding whom to trust (Granovetter 1985; Gulati 1995). For example, in his study of small firms seeking financing, Uzzi (1999) demonstrated that lending officers often relied on their personal ties to prospective borrowers to get information on past loan behavior and their character. For our study, if the parent is a donor or volunteer in a nonprofit, someone in the household works for or patronizes the provider for other purposes, or the parent socializes with a potential provider, he or she has more information on the facilities and staff and should be more satisfied with whom he or she finally decides to use.

Ties also provide parents with some control. Vendors are careful not to exploit consumers they know because a breach in trust damages friendships as well as repeat business. According to Macaulay (1963:63), in doing business “personal relationships ... exert pressures for conformity to expectations.” DiMaggio and Louch (1998) found that this explained why consumers preferred doing business with people in their personal networks when engaging in costly transactions where uncertainty is high, like buying a car or a home. This ensures better information on the prospective seller and provides a means to exercise social control if the transaction goes badly.

Hypothesis 2: If parents or someone from their household had prior business or personal ties to providers, they are more likely to judge the management and staff of organizations their children used as competent, trustworthy, and excellent.

NETWORK CLOSURE WITH PARENTS

On the network level, one can also gain control over vendors through ties with third parties. This control comes in many forms; the most common is gossip. Having closed networks provides feedback on how someone behaved when doing business with someone else. Coleman (1990) argued that knowing someone who knows the one you are dealing with provides valuable information about the person's past and current behavior. As Granovetter (1985) argued, firsthand experience with an individual allows you to know how he or she will behave in the future. Without experience, the second best strategy is to know someone who has done business with that person before. In their study of the credit card market in Russia, Guseva and Rona-Tas (2001) described how the absence of credit bureaus and other such institutions eliminated the availability of reliable, statistical estimates of an applicant's credit worthiness. Russian banks had to use familial and friendship networks to acquire information on potential cardholders to assess their trustworthiness. Burt and Knez (1995) found that gossip was a valuable source of secondhand knowledge about others in their research on managers in a high-tech firm. Having third-party ties also puts the user in a position to ruin the vendor's reputation if the latter defects, which increases the user's control.

Coleman (1988) argued that knowing the parents of the children with whom your children associate, or "network closure," provides families with information that enables them to make better decisions regarding their children and to better control their behavior. Coleman's work used network measures as well as indirect indicators of network closure, such as family residential mobility, attendance at Catholic schools, two-parent households, and church attendance (see also Bryk and Schneider 2002; Carbonaro 1998; Furstenberg and Hughes 1995; Hagan, MacMillan, and Wheaton 1996; McLanahan and Sandefur 1994; Sui-Chu and Willms 1996). We believe that the benefits of closure can also result in parents feeling better about the providers their children use. Just as parents can exchange information on what their children are doing, they also can exchange information on common providers.

Hypothesis 3: If parents know the parents of other children utilizing the same provider, they are more likely to judge the management and staff of organizations their children used as competent, trustworthy, and excellent.

The Contingent Value of Social Networks

Social networks seem to deliver the most benefits when uncertainty is high (Podolny 1994; Stuart 2000), options are difficult to compare (Burt 1997; Stuart 1998), or accountability is low (Mizruchi, Stearns, and Marquis 2006). Under these circumstances decision-makers must find referents and trust their advice. Sometimes these referents are institutionalized (e.g., ratings services); sometimes they are informal (e.g., word-of-mouth networks).

We argue that networks will increase the confidence in, trust in, and satisfaction with a provider when the user is more vulnerable to the vendor (Coleman 1990). When faced with potential losses, users will turn to others for information and assurance. As Cook (2001:xix) argues, "when the costs of misplaced trust are high, individuals often try to solve the problem of trust by relying on family members or other kin, assuming them to be more trustworthy than strangers. ... In the absence of kin-like relations or access to family members, people often turn to close associates or fellow group members for assistance. ... Embedding the act of trust in a network of social relations is a move that often reduces both uncertainty and vulnerability."

Specifically, when children engage in activities that could result in significant harm, parents will feel better about the provider if they know the parents of the other children present. This provides another avenue for information on what is happening on site. It also enables the parent to mobilize others who can bring pressure to bear on the providers if they behave irresponsibly. When children are involved in activities where the potential for harm is low, knowing the parents of other children probably has little effect on parents' ratings of providers. But when things can go terribly wrong, those with networks will realize benefits not experienced by isolates. The returns on social capital are more pronounced when risk is greater.

Hypothesis 4: When their children engage in activities where the potential for harm is greater, parents who know the parents of other children present are more likely to judge the management and staff of organizations their children used as competent, trustworthy, and excellent.

Other Factors Affecting Access to Quality Vendors

In addition to financial, cultural, and social capital, other factors can affect parents' access to quality organizational providers. For example, as the number of children increases, there are more children for whom to find opportunities and experiences. This is expensive and can also tax the time and energy of parents, since children of different ages need different things that are often scheduled at the same time. If there is only one parent, this problem is compounded. There is one less scheduler, driver, and parent to bear witness at the site. The latter is especially important, because being at the site of the child's activities gives parents and guardians firsthand information on what is going on. If there are more children or there is only one parent, the odds of parents being on site during their child's activities are reduced. This makes parents less certain about providers, since they have only their children's report of what happens on site.

Furthermore, families' structural position in the community can affect their access to quality providers. This refers to their in-group and out-group status. One dimension of status is whether families are "newcomers" to the community or "old-timers." Kasarda and Janowitz (1974), among others, have studied length of residence as a measure of community socialization and its relationship to several outcomes, such as attachment to the community, cognitive definitions and image of community, and rich and thick local networks (Janowitz 1978). For our purposes, an important part of community socialization is learning about one's community and its resources. Families who have been in their community longer have more experiences, have heard more, and are in a position to better evaluate prospective providers. Thus, they are more likely to patronize high-quality vendors. In/out-group status is also a function of being employed full-time and participating in voluntary associations such as a church. If parents work full-time or they are active in a church, they have the opportunity to hear things. They also have a way to learn how to evaluate potential providers, because they hear how others evaluate their children's providers.

Another dimension of in-group/out-group status is race and ethnicity. The impact of race and ethnicity on children's leisure time activities is complex. On the one hand, parents and children who are members of the out-group may feel discrimination based on in-group preferences for those unlike themselves. On the other hand, Wilson (1996) argues that the legacy of racism means that minorities, and particularly blacks, often find themselves in neighborhoods lacking organizational resources (Small and McDermott 2006). In either case, minorities should be less satisfied than the dominant groups with their providers.

Finally, being satisfied with a provider may depend on the activity. Individual, dual, or team sports (including cheerleading) may garner more enthusiasm from parents because the child may enjoy these activities more. Cultural activities such as religious classes, art, dance, or music classes, and even tutoring, may be very important to parents, and parents may pay more attention to these. Of course, the salience or significance of some activity may elicit a negative as much as a positive response. Also, whether or not the parents pay for the activity may influence their level of satisfaction with the provider. They may value activities more if they have to pay for them.

METHODOLOGY

We collected information on what 1,036 children, between the ages of 5 and 12, in the Phoenix-Mesa, Arizona, metropolitan area did on Saturdays during the school year. The Institute for Social Science Research (then called the Survey Research Lab) at Arizona State University and our team at the University of Arizona began collecting data in September 2003 and finished in February 2004. We selected study participants using random digit dialing methods (e.g., Bianchi and Robinson 1997; Harvey 1999) excluding cell phones.¹ Busy signals and no-answers were tried ten times at varying times of day before they were finally coded as no answers. However, if we had any hint that it was a residential number (e.g., an answering machine did not self-identify as a business or organization), we continued trying to call up to twenty attempts. Calls varied in terms of the time of day, and calls were made seven days a week. Because issues of recall were unavoidable, interviewers were instructed to create rapport with the respondents to encourage more accurate responses. Respondents for the phone survey were not paid for their participation. We had the interview translated into Spanish, and Spanish-language interviews accounted for 19.4 percent (or 201) of the 1,036 calls completed (Edwards 2004).

Our cooperation rate, which is the percentage of numbers we called (27,788) where the respondent on the other end was cooperative (15,283), was 55 percent (Edwards 2004). Non-respondents (in the denominator) included refusals to participate in the study, partial interviews, numbers we could not contact, and an estimate of households that would be eligible for our survey but were unknown to be occupied or otherwise unknown at the time we called. Upon making contact, we asked if the participants had children between 5 and 12 years of age living there at least five days a week. The percentage of cooperating households that met this criterion was 6.8, which eliminated many of the respondents with whom we made contact. This means that our overall response rate was $.550 * .068 = 3.7$ percent. However, if we take into account the number of households with children between 5 and 12 years of age, the estimated revised response rate was 22.7 percent.²

After obtaining a list of all children in our age range living within the household, the interviewer randomly selected one child and asked to speak to the adult who had the best knowledge about the child's activities on the previous Saturday.³ Of the respondents, 93.4 percent were parents; the rest included legal guardians, grandparents, aunts/uncles, older brothers/sisters, and other; one person refused to identify himself or herself. We then asked the adult for a diary of the child's activities for that day, starting at midnight on Friday and ending at midnight on Saturday (Robinson 1999). We suspended interviews during the Thanksgiving, Christmas, and New Year's holiday weeks.

To supplement the survey, we conducted fifty-five face-to-face interviews with respondents who were parents or guardians of the children. The interviews were a stratified purposive sample taken from the larger sample of households. We selected households based on household income, the ethnicity (Hispanic and non-Hispanic) of the child, the length of time the family lived in the Phoenix metropolitan area, and the respondent's expressed willingness to speak with us further. After the surveys were completed, we recontacted the respondents by phone. The interviews were semi-structured and conducted in a neutral location

or at the respondents' homes. Most interviews lasted anywhere from 30 minutes to an hour or more, and we asked questions about how respondents found activities for their child and the kinds of activities in which the child was involved. We asked respondents to tell us about their fears in finding activities and how they decided to trust the providers they used. We use the qualitative research to interpret our findings from the telephone survey.

Dependent Variables

To test our hypotheses, we had to see whether or not the child had access to activities organized by an organization. This was measured with four questions. First we asked, "I would like to know what [child's initials] did outside the home last Saturday. Begin at midnight on Friday to midnight on Saturday. Start with the morning and then talk about what they did later in the afternoon and evening. What was the first thing he or she did (e.g., play at a park, play video games, play baseball, eat out, play soccer, swim)?" Second, we asked, "Was this activity organized by an organization such as [child's initials] school, a sports league, the city parks department, or the YMCA, for example?" If the respondent hesitated, we probed, "Did this activity take place in a household or some other location?" The options for the interviewer to record were: (1) household, (2) organization/business, and (3) other location. Third, we asked, "What is the name of the [household/the organization or business] where they went?" For organizations or businesses, we then asked, "And where it is located?" Finally, we asked, "Was going to [the household/organization/business/other location] designed primarily to benefit the child or was the child just accompanying an adult?" A child was coded as having engaged in a beneficial activity organized by an organization if the respondent answered "organization/business" to the second question and either "benefit the child" or "benefit both child and adult" to the fourth question. We subsequently used the given name of the organization and the location, provided by the parent, as a way to check that the activity was indeed provided by a functioning organization or business.

We thus drew a distinction between household respondents and activities. As noted, we had 1,036 household respondents with data on one child per household. These respondents reported on activities outside the home that both benefited and did not benefit the child. One hundred and ninety-six households reported no activities for the child outside the home on the previous Saturday. An additional ninety-six households reported children participating in activities outside the home but not to the benefit of the child (e.g., running an errand with an adult). Thus, 28.2 percent of the children had no activities outside the home or participated in no activities that benefited them. One participant refused to tell us if it benefited the child or not.

Considering only activities that were outside the home and benefited the child, 743 children participated in 1,256 activities on the previous Saturday. Of these, 167 (13.3 percent) were eating activities, 179 (14.3 percent) were personal care activities (shopping, doctors' visits, haircuts), 154 (12.3 percent) were team sports (e.g., soccer, football, baseball), 14 (1.1 percent) were dual sports (e.g., tennis, boxing), 6 (0.5 percent) were cheerleading, 13 (1.0 percent) were arts/performances,

26 (2.1 percent) were educational (e.g., tutoring), 8 (0.6 percent) were hobbies/games, 137 (10.9 percent) were physical activity/individual sports (e.g., hiking, biking, go-karting), 157 (12.5 percent) were simply play, 212 (16.9 percent) were social activities (e.g., visiting, partying, sleepovers), 88 (7.0 percent) were spectator events (e.g., going to a movie, attending a festival or sporting event), 26 (2.1 percent) were religious, 66 (5.2 percent) were miscellaneous activities (e.g., animal care, looking for a house, travel out of town, helping parent at work), and 3 (0.2 percent) were missing data.⁴

As noted, after the respondent named the activity, we asked, "Was this activity organized by an organization such as [the child's name] school, a sports league, the city parks department, or the YMCA, for example?" In this article we only analyzed data on activities that were organized by an organization and that benefited the child ($N = 650$). This is because we only asked detailed questions about parents'/guardians' opinions of these providers. It is important to remember that only 372 different children (or households) participated in the 650 activities organized by an organization. Table 1 gives a breakdown of all the activities that we studied, those that were organized by an organization and those that were not, and the percentage of children engaging in each activity. Of the 1,256 activities, 650 (51.7 percent) were "organized activities" provided by organizations or businesses, 194 (15.5 percent) were unorganized activities at business or organizational sites (e.g., a shopping mall, a public park, a schoolyard), and 412 (32.8 percent) were unorganized activities at other households, in the street or desert, or "in our neighborhood."

The key dependent variables were the parents' perceptions of the staff's competence, the staff's trustworthiness, and the overall experience with the vendor who provided services for their child.⁵ We created a composite measure of the three items, since the distribution for each item was highly skewed. We asked questions for all organized activities provided by businesses or organizations. First, we asked, "How would you rate the staff's competency?" Of the 650 activities, 427 were deemed "very competent" (coded 4), 189 "somewhat competent" (coded 3), 9 "not very competent" (coded 2), 2 "not competent at all" (coded 1), and 23 respondents said they did not know, refused to answer, or did not respond. Second, we asked, "How would you rate the trustworthiness of the staff? Would you say they are very trustworthy, somewhat trustworthy, not very trustworthy, or not trustworthy at all?" Three hundred and seventy-three respondents said "very trustworthy" (coded 4), 216 said "somewhat trustworthy" (coded 3), 9 said "not very trustworthy" (coded 2), 4 said "not trustworthy at all" (coded 1), and 48 said they did not know, refused to answer, or simply did not respond.⁶ Third, we asked, "Overall, how would you rate your experience with this organization or business? Would you say it was excellent, good, somewhat poor, or very poor?" This distribution was also skewed: 348 said "excellent" (coded 4), 287 said "good" (coded 3), 9 said "somewhat poor" (coded 2), and 1 said "very poor" (coded 1). Five either refused or said they did not know. The means and standard deviations for these three items are listed in Table 2. Using these three items we created an additive index. Given that there were missing data, we generated an index based on the items on which we had data. With all three items included, $\alpha = .704$, with an average inter-item correlation

TABLE 1
The Activities Provided by Different Providers

	<i>Percentage of All Activities (N = 1,256)</i>	<i>Percentage of All Children (N = 1,036)</i>
<i>Organized Activities at Businesses, Churches, Government/Tribal Agencies, or Nonprofits</i>		
Arts/performance	0.6	0.6
Cheerleading	0.4	0.3
Dual sports	0.9	0.7
Eat/shop/personal services	23.8	12.6
Educational	1.5	1.2
Hobbies/games	0.2	0.3
Miscellaneous	1.0	0.8
Missing	0.2	0.1
Physical activity/individual sports	3.0	2.4
Play	0.6	0.4
Religious	1.7	1.6
Social activities	2.3	1.7
Spectator event	5.5	2.7
Team sports	10.0	10.5
Total	51.7 (N = 650)	35.9 (N = 372)
<i>Unorganized Activities at Businesses, Churches, Governmental/Tribal, or Nonprofits</i>		
Arts/performance	0.1	0.1
Cheerleading	0.1	0.0
Dual sports	0.2	0.1
Eat/shop/personal services	2.5	1.5
Educational	0.5	0.5
Hobbies/games	0.0	0.0
Miscellaneous	0.2	0.1
Missing	0.0	0.0
Physical activity/individual sports	3.5	3.1
Play	4.1	3.8
Religious	0.4	0.3
Social activities	0.9	0.3
Spectator event	1.4	1.0
Team sports	1.7	1.4
Total	15.5 (N = 194)	12.1 (N = 125)
<i>Unorganized Activities at Households, Neighbors' Homes, in the Street or Desert, or Missing Provider</i>		
Arts/performance	0.3	0.4
Cheerleading	0.0	0.0
Dual sports	0.1	0.0
Eat/shop/personal services	1.3	0.5
Educational	0.1	0.0
Hobbies/games	0.4	0.5
Miscellaneous	4.1	4.1
Missing	0.0	0.0

(Continued)

TABLE 1
The Activities Provided by Different Providers (Continued)

	<i>Percentage of All Activities (N = 1,256)</i>	<i>Percentage of All Children (N = 1,036)</i>
Physical activity/individual sports	4.5	3.0
Play	7.7	5.7
Religious	0.0	0.0
Social activities	13.7	9.1
Spectator event	0.2	0.1
Team sports	0.6	0.5
Total	32.8 (N = 412)	23.7 (N = 246)
<i>No Activities and No Providers</i>		
		28.3 (N = 293)
Totals	100.0 (N = 1,256)	100.0 (N = 1,036)

of .445. We then scaled the item to take on values between 0 and 1. The descriptive statistics for the index are listed in Table 2 as well.

Independent Variables

For the first hypothesis we used two items for our measures of care-giving networks. Because we were interested in gathering data on family and friendship ties, we asked who could help the respondent care for his or her children. We asked two items of all 1,036 respondents. First, "Do you have any family members in the Valley area that you call on for help with child care?" Second, "Do you have any friends, acquaintances, or former spouses in the Valley area that you call on for help with child care?" Out of the 1,036 respondents, 534 said that they had friends, acquaintances, or ex-spouses in the Valley (3 refused to answer) and 500 said they had family in the Valley (3 refused to answer). The correlation between these variables was modest (.319), so we created dummy variables for each.

The questions used to operationalize the independent variables for Hypotheses 2 and 3 were only asked of respondents whose children participated in an organizational activity. To measure if a member of the household had a direct prior connection to the business or organization, we asked, "Do you or any household members have business or personal ties to [the provider organization]?" We first asked if there was a connection or not, and then if the person worked there, volunteered labor, served as a director, donated money, or was a member. A 1 meant some connection ($n = 82$) and 0 meant no connection ($n = 566$). Only two respondents did not answer.

Measuring closure was more complicated. For the 650 activities that were organized by organizations or businesses, we first asked, "Were there other children present?" Five hundred and eight said yes (78.2 percent), 141 said no (21.7 percent),

TABLE 2

Descriptive Statistics ($N = 650$ Activities Organized by Organizations Outside the Home That Benefited the Child)

	<i>Observations</i>	Mean	SD	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
<i>Dependent variable:</i>					
Parent thinks provider "very competent"	627	3.66	.522	1	4
Parent thinks provider "very trustworthy"	602	3.59	.559	1	4
Parent thinks provider "excellent"	645	3.52	.499	1	4
Composite index	646	.768	.212	.25	1
<i>Activity variables:</i>					
Team/dual/individual sports/cheerleading	647	.244	.430	0	1
Developmental	647	.074	.262	0	1
<i>Child variables:</i>					
Child female	647	.473	.500	0	1
Child's age	650	8.492	2.212	5	12
Child Hispanic	639	.282	.450	0	1
Child non-Hispanic, non-white	639	.111	.315	0	1
<i>Household variables:</i>					
Number of children	650	1.657	.782	1	6
Years living in Phoenix metro area	649	16.44	11.86	0	52
Caregiver not married	646	.192	.394	0	1
Caregiver's years of education	648	14.29	2.92	9	20
Family income in \$1,000s (imputed)	650	78.46	51.32	-.292	250
Family attends church	637	.734	.442	0	1
Parent(s) work full-time	646	.907	.290	0	1
Family in metro area	645	.485	.500	0	1
Friends in metro area	648	.588	.493	0	1
<i>Situational variables:</i>					
Activities were free	647	.170	.376	0	1
Ties to organization	648	.127	.333	0	1
Know all parents of other children on site	507	1.59	.701	0	2
Know other children on site	649	.217	.413	0	1

and one either did not know or refused to answer (0.2 percent). For the most part, other children were not present when the child was shopping or eating with the parent. Of the 508 who said children were present, we then asked, "Do you know the parents of the children who were present?" Three hundred and sixty-three said yes (71.6 percent), 81 said yes but only some of them (16.0 percent), and 63 said no (12.4 percent). We assigned scores of 2, 1, and 0 depending on the respondent's answer.

Unfortunately, we did not ask for the number of other children present, because this could affect the likelihood of respondents knowing the parents of other children.

The fourth hypothesis discussed possible interaction effects. We argued that the effect of social capital on satisfaction would be greater if the child participated in potentially harmful activities. Since we did not have a direct measure of vulnerability or how dangerous an activity is, we based our coding on the degree to which parents thought different activities were potentially harmful.

The in-person interviews helped us to situate our understanding of what parents saw as risky or dangerous situations. Respondents were unanimous in saying that the physical safety of their children was a major concern to them in whatever activity the child was involved, but this was especially true with sports activities. Parents often brought up sports and other physical activities when we pressed them on what safety for their child meant to them. In one interview, the respondent put it this way:

Interviewer: You had mentioned that safety of your child is extremely important. Are you just talking about the well-being, the physical well-being, the mental well-being? What types of safety are you looking at when you're looking at activities for your child?

Respondent: Sometimes it depends on the activity, but like with the swimming and gymnastics, the competency of the instructors for my child's physical safety. Are they going to try and put her on the beam or something her first day there? No.

Several parents mentioned their concern that the coaches of sports teams and sports instructors might not know first aid or have access to a hospital. Some mentioned experiences where a child had gotten hurt at an activity site or their child had come home with an injury. One typical parent discussed her concern for the safety of her child:

"Yeah, I mean I think as a parent whenever your kids are away from you, you always worry, so you want them to be with the hopefully responsible adult and then as well be safe in the activity, especially with sports. You know, do they have the right first aid stuff if they need to, are they taking the right precautions, are they keeping other kids away when someone's swinging a bat, that kind of stuff."

Physical activity came to mind first when many parents talked about safety, suggesting it was the most immediate concern that they had regarding their child's activities. By contrast, only a few respondents mentioned sexual abuse or psychological abuse, such as humiliation, harassment, or stress. None mentioned dangers associated with activities such as shopping, going to the movies, or eating in a restaurant. Respondents only mentioned eating out or socializing as a concern if it was in regards to birthday parties with other children present. One respondent did mention performance anxiety when discussing her son's drama group.

We coded eating, other personal care (such as haircuts and shopping), spectator events, play, religious services, tutoring, and socializing as not potentially harmful experiences. In contrast, team sports, dual sports, individual sports (e.g., swimming, biking, gymnastics, go-karting), and cheerleading were coded as sports

related and potentially harmful. Of the 650 activities organized by organizations and business, 158 were coded this way.

Control Variables

Control variables were also gathered over the phone. We asked about the child's gender, age, and whether he or she was Hispanic, white non-Hispanic, or non-white non-Hispanic. We also asked about household income (the measure of financial resources),⁷ the caregiver's years of education (the measure of cultural resources),⁸ whether the respondent was married or not, years of residence in the Phoenix metro area, and number of children between 5 and 12 years of age. We imputed values using missing-value regression for income only.⁹ In the survey, we asked respondents, "What church or place of worship does your family typically attend, if any?" They either gave the name ($n = 718$), said they did not go ($n = 301$), claimed they didn't know ($n = 8$), refused to answer ($n = 3$), or did not answer ($n = 6$). We coded this variable 0 if the respondents said they did not go and 1 if they gave the name. The rest were coded as missing. We also asked, "Which of the following best describes your work status: Are you working full-time, working part-time, a full-time student, retired, unemployed seeking employment, homemaker, or something else?" Respondents also had the option of not answering. The same item was asked about the spouse, if there was one. We created a dummy variable, where 0 meant neither the respondent nor the spouse was working full-time ($n = 152$) and 1 meant either the respondent or the spouse was working full-time ($n = 877$). We could not code seven households. Descriptive statistics for all variables are presented in Table 2 across the 650 activities organized by organizations which benefited the child.

ANALYSIS

The analysis proceeds in three steps. First, we identified the factors which led children to participate in activities that benefited them. Second, we focused on the factors leading children to participate in organizational activities. Third, we analyzed what factors led parents to express more positive attitudes toward organizational providers.

The results addressing the first research question are provided in Table 3. The units of analysis are the 1,036 households. Model 1 presents the results from a logit model. The dependent variable is whether the child participated in an activity outside the home that benefited him or her (1) or not (0). The model fit the data reasonably well, but the pseudo- R^2 was only .067. Several variables were statistically significant at the .05 level. We can interpret the effects by taking the exponential of the coefficients. With every additional year of education, the odds that the caregiver provided beneficial activities for his or her child increased by 9.8 percent. With every additional \$1,000 in family income, the odds that the caregiver provided beneficial activities for his or her child increased by 0.6 percent. If the household attended church regularly, the odds of having a beneficial activity for the child increased by 48 percent; if the caregiver was single, the odds of having a beneficial activity increased by 53 percent; and if the child was Hispanic (as compared to non-Hispanic white), the odds of the

TABLE 3

Logistic Regressions With Participation in a Beneficial Activity Outside the Home ($N = 1,036$ Households) and Type of Provider as the Dependent Variables ($N = 1,256$ Activities)

<i>Dependent Variables:</i>	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>
<i>Beneficial Activity Outside Home and Participation in an Organizational Activity</i>	<i>Beneficial Activity Outside Home (1 = yes; 0 = no)</i>	<i>Participation in an Organizational Activity (1 = yes; 0 = no)</i>
<i>Independent Variables:</i>	<i>b (SE)</i>	<i>b (Robust SE)</i>
<i>Control variables:</i>		
Child female	-.062 (.149)	.170 (.126)
Child's age	.020 (.032)	-.005 (.028)
Child Hispanic	-.381 (.186)*	-.009 (.155)
Child non-Hispanic, non-white	-.119 (.278)	.112 (.197)
Number of children	-.025 (.084)	.027 (.075)
Years living in Phoenix	.001 (.006)	.001 (.005)
Caregiver not married	.426 (.214)*	.144 (.188)
<i>Financial and cultural capital variables:</i>		
Caregiver's years of education	.093 (.033)**	.047 (.023)*
Family income (in \$1,000s)	.006 (.002)**	.003 (.001)*
<i>Social capital variables:</i>		
Family attends church	.390 (.164)*	.088 (.148)
Parent(s) work full-time	.155 (.218)	.421 (.220) [†]
Family to help with child care	-.092 (.161)	-.185 (.138)
Friends to help with child care	.181 (.159)	.059 (.138)
Constant	-1.123 (.584) [†]	-1.358 (.480)
<i>N</i> of households	987	
<i>N</i> of activities		1,201
LR Chi ² (13)	77.9***	
Wald Chi ² (13)		30.48**
Log likelihood	-546.9	-815.1
Pseudo R ²	.067	.020

[†] $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

child having a beneficial activity decreased by 32 percent. Thus, the financial and cultural capital of caregivers as well as ethnicity, church attendance, and marital status had a major effect on what the child did on Saturdays.

In Table 3, Model 2, we estimated a logistic regression where organization activities were coded as 1 and those that were not were coded as 0. As noted, there were 650 such activities out of a total of 1,256. Now, the 1,256 activities were the units of analysis. Because caregivers often mentioned two or more activities for a child on Saturday, we clustered cases based on household ID and report robust standard errors (see Rogers 1994).¹⁰ The model is a reasonably good fit to the data, but the pseudo- R^2 is small. Only two variables were statistically significant at the .05 level. Again, computing the exponential of the coefficients, we see that with every additional year of caregiver education, the odds of the child using an organization increased by 5 percent. With

every additional \$1,000 of family income, the odds of the child engaging in organized activities increased by 0.3 percent. Church attendance had little effect on having organized activities, but if either parent worked full-time outside the home, the odds of the child using an organizational provider increased by 52 percent ($p = .055$). Thus, we see that financial capital and cultural capital were important in explaining who had engaged in organizational activities outside the home on Saturday.

Hypotheses 1 through 4 speak only to organized activities provided by businesses or organizations ($N = 650$). The results from OLS regression models are listed in Table 4.¹¹ Because activities were the units of analysis and children often did more than one activity on Saturday, we again clustered cases based on household ID and reported robust standard errors. In all three models, our dependent variable is the additive index we created tapping parents' perception of the provider's quality.

Model 1 excludes whether the parent knew the parents of the other children present. Model 2 includes this variable. The reader should note that the number of observations drops from 609 to 477 because only 78 percent of the activities had other children present. There is strong support for Hypothesis 2 but none for Hypothesis 1 or 3. Parents who had prior ties to the provider were more likely to evaluate the organization or business very favorably. However, neither having friends and/or family in the community to help with child care nor knowing more parents of the children at the activity site affected parents' perceptions of the providers.

Among the control variables in Model 1, we found that parents of children who were non-Hispanic black, Asian, or Native American were less satisfied with their children's providers than non-Hispanic whites, parents who had lived in the metro area longer were happier with their children's providers, better educated parents were more satisfied, full-time workers were more satisfied, and parents were more satisfied with providers of sports and developmental activities. Child's gender and age, being Hispanic (in contrast to non-Hispanic white), the number of siblings, family income, attending church, single parenthood, and whether the activity was free had little effect on parents' expressed satisfaction with the provider.

Model 3 added the interaction terms to test Hypothesis 4. The interaction in Model 3 was significant at the .05 level. Thus, while knowing parents of the other children present had a weak negative effect on parental satisfaction if the activity was not potentially harmful, there was a significant increase in parents' return on knowing others if the activity was potentially harmful. That is, if the child was doing sports, parents were more satisfied if they knew more of the parents of the other children present and less satisfied if they knew fewer or no parents of the other children present.

FURTHER ANALYSES

We repeated the analysis with each separate attitudinal item as the dependent variable (table available upon request). We estimated logit models. We dichotomized the dependent variables so that the most favorable responses received a value of 1 and the three less favorable responses were coded 0. Our variables of substantive interest were significant in some analyses but not others. Prior ties to the organization, for example, positively affected perceptions of trustworthiness

TABLE 4

OLS Regression With Parents' Beliefs About the Quality of Their Children's Provider as the Dependent Variable ($N = 650$ Activities Organized by Organizations)

<i>Dependent Variable: Parents' Satisfaction With Provider</i>	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>	<i>Model 3</i>
<i>Independent Variables:</i>	<i>b (Robust SE)</i>	<i>b (Robust SE)</i>	<i>b (Robust SE)</i>
<i>Control Variables:</i>			
Child female	.006 (.018)	.006 (.020)	.002 (.019)
Child's age	.003 (.004)	.004 (.004)	.005 (.004)
Child Hispanic	-.018 (.023)	-.005 (.025)	-.005 (.024)
Child non-Hispanic, non-white	-.066 (.027)*	-.057 (.029) [†]	-.058 (.029)*
Number of children	-.008 (.012)	-.009 (.014)	-.009 (.013)
Years living in Phoenix	.003 (.001)**	.003 (.001)**	.002 (.001)**
Single parent	.022 (.023)	.000 (.027)	.002 (.027)
Family attends church	.011 (.020)	-.002 (.022)	.001 (.022)
Parent(s) work full-time	.069 (.030)*	.079 (.033)*	.082 (.033)*
<i>Financial and Cultural Capital:</i>			
Caregiver's years of education	.008 (.004)*	.002 (.004)	.002 (.004)
Family income (in \$1,000s)	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)
<i>Activity:</i>			
Activity is free	.016 (.026)	.012 (.028)	.019 (.028)
Religious / art / performance / educational	.079 (.037)*	.111 (.036)**	.103 (.036)**
Team/dual/individual sports/cheerleading	.064 (.019)**	.058 (.021)**	.062 (.022)**
<i>Social capital:</i>			
Family in metro area	-.027 (.019)	-.028 (.021)	-.029 (.020)
Friends in metro area	.021 (.019)	.025 (.021)	.025 (.020)
Ties to organization	.089 (.025)**	.074 (.027)**	.072 (.027)**
Know parents of other children on site		-.009 (.015)	-.031 (.018) [†]
<i>Interaction effect:</i>			
Team/dual/individual sports/cheerleading × Know parents of other children on site			.058 (.029)*
Constant	.515 (.067)**	.594 (.078)**	.636 (.078)**
<i>N</i> of activities (max. = 650)	609	477	477
<i>N</i> of children (max. = 372)	347	287	287
<i>F</i>	6.41***	4.14***	4.19***
<i>R</i> -squared	.111	.109	.117

[†] $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

and overall excellence but not perceptions of staff competency. Having friends to help with child care affected perceptions of staff trustworthiness, but only at the .10 level and if knowing parents present was not included in the model. Having

TABLE 5
 Statistics for the Methods Used to Find Out About the Child's Provider

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Observations</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min.</i>	<i>Max.</i>
Drive by / saw it as I passed by	570	.284	.451	0	1
Did research / found on the web	570	.016	.125	0	1
Information from school/NPO/church/library	570	.109	.312	0	1
Ads/fliers/TV	570	.195	.396	0	1
Friend	570	.102	.303	0	1
Family	570	.068	.253	0	1
Neighbors/coaches/parents	570	.037	.189	0	1
Word of mouth	570	.021	.144	0	1
It's always been there	570	.053	.223	0	1
I saw it being built	570	.023	.149	0	1
It is near to where I work	570	.016	.125	0	1
It is near our home	570	.053	.223	0	1
Other ways	570	.107	.309	0	1

family to help with child care actually lowered the likelihood of being satisfied with the provider. Again, knowing the parents of other children present had no direct effect on the attitude items, but the interaction term was modestly significant for trust ($p = .080$) and statistically significant for overall satisfaction with the provider ($p = .035$).

We were especially curious about the lack of an effect for having friends and family in the metro area. In the course of the interview we also asked respondents, "How did you first find out about [the provider]?" Of the 650 organized activities, we obtained valid responses for only 570. We coded responses, and the descriptive statistics are listed in Table 5. The most frequently cited method was "driving by"; however, several mentioned using friends, family, neighbors, or "word of mouth." We created a new dummy variable where a "1" indicated that they used either a friend, family member, neighbor, or other word-of-mouth contact and a "0" otherwise and replaced having family and/or friends in the area with this new variable. We also included dummies for "driving by," information from school/NPO/church/library, and ads/fliers/TV.¹² The regression results showed that none of these four information variables were statistically significant in explaining satisfaction, and the variables that had been significant in Table 4, Model 1, continued to be significant. Thus, we can be confident that having family or friends in the area or even getting information on providers through social networks did not lead parents to more satisfactory experiences. Rather, direct ties to the organization and knowing parents, when the activity was risky, were better methods to ensure more satisfying experiences.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Our ultimate purpose was to answer the research question: Do caregivers' network ties to others and to organizations lead to better experiences for their children

when they engage in out-of-school and out-of-home activities? We examined what children did on Saturdays during the school year in the Phoenix metropolitan area and then tried to explain why some engaged in organizational activities outside the home and why some expressed more satisfaction with the provider.

In our preliminary analysis, we found that parental education and family income were strong predictors of children having beneficial activities outside the home and engaging in an activity arranged by an organization. Hence, this part of our study provided a new and rigorous test of theoretical insights provided by Lareau (2002; 2003). We confirmed the relationship between parental financial and cultural capital and access to formally organized activities. It is in formal organizational settings and not informal play environments, such as households and streets, where children accumulate important skills and resources that benefit them in the future, and thus families with resources took advantage of the opportunity. Of course, our results could also be due to families with a lower socioeconomic status participating in these activities, not feeling welcome, and leaving because of the social distance between themselves, other users, and service providers.

In our main analysis we focused on how satisfied parents and guardians were with the providers. We found no support for our first hypothesis. Parents who had family and/or friends/acquaintances/ex-spouses available for child care were not more likely to say that staff was competent, trustworthy, or the overall experience with the provider was excellent. Also in our follow-up analysis, we found that respondents who found out about the provider through interpersonal ties were not likely to have more satisfying experiences. However, in the qualitative interviews, parents and guardians acknowledged that networks among parents were important when looking for providers. When asked about how she found activities, one respondent told us she learned about things by word of mouth: "You know, one parent says 'Oh you know, Matt's in swimming.' [I reply] 'Oh really, where and does he like it?'" These respondents indicated that talking to parents was the best way to obtain information about activities because other parents were more likely to discuss their child's actual experience. Others mentioned finding out about activities through family members such as the guardian's siblings or in-laws. However, while personal ties were mentioned in our interviews, our quantitative results showed that they did not result in more satisfying experiences. This suggests that parents may use their networks to find options for their children, but this does not always result in better outcomes.

We found strong support for our second hypothesis: parents who had direct ties (employment, volunteer, donor, etc.) to their children's providers were likely to express a great deal of satisfaction in these providers. This item was important in explaining whom parents' trusted and overall satisfaction with the provider, however it did not seem to affect beliefs about the staff's competency. Our results are consistent with recent work by Marwell (2007), Small (2009), and Watkins-Hayes (2011) on the importance of residents' ties to organizations for their social, political, and economic well-being. Families that were organizationally embedded seemed to fare better.

The qualitative data corroborated these findings. The parents in our study said that one way to cope with the uncertainty surrounding providers was to have some personal involvement with or knowledge of the providers. Respondents mentioned

that it was because of their relationship with a coach that they let their child participate in a sport. While some sports leagues had training for their coaches, it was a personal relationship with the coach that seemed to be the most reassuring. One parent said, "Well they are trustworthy because we have spoken to him [the coach] on various occasions. He calls here and talks to our children. He has invited us to watch the games." Some parents were deeply embedded in the coaching networks. A respondent indicated that she knew most of the parents who were coaches, and therefore, her family's process of finding activities occurred via these ties: "Ok this dad is coaching, let's try to get on that team. Or the dad will call up and say I'm coaching, you know, Put—write my name down. You'll get me as a coach." Parents would even follow the coaches they particularly liked from one place to another. The coaches formed a very clear tie to the activities that helped parents more easily trust the provider.

Without these prior ties, parents had to entrust their children to an organization without knowing much about the people involved. When discussing the safety of their children, parents talked about the difficulty of leaving their children behind. Some parents solved this by staying at the activity site to watch their children participate or asking their children to tell them if they dislike the activity or the staff. One respondent said in response to the question:

Interviewer: How do you know if they're [the provider] trustworthy?

Respondent: I don't, that's why I stay.

Respondents who lacked connections in the area mentioned trusting their "gut instinct" or relying on "intuition" to decide whom to entrust with their children. They also expressed unease with this strategy.

Finally, we found support for Hypothesis 4. If parents knew more of the parents of the other children participating in the activity, they evaluated providers more positively—but only when the experience was more risky. If the parents knew none of the other parents or only a few, their evaluation of the provider was positive but lower. Network closure, a form of social control, seemed to matter more when risk was greater.

These results could also be explained by the fact that during sporting events the experience is enhanced if friends and neighbors are also there. The activity increases the effect of social capital on satisfaction, but not because there is greater control over the coach or referees and thus they do a better job. Sporting events are just more fun if you can experience them with people you know. Subsequent research needs to untangle these complex effects.

Future research also needs to measure risk and parental closure better. For example, the number of children present at a venue, which we did not measure, can seriously affect the percentage of parents one can know. This can be an issue especially at spectator events, team sports, on a field trip, or at a church activity. Although our results were encouraging, better measurement is needed before we can draw firm conclusions.

Our results become policy relevant when we consider that not all parents had the capacity to provide organizational experiences for their children on Saturdays. Neither did they all evaluate their children's providers positively, although most did. Those with less income or less education were less likely to arrange any activities

for their children or, if they did, to provide organized activities for their children. Furthermore, parents who did not have direct ties to providers, were newcomers to the Valley, were unemployed, had less education, or were racial minorities tended to evaluate their children's providers less positively. In the literature, social capital has not been seen as important as financial and cultural capital in assuring equal access to community resources. Yet our results suggest that helping to build ties among households and between households and organizations should be an important policy goal to enable parents to utilize trustworthy and quality providers.

Acknowledgments: This article was originally presented as a paper at the American Sociological Association meetings in 2004 and was entitled "Utilization Patterns in the Market for Youth Services." We thank Steve Corral and Matt Green, who were co-authors on that paper, for their contributions. It was revised extensively and presented at the Social Capital and Networks Conference at Ohio State University in 2005 under the title "Local Networks as Mechanisms to Encourage Trust in Economic Transactions." We thank Pamela Paxton and James Moody for this opportunity. We also acknowledge Joy Inouye, Paola Molina, Mike Jacobs, Sarah Lauro, and Alison Fogarty, who worked so diligently on this project, and Deborah Casper, who provided us with some key references. We would also like to thank Shapard Wolf, Bill Edwards, and Michael McLaen for their expert help in collecting and interpreting the data. Finally, we would like to acknowledge the late James S. Coleman, whose writings on families, trust and social structures provided inspiration for this research. Funding for this research was provided by the National Science Foundation (SES 0531650) and the University of Arizona Social and Behavioral Science Research Institute.

NOTES

1. Specifically, the sampling frame is defined by the three area codes—480, 602, and 623—which stretch across the metro area and into rural areas on the east and west (<http://www.whitepages.com/maps/PHE>). The Genesys database has all the numbers listed under these area codes. Included in these three areas codes are 584 working exchanges. Within the 584 exchanges (within the three area codes) the computer drew numbers from 100 blocks ("100 blocks" refers to sets of numbers within the exchange, for example, 602-546-8700 to 602-546-8799) and randomly generated the last two digits, which told the system whom to call (Edwards 2004).
2. Since we do not have statistics on the number of households in the metropolitan area with children between 5 and 12 years of age for 2003 or 2004, it is not possible to calculate the eligibility rate exactly, which would be useful in evaluating our response rate. In Maricopa County in 2000 there were 1,132,886 households, 410,497 had at least one person under 18 years of age, 824,616 children under 18 lived in these households, and we estimate that 373,179 of these were between 5 and 12 (the Census combines 12- and 13-year-olds, so we split the number in this category in half and added it to the 5- to 11-year-olds). We divided the number of children between 5 and 12 (373,179) by the number of children under 18 (824,616) and multiplied this by the number of households with children under 18 (410,497). We then took this number (184,724) and divided it by the number of households in Maricopa County (1,132,886). The result is .163 of the estimated proportion of households with children between 5 and 12 and is an estimate of

the eligibility rate. If we divide our response rate .037 by .160, the revised response rate is 22.7 percent. We would like to thank Mike McLaen, Senior Project Manager, Institute for Social Science Research at Arizona State University, who provided the numbers and analysis for us. He drew data from the Census Factfinder, Tables P019 and P029 (<http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>).

3. We weighed interviewing children and asking about Sunday. Although many studies interview children (e.g., Bianchi and Robinson 1997; Hofferth and Sandberg 2001; Timmer et al. 1985), we decided against it because with adult respondents the pretests were averaging 20 minutes and interviewing children would add more time. We also wanted parents/guardians' evaluations of providers. Pretests also showed that there was more activity outside the home on Saturday than on Sunday and so we restricted our questions to Saturday's activities.
4. A description of what kinds of children participated in different activities can be found at <http://www.childresearch.net/RESOURCE/RESEARCH/2007/GALASKIEWICZ.HTM>. It should be noted that the respondent decided on what benefited the child and what did not. Thus, some activities (e.g., helping a parent at work) were coded by some respondents as beneficial to the child and by other respondents as not beneficial.
5. Defining and measuring quality is difficult. Research looks at outputs (e.g., expenditures) and outcomes. Quality can also be evaluated by measuring inputs (e.g., Is the staff well trained and trustworthy?), but this does not measure the organization's accomplishments. However, human service organizations have different constituencies and there are different performance indicators for each (Kanter and Summers 1987). Recent research advocates that both objective measures and consumer satisfaction surveys be used (e.g., Milward, Provan, Fish, Isett, and Huang 2010); we use only the latter in this study.
6. The missing data may be due to a technical problem at the time of the interview.
7. We asked for "the total income for the last 12 months before taxes for all members of your family living with you there." The interviewers read income categories (in \$10,000 increments). For values, we assigned the midpoint.
8. While participation in certain activities is a standard measure of cultural capital, some have used education as a proxy (see Bourdieu 1977; Robinson and Garnier 1985). Further, parental educational attainment has been shown to be a much stronger indicator of participation in cultural activities than income and occupation (Ganzeboom 1982; Hughes and Peterson 1983; Mohr and DiMaggio 1995).
9. There were missing data on family income for 9.5 percent of the households. Values were imputed on the basis of predicted values from the regression on the known variables for the respondent (Little and Rubin 1987). These included whether the caregiver was single, white, or Asian (versus other); there was a full-time worker in the family; the number of cars in the family; the education of the respondent; the number of years the family had lived in the Phoenix metropolitan area; and the number of children in the family.
10. The latter will adjust the standard error (usually upwards) to compensate for the fact that the same child/household engaged in more than one activity. We used STATA 10.0.
11. We began by estimating a regression model with sample selection. Our selection model used a dichotomous variable, *select*, which equaled 1 if the child engaged in organized activities in the Phoenix area ($N = 650$) and 0 if the child engaged either in unorganized activities or no activities outside of the home. We first included all variables found to be significant at the .10 level in Table 3, Models 1 and 2. However, being Hispanic was not significant in our selection model, so we only included family income, caregiver education, parent works full-time, attendance at church, and being single as regressors

in the selection model for Table 4, Model 1. For Models 2 and 3, we could include only family income, education, and parent works full-time because the models would not otherwise converge. We ran the regressions with sample selection and discovered that ρ was never statistically significant ($\rho = 0$ is the null hypothesis that the two equations are independent). Also the results of the substantive models with selection and OLS results were very similar. Therefore, we present only the latter.

12. These search methods were not mutually exclusive, because respondents would mention using more than one method for their search.

REFERENCES

- Adler, Patricia A. and Peter Adler. 1994. "Social Reproduction and the Corporate Other: The Institutionalization of Afterschool Activities." *Sociological Quarterly* 35(2):309–28.
- Bianchi, Suzanne M. and John P. Robinson. 1997. "What Did You Do Today? Children Use of Time, Family Composition, and the Acquisition of Social Capital." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 59(2):332–44.
- Bianchi, Suzanne M., John P. Robinson, and Melissa Milkie. 2006. *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction." Pp. 487–511 in *Power and Ideology in Education*, edited by J. Karabell and A. H. Halsey. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, Jacqueline Johnson and Peter H. Reingen. 1987. "Social Ties and Word-of-Mouth Referral Behavior." *The Journal of Consumer Research* 14(3):350–62.
- Bryk, Anthony S. and Barbara L. Schneider. 2002. *Trust in Schools: A Cored Resource for Improvement*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Burt, Ronald S. 1997. "The Contingent Value of Social Capital." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42(2):339–65.
- and Marc Knez. 1995. "Kinds of Third-Party Effects on Trust." *Rationality and Society* 7(3):255–92.
- Buskens, Vincent and Jeroen Weesie. 2000. "An Experiment on the Effects of Embeddedness in Trust Situations: Buying a Used Car." *Rationality and Society* 12(2):227–53.
- Carbonaro, William J. 1998. "A Little Help from My Friends' Parents: Intergenerational Closure and Educational Outcomes." *Sociology of Education* 71(4):295–313.
- Chang, Mariko Lin. 2004. "With a Little Help from My Friends (and My Financial Planner)." *Social Forces* 83(4):1469–98.
- Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94(Supplement):S95–S120.
- . 1990. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cook, Karen S. 2001. "Trust in Society." Pp. 1–24 in *Trust in Society*, edited by K. S. Cook. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Cooper, Harris, Jeffrey C. Valentine, Barbara Nye, and James J. Lindsay. 1999. "Relationships between Five After-School Activities and Academic Achievement." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 91(2):369–78.
- Corsaro, William A. 2005. *The Sociology of Childhood*, 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- de Ruijter, Esther, Tanja van der Lippe, and Werner Raub. 2003. "Trust Problems in Household Outsourcing." *Rationality and Society* 15(4):473–507.
- DiMaggio, Paul and Hugh Louch. 1998. "Socially Embedded Consumer Transactions: For What Kinds of Purchases Do People Most Often Use Networks?" *American Sociological Review* 63(5):619–37.

- Edwards, Bill. 2004. "Valley Youth Activity Provider Survey." Methodological Memo, Survey Research Laboratory, Arizona State University, March 12.
- Furstenberg, Frank F., Jr., and Mary Elizabeth Hughes. 1995. "Social Capital and Successful Development among At-Risk Youth." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57(3):580–92.
- Ganzeboom, Harry G. G. 1982. "Explaining Differential Participation in High-Cultural Activities—A Confrontation of Information-Processing and Status-Seeking Theories." Pp. 186–205 in *Theoretical Models and Empirical Analyses: Contributions to the Explanation of Individual Actions and Collective Phenomena*, edited by W. Raub. Utrecht, the Netherlands: Explanatory Sociology Publications.
- Granovetter, Mark. 1985. "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." *American Journal of Sociology* 91(3):481–510.
- Gulati, Ranjay. 1995. "Familiarity Breeds Trust? The Implications of Repeated Ties on Contractual Choice in Alliances." *Academy of Management Journal* 38(1):85–112.
- Guseva, Alya and Akos Rona-Tas. 2001. "Uncertainty, Risk, and Trust: Russian and American Credit Card Markets Compared." *American Sociological Review* 66(5):623–46.
- Hagan, John, Ross MacMillan, and Blair Wheaton. 1996. "New Kid in Town: Social Capital and the Life Course Effects of Family Migration in Children." *American Sociological Review* 61(3):368–85.
- Harvey, Andrew. 1999. "Guidelines for Time Use Data Collection and Analysis." Pp. 19–46 in *Time Use Research in the Social Sciences*, edited by W. E. Pentland, A. S. Harvey, M. P. Lawton, and M. A. McColl. New York: Kluwer.
- Hofferth, Sandra L. and John F. Sandberg. 2001. "How American Children Spend Their Time." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 63(3):295–308.
- Hoffmann, John P. and Jiangmin Xu. 2002. "School Activities, Community Service, and Delinquency." *Crime & Delinquency* 48(4):568–91.
- Hughes, Michael and Richard A. Peterson. 1983. "Isolating Cultural Choice Patterns in the U.S. Population." *American Behavioral Scientist* 26(4):459–78.
- Janowitz, Morris. 1978. *The Last Half Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kahne, Joseph and Kim Bailey. 1999. "The Role of Social Capital and Youth Development: The Case of 'I Have a Dream' Programs." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 21(3):321–43.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss and David V. Summers. 1987. "Doing Well While Doing Good: Dilemmas of Performance Measurement in Nonprofit Organizations and the Need for a Multiple-Constituency Approach." Pp. 154–66 in *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, edited by W. W. Powell. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kasarda, John D. and Morris Janowitz. 1974. "Community Attachment in Mass Society." *American Sociological Review* 39(3):328–39.
- Lareau, Annette. 2002. "Invisible Inequality: Social Class and Childrearing in Black Families and White Families." *American Sociological Review* 67(5):747–76.
- . 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race and Family*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Little, Roderick J. A. and Donald B. Rubin. 1987. *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Macaulay, Stewart. 1963. "Non-Contractual Relations in Business: A Preliminary Study." *American Sociological Review* 28(1):55–67.
- Marsden, Peter V. 1987. "Core Discussion Networks of Americans." *American Sociological Review* 52(1):122–31.
- Marsh, Herbert W. and Sabina Kleitman. 2002. "Extracurricular School Activities: The Good, the Bad, and the Nonlinear." *Harvard Educational Review* 72(4):464–515.
- Marwell, Nicole P. 2007. *Bargaining for Brooklyn: Community Organizations in the Entrepreneurial City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- McFarland, Daniel A. and Reuben J. Thomas. 2006. "Bowling Young: How Youth Voluntary Associations Influence Adult Political Participation." *American Sociological Review* 71(3):401–25.
- McLanahan, Sara and Gary Sandefur. 1994. *Growing Up with a Single Parent: What Hurts, What Helps*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McPherson, J. Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and Matthew E. Brashears. 2006. "Social Isolation in America: Changes in Core Discussion Networks over Two Decades." *American Sociological Review* 71(3):353–75.
- Medrich, Elliot A., Judith Roizen, Victor Rubin, and Stuart Buckley. 1982. *The Serious Business of Growing Up: A Study of Children's Lives Outside School*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Milward, H. Brinton, Keith G. Provan, Amy Fish, Kimberley R. Isett, and Kun Huang. 2010. "Governance and Collaboration: An Evolutionary Study of Two Mental Health Networks." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 20(Supplement 1): i125–41.
- Mizruchi, Mark S., Linda Brewster Stearns, and Christopher Marquis. 2006. "The Conditional Nature of Embeddedness: A Study of Borrowing by Large U.S. Firms, 1973–1994." *American Sociological Review* 71(2):310–33.
- Mohr, John W. and Paul DiMaggio. 1995. "The Intergenerational Transmission of Cultural Capital." Pp. 167–200 in *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility: Volume 14*, edited by M. Wallace. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Podolny, Joel M. 1994. "Market Uncertainty and the Social Character of Economic Exchange." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 39(3):458–83.
- Robinson, John P. 1999. "Time Diary Method: Structure and Uses." Pp. 47–89 *Time Use Research in the Social Sciences*, edited by W. E. Pentland, A. S. Harvey, M. P. Lawton, and M. A. McColl. New York: Kluwer.
- Robinson, Robert V. and Maurice A. Garnier. 1985. "Class Reproduction among Men and Women in France." *American Journal of Sociology* 91(2):250–58.
- Rogers, William H. 1994. "Regression Standard Errors in Clustered Samples." *Stata Technical Bulletin* 3(13):19–23.
- Sallaz, Jeffrey J. and Jane Zavisca. 2007. "Bourdieu in American Sociology, 1980–2004." *Annual Review of Sociology* 33(1):21–41.
- Small, Mario Luis. 2009. *Unanticipated Gains: Origins of Network Inequality in Everyday Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- and Monica McDermott. 2006. "The Presence of Organizational Resources in Poor Neighborhoods: An Analysis of Average and Contextual Effects." *Social Forces* 84(3):1697–724.
- Stuart, Toby E. 1998. "Network Positions and Propensities to Collaborate: An Investigation of Strategic Alliance Formation in a High-Technology Industry." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43(3):668–98.
- . 2000. "Interorganizational Alliances and the Performance of Firms: A Study of Growth and Innovation Rates in a High-Technology Industry." *Strategic Management Journal* 21(8):791–811.
- Sui-Chu, Esther Ho and J. Douglas Willms. 1996. "Effects of Parental Involvement on Eighth-Grade Achievement." *Sociology of Education* 69(2):126–41.
- Timmer, Susan Goff, Jacquelynne Eccles, and Kerth O'Brien. 1985. "How Children Use Time." Pp. 353–82 in *Time, Goods, and Well-Being*, edited by F. T. Juster and F. P. Stafford. Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.
- Uzzi, Brian. 1999. "Embeddedness in the Making of Financial Capital: How Social Relations and Networks Benefit Firms Seeking Financing." *American Sociological Review* 64(4):481–505.

- Valentine, Jeffrey C., Harris Cooper, B. Ann Bettencourt, and David L. DuBois. 2002. "Out-of-School Activities and Academic Achievement: The Mediating Role of Self-Beliefs." *Educational Psychologist* 37(4):245–56.
- Warde, Alan and Gindo Tampubolon. 2002. "Social Capital, Networks and Leisure Consumption." *The Sociological Review* 50(2):155–80.
- Watkins-Hayes, Celeste. 2011. "Race, Respect, and Red Tape: Inside the Black Box of Racially Representative Bureaucracies." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21(Supplement):i233–51.
- Wilson, William Julius. 1996. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Zimmer, Michelle H., Anne Duggan, Barbara Howard, and Raymond Sturmer. 2001. "Participation in After-School Activities and Psychological Well-Being during Adolescence." *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics* 22(5):345.