

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT to article in

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2006, VOL. 71 (JUNE:353–375)

Social Isolation in America: Changes in Core Discussion Networks over Two Decades

Miller McPherson
University of Arizona and Duke University

Lynn Smith-Lovin
Duke University

Matthew E. Brashears
University of Arizona

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table A1. Influence of Proportion Kin on Network Density and Heterogeneity

Table A2. Basic Parameters of Discussion Networks: 1985, 1987 and 2004

Table A3. Number of Respondents That Had Various Relationships with at Least One Discussion Partner

Table A4. Respondents with Spouses Only, Non-Spouse Kin, and Non-Kin in the Network

Table A5. Differences by Age, Education, Sex and Race in Network Size and Kin/Nonkin Composition

Table A6. Cooperativeness as Rated by the GSS Interviewer in 1985 and 2004

Table A7. Negative Binomial Regression of Size of Discussion Network

Table A8. Logistic Regression Coefficients for Having Someone to Talk to About Important Matters

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT
to article in
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2006, VOL. 71 (JUNE:353–375)

Table A1. Influence of Proportion Kin on Network Density and Heterogeneity (OLS Regression of Density and Heterogeneity on Proportion Kin)

Dependent Variable	Unstandardized Regression		Predicted Value at Proportion Kin of				R-squared	
	Coefficient for Proportion Kin		0		1			
	85	04	85	04	85	04	85	04
Density	.36	.26	.42	.49	.78	.78	.18	.10
Age Heterogeneity (S.D. of alters' ages)	5.48	7.53	7.30	6.56	13.54	13.88	.09	.15
Education Heterogeneity (S.D. of alters' educations)	.30	.20 ^{NS}	1.61	1.38	1.92	1.58	.01	.00 ¹
Race Heterogeneity (IQV)	-.08	-.12	.09	.15	.01	.03	.03	.04
Sex Heterogeneity (IQV)	.27	.27	.54	.53	.79	.80	.06	.06

Note: All coefficients significant, $p < .01$, except where indicated.

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT
to article in
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2006, VOL. 71 (JUNE:353–375)

Table A2. Basic Parameters of Discussion Networks: 1985, 1987 and 2004

	1985 (N=1531 ^a)	1987 (N=1800)	2004 (N=1467 ^b)
Network Size			
0	10.0%	4.51%	24.6%
1	15.0%	14.27%	19.0%
2	16.2%	19.02%	19.2%
3	20.3%	49.06%	16.9%
4	14.8%	6.78%	8.8%
5	18.2%	3.20%	6.5%
6+	5.4%	3.12%	4.9%
Mean	2.94	2.63	2.08
Mode	3	3	0
S.D.	1.79	1.28	1.81
Kin Network Size			
0	26.4%	22.25%	42.4%
1	29.6%	35.70%	29.0%
2	21.6%	25.67%	14.5%
3	12.6%	16.39%	9.1%
4	6.3%	0.00%	3.5%
5 ^c	3.3%	0.00%	1.4%
Mean	1.44	1.36	1.12
Mode	1	1	0
S.D.	1.41	1.00	1.38
Non-kin Network Size			
0	36.4%	36.79%	54.1%
1	22.2%	26.99%	21.3%
2	18.9%	20.03%	14.0%
3	13.0%	11.14%	5.7%
4	6.3%	3.50%	3.3%
5	3.3%	1.54%	1.5%
Mean	1.42	1.22	.88
Mode	1	0	0
S.D.	1.57	1.22	1.40
Proportion Kin			
0	19.2%	18.57%	21.0%
.01-.33	15.4%	4.44%	10.9%
.34-.66	20.7%	25.71%	19.4%
.67-.99	14.5%	17.48%	11.6%
1	30.2%	33.80%	37.1%
Mean	.53	.57	.60
S.D.	.44	.38	.53

^a Proportion kin is defined only for those who have at least one alter. Therefore, the N = 1395 for the proportion kin analysis.

^b N = 1070 for the analysis of proportion kin.

^c Information on kinship was collected only on the first five alters cited. Therefore, the sum of the kin and non-kin alters is not equal to the overall network size distribution.

Table A3. Number of Respondents That Had Various Relationships with at Least One Discussion Partner (e.g. What Percent of the Sample Mentioned A Spouse/Parent/etc. As A Person with Whom They Discussed Important Matters?)

Type of Relationship to Respondent ^c	1985 (N=1531)	1987 ^a (N=1800)	2004 ^b (N=1467)
Spouse	30.9%	43.21%	38.1%
Parent	23.6%	26.81%	21.1%
Sibling	21.1%	16.0%	14.11%
Child	17.9%	16.92%	10.19%
Other Family Member	18.2%	14.79%	11.8%
Co-worker	29.4%	28.44%	17.9%
Co-member of group	26.1%	21.48%	11.8%
Neighbor	18.5%	18.84%	7.8%
Friend	73.2%	77.98%	50.6%
Advisor	25.2%	45.03%	19.2%
Other	2.1%	4.50%	7.2%

^a All differences between 1987 and 1985 are statistically significant at the $p < .01$ level except for Spouse, Parent, Child, Friend, and Other, which are non-significant.

^b All differences between 2004 and 1985 are statistically significant at the $p < .01$ level. Differences between 1987 and 2004 are statistically significant at the $p < .01$ level except for Siblings and Others, which are non-significant.

^c Since more than one type of relationship can be mentioned for any given discussion partner (e.g., a co-worker can also be a co-member of a group, an advisor and a friend), the percentages do not sum to 100.

Table A4. Respondents with Spouses Only, Non-Spouse Kin, and Non-Kin in the Network

	1985 (N = 1531)	1987 (N=1800)	2004 ^a (N = 1467)
Spouse ONLY Present	6.4%	5.5%	9.3%
At Least One Non-Spouse Kin	58.79%	60.19%	42.87%
At Least One Non-Kin	80.15%	83.79%	57.16%

^a Significantly different from both 1987 and 1985 at the $p < .01$ level.

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT
to article in
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2006, VOL. 71 (JUNE:353–375)

Table A5. Differences by Age, Education, Sex and Race in Network Size and Kin/Nonkin Composition^a (Unstandardized OLS Regression Coefficients of Network Variables on Respondents' Demographic Characteristics)

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables											
	Network Size			# of Kin			# of Non-Kin			Proportion Kin		
	85	87	04	85	87	04	85	87	04	85	87	04
A. Age												
Age	.02 ^{NS}	.02 ^{NS}	.02 ^{NS}	-.02 ^{NS}	.02	.01 ^{NS}	.03	-.01 ^{NS}	.00 ^{NS}	-.01	.01	.00 ^{NS}
Age ²	-.00	-.00	-.00 ^{NS}	.00 ^{NS}	-.00	-.00 ^{NS}	-.00	.00 ^{NS}	-.00 ^{NS}	.00	-.00 ^{NS}	-.00 ^{NS}
Constant	3.17	2.47	1.68	2.06	.97	.85 ^{NS}	1.17	1.51	.88 ^{NS}	.69	.40	.48 ^{NS}
R	.27	.14	.03 ^{NS}	.08	.09	.04 ^{NS}	.26	.08	.01 ^{NS}	.18	.07 ^{NS}	.05 ^{NS}
B. Education												
Educ (yrs)	.19	.10	.14	.02	.02	.05	.15	.08	.08	-.03	-.01	-.02
Constant	.61	1.33	.08	1.15	1.17	.45	-.47	.20 ^{NS}	-.28	.87	.75	.79
R	.35	.27	.23	.06	.05	.11	.35	.21	.20 ^{NS}	.23	.12	.10
C. Sex												
Sex (f=1)	-.04 ^{NS}	.11 ^{NS}	.20 ^{NS}	.28	.17	.23	-.30	-.07 ^{NS}	-.02 ^{NS}	.07	.04	.01 ^{NS}
Constant	2.94	2.56	1.95	1.28	1.09	1.00	1.59	1.33	.89	.49	.50	.59
R	.01 ^{NS}	.04 ^{NS}	.05 ^{NS}	.10	.09	.03	.10	.03 ^{NS}	.01 ^{NS}	.10	.06 ^{NS}	.01 ^{NS}
D. Race/ethnic (White is reference category)												
Black	-.79	-.51	-.51	-.58	-.34	-.53	-.19 ^{NS}	-.15 ^{NS}	-.12 ^{NS}	-.08 ^{NS}	-.05 ^{NS}	-.08 ^{NS}
Other	-.43 ^{NS}	-.06 ^{NS}	-.64	-.42	-.03 ^{NS}	-.49	.00 ^{NS}	-.00 ^{NS}	-.11 ^{NS}	-.08 ^{NS}	-.02 ^{NS}	-.11
Constant	3.03	2.68	2.22	1.51	1.41	1.23	1.44	1.24	.91	.54	.58	.61
R	.14	.14	.15	.14	.11	.17	.04 ^{NS}	.04 ^{NS}	.04 ^{NS}	.07 ^{NS}	.05 ^{NS}	.10 ^{NS}

Note: All coefficients significant, $p < .01$, except where indicated.

^a Marsden (1987) also analyzed differences in network size and kin composition by size of place, but this variable has not yet been coded for 2004 so comparable analyses are not possible at this time. (The size of place variable is added to the data set after the data are collected, using the respondents' addresses and current Census tract information.)

Table A6. Cooperativeness as Rated by the GSS Interviewer in 1985 and 2004

	1985 (N = 1531)	1987 (N=1800)	2004 (N = 1467)
Level of Cooperativeness			
Interested/Friendly	79.27%	77.05%	82.18%
Cooperative	16.74%	18.78%	15.13%
Restless/Impatient	3.58%	3.65%	2.65%
Hostile	.41%	.52%	.04%

Note: X^2 with 6 df = 32.07, $p < 0.00$

Table A7. Negative Binomial Regression of Size of Discussion Network

Independent Variable	Model		
	I	II	III
Constant	1.069	1.129	.554
Wave2 (1 =1987)	-.108	-.084	-.10
Wave3 (1=2004)	-.349	-.336	-.404
Cooperative	–	-.187	-.121
Restless/Impatient	–	-.501	-.431
Hostile (Compared to Friendly/Interested)	–	-.785	-.618
Number Missing in Preceding Questions	–	-.197	-.162
Education (in yrs)	–	–	.047
Female	–	–	.069
Age ^a	–	–	-.002
Currently Married	–	–	.014 ^{NS}
Black	–	–	-.210
Other Race (Compared to White)	–	–	-.177
Number of Adults in Household	–	–	.018 ^{NS}
Number of Children Ever Born	–	–	.008 ^{NS}
Number of Siblings	–	–	.001 ^{NS}
Alpha (Heterogeneity Coef.)	1.01*10 ⁻⁷	7.50*10 ⁻⁸	8.95*10 ⁻⁹
F	66.84	50.77	47.21

Note: All coefficients significant at $p < .01$, unless otherwise indicated.

^a The squared term for age was not significant.

Table A8. Logistic Regression Coefficients for Having Someone to Talk to About Important Matters (Dependent Variable: No One to Talk to= 0, Someone to Talk to = 1)

Independent Variable	Model			
	I	II	III	IV
Constant	2.200	2.433	2.159	1.266
Wave2 (1 =1987)	.851	.986	.897	1.273
Wave3 (1=2004)	-1.080	-1.066	-1.392	-.247 ^{NS}
Cooperative	–	-.364	-.159 ^{NS}	-.160 ^{NS}
Restless/Impatient	–	-1.429	-1.293	-1.269
Hostile (Compared to Friendly/Interested)	–	-2.258	-1.968	-1.968
Number Missing in Previous Module	–	-.549	-.473	-.469
Education (in yrs)	–	–	.089	.152
Education*Wave2	–	–	–	-.038 ^{NS}
Education*Wave3	–	–	–	-.100
Female ^b	–	–	.254	.253
Age ^a	–	–	-.018	-.016
Currently Married	–	–	.315	.250 ^{NS}
Black	–	–	-.903	-.863
Other Race	–	–	-.284 ^{NS}	-.267 ^{NS}
Number of Adults in Household	–	–	–	.089 ^{NS}
Number of Children Ever Born	–	–	–	.018 ^{NS}
Number of Siblings	–	–	–	-.013 ^{NS}
F	118.56	50.78	37.28	27.12

Note: All coefficients significant at $p < .01$ unless otherwise indicated.

^a The squared term for age was not significant.

^b Significant at the $p < .05$ level.