UNEDITED DRAFT

GENERATIONS AND GENDER SURVEY: DESIGN AND CONTENT

Note

This document is based on discussions that took place within the group working on the GGS questionnaire (G. Beets, F. Billari, M. Corijn, J. Hoem, Z. Spéder, A. Töelke) and on discussions within different groups of the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research in Rostock working on the questionnaire. Different parts of the document have been authored by different members of the working group.

Contents

GGS: SURVEY DESIGN AND RELATED ISSUES

Gijs Beets, Francesco C. Billari, Martine Corijn, and Jan M. Hoem

For each participating country in the Generations and Gender Programme (GGP), the national Generations and Gender Survey (GGS) is conceived as a unitary national panel survey of adult women and men. The GGS reflects the theoretical framework of the GGP, and is closely linked to other efforts of data collection within it, such as the collection of contextual data.

PANEL DESIGN

Justification

We need to develop a novel sample design for the GGS that is more informative than the one of the previous European Family and Fertility Surveys (FFS). Our proposal for the GGS is to use a multi-wave panel design with a mix of information about current status at each wave, past histories (collected mostly at Wave 1), and event histories between panel waves. As a minimum, two waves are foreseen for each national survey. Some of the present authors doubt that for some of the participating countries financing and organising more than two waves is realistic. Nevertheless, the rest of this note is written so as not to preclude this possibility.

The panel design allows behavioural events recorded in any Wave n+1 to be seen as dependent on both past histories and past characteristics (income, values, norms, attitudes, expectations, social network configuration) as recorded in or before the previous Wave n. Conversely, one may compare income or personal values collected in Wave n with those in Wave n+1 and see the changes as a function of demographic events between the two waves.

Such opportunities, which have been lacking so far, makes it possible to test theories concerning the impact of variables that cannot be measured in a retrospective fashion. The comparative perspective of the GGP permits the generality of existing theories to be checked, and the availability of panel data opens new opportunities for empirical research of this nature.

The collection of retrospective histories makes sure that it is possible to describe trends already before Wave 2, to study interactions between careers across cohorts and historical periods, and so to better understand national differences in the current demographic situation. This is particularly important for societies currently in transition in Central and Eastern Europe.

There is a clear added value of going beyond two waves whenever possible. A multiple-wave design is important for assessing the medium- and long-term consequences of demographic behaviour and of subjective evaluations. Demographic processes take time to develop, and going beyond two waves may be important specifically for the processes of partner relations and parent-child relations so much in focus in the GGP. Assessing the impact of macro-changes across time (e.g. changes in policies as well as institutional and economic changes) on demographic behaviour is also greatly simplified with multiple waves. In addition, the establishment of the GGS as a means of monitoring future demographic change relies on multiple-wave data collection.

Organisational issues

The survey questionnaire will be designed so as to take into account the essentially longitudinal nature of the GGS panel, but also so as to make sure that the data collected in Wave 1 can be analysed on their own.

It is highly desirable that the participating countries hold the first wave during the year 2003, and that countries that cannot do that follow as soon as possible.

The second wave should be held exactly three years (36 months) after the first wave, which means during the year 2006 if the first wave is held during the year 2003. A period of three years between the waves is operationally ideal in order to record enough demographic events to study using appropriate techniques. This frequency may carry over to waves after the second. A period longer than three years is not advisable because of the higher risks of panel dropout and because of the need to monitor relatively rapid changes.

Rules for handling non-response and rules for possible substitution of non-respondents in Wave 1 will have to be set by central GGS co-ordinators. These co-ordinators should also set rules for possible rewards to respondents.

In each wave, respondents should explicitly be invited to participate in the subsequent wave.

Given the nature of the survey, a concerted effort should be undertaken to minimise dropout rates and to follow respondents into Waves 2 and above. After Wave 1, address changes among respondents should be monitored closely, perhaps through devices like annual birthday postcards or Christmas cards as well as through an occasional survey news-sheet.

Between panel waves, short telephone interviews (possibly using Computer Aided Telephone Interviewing) may also be considered for keeping in touch with respondents and at the same time collecting some basic information.

Given the cross-national nature of the survey, it is conceivable that people can be followed also outside the national borders if they move to a country where a GGS is carried on. Some agreements between national survey institutions should be negotiated for this purpose.

As multiple waves are foreseen, rules will have to be developed on the possible inclusion of new cohorts in the study and on the replacement of participants who have dropped out or died. New entrants will allow maintaining representativeness of the population and a reasonable sample size.

TARGET POPULATION

The target population of the GGS consists of all individuals aged from 18 to 75 (or 79) years and resident in each participating country, including non-national residents. One should consider whether the target population should be defined by birth cohort (independently of the year of the 1st wave) or by age.

SAMPLING UNIT

Given the focus of the GGP on generations and gender relations, sampling units other than the individual have been considered. Practical considerations have lead us to suggest the individual as the ultimate sampling unit of the GGS. On this background, the survey will use a random sample of individuals (not households or couples, for instance). It may possibly include people resident in institutional households, and a centralised decision will have to be taken on whether to include such individuals. A focus on individuals will also make it easier to track them in the panel design (because households or couples can split).

The sampling frame for each national GGS will reflect the possibilities in each country. In many cases respondents will be selected from population-census lists. In some countries a population register is an obvious frame instead.

A multiple-stage design involving sampling areas and dwellings may appear the most attractive in some countries. In Russia, sample selection may be restricted to a set of core regions. Even if household selection is a stage in a national sampling plan, a possibly pre-selected anchor individual would be the ultimate sampling unit in each target household. We expect that interviewing efforts will primarily be directed toward this anchor respondent. Below, we discuss the possibility of obtaining additional information from other family members.

For each country the initial sample comprises ideally at least 10,000 anchor individuals. We suggest a sample size of a minimum of 2,500 individuals for each of the following four groups: (i) men aged 18-50, (ii) men aged 51-75 (or 79), (iii) women aged 18-50, and (iv) women aged 51-75 (or 79).

Further details about permissible sampling schemes remain to be discussed, but it appears likely that stratification by age and region (as well as by ethnic group in some countries) may be used. Within each age interval, age stratification in 5-year intervals, proportional to the actual size of the corresponding sub-population, is suggested.

Oversampling of specific target groups (for instance of special ethnic groups, of the foreign-born population, or of the population living in institutions) may be undertaken in some countries, provided that both the overall national representativeness and the minimum size for each age-and-sex group are retained.

GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE

All countries of the UNECE region will be invited to participate in the GGP. The issue whether existing national surveys can be integrated in the GGP must be considered with great care.

THE FORMAT OF THE GGS

We expect the main format of the GGS to be a personal interview in the household of the anchor.

There will be a core questionnaire with topics relevant for respondents at all ages and with some questions restricted to selected age groups. (Any questions about sterilisation or reproductive health will presumably be restricted to respondents at reproductive ages. Other health questions and questions concerning retirement may be restricted to respondents above reproductive ages.) We foresee that selected questions will be optional and that the individual country may include or delete optional questions at will. Special extra modules may be developed to deal with issues specific to particular population subgroups.

Wherever possible, Computer Aided Personal Interviewing should be used. CAPI will improve data quality and reduce interviewing time. Interviews need to be administered by trained interviewers.

The interview with an anchor in Wave 1 can take at most 60 minutes on average. A balance needs to be struck concerning which information must be obtained in Wave 1 and which information can be postponed to subsequent waves. We foresee that due to time limitations Wave 1 will only contain minimal or even rudimentary migration histories (such information on where the respondent grew up and the time at which s/he left the parental home) and that any more complete retrospective migration histories must be consigned to Wave 2.

Systematic use of mail-back or subsequent-pick-up parts of the questionnaire for the anchor respondent is not foreseen. We have been advised that such data collection may be difficult in

many countries and see a need to preserve data comparability across countries. Such comparability may be jeopardised if countries use different procedures of data collection. We return below to similar issues concerning possible secondary respondents close to the anchor.

INFORMATION ON PARTNER, PARENTS AND CHILDREN

As outlined in the theoretical framework of the GGP, it is essential to gather information about the anchor's partner, parents, and children (if any). Ideally, personal information should be obtained from the person it concerns, but this may be impracticable in the GGS. For practical reasons we suggest that some of the information, mostly that based on objective facts, be gathered from the anchor.

Some of us believe that in many or all countries, all data must be obtained from the anchor and that data collection should be limited to items where this can be done reliably. Others among us trust that it will be possible to obtain information also from the anchor's partner, parents, and/or adult children, and perhaps from other household members. We all agree that the kind of information (if any) that should be obtained directly from the partner, parents, and/or children of the anchor (and possibly others) must be selected carefully, as must the format of such data collection. For the latter, the choice seems to be between conducting a separate interview and using a self-administered questionnaire. The latter choice has the advantage of reducing total interviewing time in the household (or giving more room for other questions in the interview actually conducted). The mode of administration and collection of any such extra questionnaire module must also be considered carefully, particularly in the light of the unfavourable comments we have received concerning the feasibility of data collection of this nature.

The data potentially collected from other family members than the anchor could include basic information on how partners interact and decide about basic (demographic) behaviour. Such members should probably be re-interviewed at least in Wave 2. Where a couple has split up by then one may consider data collection in Wave 2 (and correspondingly in later waves) both from the anchor's old partner and from any new partner. In principle, such data would give investigators the opportunity of studying issues of separation/divorce and union re-formation from various angles. The numbers of respondents who experience union disruption between two waves may be small, which would simplify the extra data collection but make it difficult to carry out much empirical analysis before several waves have been collected. Some of the authors are sceptical to the feasibility of following family members who no longer share the anchor's household.

CONTEXTUAL DATA COLLECTION AND ITS IMPLICATION FOR SAMPLING

In many countries, a two-stage sampling scheme is chosen, with a selection of areas first and of individuals within areas subsequently. More complex schemes may need to be considered in some countries. Countries with good population registers may want to use a single-stage sampling scheme where individuals are selected randomly from the entire country or from predefined population strata. Where two- or multiple-stage sampling is conducted, the parallel collection of area-level contextual data may be tied to it. Conversely, area selection may be motivated by the availability of contextual data. In fact, even countries for whom single-stage sampling is possible may want to concentrate their sampling to selected areas in order to facilitate the parallel collection of contextual data. The envisaged acquisition of contextual data for the GGP will facilitate multilevel event-history (and other) analyses. Multilevel analysis will be most efficient if the geographical location of an individual is also known on a continuous basis (or at least across panel waves) and if contextual data can be tied to the same locations. For large cities, contextual data could perhaps be collected for geographical tracts or neighbourhoods.

Additional benefits will come from the collection of national-level contextual data, such as economic time series, public-policy accounts, and register or census aggregates. Pooling samples across countries, with the nation possibly constituting another level on top of the national regions and areas, will allow the investigator to use national-level data to explain behaviour. In addition, such pooling will facilitate the study of events that are too rare at the national level.

GGS: CONTENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

VARIOUS COMPONENTS

In this part of the document the information to be collected by the Generations and Gender Survey is organised into a series of components. These components mainly reflect meaningful substantive issues that will be covered by GGS. They do no fully reflect the way in which the GGS questionnaire will be structured as practical considerations may require a different organisation.

The following components are introduced:

PARTNER RELATIONS
PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS

HOUSEHOLD
FAMILY
NETWORK

EDUCATION
EMPLOYMENT

EARNINGS AND ASSETS
HOUSING

NETWORK TRANSFERS
PUBLIC TRANSFERS

MIGRATION
HEALTH

SUBJECTIVE EVALUATIONS AND INTENTIONS
GENDER

GGP's major research goal is to study the dynamics of the child-parent and partner-partner relations of individuals placed within broader changes taking place in their households, families and support networks. These relations will be studied within the context of proximate and remote environments of the individual comprising intergenerational and gender relationships.

On the PARTNER-PARTNER RELATION GGS will collect information on the start, kind and end of partnerships in the partner history of the anchor, collect detailed information on the current situation and on the intentions for the future.

On the PARENT-CHILD RELATION GGS will collect information on the timing and kind of start and end of the relationship with the child(ren) of the anchor, collect detailed information on the current situation and on the intentions for the future.

GGP will put the relations of anchor with the partner, the parents and the children, if any, into a broader social context. HOUSEHOLD members, FAMILY members and important non-kin members will be considered the primary social NETWORK, constituting a mezzo-level or proximate context of major importance.

Information on the EDUCATION and EMPLOYMENT, on the EARNINGS AND ASSETS as well as on the HOUSING conditions offer a variety of data on the socio-economic context of the partner and parent-child relations of the anchor.

Both network and public transfers are supposed to have an impact on the partner and parent-child relations of the anchor. Within the NETWORK TRANSFERS, GGS will focus on particular intragenerational transfers and intergenerational transfers. GGS will make a selection of time-related transfers and financial transfers.

In the context of different issues GGS will collect information on PUBLIC TRANSFERS in order to obtain a picture of how network and public transfers complement and/or substitute each other.

Selected MIGRATION data will be collected in order to be able to make a link between the micro-data and relevant macro-contextual data. The issue of parents and children stopping and restarting sharing the same household will also be dealt with in this component.

Some basic HEALTH data will be collected.

Information on the SUBJECTIVE EVALUATIONS AND INTENTIONS with regard to several relevant issues as covered in the different components will be collected. GENDER-related issues will be dealt with throughout the different components. However, some issues will be brought together in a separate section.

The interview time for the questionnaire at wave 1 may not take more then 60 minutes. The components as presented here are of relevance for all age groups. Pre-tests may reveal the average time needed to deal with each component. Pre-test results may identify groups for which the interview takes very little time or too much time. Any draft of components of the GGS questionnaire will be tested in pilot studies in countries with various survey experiences and with a diversity of socio-economic and socio-cultural background.

Each component is introduced by its RATIONALE spelling out links with the framework document. Important CONCEPTUAL ISSUES for each component are introduced and some selections are proposed. These conceptual issues open the way to the kind of INFORMATION THAT IS REQUIRED as well as the required time perspective for the data. As most components are interlinked some LINKS WITH THE OTHER COMPONENTS are spelled out.

Both partner-partner and parent-child relations of the anchor are put into a broader context. Some relevant CONTEXT RELATED ISSUES are specified. The intergenerational and gender relevance of each component is shortly dealt with.

For some components, particular issues or particular problems will need special consideration depending on the country, the political history and/or the welfare regime. We bring these together under the REGION SPECIFIC ISSUES.

The components presented are relevant to the broad age range. However, for some components or particular aspects of them, AGE-RELATED ISSUES have to be discussed.

DESIGN-RELATED ISSUES cover any specific problems or links between the component under consideration and the panel design.

PARTNER RELATIONSHIPS[1]

Angelika Tölke [2]

RATIONALE

Living arrangements and the way living arrangements are linked with other life domains have rapidly changed in recent decades. New living arrangements like those of stepfamilies, single households, single parents, and couples living apart from each other (LAT relationships) have become increasingly common. Living arrangements have (at least) three dimensions that should be covered in the questionnaire[3]:

- Partnering (whether the respondent has a partner or not).
- Co-residence (whether any partner lives in the same household as the respondent, or does not).
- Legal marital status (whether the respondent is single, married, separated, divorced, or widowed).

Information on co-residence and marital status was also collected in the earlier Fertility and Family Survey (FFS). Information on LAT relationships and on the socio-demographic characteristics of partners was not collected in the FFS-questionnaire. Therefore, in the following, reasons are only given for including the two new aspects in the questionnaire. An LAT relationship is not only a living arrangement for young people, but increasingly also for people in their middle and older ages. In Western Europe it is no longer only a period of preparation for the formation of a more established kind of relationship, but it has become an independent kind of relationship in itself. For some couples the labor market or different places of training/education may cause them to live apart from each other, others prefer this living arrangement for personal reasons. Even legally married couples may spend part of their time in different dwellings or have completely different addresses. In Eastern and Central Europe the housing market plays a decisive role and may induce couples to live apart from each other. Young people may have to stay with their parents longer than wanted. Sometimes they are married already but may still have to stay in their separate parental homes because no common dwelling is available. This living arrangement may also be chosen by people at higher ages who want to preserve a certain degree of autonomy from each other or may want to keep a widow's pension. Conversely, divorced persons may live in the same dwelling due to difficulties in finding other housing and/or for financial reasons; this may be particularly relevant for Mediterranean and Eastern European countries.

In the light of the increasing number of adults who experience more than one relationship, the process of selection into new living arrangements, their stability, and their development are of interest. Beyond this, the influence on fertility and the long-term effects concerning the social network, care, and living arrangements at older ages are of interest. Studies of stepfamily fertility put an emphasis on co-residence with children. In most cases of union break-up children stay with their mother, and thus the parity of the woman can be expected to have a stronger impact on further childbearing than that of the man, assuming that co-resident children matter more than those living elsewhere. Less is known about the long-term effects of previous living arrangements

---

[1] The proposal of the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research was used as a starting-point for this introduction (Hoem et al. 2000).

[2] Thanks are due to my colleagues in the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Rostock, to Martine Corijn of the PAU at the UNECE and to Gijs Beets, of NIDI, for many useful comments on previous versions of the present text.

[3] Including information on the parent-child-module, the parent/family aspect could be added to the three-dimensions when analysing the data.

for people at the older ages, including the effects on their social network (composition and functioning).

In the analysis of marriage dissolution it is important to distinguish between split-up and divorce. The divorce after splitting up is postponed longer in some countries than in others. This can be caused by differences in legal regulations. In Sweden, for instance, divorce can be immediate on demand or after a brief waiting period, while in Italy a separation period of three years is required before divorce from the date of separation, and in Germany a period of two years.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

The definition of a relationship is intentionally kept vague in the draft questionnaire. Trying to define a relationship by using criteria like love, sex, or emotional closeness, for instance, are bound to fail, as even marriages do not necessarily fulfill these criteria. Feeling emotionally close or feeling responsible for someone's well-being is not exclusive to couples, but might be true also for members of a social network. In a questionnaire, a phrase is needed that is common in the everyday language of each society or culture. A professional sociological definition of a relationship is not appropriate in a questionnaire. The term "stable relationship (in German: *feste Partnerschaft*) that lasted at least one year" has worked fine in some surveys in Germany. Casual affairs are normally excluded from the questionnaire by intention. There is no room for collecting information about casual affairs in our survey, nor is a specific research question or hypothesis concerning their effects on the further life course available. It may be appropriate to change the term "stable relationship" into "having a partner" in some languages, but it does not seem advisable for German-speaking communities or other countries with Germanic languages. The German language differentiates between female and male partners. We plan to include same-sex relationships as well, at least implicitly, and the interviewer cannot know in advance whether one or more (and which) of the partners are of the same or opposite sex. Consequently, we will want to avoid formulations in the questionnaire that assume that all partners are of the opposite sex.

We suggest that relationships previous to any current one be recorded only if they lasted at least four months. This duration is an inheritance from the previous FFS, where only cohabitational unions that lasted at least three months should have been mentioned. To make the data of these two surveys comparable we also need to cover cohabitational unions lasting at least three months in the GGS. We have added one month because some time usually passes before a couple moves in together. We recommend strongly that the four-month duration (rather than the one-year duration used in the definition of a stable relationship in the German Family survey) be tested in a pilot study.

Information on the characteristics of the couple is needed to understand the development of a relationship and of fertility. This means that at least some crucial characteristics should be collected for both partners. It does not seem realistic to attempt to interview both members of couples in this survey[4]. Information about (non)homogeneity (age, education, nationality) and experiences in relationships and family life (marital status, children) is required for both partners in order to explain the development of their relationship. For this reason some characteristics of each partner should be asked retrospectively. More information should be obtained regarding any current partner.

A standardized time reference should be chosen for the collection of information concerning basic characteristics of each partner. We suggest the start of each relationship as the best such time reference. It is the only point where characteristics will be comparable across relationships, and the partners' characteristics at that stage affect the development of the whole relationship.

[4] Even if the current partner could be interviewed, we would need the information for previous partners in order to understand the dynamics of relationships and family development in the previous life course.

INFORMATION REQUIRED

We need to collect a detailed history of relationships from each primary respondent. The history should contain the time[5] when each relationship began and ended as well as any kind of change in the three dimensions mentioned above (partnering, living arrangement, marital status) and their corresponding timing. Such information will still unavoidably be partial, given the possible complexity of relationship formation, the development of relationships, and the process of splitting up.

The partner-relationship module should be used by all countries and for all age groups. It will not increase the interview time appreciably if we use the same definition of a relationship consistently. The definition is wide, in that it also includes living apart together (LAT relationships), but most people in the older age groups have not experienced many such relationships, so on average there will not be any appreciably larger total number of relationships than if LAT relationships were left out. In addition, marriage seems to be the standard life pattern in the Eastern and Central European countries in any case.

All three dimensions (partnering, living arrangement, and marital status) can be asked retrospectively. A great deal of experience is already available in using this type of questionnaire module. The only aspect added in our draft module is whether a couple lived separately for a while. The reliability of data collection on this aspect should be tested, especially in a pilot-study, because to our knowledge temporary split ups have never been asked retrospectively in a survey before.

Although we get the information on whether the respondent has been living together with the children of a partner from the childbearing-and-parenting module already, we should include a question on the living arrangement in the present module as well. Such information can be used as a crosscheck and it makes analysis easier[6].

We have included a separate question concerning same-sex relationships at the end of the partner-relationship module.

References

Alt, Christian (2001): Kindheit in Ost und West. Wandel der familialen Lebensformen aus Kindersicht. Opladen

Hoem, J.M. (2000): Concepts for a second round of fertility and family surveys in Europe with particular attention paid to persons of reproductive working age. In: Jan Hoem et al. *Generations and gender programme: exploring future research and data collection options.* New York; Geneva: United Nations, 59-104.

[5] In order to study simultaneous processes in life courses exact dates are needed. For event-history-analyses dates must be collected to the accuracy of a month. Otherwise one has to deal with too many cases of apparently synchronous but in reality distinct events. This is true for all life history modules.

[6] It is time-consuming to link the information in the partner-relationship-history to the data in the parent-child-module during data analysis. Sometimes the various pieces do not seem to fit to each other at all when no cross-check is built into the data-collection procedures (experience from the "Familiensurvey" of the German Youth Institute in Munich).

PARENT – CHILD[7]

Angelika Tölke [8]

RATIONALE

One has still not come far enough in providing causal explanations for the changes and differences in fertility patterns in Europe. Current results concerning the associations between various life careers and the timing of critical transitions in each of them have not been sufficient to explain the variations in fertility patterns across Europe, nor have they explained trends in fertility levels over time. Countries in Central and Eastern Europe have undergone rapid changes, so special emphasis should be placed on documenting the impact of recent societal change on fertility patterns and family dynamics, in this region and (for comparative purposes also) elsewhere. Information on a respondent's childbearing history is the cornerstone of any survey geared towards analyzing reproductive behaviour.

The timing of the transition into mother-/fatherhood has an effect on final fertility, and the fact that contemporary societies are structured in such a way as to stimulate a postponement of this crucial life transition is one of the explanations of low fertility levels. One should determine which other life transitions (leaving the parental home, finishing education, finding a job, etc.) and which conditions are prerequisites for the transition into parenthood.

From a theoretical point of view, many Western researchers have believed strongly that female employment and fertility should be negatively correlated. However, this popular line of thinking relies on the premise that child-rearing and female employment are not mutually compatible. Only relatively recently has one realized that one additionally needs to take into account policies that support the compatibility of child rearing and employment (cf. section on contextual data). However, relatively little is known about the impact that childcare *costs* have on fertility decisions (Blau and Robins 1988) and about such effects of the *availability* (Kravdal 1996) and *kind* of childcare used.

The complex design of the parent-child module offers a further possibility for analysis, in that life courses can be analyzed from the perspective of each child as well. Some theoretical approaches to fertility investigations assume that there is a polarization of life patterns into family and non-family life careers. Strohmeier (1993) postulates that the variety of life patterns in the non-family sector will increase further, but that the family- life pattern will stay pretty stable. Current empirical research on life courses of children -- obtained from their mothers' or fathers' life course – give empirical evidence that even children experience an increasing variety of events in their childhood and youth (Alt 2001). The number of children who do not live together with both biological parents increases all the time until they reach age 18. How many parenting people step into the lives of these children? The current questionnaire module allows us to gather information for this kind of analysis.

---

[7] The proposal of the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research was used as a starting-point for this introduction (Hoem et al. 2000). Information concerning the meaning and the role of children for elderly people will be discussed in the section on social networks. The present chapter focuses on parenting and childcare, but it also contains a discussion of information needed to study many other family aspects.

[8] Thanks are due to my colleagues in the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Rostock, to Martine Corijn of the PAU at the UNECE and to Gijs Beets, of NIDI, for many useful comments on previous versions of the present text.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

As already mentioned above, relationship patterns have changed. For this reason it is indispensable to broaden the family perspective and therefore also the "definition" of children. Biological children are no longer the only ones who establish parenthood. Social mother- and fatherhood are of increasing importance. Step-parenthood not only includes children of a spouse, but also children of an unmarried partner with whom one has been/is living together.

Small children who live in one's household and who share one's everyday life have an effect on one's own further fertility, on the stability and on the development of one's relationship, on one's social network, and on one's job career. It is therefore essential to include all these children as well in the parent-child module. Such a "variety" of children has become more evident in recent years. This may be particular mostly to Western Europe, but it costs very little interview time to use the same definition in all countries and all age groups.

- Childcare

Parental leave pretends to be a means for women to stay employed and retain the same position after finishing parental leave, and to give fathers the chance to father. We want to know who, when and how long mothers/fathers have been on parental leave and whether the parents shared their parental leave. On the one hand, a more detailed picture is needed on the use and practice of parental leave, and on the other hand, we need to know more about its effects on fertility, on the development of a relationship, and on employment and job careers. The effects of family policy on individual life courses and on the development of families can be evaluated while covering an important gender topic.

The parent-child module[9] provides a database for a comparison of how parents organize day care for their children across Europe. Asking about childcare retrospectively at ages two and four for children up to the age of 15 at the time of the survey[10] opens up new research possibilities in the current debate, as follows:

- It allows us to analyze the effects of different modes of childcare on the probability of having another child. At least preliminary analyses (Familiensurvey 1988 and 1994; German Youth Institute, Munich) suggest that families that have one parent staying home tend more often to have another child than families where a grandparent looks after the child. Families where first child receives institutional care have the lowest probability of having another child. It seems that there is a hierarchy from personal to institutional care affecting further childbearing, at least in Germany. Whether this is a direct effect, or an indirect effect caused by other variables, should/could be analyzed.
- Discovering typical successions of modes of childcare can give clues to how fragile modes of childcare are and how parents "solve" problems. Retrospective data can show which modes of childcare actually have been used. Changes in the mode of childcare may influence the probability of having another child and also the employment and career track of at least the mother. The effects of intentions and preferences can be compared with the effects of the actual situation in the panel design.
- Even in huge representative samples one can expect only a small number of respondents who have a small child at the time of the interview. By using a retrospective questionnaire module we

[9] Regarding the availability of childcare through social networks, see the modules on social network and on parenting. Regarding questions on social norms, for instance questions concerning who should care for a child until the child has reached a certain age, see the module on values.

[10] Age 15 seemed to be appropriate in order to still reliably recollect retrospective information on childcare. As almost all children still stay at their parental home at this age, the care aspect is still present or at least not too far back in the past.

increase the number of children for whom we get information about caring and care arrangements.

Definition, mode, and duration of parental leave vary between countries and have changed in recent times. A discussion is needed with representatives from other countries on whether the current module matches all countries.

- Abortion/Infertility

As abortions are usually strongly underreported – at least in Western European countries – we suggest that questions on abortions be optional. We assume that information about abortions will not be asked in most Western European countries, but that they possibly may be collected in some Eastern or Central European countries.

In Western Europe current concern about infertility treatments and new medical developments to improve/achieve fertility may induce some countries to want to include corresponding questions instead. There is probably considerable variation between countries as well as between social groups in the (actual as well as perceived) availability and affordability of such treatment, and information may be seen as needed. We propose that this aspect be covered in the questionnaire module on parenting through a set of optional questions.

In addition, we would regard information on whether a given child was wanted, and whether a further child is wanted at the time of the interview, as strongly desirable, but we have not included it in our current version of the questionnaire. (We get back to this issue below.) Similarly, questions on the conditions needed for a respondent to realize a current wish to have children remain to be developed.

- Gender aspects (more to follow in a separate section on gender issues)

As marriages are becoming increasingly less important (and are in part replaced by consensual unions) and as relationships are becoming increasingly unstable, women and men are increasingly faced with different family experiences. In order to understand the patterns of behaviour, one must obtain relevant information from men as well as women.

There is a greater diversity among men than among women concerning their number of biological as well as the number of foster children. More men are childless than women, while some men father a relatively large number of children. There is also a greater diversity in experiences of social parenthood and of partnership dynamics among men than among women. Men have higher re-entry rates into new relationships following union disruptions than women have. Consequently, they are more likely to experience multiple reproductive partnerships and they are more likely to foster children in a stepfamily.

The increasing prevalence of union disruption calls for more attention to be paid to the separate experiences that men and women have after separation. Also too little is known about divorced or separated parents (esp. fathers) and their children. Therefore, we suggest that this aspect be addressed in the questionnaire, and that one should ask whether the separated parent, in most cases the father, is still in contact with his children and how often they meet. With an additional question about what the situation was like after two years of separation, we want to exploit a point in time that is comparable between respondents, and we hope to cover a point when contact arrangements essentially have become a matter of routine for most parents. Questions regarding financial obligations to separated children need to be developed in the section on incomes, expenses, and assets.

Finally, it is important to keep in mind that men have a more extended reproductive life span than women. Consequently, we need to follow men up through higher ages than what is normally used when one focuses on the reproductive experiences of women alone.

- Timing of childbirth and (un)wanted children

Although it is a "subjective" question it seems to be practicable and reliable to ask retrospectively whether a pregnancy/child was wanted and whether it was planned at that time. It is not only of interest to determine the number of unwanted children, but also the effect that an unwanted or mistimed pregnancy that has been carried to term has on the further life course. If this information is desired, such a question (as in the FFS) could be added in the parent-child module. One has to keep in mind that the man and the woman in a couple may give different answers to this question. Therefore the question should be more elaborate than the previous question in the FFS, or the question should make it clear that only the opinion of the respondent is being asked for.

INFORMATION REQUIRED

There is an obvious need to collect the birth dates (month and year) of all children born alive and of the children of the partners who have been living or are still living at the respondent's home.

Ideally, one wants to also survey the complete childcare history of each child that has lived in the respondents' household. This seems to be an unrealistic task for the planned survey, so we propose a more pragmatic approach, namely to collect data for children at selected ages. The ages of two and four years seem to be a good selection. In many countries there are only very few public childcare institutions for small children up to the age of 3; this is certainly the case in Western European countries like Germany, Austria, Switzerland, and Italy. In these countries (and surely many others) kindergarten starts at the age of three. Ages two and four, therefore, cover two different phases of childhood. They also cover stages when the state of flux should be over and when childcare should be established on a (more or less) regular level. One must find out whether these ages need to be adjusted to suit country-specific situations. We suggest that childcare mode (public day-care center, child-minder, social network, spouse, and so on) and probable multiple care arrangements be obtained as well as the number of hours per week and the current costs of childcare.

Although Eastern and Central Europe had a long tradition of combining employment and childrearing up to the beginning of the 1990s, the situation has changed in the last decade. Therefore one would be interested in collecting the same detailed information about childcare as in Western European countries.

Additionally, we suggest that the childcare costs for each child be surveyed for the situation at the time of the interview for children up to age six (i.e., before starting primary school). This is especially relevant for countries with a high ratio of private day care. As questions concerning costs cannot be asked retrospectively, such questions cover the situation at interview only. The importance of financial costs on the decision of having another child can then be tested in the follow-up study.

We suggest that questions on abortion and infertility treatment be made optional.

Information on whether a given child was wanted, and whether a further child is wanted at the time of the interview is strongly desirable, but we have not included it in our current version of the questionnaire. Similarly, questions on the conditions needed for a respondent to realize a current wish to have children remain to be developed.

REGION SPECIFIC ISSUES

Definition, mode, and duration of parental leave vary between countries and have changed in recent times. A discussion is needed with representatives from other countries on whether the current module matches all countries. The same is true for childcare.

References

Avramov, Dragana (1993): Child Care, School Time Schedules and Professional Activity of Parents. In : Avramov, Dragana/Rallu, Jean-Louis/ Blum, Alan (ed.). *European Population: Demographie Europeenne*; Vol. 2: Demographic Dynamics: Dynamiques Demographiques.

Blau, David M. /Robins, Philip K. (1988): Child care costs and family labor supply. *Review of Economics and Statistics* (70): 374-381.

Hoem, J.M. (2000): Concepts for a second round of fertility and family surveys in Europe with particular attention paid to persons of reproductive working age. In: Jan Hoem et al. *Generations and gender programme: exploring future research and data collection options*. New York; Geneva: United Nations, 59-104.

Kravdal, Ø. (1996): How the local supply of day-care centers influences fertility in Norway: A parity-specific approach. *Population Research and Policy Review* (15): 201-218.

Strohmeier, K.P (1993): Pluralisierung und Polarisierung der Lebensformen in Deutschland. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte. Beilage zur Wochenzeitschrift "Das Parlament.* B17: 229-261.

HOUSEHOLD

RATIONALE
The household is a basic unit where partners and parents-children can exchange space, money and as well as time.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES
Co-residence within the household is considered an important characteristic of the context in which the partner-partner relation and the parent-child relation can operate. The family and the broader social network will be considered as the broader units within which the partner relations and parent-child relations operate.

As mentioned in the partner-partner and parent-child component, GGS is interested in all kinds of parents (biological, step, adoptive, foster) and all kinds of children (biological, step, adoptive, foster). Information on the household members will contribute to the information on the primary social network.

For some persons, co-residence became a matter of degree. Survey-based household data offer the opportunity to collect information on the de facto household composition and on household members that are temporarily present/absent or that are only part-time members of the household.

The definition of the de facto household composition must be clear on how to deal with persons such as: students returning to the parental home during the weekends only; partners living together only during weekends for job-related reasons, partners with diverse arrangements of living apart and together, parents and children with diverse arrangements of living apart and together in the context of a post-separation arrangement of their parents. A formal criterion for full membership of the household could be 'spending at least four nights a week in the household'.

In particular countries, separated partners have to share the same dwelling due to financial or housing constraints. The household definition must give room to identify these specific situations.

As individuals are the sampling unit, we must know in which kind of household they are living, taking into account the new arrangements of so-called 'assisted living communities' (special or sheltered housing).

REQUIRED INFORMATION
Information on the household concerns the current household. However, information regarding the time since members joined the household or the time since arrangements of temporary or part-time membership were introduced could be very informative as it opens a window on the household history. Intentions for the future on partners, parents and/or children joining or leaving the household will be picked up in the other components.

Basic socio-demographic characteristics of all household members will be asked for, including the relation to the anchor:

- partner
- parent by kind of parent
- partner's parent by kind of parent
- son/daughter by kind of child
- brother /sister by kind of sibling
- partner's brother/sister by kind of sibling
- grandparent

- partner's grandparent
- grandchild
- partner's grandchild
- other relative
- non-relative

Morever, for all household members we need to know:
- gender
- age
- cohabitational/marital status
- parental status.

For all de facto household members information details will be asked on
- full-/part-time membership of the household
- temporary membership.

In the context of the collection of information on the household income and on the availability of members for providing transfers and in need of transfers, information on the activity status of all de facto household members will be useful.

LINK WITH OTHER COMPONENTS

PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIP: The history of children entering and leaving the household of the anchor will be dealt with in this component.

NETWORK: All household members are considered as part of the latent primary social network, hence similar information on household members and other network members must be obtained.

NETWORK TRANSFERS: Information on network transfers will be both person-centred and transfer-centred. Household members belong to the person-centred part. It will be of relevance to see which network transfers take place within the household and which ones take place beyond the household.

EARNINGS AND ASSETS: Household members might contribute to the earnings and assets of the household.

HOUSING: Basic, household information will be linked to the housing quality data

MIGRATION: Children and parents can decide at several moments to stop sharing residence (young adults leaving the parental home) or to (re)start sharing residence (young adults returning to the parental home, parents joining the children's household). Some of these issues may be dealt with in the migration component.

VALUES: Values on co-residence will be dealt with as we are interested in the normative orientations with regard to co-residence.

CONTEXT RELATED ISSUES

GENERAL: Households are the context of co-residence of the partner-partner and parent-child relations of anchor. The household is considered a primary unit of the social and economic mezzo-context of individuals.

It will be possible to put the GGS household data into a broader regional/national context by using the data on the gender and intergenerational composition of households from the 2000-census round.

INTERGENERATIONAL RELEVANCE: The household data will allow measuring the residential segregation by age. Multigenerational households constitute a crucial unit of a multitude of within-household intergenerational transfers. Cross-generational parenting - grandparents raising their grandchildren- is an issue of importance in particular settings.

GENDER RELEVANCE: Household information will shed light on the diversity of patterns of co-residing fatherhood and motherhood. Stepfatherhood and fathers having their children only temporarily in the household are emerging patterns due to separation/divorce. Co-residence of older (adult) children with parents and of (adult) children with older parents is often gender-specific as for example sons stay longer in the parental home and as older parents join more easily the household of their daughters.

REGION SPECIFIC ISSUES

In particular regions, multigenerational households are more prevalent. Forced co-residence of partners after separation, or forced living apart for housing- or work-related reasons are more prevalent in particular regions. It has to be decided how much consideration can be/has to be given to these specific patterns.

AGE SPECIFIC ISSUES

As mentioned above, new living arrangements of sheltered housing for older persons may require additional information to better define the kind of household one is living in.

The American National Surveys on Family and Households devoted a special section to older children living in the household of their parents, as in some countries young adults stay long in the parental home and in particular social-economic settings sons and daughters never leave the parental home. If desirable, a short extra-module on these child-parent and parent-child relations could be developed.

DESIGN RELATED ISSUES

In the first wave of the panel survey, information on since when members belong to the household could be very useful as this opens in a simple way a window on the past and generates some co-residential history information.

Basic household information in any wave will be used as an explanatory variable in later waves. Moreover, it will be useful to monitor changes in multigenerational households over time.

FAMILY

RATIONALE

For a large proportion of adults their child-parent and parent-child relations exist beyond the household. The number of generations alive in a family has increased. Parent-child relations became part of a longer intergenerational chain. At the same time the number of same-generation kin declined. Moreover, the co-residence patterns of children with their parents and of parents with their children have changed dramatically. In order to collect information on the child-parent relation one must go beyond household and obtain information of the family along the maternal and paternal line. Generational structures become an important independent variable (see Hagestad, 2000).

Family ties can be hypothesised to have weakened, alternatively, family ties may have strengthened through reliance on the family as the only remaining vestige of the private sphere.

Social and economic characteristics of the family of origin have proved their value as important determinants of the partnership and family formation and dissolution processes. It may prove useful as a determinant of other family-related processes and of family transfers. There is clear evidence for the intergenerational transmission of behaviour.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

According to Riley and Riley (1993), multigenerational families represent 'latent kin networks' of support that often are enacted only in times of crisis.

As the GGP focuses on the partner-partner and child-parent relation, the family picture in this component of GGS will concentrate on the parents and children of anchor, and those of the partner, if any, living beyond the household. Information on the grandparents and grandchildren and on the siblings will be more restricted. This information complements the information gathered in the household component.

With regard to parents, children and siblings a broad definition will be used in order to grasp the increasing complexity of families due to successive partnership and family formation and dissolution. Children and grandchildren will concern all kinds: biological, step, adoptive and foster. Parents and grandparents will concern all kinds: biological, step, foster and adoptive, both along the paternal and maternal line. Siblings will concern biological, step, foster and adoption siblings.

For most persons the family of origin coincides with the household in which a person spent most of his/her childhood years up to age 15. For those persons who did no live during these childhood years with both biological parents or whose parental background changed crucially - due to family dissolution or migration - an alternative definition of the family of origin will be required.

REQUIRED INFORMATION

This component will yield information on members of the current family alive of the anchor and the partner, if any. Some intentions on the future of the family will be dealt with in the partner-partner and parent-child component.

The main focus will be on the characteristics of the parents and the children, as well as on the siblings. Basic socio-demographic information on the parents, children and siblings of the anchor and the partner, if any, not living in the household will be the same one as the one on the household members (see household component).

Apart from the relation with the anchor and the partner, if any, we are interested in

- gender
- age
- cohabitational/marital status
- parental status
- activity status.

For family members we also want to obtain an idea of their geographical distance, as proximity to kin makes a significant difference for contact and time-related transfers

Information on the (grand)grandparents and (grand)grandchildren will be restricted to the number still alive. If these family members are important to anchor and the partner, if any, they will show up in the network component.

Some information on parents and children no longer alive will be obtained in the parent-child component and in the section on the family of origin.

Central characteristics of the parental household will be:

- place of birth
- place of residence during childhood years,
- social and economic characteristics of the parents involved in the childhood years
- social and economic characteristics of the parental household during childhood years.

It would be highly desirable, if legal regulations permit, to ask for the name of the place of birth and of residence during the childhood years that allows for coding up to NUTS5 level so that researchers have the opportunity to use any higher NUTS-level they need (see migration component).

Social and economic characteristics of both the parents involved concern:

- cohabitational/marital status during childhood years and changes therein, if any
- educational level
- activity status
- socio-economic indicator
- ethnical background / nationality
- current status (deceased or current living arrangement status).

LINK WITH OTHER COMPONENTS

NETWORK: Parents, children and siblings living within or beyond the household of the anchor and of the partner, if any, are considered as part of the latent primary social network. Hence similar information on these and other network members must be obtained. If other family members such as nephews or aunts are of major importance to the anchor, they may show up in the network component.

NETWORK TRANSFERS: The relative position of kin members and non-kin members involved in the network and network transfers will be identified.

VALUES: Values on the family will be asked for.

CONTEXT RELATED ISSUES

A major critique on FFS was that it was overly focused on the individual. Putting the partner-partner relationship and the parent-child relationship of the anchor and of the partner, if any, into

the context of the household and the family goes a long way towards introducing mezzo-level or proximate contextual information in future analyses of the two relations.
Some countries have national estimates of kinship members that can be used as macro-contextual information.
Information on the place of birth and the place of residence during the childhood years will open an opportunity for the use of regional macro-contextual data in multi-level analyses of biographical data.
INTERGENERATIONAL RELEVANCE: The family component provides a more complete picture of the relationships of anchor and the partner, if any, with the parents, grandparents, children and grandchildren. The data will show the degree of verticalization of the family, the top versus bottom-heaviness, the sex ratios, the generational distance, the generational turnover. Information on the family of origin is relevant as a large amount of intergenerational transfers take place during childhood years.
GENDER RELEVANCE: The family picture will reveal the gender imbalances among the oldest family generations. Both the household and family data will reveal the gendered patterns of co-residence with older parents and with children. The role of women as main mediators of relations between generations in the family and as kin-keepers will be documented.

REGION SPECIFIC ISSUES
Information on the household and the family will reveal the regional variations of the prevalence of co-residence of members of different generations. Multigenerational co-residence may both affect and be affected by the social welfare origin.

AGE SPECIFIC ISSUES
Very old persons may not know with certainty the required information on their family members. Solutions for this problem must be considered.

DESIGN RELETED ISSUES
Information on the family members of the partner of the anchor, if any, can be best obtained directly from the partner, however, operationally this may be difficult (see sampling design).
Basic information on the current family in a wave will be used as explanatory variable in later waves.
Moreover, changes over time in the family composition will be monitored. Multi-generational family demography is seriously in need of good data.

References

Hagestad, G.O., 2000. Adults intergenerational relationships. In Generations and Gender Programme. Exploring future research and data collection options. Geneva : United Nations

Riley M.W and J.W. Riley, 1993. Connections : Kin and cohort. In V.L. Bengtson & W.A. Achenbaum (eds.), The changing contract across generations. New York : Aldine de Gruyter.

NETWORK

RATIONALE

GGP puts the partner-partner and the parent-child relations and their transfers into a broader context of a network of kin and non-kin. The network data will provide a picture of the social embeddedness of the anchor and his/her relations with partner, children and parents, if any. Transfers within this network constitute a major component of GGP.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

In order to ask about the network transfers, the network has to be identified. Network transfers can be gathered via person-centred and/or transfer-centred transfers.

GGS is interested in the primary social network (and the network transfers involved) around the partner and parent-child relations of the anchor. An appropriate delineation of the relevant network has to be identified, as in fact network of partners e.g. are only partially overlapping.

The persons of the person-centred transfers will include the partner, the children and the parents, if any alive and other household members, if any. These persons are considered being part of a latent kin network. However, if one were to focus only on these family members (and the transfers involved) the picture of the social embeddedness of those without many or any of these family members would be limited as it would not include other kin and non-kin that are important in the context of the network and the related transfers. Hence, the network will include other kin and non-kin members that are (actively) important or are considered to be (potentially) important with respect to transfers in the life of the anchor.

For immigrants and minority groups 'language' spoken in the network (household, family, others) could reveal the degree to which these networks are open or closed.

Social participation is another indicator of the social embeddedness of the anchor. Some surveys, in particular on younger and older persons, have complemented their social network information with information on the social participation (membership of different kinds of organisations and kind of involvement in these). However, the kind of transfers included in this kind of social participation is often of a specific nature. A decision on the importance of this particular topic has to be taken.

REQUIRED INFORMATION

The network data concern the current network.

Depending on the delineation of the network, information may be obtained from the anchor only, or also from the partner, if any. A friend of the anchor's partner could be an important member of the network of the relationship, but anchor may be incapable to provide appropriate information on this friend. Similarly, a network transfer to the partner of anchor, may be of major importance for the couple, but the anchor may not be capable of giving the appropriate information on this transfer. We have to find a manageable solution.

The National Research Council (2001) mentions that when mapping the network, attention should be given to carefully defining the unit in question. If a respondent is living alone, little confusion is likely to arise in tracing the exchanges between the respondent and his or her network. When the respondent is not living alone, however, care must be exercised as to whether the questions are intended to cover the couple or the particular respondent. Although visits and transfers of

money and goods are likely to be for the benefit of the couple, this will not always be the case. If the intent is to measure exchanges in which the couple is involved, this should be made clear from the structure of the questionnaire. In practice, one will usually seek a mix of respondent and couple responses (p.176).

In order to obtain a picture of the network members involved in important transfers the selection of the name elicitation question for members other then the partner, the children and the parents is crucial.

Once the relevant kin and non-kin members of the network have been identified, the same basic information as the one on the household and central family members is collected:
Characteristics of the members:

- relation with anchor (or the partner)
- gender
- age
- cohabitation/marital status
- parental status
- activity status
- residential proximity.

LINK WITH OTHER COMPONENTS

HOUSEHOLD: In GGS household members are considered part of the network.

FAMILY: In GGS parents, children and siblings living beyond the household are considered part of the network.

NETWORK TRANSFERS: Information on the network is collected as network members are considered as the potential and/or actual givers and receivers of the network transfers.

VALUES: Importance of kin versus non-kin will be covered in the values component.

CONTEXT RELATED ISSUES

The primary social network, comprising kin and non-kin members constitute an important mezzo-context.

INTERGENERATIONAL RELEVANCE: Including the various kin and non-kin members in the network will reveal the relative size and position of intergenerational relations and same generation relations within the primary social network. The generational composition of the network may be an important determinant of the kind of transfers within the network.

GENDER RELEVANCE: It will be possible to describe the gender composition of the network of men and women. This gender composition may be an important determinant of the kind of transfers within the network.

REGION SPECIFIC ISSUES

The size, composition and density of the primary social network are likely to vary across societies. The dominance of particular institutions (church, political party, unions) may be reflected in the network, and especially in any social participation information..

AGE SPECIFIC ISSUES

The size, composition and density of the primary social network may vary across age.

The topic of social participation could be considered an issue of particular interest for older persons.

DESIGN RELATED ISSUES

The ultimate delineation of the relevant network of the partner and parent-child relations of anchor will have implications for the data collection.

An important research issue will be to analyse the impact of the network on the start, nature and end of the partner-partner and parent-child relation as observed in a later wave.

Changes in the primary social network over time due to family formation and/or dissolution, due to household changes, due to ageing will be registered in the subsequent waves.

References

National Research Council, 2001. Preparing for an aging world. The case for cross-national research.

EDUCATION[11]

Angelika Tölke [12]

RATIONALE

There is a large body of literature in which the impact of educational attainment on family formation is analyzed (Cf. Liefbroer and Corijn 1999). Currently, one of the most interesting questions seems to be whether educational differentials in the timing of entry into motherhood are due to differences in the length of educational participation ("institutional effect") or to the level of education ("level effect"). In other words: Are college graduates older when they enter parenthood only because they are in the educational system for a longer time and because child rearing and receiving education are not compatible (Blossfeld and Huinink 1991)? Or do they start childbearing later because college graduates have a better starting point for different career tracks due to their high educational level and specific professional training, and because they therefore postpone parenthood further, even after the completion of their education?

Some researchers even speculate about a "polarization of family structures" (Federkeil 1997; Strohmeier 1993) in Europe, meaning that highly educated women can largely be grouped into those that have no children and those that have at least two children. Since in many countries a successful working career is rather incompatible with having children – at least for women, highly educated women might remain childless. On the other hand, women who have given up employment to have a child might be more likely to have further children, because they have given up on their own working career anyway – even when they have a high level of education. These women are usually married to highly educated men so that they can afford to stay at home.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

Sociologists and demographers need to know about life segments when the respondent was in education, the level of education, and preferably also the general subject area of the education (e.g. training in humanities vs. science, or technical vs. the teaching or caring professions) and whether this education was part- or full-time. Each of the four dimensions (might) have a separate effect on the life course, especially on family development. Therefore, one ideally wants the complete educational history of a respondent. This is even feasible in principle, but an international survey has special problems. Dourleijn et al. (2000) used the FFS to investigate the impact of educational attainment on first-birth risks. One of their main findings was that the ISCED-classification (1988) does not provide results that are sufficiently reliable across countries, even over and above misunderstandings and coding errors.

As educational systems vary, much effort should be made to ensure that information collected on education is comparable across countries. First of all, the situation in each country must be assessed in such a way that the respondents can easily pick their (level of) education from a list of response categories. On the other hand, these lists must also be constructed so as to permit national comparisons. Therefore an underlying suitably abstract classification must be found. An explanation of what the term 'education' means is needed and the country-specific educational systems have to be taken into account when the questions are formulated for each country. In a country like Germany, there is a clear-cut difference between general schooling (*erste allgemeinbildende Schulzeit*) and education after this level. In such a country education after school is formalized and one gets a generally valid certificate. Such a certificate specifies the

---

[11] The proposal of the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research was used as a starting-point for this introduction (Hoem et al. 2000).

[12] Thanks are due to my colleagues in the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Rostock, to Martine Corijn of the PAU at the UNECE and to Gijs Beets, of NIDI, for many useful comments on previous versions of the present text.

educational level attained (as e.g. university education, vocational training, and public health-/business-/technical school) and opens up entry-level access into occupational positions. Other countries have different systems.

INFORMATION REQUIRED

A complete history of periods when the respondent was in education, the level of education, the general subject area of the education (e.g. training in humanities vs. science, or technical vs. the teaching or caring professions), and whether this education was part- or full-time is wanted.

The questions concerning subject areas within education and whether the education was part- or full-time have lower priority. This means that if the questionnaire needs to be shortened, these questions are candidates for deletion.

COUNTRY SPECIFIC ISSUES

As educational systems vary, much effort should be made to ensure that information collected on education is comparable across countries. The task of making the uestionnaire module comparable must be solved in cooperation with representatives of the various countries involved; right now we only present the list for Germany with the draft questionnaire. The 1997-ISCED-schema must be checked in order to see whether a newly developed schema fits the demands of all countries. This is no mean task. For instance, the classification used in the European Community Household Panel (ECHP) is not convincing, at least not for Germany.

References

Blossfeld, H.-P. & J. Huinink (1991): Human Capital Investment or Norms of Role Transition? How Women's Schooling and Career Affect the Process of Family Formation. *American Journal of Sociology* (97): 143-168.

Federkeil, G. (1997): The Federal Republic of Germany: Polarization of family structure. In: F.-X. Kaufmann, et al. (Eds.): Family life and family policies in Europe. Oxford.

Hoem, J.M. et al. (2000): Concepts for a second round of fertility and family surveys in Europe with particular attention paid to persons of reproductive working age. In: Jan Hoem et al. *Generations and gender programme: exploring future research and data collection options*. New York & Geneva: United Nations, 59-104.

Liefbroer, A. & M. Coijn (1999): Who, What, and When? Specifying the Impact of Educational Attainment and Labour Force Participation on Family Formation. *European Journal of Population* (15): 45-75.

EMPLOYMENT AND OCCUPATIONAL STATUS[13]

Angelika Tölke [14]

RATIONALE

Today, life courses are more diverse than conventional notions of a "linear" progression from education to employment to retirement. Traditional, clearly structured and timed patterns are increasingly dissolving. There is a need to analyze how fertility interrupts labor market activities as well as vice versa, namely whether being non-employed or being discontinuously employed affects family development. We also want to know the direction of any impact. Especially for countries in transition and in periods of economic crisis, the individual consequences for fertility decisions are of interest.

Characteristics of a respondent's occupational status offer information on social class, economic situation, and career track. Theoretical approaches like New Home Economics or theoretical statements about the polarization of life patterns underline the importance of this dimension for family formation and family development (childbirth, union disruption, and family re-formation).

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

The following dimensions (including changes and the timing of changes) are perhaps the main ones that one would like to take into account in the analysis of the relationship between the processes of family development and employment and job career (given that educational history is already asked separately):

- Timing of activities
- Occupational status
- Working arrangements (simultaneous jobs, shift work)
- Hours of work per week
- -- Economic sector
- Security of the work place (e.g. public sector, mode of contract, future of the firm)
- Reasons for changes in the above dimensions

To remain realistic, we must make a selection for the questionnaire module [15]. It is important that the Consortium Board make this selection. For illustration and because it is our own preference, we suggest that the following two dimensions be included in the questionnaire.

- *The timing of activities*: Especially for countries in transition and in periods of economic crisis, the individual consequences of the employment pattern for fertility decisions are of interest, as well as whether and how social networks can help overcome difficult (un)employment situations.

---

[13] The proposal of the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research was used as a starting-point for this introduction (Hoem et al. 2000).

[14] Thanks are due to my colleagues in the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Rostock, to Martine Corijn of the PAU at the UNECE and to Gijs Beets, of NIDI, for many useful comments on previous versions of the present text.

[15] Beyond this, trying to ask about all the changes in the above mentioned dimensions produces separate stimuli for the employment/job history in a questionnaire module. Each of the dimensions can change independently. There is no longer a clearly defined stimulus which a respondent can follow like a thread, nor can the time axis be followed continuously. This produces problems in the construction of a questionnaire module, at least where a paper and pencil interview will be conducted and when standardised questions are required.

The first of these aspects can be (and must be) asked retrospectively, because the panel design contemplated only covers a period of three years, which is too brief to get appreciable effects of employment breaks on fertility and conversely. By contrast, the second aspect needs a panel design.
Until the 1990s women in Eastern and Central Europe were able to combine employment (and sometimes even a career) with having a family. How have women's lives changed since the beginning of the transition period in this region? Does a break (including parental leave) still have such crucial consequences for a woman's employment and job career in Western Europe, in the manner that it had in previous decades? How are men's family dynamics in any region affected by discontinuous employment?

The long-term effects of the previous life-course pattern (concerning non-employment, job career, and family) on health and well being at older ages (for instance) can be analyzed by means of life histories of the elderly. This is an example of a research perspective that will use data from different questionnaire modules. How secure is the support from children when someone is getting old and is in need? How have childless, and therefore probably continuously employed people, made provisions for their old age and their (supporting) social network?

Not only are employment histories becoming more diverse, but so are periods without employment. Non-employment activities may be unemployment, parental leave, unpaid leave, formal education, or "traditional" non-employment such as household work or unpaid caring activities. Some of this information is already asked in other questionnaire modules. Parental leave is asked in the parent-child module, for instance, and periods of education are asked in the education module. In the current draft of the employment module we cover the reasons why someone left the labour market for each employment break. With this module we obtain information about the kind of transition that starts a period of non-employment, including especially the time when a respondent leaves the labour market (for a while). We get to know whether this was for structural reasons (closure of a company, limited contract), for personal reasons (perhaps for further education), for family reasons, and so on. In a separate question at the end of the questionnaire module all periods when the respondent has been searching for a job are mapped. An alternative could be to map periods when he/she was registered as unemployed.

- *Occupational status*: Theoretical approaches underline the importance of the occupational status for family formation and family development. There is empirical evidence that even for men, the two life domains of family and professional career are related to each other (Tölke 2001). If we know a respondent's career track we can analyse its effects on other life domains in the past. We can also analyse its influence on the current situation (for instance, well being, health, or composition of the social network) and intentions for the future (for instance, concerning family formation, or concerning retirement from the labour market).
Demographic processes in partnerships (such as childbearing and marriage) are influenced in general by the occupational histories of both partners. It is not conceivable that this can be covered in retrospective questions. We can cover this aspect only in the follow-up (panel) study. With this in mind, detailed information is asked on the current partner's characteristics concerning his/her current activity (e.g. occupational status, hours of work, income) while sparse data on previous partners is collected from the time when the relationship began along with the characteristics of the respondent at that time.

The definition of employment, selection of response categories, and problems of comparability should be discussed with colleagues from various countries, in the manner we already mentioned regarding the education module. Among issues that must be faced are how we should handle sporadic or marginal employment, how we treat respondents who have a contract but who work

no hours (as was the case in the former German Democratic Republic after "die Wende"), or who get income irregularly or even have no income for a while (as for instance in Russia).

We suggest that a respondent who has two or even more jobs at the same time be requested to report which job is more important for him/her. Other criteria like for instance "job with the higher amount of working hours" does not hit the mark. That job might have be taken just to earn one's living without a professional perspective, whereas some other, seemingly marginal job has been taken as a starting point to build up a professional career.
Since employment situations have become more varied over time, we have added a few questions on the employment situation in the year preceding the interview to cover the aspect that people might have more than one job at the same time.

INFORMATION REQUIRED

Information on the periods of (un)employment is indispensable. The reasons behind the decision to leave the labor market and at least some information on the career track of the respondent are essential for the analyses of family development. There is a need for more information on the working life (e.g. public/private sector, working hours) but there is probably not enough time available to cover these aspects in the questionnaire as well.

For the current situation we have added a few more questions on working hours, shift work, kind of contract, kind of work, and on the location of the workplace.

Questions on having more than one job are added as well. This is because of the tight economic situation which Eastern Europe (among other regions) face. In some Western countries, the number of people having two jobs at the same time is increasing, too.

REMARKS ON THE DRAFT QUESTIONNAIRE

There is a great deal of experience with this type of questionnaire, and various formats are available for potential testing. After consultations with colleagues from Central and Eastern Europe and based on our own experience in some Western countries, particularly Germany, we have adapted a format that may be suitable when the investigator only has limited control over the field staff and its training. This does not mean that we believe we have found anything like an "ideal" solution. For instance, only asking for information on periods of unemployment in a compact form at the end of the module may cause problems. More periods of unemployment may be missed with this solution than where this question is included in the "retrospective loops" of the module. We have chosen our solution because it simplifies data collection and minimises the need for field-staff control.

Whether the effects of the rapid changes in the Central and Eastern European countries on individual employment patterns and on the career tracks since 1990 can be covered sufficiently with this questionnaire module should be carefully tested. Since employment patterns in this region seem to have been very stable before the transition started, most of the data collection time will presumably go into mapping what happened later.

References

Hoem, J.M. et al. (2000): Concepts for a second round of fertility and family surveys in Europe with particular attention paid to persons of reproductive working age. In: Jan Hoem et al. *Generations and gender programme: exploring future research and data collection options*. New York; Geneva: United Nations, 59-104.

Tölke, Angelika (2001): Success at Work, and Overall Life Satisfaction: Changes in the Lives of Men and Women since the 1980s in West Germany. *DIW-Vierteljahresheft*(1): 80-86.

EARNINGS AND ASSETS

RATIONALE

GGP envisages putting the partner-partner and parent-child relationship of the anchor into a broader economic mezzo-context in order to test the relative position of economic determinants of the start, nature and content and end of partner-partner and parent-child relationships.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

Economic characteristics and conditions of the partner-partner relationship and of the parent-child relationship of the anchor can be grasped by different indicators. Data on the current employment of the anchor, of the partner and of other household members, if any, will contribute to the information on the economic conditions of the household (see employment component).

Earnings from different sources -employment, capital, land- constitute a major component of the income of the anchor, of the partner, if any, and of the household. Both physical and financial assets make up the wealth of the anchor, the partner, if any, and the household

As GGS is not an income survey it will not seek to obtaining a complete picture of the earnings and assets of the anchor, the partner, if any and the household. Nor will it try to obtain details on the different sources of the household income. However, a parsimonious but robust approach to earnings and assets data collection will be required. Therefore a selection is needed.

he focus in GGS will be on the income of the household of anchor of the last 12 months. Within this household income, GGS is interested in three main sources: earnings from labour, financial network transfers and financial public transfers. Moreover, GGS wants to identify the recipients of these three sources.

Due to timing constraints GGS can not elaborate in detail on all physical and financial assets of the household. Some will be covered as far as they are part of the network transfers, including intergenerational transfers. Information on the dwelling unit, which can be part of the physical assets, will be dealt with in the housing component.

An accurate picture of the use of the disposable household income may require information on the different kinds of fixed expenditures. A position has to be taken on how to deal with debts.

REQUIRED INFORMATION

Information on the different sources of the current household income is highly desirable in GGS. In the context of a panel design, information on expected income sources in particular for the households with low income could be desirable.

Regions, countries and scholars differ in opinions as to how feasible it is to obtain reliable information on all kinds of finance-related issues. In Europe, the ECHP and LIS collect and compile this finances-related information in a comparative perspective, as this is their main objective. In France, the survey on *'Relations entre générations et soutien familial'* asks for details on financial intergenerational transfers and savings. In the USA, the HRS and NSFH also collect quite detailed information on earnings and assets. The major objection of those who do not believe in the feasibility of collecting finances-related information is that these efforts result in reduced response rates.

GGS has to draw on the experiences of other surveys to find an efficient way of collecting information on earnings contributing to the household income. The same applies to assets.

Earnings from labour can came from different household members but are not necessarily considered as belonging to the household income. This may be the case where the individuals concerned do not pull their financial resources. Similarly, earnings from the various assets can belong to one member of the household or be jointly owned by different household members.

Final decisions have to be taken on the need for information on gross income, net income and the disposable income.

For all income sources, information on the recipient (the anchor, the partner and other household members) and the amount (or range of the amount) would be highly desirable.

Any classification of the household income sources beyond earnings from labour, financial network transfers and financial public transfers, will have to be general enough to cover the different income sources in the different UNECE region countries.

With regard to physical assets, special attention will be given to house ownership (see Housing component).

In order to obtain a robust approach to the income data and its sources that allows for comparability across countries, pre-testing will be very much needed.

LINK WITH OTHER COMPONENTS

EMPLOYMENT: For the anchor and the partner, if any, currently engaged in paid work related economic indicators will be gathered through the employment component.

NETWORK TRANSFERS: Contributions to the household income coming from ex-partners, parents, children and other kin and non-kin will be dealt with in the network transfers component.

PUBLIC TRANSFERS: Contributions to the household income coming from public transfers will be dealt with in the public transfers component.

VALUES. Subjective assessments of the household income are usually added to the amounts.

CONTEXT RELATED ISSUES

The GGS information on earnings and assets will go a long way towards providing data on the financial position of the anchor in general and within the financial position of the household. The labour earnings and household income data, along with assets data, can be combined with a variety of economic macro-indicators at the regional and national level.

INTERGENERATIONAL RELEVANCE: Several intergenerational issues concern the different composition of the household income (see section on public transfers). Income-related data will open the way to information on the distribution of economic resources (between partners) and across generations. If possible, detailed information on the role of parents (and partners) in the acquisition of assets can be gathered.

GENDER RELEVANCE: The changing labour force participation of women will be reflected in the composition and share of male and female earnings from labour. Gender differences are in particular relevant with regard to the household income for male and female single households and one-parent households and the related poverty levels. Gender-related issues will deal with the differential composition of the household income (developed in the public transfers component).

REGION SPECIFIC ISSUES

Asking for household income data may seem to be impossible in certain countries. For those countries, alternative approaches to obtain information on the relative wealth position of the households have to be developed.

As certain countries will be also interested in the major fixed expenditures of the household a specific set of questions could be developed on: housing-related expenditures; child-rearing related expenditures; health and disability related expenditures; household related expenditures.

In the employment component, GGS is interested both in the primary and secondary jobs and in formal and informal jobs. Here GGS is interested in earnings from these different jobs. An issue that may be of particular relevance for specific countries or specific sectors of the labour market but may be difficult to deal with.

AGE SPECIFIC ISSUES

The share of earnings from labour in the household income changes greatly with age.
National regulations on age at retirement and the changes over time in this respect will explain intercountry and temporal changes in the age distribution of the share of earnings from labour in the household income, before and after retirement.

DESIGN RELATED ISSUES

Income data will be important economic covariates in the analysis of partnership and reproductive behaviour and of caring arrangements.

HOUSING

RATIONALE

Housing conditions reflect the setting for sharing space with partner, parents and children, if any, belonging to the household. They constitute an important setting for caring arrangements (transfers) of children and older persons. The house may be part of the assets the anchor and/or of the household.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

Type of dwelling and quality of the dwelling are the main relevant characteristics.
The ownership/renting position of the dwelling reflects the wealth position.
Intergenerational transfers often play a role in the acquisition of a dwelling.

REQUIRED INFORMATION

Information on the current dwelling will be asked for. Plans for the future may be added.
With regard to housing, standard information on the type of dwelling and quality of the dwelling will be asked. Decisions on the degree of detail have to be taken.
Questions on the ownership/renting position of the house will include questions on the respective role of the family, market and state transfers.

LINK WITH OTHER COMPONENTS

HOUSEHOLD: Data on housing conditions will be linked with the information on the household size and household composition.
EARNINGS AND ASSETS: Information will be asked on the acquisition process of the actual housing.
TRANSFERS: The role of the network and public transfers in the acquisition or renting of the housing will be dealt with.
VALUES: Values on housing could be dealt with in the values component. Subjective evaluations of the housing quality may be added.

CONTEXT RELATED ISSUES

Link with macro-information on the housing conditions derived from the 2000-census round could be established to put the housing unit into its regional and national context.
INTERGENERATIONAL RELEVANCE: The role of the parents/children in the acquisition or renting of the dwelling unit will be asked for.
GENDER RELEVANCE: Poor housing conditions could be gender-related.

REGION SPECIFIC ISSUES

Questions on the quality of the housing may be more elaborated in countries with a poor or old housing market.
Some countries may show interest in information on improvements and changes of the housing and of the amenities in the future.
As certain countries will show interest in the availability / need for consumer goods (durables) this information may be collected in a specific extra-module.

AGE SPECIFIC ISSUES

For older persons, but also for disabled persons, information on the importance of the availability or the need for sheltered housing or assisted housing could be collected.

NETWORK TRANSFERS

RATIONALE
GGP is interested in how network transfers affect the start, the change in and the end of the partner-partner and the parent-child relationship of the anchor.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES
The term network transfers is introduced to refer to transfers within the primary social network.

Some network transfers are the result of legally binding obligations; other flows of transfers are rooted in voluntary actions.

As said above, the primary social network concern those kin-members and non-kin members, including all household members and some crucial family members (parents and children) that are important in the life of anchor as far as they are potential or actual givers of transfers to anchor or potential or actual receivers of transfers from anchor.

Attention should be given to carefully defining the unit receiving/giving the transfers (see similar problem in network component). Transfers of time and money can be oriented towards a particular person, but other members of the household may benefit from it or be affected by it. This concerns both the giving and receiving of transfers. As the National Research Council (2001) mentions, in measuring exchanges, one will in practice usually seek a mix of respondent and couple responses. In asking about the receipt of physical assistance or assistance with household duties or about specific forms of companionships or emotional support, the focus in almost on the respondent. But questions about financial support or more general patterns of visiting are often formulated with the couple in mind. Similar caution is needed in tracing what the unit does for other. Should the focus be on what the couple does or what the particular respondent does in terms of financial assistance, taking care of grandchildren, assisting children, and so on? (pp.167)

Network transfers include transfers between partners, transfers with other kin or with non-kin. We opt for this broader definition as other kin or non-kin may step in if parents, children or partners are not available for transfers or not in need of transfers. Intra-household transfers and inter-household transfers can be distinguished. Intergenerational transfers are part of these network transfers as they concern only the network transfers between members of different generations (from parents to children, from children to parents). Hagestad (2000) points out the skip patterns in the intergenerational transfers, e.g. from grandparents to grandchildren.

The data on the network transfers will be complemented by data on the public (market, state) transfers.

A variety of classifications exist to categorise the kind of transfers, depending on the scholars involved or the age group envisaged.

The National Research Council (2001) distinguishes three major 'currencies' of transfers - space, money and time. Transfers of space, in the sense of sharing the household, are a kind of in-kind transfers. GGS deals with this in the household component. GGS is interested in financial transfers. However, GGS will focus on financial transfers which circulate between living generations, namely inter vivos transfers and not on bequests (inheritance) Bequests are more important in size; but inter vivos transfers are more interesting of terms of social policy (they reach their beneficiaries earlier in life when their needs are large) as well as in theoretical terms

(they are part of an ongoing interaction process and open up a broader range of motives and negotiations) Transfers of time include a variety of transfers, from short visits to intensive care arrangements. A selection has to be made.

Bengtson (2001) introduces a classification based on the notion of intergenerational solidarity. Luescher and Pillemer (1998) distinguish both intergenerational solidarity and intergenerational conflict and introduce the word intergenerational ambivalence. GGP opts for the more neutral concept of transfers.

Bengtson (2001) distinguished different types of intergenerational solidarity. GGS will focus on what he called:

- associational solidarity (type and frequency of contact) and
- structural solidarity (geographic proximity).
- functional solidarity (assistance) (exchange of instrumental assets and services and exchange of emotional support)

The National Research Council (2001) distinguishes the following dimensions of intergenerational transfers, which also apply to network transfers:

- participants (who is involved)
- direction (provider and recipient of each transfer)
- purpose (what is exchanged)
- magnitude (amount of money or values of goods and amount of time exchanged)
- timing (regularity and frequency of exchange)
- chronological time (current or past, persistence of exchange over time)
- form (direct versus indirect, gift or loan)
- impact (needs of recipient, resources of provider, effect on recipient and provider).

Operationalizing these dimensions is complex and presents a number of difficult options.

Keating et al. (1999) distinguish four types of care-giving tasks to older persons:

- personal care
- household activities: housework
  household maintenance
- assistance with shopping, errands, transportation and finance management
- emotional support

Attias-Donfut (2000) distinguishes personal, domestic and social care services.

GGS will focus on care transfers (care services, informal care, care and assistance) and financial transfers.

REQUIRED INFORMATION

GGS is interested in the transfers over the last 12 months.

The National Research Council (2001) has identified key measurement issues for transfers which GGS will take into account.

Basic characteristics of the members involved in the transfers will be known (see household, family and network component)

Basic characteristics of the relation with the network member will be asked for:

- emotional closeness of relationship

- duration of relationship
- distance (in distance or time; distance/time can be direction-specific)
- frequency of contact (just contacts or visits (plus direction specified) and other contacts (mail, e-mail, telephone)

With regard to care transfers, the intergenerational focus of GGP puts first the care transfers given to and received from parents and/or children in the context of important family related issues such as raising children, and caring for parents.

With regard to financial transfers, the intergenerational focus of GGP puts first the financial support given to and received from parents and/or children in the context of important family related issues such as raising children, and caring for parents.

A specific interest concerns the financial transfers in the context of important housing-related issues such as starting an independent living and becoming a house owner.

A specific entry concerns the exchanges in the context of inheritance.

Particularly the kind of care transfers will depend very much on the age of anchor, and on the age of the parents and children involved.

Based on the specific objectives of GGP, the experiences of surveys dealing more extensively with transfers and in particular of the French survey *'Relations entre générations et soutien familial'*, appropriate decisions on classifications for the most relevant financial and time-related transfers have to be constructed and pre-tested. Their applicability to the GGS age range of the anchor will be an important issue. Comparative research on transfers is very rare up to now.

LINK WITH OTHER COMPONENTS

HOUSEHOLD: Apart from exchanging and sharing money and time, partners and generations share space. The issue of children leaving and returning to the parental home will be dealt with in the migration component. The issue of parents joining the children's household can be dealt with in a short extra-module. The issue of partners sharing or not sharing space will be dealt with in other components as well.

NETWORK: Private transfers take place within the primary social network

PUBLIC TRANSFERS: Information on network transfers will be complemented by information on public transfers.

VALUES: Issues on what is called normative solidarity could be dealt with in the values component, as values on intergenerational transfers seems to be very country-specific (Hagestad, 2000)

CONTEXT RELATED ISSUES

Each society develops a set of mechanisms, including formal and informal elements, that define the timing and content of support, the appropriate participants and their mutual obligations.

INTERGENERATIONAL RELEVANCE: Intergenerational transfers are considered part of the network transfers. The kind and amount of these transfers going downwards and upwards will obtain specific attention. With regard to non-financial exchanges, the intergenerational focus of GGP puts upfront the services given to and received from children and parents in the context of childcare and care for parents, as well as care for partners.

GENDER RELEVANCE: Gender characteristics of transfer givers and receivers will be analysed. Generational contracts rely on an implicit gender contract, expressed through the gender division of paid and unpaid labour, especially in the home through women as carers (of children and older

people). Women stand at a pivotal point where the public (i.e. professional care-givers and social services) and private sectors meet (i.e. co-ordinating care within the family and complementing professional care) (Attias-Donfut and Arber, 2000).

REGION SPECIFIC CONCERNS
The legal obligations between partners and of parents towards children and of children towards parents are country-specific

AGE SPECIFIC CONCERNS
Financial network transfers are important at all ages. Network exchanges of care services are more age-specific, in particular as they concern the car for children and for parents, if any

DESIGN RELATED ISSUES
Both upward and downward transfers change over time, especially as far as they concern transfers to meet a need of the child/parent. A panel will allow monitoring these changes over time.

Any meaningful analysis on transfers needs to taking into account the characteristics of both the givers and the receivers. A transfer to a child/parent in need, e.g. with poor income resources is different from one to a child/parent not in need. Transfers may be more easily received from rich parents then from poor parents. Usually, the anchor is not capable of given all these characteristics and information is needed directly from the givers and the receivers. However, as GGS is not a real transfers survey, the shortcomings with regard to the most appropriate kind of information have to be dealt with.

References

Arber, S. and C. Attias-Donfut, 2000. The myth of generational conflict. The family and state in ageing societies. London : Routledge.

Attias-Donfut C. and S. Arber, 2000. Equity and solidarity across the generations. In Arber, S. and C. Attias-Donfut, The myth of generational conflict. The family and state in ageing societies. London : Routledge, 1-21.

Attias-Donfut C. and F.-C. Wollf, 2000. The redistributive effects of generational transfers. In Arber, S. and C. Attias-Donfut, The myth of generational conflict. The family and state in ageing societies. London : Routledge, 22-47.

Bengtson, V.L., 2001. Beyond the nuclear family : the increasing importance of multigeneral bonds. Journal of Marriage and Family, 63, 1-16

Hagestad, G.O., 2000. Adults intergenerational relationships. In Generations and Gender Programme. Exploring future research and data collection options. Geneva : United Nations

Keating et al., 1999. Eldercare in Canada : Context, content and consequences : Ottawa : Statistics Canada.

Luescher, K. and K. Pillemer, 1998. Intergenerational ambivalence : a new approach to the study of parent-child relations in later life. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60, 413-425.

National Research Council, 2001. Preparing for an aging world. The case for cross-national research.

PUBLIC TRANSFERS

RATIONALE
GGP is interested in how public transfers in combination with network transfers, affect the start of, change in and the end of partner-partner and parent-child relations. Private and public transfers can complement each other through different mechanisms.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES
GGP makes a distinction between network transfers and public transfers. However, it is clear that in some countries the market transfers are becoming more important in addition to the state transfers.

GGS will focus on financial public transfers and on care-related public transfers.

REQUIRED INFORMATION
GGS will ask on the kind and amount of financial public transfers contributing to the household income over the last 12 months. Expectations for the future can be dealt with.

GGS will also ask for the kind and amount of public care transfers, in the context of child care and care for the older persons.

LINK WITH OTHER COMPONENTS
NETWORK TRANSFERS: The data on the public transfers will complement the data on the network transfers.
HOUSING: The role of the public transfers in the acquistion of the housing will be dealt with in the housing component.
VALUES: Values on the value of network versus public transfers and on the perceptions of government responsibility for financing care services will be dealt with.

CONTEXT RELATED ISSUES
The data on the public transfers to the household can be linked with regional/national data on public expenditures
INTERGENERATIONAL RELEVANCE: Entitlements to public transfers are becoming more and more individual entitlements. However, some entitlements are still household- or family-related; others are age-specific.
GENDER RELEVANCE: Entitlements for public transfers can have different implications for men and women. Public care transfers are provided by a strongly gender-segregated sector.

REGION SPECIFIC ISSUES
Public transfers have a different position in the redistribution policy of different welfare regimes.

AGE SPECIFIC ISSUES
For anchors with small children, GGS will ask some more detailed information on the child-related public transfers. For older anchors GGS will ask some more detailed information on the older-age related public transfers.

MIGRATION

RATIONALE

GGP aims at putting the micro- and mezzo-level data of the GGS into a broader social and economic context. In order to make a link between the micro- and mezzo-data and the macro-data, GGS needs information on the place of residence of anchor at particular times/events.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

GGS is interested in information on the place of residence as far as it is relevant for any multi-level analysis. An analysis of the migration biography is not of main interest.

With regard to the place of residence GGS has to decide on the how complete the information on the residential history of the anchor must be and on the requested level of detail of this information.

Decisions will have to be taken on the most appropriate level of the information on the place of residence in the context of a comparative study. The lower the level, the more flexibility researchers have afterwards.

Leaving the parental home is an important migration step. The way young adults leave the parental home has become more diversified. Moreover, empirical research has shown that the way of leaving seems to have long-term consequences for the partnership and family formation process. Better agreements on what is considered a departure from and a return to the parental home or any other institutional context in which a person grew up, must avoid the problems researchers had using the FFS data.

REQUIRED INFORMATION

Information on the place of residence at the NUTS5 level will be highly desirable in order to allow making more general classifications if needed.

Moreover, the use of GIS information is becoming more prevalent.

Special interest will be given to the timing and reasons for and living arrangement at the first departure from the parental home and about the timing and reasons for the first return, if any.
The required information concerns:

- timing and reason of first departure and living arrangement at first departure
- timing and reason of first return
- timing and reason of most recent departure and living arrangement at most recent departure
- timing and reason of most recent return

In order to define better the social-economic and social-cultural background of the anchor information is needed on the ethnic origin and the nationality (changes) of the anchor.

LINK WITH OTHER COMPONENTS

Data on the place of residence (at particular events/periods) will allow putting all other information in a broader social and economic context.

NETWORK TRANFERS: Issues of the intergenerational transfers at the first departure/return could be dealt with in a specific optional section if they are of interest for particular countries or cohorts.

CONTEXT RELATED ISSUES

Data on the place of residence will allow making links with appropriate regional macro-level data.

INTERGENERATIONAL RELEVANCE: Issues of the intergenerational transfers at the first departure/return could be dealt with in a specific optional section if they are of interest for particular countries or cohorts.

GENDER RELEVANCE: Leaving and returning to the parental home remains a gendered issues is most countries.

REGION SPECIFIC ISSUES

In countries where borders have changed over the last years, specific problems with regard to the residential mobility should be dealt with.

Permanent shared residence of children/parents seems to be more prevalent in some regions, while re-cohabitation of children/parents is more prevalent in order regions.

AGE SPECIFIC ISSUES

For older people or for people with complex histories of residential mobility, the issue may be dealt with in another way.

DESIGN RELATED ISSUES

GGS is interested in the places of residence of the primary respondent as far as they are relevant for the use in multi-level analyses. If multi-level analyses are planned for the biographical data, then information on the migration history may be needed.

HEALTH AND WELL-BEING
Gijs Beets

RATIONALE
To capture an overview of personal health and well-being circumstances that interrelate with union formation and fertility: variation in health and well-being may lead to variation in union formation and/or fertility outcomes, whereas variation in union formation and/or fertility outcomes may lead to variation in health and well-being

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES
Health: physical – mental
Reproductive health
Well-being

REQUIRED INFORMATION
- decisions on what we want to know about health, in particular of older persons
- information on health is relevant in the context of the network and the exchanges
- decision on window for the current situation

1. HEALTH
   Evaluation of health
   Physical or mental limitations
   Alcohol and drugs problems (?)
   ADL for older persons
2. REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH
   Age at first intercourse
   Age at first use of contraception
   Miscarriages / abortions
   Sexual harassment
3. WELL-BEING
   Satisfaction – see draft MPIDR
   Happiness – depression – loneliness
   Agency – internal/external locus of control (?)
   Trust – security (?)
   Risk taking (?)

Together with having a nice relationship (family), having enough to eat and a roof + bed to sleep, personal health is mainly rated among the top-most important issues one can think of in a personal life. All challenges of the respondent's health and even of the health situation of his/her most important kin and non-kin network members are of major concern to people. Equal relationships between men and women with respect to sexuality and reproduction, and the complete respect of each individual's physical integrity ask for responsibility and solidarity. Of course we are mainly interested in chronic (negative) health and well-being issues, although temporary setbacks may also have repercussions on union formation and/or fertility outcomes.

Reproductive rights also include the fact that each individual person is able to make his/her own free and responsible choices with respect to union formation, sexual relationships and reproduction. Respect should exist from the earliest stages of childhood to the most adult ages.

Well-being is the expression of feeling well in combination with physical and mental health. Even the healthiest persons may feel bad for shorter or longer periods due to collapsing personal relationships, due to bad experiences in one's job (sexual harassment, discrimination, depression)

or bad experiences with other events which could have (had) a major impact on (part of) their life (loneliness, violation of human rights).

Unfortunately the health situation is rather unequal, even in Europe. That may be due to more or less external factors like environmental issues, a lack of (health) facilities, failures in the food production, but it could also be an expression of having personally a more fragile body.

In the GGS questionnaire we propose to include questions both on the health and well-being situation of the respondent's and his/her most close network members. At this very moment it has not yet been decided what the questions will exactly look like. Research into tested sets of questions used elsewhere will reveal what may be most useful for the GGP purposes. We will mainly focus on objective issues. It is already clear that issues like the age at first sexual activity and the use of contraceptives will be included as well as possible unwanted pregnancies or unwanted outcomes of wanted pregnancies. These may have life long impacts on union formation and fertility.
With increasing age fragility may rise. It is almost self-evident that people will be asked to indicate their physical abilities (probably ADL scores). Filters will bring (younger and older) respondents to the relevant set of questions pertaining to their personal situation.

LINK WITH OTHER COMPONENTS
- health and well-being of other (kin and non-kin) network members than anchor
- relationship with education / labour market activities and union formation / fertility
- relationship with social relations and exchanges

CONTEXT RELATED ISSUES
INTERGENERATIONAL RELEVANCE (genetic) biological effects of parents to the health and reproductive capacity of their off-spring
GENDER RELEVANCE effect of (reproductive) health and well-being issues on (gender) relationship between partners, parents and children

REGION SPECIFIC ISSUES
- health and well-being in multigenerational households
- health and well-being in 'western' versus Central and Eastern Europe (before/after 1990)
- country-specific variation in data reliability
- region-specific variation in health facilities (overview of facilities available via contextual database)

AGE SPECIFIC ISSUES
- younger age groups: mainly struggling with discovery of personal reproductive health/well-being issues and/or health issues of parents
- older age groups: mainly living with the effects of earlier detected reproductive health/well-being issues and/or personal fragility

DESIGN RELATED ISSUES
- relation with FFS on some reproductive health issues
- data reliability (tested experiences elsewhere (European Health Survey), objective/ subjective measures, SAQs, recall issues for past experiences, complete health biography?)

SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION AND INTENTIONS

Francesco C. Billari and Jan M. Hoem[16]

RATIONALE

Changing attitudes, norms, and values play a prominent role in explanations of current fertility patterns and developments as well as for other aspects of family dynamics. Such subjective dimensions may also be important for an understanding of gender issues in a family as well as for insights concerning the relationships between family members from different generations. For such reasons, rather extensive information concerning attitudes, norms, and values should be collected during the first wave of the Gender and Generations Surveys (GGS). The impact of the subjective dimensions on demographic behaviour can then be studied on the basis of the events recorded in the period up to the second wave. Conversely, accumulating life experience surely makes individuals and families adjust their attitudes and values. Information on the same subjective dimensions should therefore be obtained in the second survey wave in order to enable investigators to relate changes in such dimensions to demographic behaviour up to the time of the second wave. The same argument applies to any subsequent panel waves.

Intentions and plans for future demographic behaviour are closely connected to the same subjective dimensions, and corresponding information is suitably collected in the same segment of the GGS questionnaire. Data on intentions should be collected in the first panel wave to enable investigators to confront recorded intentions with manifest subsequent demographic behaviour. Where there are more than two panel rounds, intentions should be elicited in the second and later waves for the same reason. This would also enable analysts to study changes in intentions and their correspondence with accumulating life experience.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

Subjective dimensions may be proximate or distant determinants of demographic behaviour. In practice this means that they may concern general value orientations on the one hand, or may be more directly tied to demographic choice on the other. In the GGS, demographic choice is connected to concrete and directed family behaviour, such as whether to start living together without getting married, whether to turn a consensual union into a marriage, or whether to go in for childbearing in the next few years. These are two different but complementary approaches, and we suggest that both be incorporated into the GGS.

The more purpose-directed approach is targeted at revealing how attitudes and norms influence demographic behaviour in different contexts (perhaps via intentions). The approach is centered on proximate determinants of decision-making, and it is based on the social-psychological theory of planned behaviour. For instance, it addresses how the intention to have a child in the next three years is shaped by the individual's perception of costs and benefits of having a child, by norms perceived by members of the anchor respondent's network, and by how the anchor's sees his or her ability to control childbearing. In this approach one also asks how such intentions materialize in real childbearing.

The other perspective relies on general value orientations that are more distant determinants of demographic behaviour. It tries to address questions like whether career oriented individuals

---

[16] This manuscript draws on the work of a Working Group at the Max Planck Institute of Demographic Research. Beside FB the group members were Gunnar Andersson, Pau Baizán, Laura Bernardi, Johannes Huinink, Annette Kohlmann, Gerda Neyer, Dimiter Philipov, and Holger von der Lippe. The authors have also benefited from discussions with Ron Lesthaeghe and Aart Liefbroer and comments from Martine Corijn.

postpone childbearing, and whether people who put a high value on intergenerational ties have a lower fertility.

Here is a more detailed outline of the conceptual background of these two approaches.

Attitudes, norms, and intentions in demographic choice
Explaining a specific demographic behaviour such as childbearing or starting and ending a partnership is of key interest to us in the GGS context. A focus on attitudes, norms, behavioural control, and intentions will permit international comparisons of the potentially differential impact of each such component on subsequent behaviour in the various settings on the European scene. This is in line with John Hobcraft's call for subjective proximate determinants of demographic behaviour in any new demographic comparative survey (Hobcraft, 2000).

The theoretical basis for including a corresponding module is partially found in the social-psychological theory of planned behaviour (a newer version of the theory of reasoned action), outlined by Fishbein and Ajzen (Ajzen 1988, 1991). According to Ajzen (1988, 1991), behaviour is influenced by two 'proximate' determinants, viz. the behavioural intention and the actual control over the behaviour in question. In addition, three more distant factors play a role, viz. attitudes or beliefs, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control. These factors directly influence people's intentions and indirectly influence their behaviour. The subjective norm in Ajzen's model is determined by normative beliefs ? the perception that individuals have about whether 'important others' will approve or disapprove of a given behaviour (Billari and Liefbroer, 2001). More specifically, according to Ajzen (1988), "an attitude is a disposition to respond favorably or unfavorably to an object, person, institution or event", the (subjective) norm is a "person's perception of social pressure to perform or not to perform the behaviour under consideration", while (perceived) behavioural control "refers to the perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behaviour and it is assumed to reflect past experience as well as anticipated impediments and obstacles".

A full implementation of the theory of planned behaviour is hardly feasible in a large-scale comparative demographic survey. For the GGS, we propose a 'minimalist' implementation, simplifying the social-psychological framework. In particular, on attitudes, we suggest that we should not ask about 'beliefs', which is the subjective probability that a certain behaviour will produce the expected consequences. Instead we suggest that one should ask only what the expected consequences are.

In this part of the questionnaire intentions will pay a key role. Intentions should be implemented on the timing of demographic events (Miller and Pasta, 1995, with a specific emphasis on the time window between the panel waves (see our example above concerning childbearing intentions).

There are already some applications of the theory of planned behaviour to demographic behaviour using panel data: Miller and Pasta (1994) on child timing, Liefbroer and de Jong Gierveld (1993) on cohabitation, Baanders (1998) and Billari and Liefbroer (2001) on leaving home. Several papers on contraceptive use are published e.g. in the *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. Work that can be related to this approach is being conducted using several panels in the US (in the Detroit area for instance: see Barber et al., 2000).

The GGS would constitute the first international comparative effort to use such a framework, and this is expected to give considerable added value in the explanation of difference between and within countries.

In the GGS questionnaire we would like to focus on the followin g specific behaviour.
- The birth of the next child (Further consideration of non-biological parenthood is needed.)
- Union formation.
- Union dissolution.
- Leaving the parental home.
- Retirement.
- The transition to institutional living arrangements (for older adults).

Value orientations
The interplay between value orientations on the one hand and family and fertility behaviour on the other has recently been reviewed by Lesthaeghe and Moors (2000). An attitude is targeted towards a concrete object, person, institution, or event. By contrast a value is "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence" (Rokeach, 1973).

We aim at designing the GGS so as to let researchers address this complex interplay. This is possible given the intention to use a panel design. It will add more power to some of the measures and concepts that have already been implemented in the previous Family and Fertility Surveys (e.g. the optional module on values and beliefs), but that were not exploitable in that connection because of the one-shot design of the FFS.

We want to include the dimensions of a value system that either pertain directly to intergenerational and gender relations, or that have proven to be important in the literature on demographic behaviour. Based on experiences from existing surveys we plan to obtain data on the following dimensions.
- *Intergenerational relations, family orientation, and familism.* The literature suggests that values on intergenerational relationships and on the role of public versus kinship support vary substantially across societies. We need to collect corresponding data. In addition we need to investigate the impact of interplay between demographic behaviour and the strength of family orientation (emphasized by several authors) as well as the strength of family ties, as suggested by the works of Reher (2000), Micheli (2000) and Dalla Zuanna (2001).
- *Gender.* See the essay on gender issues for a thorough discussion.
- *Religiousness and secularization.* The central role of this dimension for the explanation of demographic change is emphasized in narratives such as the "Second Demographic Transition" and is central in several approaches to explain demographic behaviour. Some reformulation may be necessary to capture idiosyncrasies in Central and Eastern European countries.
- *Materialism and postmaterialism.* This dimension comes from the work of Ingelhart (1977), who in turn draws on Maslow's previous work. It has been applied to explaining demographic behaviour in the notion of Second Demographic Transition developed by Lesthaeghe and van de Kaa. We want to grasp this dimension in a manner that also works in Central and Eastern Europe.
- *Confidence and trust*. This dimension addresses changes related to the societal transition in Central and Eastern Europe, in particular intensified social anomie (or alienation) and disorderliness. Philipov (2001) has outlined links to demographic behaviour. People react to these changes by developing diverse coping strategies. Successful coping strategies often stem from the ability to mobilize social contacts, i.e. from the availability of social capital at the individual level. We propose to focus on the respondent’s confidence and trust in public - and private-sector institutions.

In the selection of questionnaire items we rely on several existing surveys, such as the European/World Values Surveys and the Population Policy Acceptance surveys. These questions

have already been tested and found useful in the study of demographic behaviour. Using them also secures comparability with previous studies.

REQUIRED INFORMATION

We do not suggest that collect any information on subjective dimensions in the past. On the other hand, past histories in other parts of the questionnaire can be used to explain attitudes, beliefs, norms, and values (and perhaps also intentions) at the time of the interview.

The information that we require on subjective dimensions refers to the situation at the time of the interview. In some cases it may also depend on the current status of the anchor. (For instance we do not plan to not ask questions about attitudes to leaving home among respondents who do not live with their parents.)

We suggest that the GGS collect information on intentions about demographic behaviour in the near future. The time horizon for intentions must be consistent with the panel period.

REGION-SPECIFIC ISSUES

Most studies on attitudes, beliefs, norms, and values have concentrated on the U.S. and on Western Europe, though European/World Values Surveys have recently been conducted in almost all Central and Eastern European countries. Specific attention must be devoted to the relevance of the value dimensions sketched in our proposal for Central and Eastern European countries.

Decision-making in the case of a pregnancy (such as the choice between abortion and continuing the pregnancy) may also be more of an issue in Central and Eastern European countries than in the West.

AGE-SPECIFIC ISSUES

Trivially, some of the questions we suggest may be more relevant to specific age groups than to others. Simple filters should be able to take care of this issue.

DESIGN-RELATED ISSUES

The panel nature of the survey design is essential for exploiting subjective dimensions and evaluation of how intentions materialize in behaviour. Having several waves will also allow investigators to track ideational change over time and to analyze mutual interrelationships between behaviour and subjective evaluations.

REFERENCES

Ajzen I., 1988, *Attitudes, Personality and Behaviour*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

Ajzen I., 1991, “The Theory of Planned Behaviour”, *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 50: 179-211.

Barber J.S., Axinn W.G., Thornton A., 2000, "The Impact of Attitudes on Family Formation Processes", paper presented at the Brussels workshop, September 2000.

Baanders A.N., 1998, *Leavers, Planners and Dwellers. The decision to leave the parental home*, Wageningen Agricultural University, Wageningen.

Billari F.C., Liefbroer A.C., 2001, "Should I stay or should I go? The impact of age norms on leaving home", paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, Washington.

Dalla Zuanna, G., 2000, "The banquet of Aeolus. A familistic interpretation of Italy's lowest low fertility", *Demographic Research*, vol 4, num 5.

Hobcraft, J., 2000, "Moving Beyond Elaborate Description: Towards Understanding Choices About Parenthood", paper presented at the FFS Flagship Conference, Brussels.

Hoem J. et al., 2000, "Concepts for a second round of Fertility and Family Surveys in Europe with particular attention paid to persons of reproductive/working age", in UNECE/UNFPA, *Generations and Gender Programme. Exploring future research and data collection options*, United Nations, Geneva.

Inglehart R., 1977, *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Lesthaeghe R., Moors G., 2000, "Life course transitions and value orientations: Selection and adaptation", paper presented at the Royal Academy Contact Forum, Brussels.

Liefbroer A.C., De Jong Gierveld J., 1993, "The Impact of Rational Considerations and Perceived Opinions on Young Adults' Union Formation Intentions", *Journal of Family Issues*: 14, 213-235.

Micheli G. A., 2000, "Kinship, family and social network.The anthropological embedment of fertility change in Southern Europe", *Demographic Research*, Vol 3, article 13.

Miller W.B., Pasta, D.J., 1994, "The Psychology of Child Timing: A Measurement Instrument and a Model", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*: 24, 218-250.

Miller W.B., Pasta D.J., 1995, "Behavioural Intentions: Which Ones Predict Fertility Behaviour in Married Couples?", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*: 25, 530-555.

Moors G., 1997, *The Dynamics of Value-Based Selection and Values Adaptation. With an Application to the Process of Family Formation*, IPD-Working Paper 1997-4, Brussels.

Philipov D., 2001, "Low fertility in Central and Eastern Europe. Culture or Economy?", paper presented at the IUSSP Seminar on Low Fertility, Tokio.

Reher D.S. (1998), "Family Ties in Western Europe: Persistent Contrasts", *Population and Development Review*, 24, 203-234.

Rokeach M., 1973, *The nature of human values*, Free Press New York.

GENDER
Prepared by Gerda Neyer
based on earlier documents by Antonella Pinelli and Gerda Neyer

RATIONALE
With its focus on "gender and generations" the GGP aims at incorporating gender as a central constituent of the research on demographic behaviour, demographic events, and the demographic life-course. This approach differs from conventional demographic research on family, fertility, and aging, which often tends to use 'gender' either as an independent variable to differentiate between the demographic behaviour of women and men, or merely as a word that substitutes for 'women'.

We conceive of gender as a cultural, social, and political construct and as "the most pervasive stratification dimension within all societies" (Presser 1997, 312). This necessitates conceptualizing the planned survey, its theoretical assumptions, its research tools, and its research models from a gender perspective that exceeds the notion of gender as a fixed, permanent, universal, and binary category of sexual differences (male vs. female) or as an attribute of women. It entails, for example, that one must acknowledge that ostensibly gender-neutral variables such as education, labour-force participation, social security, unemployment, reproduction, aging, equality, and so forth are gendered, in the sense that the underlying concepts and analytical assumptions often take men as their point of departure. Seemingly gender-neutral categories may bear different meanings for women than for men and have different implications for women's and for men's life-courses. In addition the way in which gender is produced and inscribed in a society varies across cultures, across political systems, and over time. This implies that we must incorporate indicators and elements of gender systems (Mason et al. 1995) in demographic analysis to better grasp the stratification and power dimensions of gender and their relation to demographic processes.

Indicators of gender systems (such as female and male unemployment rates, gender-aspects of social-security provisions, and so forth) will be incorporated through the contextual variables compiled in the GGP. Elements of gender systems such as gender attitudes and behaviours will be incorporated into the GGS through special questionnaire modules *and also* through attention to gender aspects in question formulation and response-category selection. We aim at maintaining a gender perspective throughout the GGS and at integrating gender into all of its components. Since gender is culturally, socially, and politically constructed, we aim at picking up gender aspects that are specific to each country and each generation while at the same time ensuring that we maintain international comparability.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES
Demographic research that includes gender tends to focus on the impact of gender and gender relations on demographic events, demographic behaviour, and demographic processes. For example, a large body of demographic literature deals with the effects of gender equality (often measured in terms of women's labour-force participation and far less often in terms of men's engagement in childcaring, say) on fertility. Studies investigating the impact of demographic events and demographic processes on gender and gender relations most often deal with economic aspects, such as the impact of childbirth and parental leave on women's subsequent labour-force participation and/or income, or the impact of single motherhood or of divorce on levels of economic well-being. We know very little about how gendered demographic events affect gender relations on the private level, even though they in turn may affect future demographic behaviour.

The GGP should be designed so that it allows investigation into the mutual relationship between demographic processes and gender issues. First, since the programme will collect information across generations and thus focus on women's and men's entire life-course rather than on specific events or specific age groups, investigators can follow changes in the gender system across cohorts and over the lifetime. This makes it necessary to collect life histories of the major dimensions through which gender systems manifest themselves (such as employment, parental leave, and non-employment). Second, the panel approach permits us to follow the modification of gender relations and gender systems during the demographic life-course and in connection with demographic events (such as leaving home, entry into and exit from unions, entry into parenthood, retirement). Third, information on the characteristics of current and former partners is needed to provide parameters of gender systems in the private sphere over the union's or family's own life-course.

As we have mentioned above, we try to capture the manifestation of gender behaviour and gender systems in our data through the inclusion of gender issues in each module of the questionnaire. In order to avoid being trapped by our own gendered view of women's and men's life courses we form each module so that wherever possible it pertains to women and to men equally. This allows us to pick up the range in which gender equality and gender difference manifest themselves in a society. In particular, we pay attention to the need to get insight into how gender works and how gender is lived ("doing gender") along the following dimensions:

- Women and men in education (educational attainment; gendered educational choices).
- Women and men as (paid) workers (employment histories; unemployment; non-employment).
- Women and men as partners (possibilities and facts of entry into and exit from a union; living in various forms of partnership).
- Women and men as parents (possibilities and facts of becoming and being a parent during a marital or non-marital union, a lone parent, a stepparent, a non-resident parent).
- Women and men as providers and receivers of care and social welfare (childcare, care for the elderly, care by the partners for each other, social networks).
- Women and men as social citizens (recipients of transfers; users of social provisions, e.g. parental leave; subjects of public policies, e.g. divorce regulations).
- Women and men as individuals (living alone; time use; attitudes; personal needs and interests).
- To operationalize gender (beyond a simple male-female differentiation) we focus on three of its analytical dimensions, as follows.
- Gender as a relational concept: women and men in relation to each other; female-and-male mutual relations as they permeate all levels of society.
- Gender as a structural and normative principle: gender attitudes, gender norms, gendered behaviour, expectations of gendered behaviour, and so on.
- Gender as an identity concept: gender/sexual identity; reproduction as part of one's self-perception as a woman or as a man.

These dimensions should reflect how gender is constructed in the cultural, social, and political spheres and allow us to better analyze the dynamics of power and inequality and their relation to demographic developments.

INFORMATION REQUIRED

In accordance with the three aspects of gender mentioned above, the questionnaire should include the following items:

Gender as a relational concept:
We should try to capture how gender relations in the private sphere (the couple, the family), in the workplace (the labor market), and in the public sphere (e.g. social networks; public policies) are organized and perceived by the respondents. Questions dealing with gender relations in the private sphere comprise, for example, the organization of household tasks, childcare, and the access to money. It also includes the distribution of time, the power of decision in the household, the perception of fairness of the division of (paid, unpaid, caring) work (in the household and outside of it), of expenditure, of time for oneself, as well as satisfaction with the division of (paid, unpaid, caring) work, satisfaction with various aspects of the partnership, disputes among the partners (including domestic violence), and implications, attempts, and degree of success in bringing about changes in private gender relations.

Gender relations in the employment sphere are addressed through questions dealing with the distribution of male/female workers at the workplace; experienced or perceived gender-inequality and gender-discrimination in the workplace and the labor market; gender-stereotypes regarding women and men as paid workers (e.g.: work commitment).

Gender issues in the public sphere will be covered through the gender-composition of the social network, through questions dealing with women's and men's positions in society (experienced or perceived equality or inequality), and with expectations regarding politics.

Gender norms and gender attitudes:
Most studies that include questions related to gender norms and gender attitudes have so far employed the same set of questions (see: EFFS, PPA, World Value Survey, ISS, and many others). Recent research has shown that these questions, developed in the 1970s for Western countries, no longer give adequate results (Braun 1998). We suggest that in the GGS they be replaced by questions that follow the conceptualization of values and norms as outlined in the essay on "Subjective dimensions and intentions" by Billari and Hoem. This means that we suggest concentrating on behaviour-specific gender norms, values, and attitudes, as well as on intentions to uphold or to change gender-specific situations (e.g.: in the division of household work). In a panel this would allow us to investigate how specific demographic or demographically relevant events in a woman's or a man's life (like divorce, marriage, becoming a parent, unemployment) affect gender attitudes, values, and norms. Since gender norms (or at least the rhetoric surrounding gender difference, gender equality, and gender behaviour) have changed considerably since the 1970s, we should try to develop questions that better catch current manifestations of gender and the respondent's attitudes regarding gender issues, for example by asking who should be dismissed from work in times of high unemployment. We further suggest taking into account that gender norms vary with regard to a woman or a man's age. This implies that we need to develop questions that capture norms, values, and attitudes related to women's and men's various stages in life.

Gender as an identity concept:
Demographic behaviour may also be determined by the way in which a woman or a man perceives her/his own gender and sexual identity. (Queer theory and gay-and-lesbian studies have contributed considerably to the awareness and the understanding of sexual and gender identity.) In the GGS we should try to capture some elements of gender and sexual identity. One aspect of this should address motherhood and fatherhood as part of one's own identity, that is, one should obtain data to illuminate to what extent a woman or a man views reproduction as part of her/his own self as a woman or a man. Another aspect of gender and sexual identity may deal with one's perception of womanhood and of manhood, for example the perception of one's own body (of

youth or old age). Furthermore, as mentioned elsewhere, the GGS is designed in a way that allows us to also pick up elements of the life-course of lesbians and gays.

REGION-SPECIFIC ISSUES

Since gender is a social, cultural, and political construct and an organizing principle of societies, gender relations vary considerably across regions and nations. Despite regional and national differences our primary goal is to provide a questionnaire that allows comparative demographic research. As far as possible our questions will therefore be formulated in a way that applies to all countries. In cases in which a topic requires that the questions or categories be adapted to the situation particular to a country or region, we will propose criteria for the formulation and the content of the question or categories. These criteria should guarantee comparability in cases in which the questions cannot be posed identically in all countries.

AGE-RELATED ISSUES

Our definition of gender requires that the GGS remains sensitive to the different meaning that gender has for women and men at different ages.

References:

Braun, Michael (1998): Gender roles. In: Deth, Jan van (ed.). *Comparative Politics. The Problem of Equivalence.* London: Routledge.

Mason, Karen and An-Magritt Jensen (Eds., 1995): *Gender and family change in developed societies.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Neyer, Gerda (2000): Gender issues in family and fertility research. In: Hoem, J. M. et al.: *The ECE/PAU Generations and Gender Programme: Concepts for a second round of Fertility and Family Surveys in Europe with particular attention paid to persons of reproductive/working age*. Geneva.

Pinelli, Antonella (2000): Gender Aspects of GGP Research and Related Data Collection. Discussion note for the Meeting of the Gender and Generation Programme (GGP) Consortium Board, Berlin 15-16 December 2000.

Presser, Harriet B. (1997): Demography, Feminism, and the Science-Policy Nexus. In: *Population and Development Review 23 (2)*, 295 – 331.