

Netherlands
ISSP 2012 – Family and Changing
Gender Roles IV
Study Description

**INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SURVEY PROGRAMME –
NETHERLANDS 2009 & 2012**

MODULE 2009: Social Inequality IV

MODULE 2012: Family & Gender Roles IV

Data documentation

Harry B.G. Ganzeboom [Principal Investigator]

Shashi Roopram [Fieldwork Manager]

First edition: June 22 2014

Table of contents

Study description
Questionnaire development and post-processing
General procedures
Fieldwork and response
Post-stratification weights

INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SURVEY PROGRAMME NETHERLANDS – 2013 fieldwork

MODULE 2009: Social Inequality IV
MODULE 2012: Family & Gender Roles

STUDY DESCRIPTION

Study title:	“ISSP-NL 2009 & 2012: Family and Social Inequality”
Fieldwork dates:	February–August 2013
PI:	Harry B.G. Ganzeboom Shashi Roopram (fieldwork manager)
Sample type	(Step 1:) Simple random address sample, (Step 2:) random date selection of household member (*)
Response:	29.9% (*)
Fieldwork agency	VU University Amsterdam
Fieldwork Methods	Postal survey
Sample size	1315
Language	Dutch
Weights	post-stratification (*)
Funding	Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research NWO (#481-08-012), VU University Amsterdam, University of Amsterdam

(*) See further below.

The data will appear in the ISSP publicly released data as two independent data-files. The user should be aware that the cases are identical between these modules.

The complete data file (described in this documentation), including all the collected information on demography and social background, as well as the standardized ISSP variables has been archived at DANS [Data Archiving and Networked Services] in The Hague, the successor to the Steinmetz Archive. The appropriate bibliographic reference to this file will be:

Ganzeboom, Harry B.G. [principal investigator] & Shashi Roopram (2013). “ISSP-NL 2009 & 2012: Family and Social Inequality” [machine-readable data file]. The Hague: DANS. To be archived.

Ganzeboom, Harry B.G. & Shashi Roopram (2014). “ISSP-NL 2009 & 2012: “Family and Social Inequality” [data-documentation]. Amsterdam: VU University.

Introduction

The modules 2009 (“Social Inequality IV”) and 2012 (“Family and Gender Roles IV”) of the International Social Survey Programme in the Netherlands [ISSP-NL] were conducted in March-September 2013 as a stand-alone postal survey at VU University Amsterdam [VUA] (Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Sociology) by Harry B.G. Ganzeboom [principal investigator] and Shashi Roopram [fieldwork manager]. Note that the complete dataset is more elaborate than the Dutch part of the international ISSP file, archived at GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Cologne, Germany.

The data-collection followed very much the same methodology as for the ISSP-NL 2003&2004, ISSP-NL 2005&2006, ISSP-NL 2007&2008 and ISSP 2010&2011. The data collection process can be summarized as follows:

- The two ISSP questionnaires were combined in one single questionnaire. Data for the two modules share the same social background questions (starting with Z). The Social Inequality IV variables start with J, the Family & Gender Roles IV variables with I. These variables are generally numbered in the same way as the ISSP source questionnaires (but with exceptions, see below).
- Translation of the ISSP questionnaire documents was conducted by ourselves, in consultation with our Belgian ISSP colleague Ann Carton. The translation for the items of both modules was copied from earlier issues of the modules, when applicable. But again with exceptions, since we had to accommodate different earlier versions in the Netherlands and Belgium.
- The standard ISSP questions are complemented with a large number of demographic variables, most of them on social mobility.
- A simple random sample was drawn from the complete list of addresses in the Netherlands, maintained by Cendris, a subsidiary of the national postal service. For about 72.7% of the addresses there is an associated family name and about 28.3% also has a phone number (matched with the national phone register). The sampling frame [i.e. the list of addresses] is known to be very accurate and complete.
- All respondents were approached using (A) advance letter, (B) first questionnaire, (C) first reminder by postcard, (D) second reminder by letter, (E) second questionnaire.
- All the questionnaires received were screened on completeness and double answers. All alphanumeric information was transferred to a coding file.
- The remaining (numerical) information was keypunched (single punching) by a professional agency (InDat). Some 40 randomly selected questionnaires were entered twice to check data entry accuracy.
- The alpha-numerical information for country of origin and occupations was coded using standard international classifications. Other string information (mostly ‘other, specify’ responses were given a unique numerical label.
- The key-punched data were checked and labelled and merged with the coded alpha-numerical information.
- A post-stratification weight was developed using (A) information from the sampling frame, (B) information from the household roster (C) comparison with election results. No other national benchmark was used.

Respos

Table 1 details the various steps taken to (re)approach the respondents and its results in terms of received questionnaires.

Throughout the fieldwork, respondents could call (in fact: call an answering machine) to ask further information, refuse participation or make comments. Once respondents had expressed non-willingness to participate, either by phone or (e-)mail, they were not contacted again. General information on the ISSP project and the data-collection was also provided on a website, that was referred to on the questionnaire and all the information sent to the respondent.

Table 1: Mailings and response pattern						
Week	Midweek	Action	Event Date	Total	%	
1	02/19	Advance letter	26/02			
2	02/26	First questionnaire	26/02	0	0.0%	
3	03/05	Reminder postcard	07/03	432	32.9%	
4	03/12			711	54.1%	
5	03/19	Reminder letter	14/03	970	73.8%	
6	03/26	Second questionnaire	22/03	1028	78.2%	
7	04/02			1135	86.3%	
8	04/09			1261	95.9%	
9	04/16			1278	97.2%	
10	04/24			1292	98.3%	
11	05/01			1296	98.6%	
12	05/08			1298	98.7%	
13	05/15			1301	98.9%	
14	05/22			1304	99.2%	
18	06/19			1307	99.4%	
22	09/01			1315	100.0%	

Sample

The sample was drawn from the national addresses list of Cendris, a subsidiary of PostNL, the Dutch national postal agency. The specifications called for a random sample of N=4500. For over 72%, the addresses are associated with a family name – the remaining 28% were addressed as “To main occupant [hoofdbewoner]”.

Sampling within households was conducted by random date selection. The addresses were stratified in 12 random date groups and the addressee was invited to have the questionnaire completed by the household member whose birthday was first after the date specified.

	2007&2008		2010&2011		2009&2012	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Initial sample	9000	100.0%	4500	100%	4500	100.0%
Undeliverable, occupant unable to answer	289	3.2%	125	2.8%	97	2.2%
Net sample	8711	100.0%	4384	100%	4403	100.0%
Valid response	2843	32.6%	1472	33.6%	1315	29.9%
Explicit refusal	983	11.3%	552	12.6%	578	13.1%
No response	4885	56.1%	2360	53.8%	2516	57.2%

Errors in questionnaire: Version 1 and Version 2

During fieldwork, a number of errors in the questionnaire were discovered, and in fact repaired before mailing the second questionnaire (Version 2).

I.21	Answer categories were incidentally copied from I.20. Many respondents noticed this and refused. This error was repaired in Version 2.
I.26 I.27	The answer for category 0 (Not applicable) was incidentally copied from I.25 and read: NA, no job. These questions are about family life and health.
I.1	I.1a and I.1b are copied from I.2a and I.2b. Few respondents actually noticed; correlations were over 0.80.
Z.27	Z.27 (Type of work organisation partner) was numbered in the questionnaire Z.26.
Z.42 Z.43	The answer categories did not list “Lijst 50+”, despite the fact that this party participated in the 2012 election and won 2 seats in parliament. The party in fact gained considerable popularity after the election and during the fieldwork period and many respondents used the write-in alternative to indicate their vote for this party. It was added in Version 2 of the questionnaire. Both versions of the data reflect the vote for Lijst 50+ adequately.

POST-STRATIFICATION WEIGHTS

There are three sources of information that can inform us about selectivity that occurs because of non-response, and can be used to post-stratify the data.

Sample-frame information

- Location of the sampled address. It is to be expected that response in urban areas, and in particular in the four major cities (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague, Utrecht) is lower than elsewhere.
- Name: for about 27% of the sample there was no access to a name of the inhabitants. This has decreased the response.
- Phone: for about 72% of the sample there was no access to a phone number. It is to be expected that not being listed in the phone-register is a strong correlate of willingness to participate.

- Foreign family name: Family names in the Netherlands can with considerable accuracy be classified as foreign and non-foreign. In particular Moroccan and Turkish names are easy to recognize, this is much harder for Surinamese and Antillean names. 3.8% of all addresses was deemed to be a ‘foreign name’.

In 7 cases, the respondents had removed their identification number from the mailed back questionnaire, although they supplied useable information. These questionnaires cannot be connected to the sample frame information and thus cannot be post-stratified in this respect (and these respondents kept receiving reminders to the very end...).

Household box information

Selectivity may also occur within responding households. Each respondent was asked to complete a household box, which gives access to information of all household members with respect to:

- Gender
- Age
- Position in household
- Main activity
- Highest completed / current education.

In addition, we have information on:

- Total number of persons in household eligible for the sample (i.e. all household members of 18 and older).

Using this information, a synthetic population can be formed that consists of all household members in the designated age bracket (18-75+). The actual sample should be representative of this synthetic population. All this information was used to develop the second post-stratification weight (www2).

The weights have been constructed by taking the inverse of the expected probabilities from a logistic regression that predicted response from (A) sample frame characteristics, (B) constructed sample from household roster.

Election result

Respondents report on their voting behavior at the most recent national election, which happened to have been on September 10 2012. Two population characteristics can be used as benchmark: turnout (75,4%), and the distribution of voting over parties. As in other surveys, voter turnout is considerably overestimated by the survey (at 88%), which is assumed to be caused by lower response to surveys among non-voters. Unlike in other ISSP-NL issues there was a significant difference between the population benchmark for one party, PVV (Lijst Wilders), which may be due to lower survey participation among the PVV-voters, or underreporting. The former seems the more plausible interpretation. The post-stratification weight www3 was developed by iterative proportional fitting.

Table 4: Marginal weights for selected categories (used to develop the weights)			
	2007/2008	2010/2011	2009/2012
URBANIZATION*	Weight	Weight	Weight
1 minder dan 5000 inwoners	0.925	0.686	0.851
2 5000 - < 10000 inwoners	0.909	0.916	0.851

3	10000 - < 20000 inwoners	0.938	0.907	0.912
4	20000 - < 50000 inwoners	0.973	0.983	0.956
5	50000 - < 100000 inwoners	1.017	0.933	1.012
6	100000 - < 150000 inwoners	1.053	1.013	0.977
7	150000 - < 250000 inwoners	1.020	1.083	1.027
8	250000 inwoners of meer	1.183	1.448	1.231
NAME*				
	Weight	Weight	Weight	
	No name	.953		0.941
	With name	1.108	1.048	1.219
FOREIGN NAME*				
	Weight	Weight	Weight	
	Dutch name	.983		0.978
	Foreign name	1.913	2.736	2.648
PHONE*				
	Weight	Weight	Weight	
	No phone listed	1.117	1.112	1.077
	Phone listed	.861	0.770	0.851
AGE **				
	Weight	Weight	Weight	
	18-24	1.581	2.599	2.489
	25-34	1.060	0.985	1.035
	35-44	0.975	0.980	0.966
	45-54	0.984	0.974	1.005
	55-64	0.950	0.954	0.947
	65-74	0.955	0.898	0.869
	75-hi	0.931	0.878	0.913
EDUCATION**				
	Weight	Weight	Weight	
	1 Basisonderwijs	1.108	1.338	1.053
	2 LBO-VBO-VMBOb	1.094	1.121	1.010
	3 MAVO-MULO-VMBOt	0.962	0.967	0.973
	4 HAVO-MMS	1.192	1.001	1.236
	5 VWO-HBS-Athen-Gymn	1.038	0.995	1.394
	6 kMBO	1.055	1.013	1.130
	7 MBO	0.980	1.037	0.979
	8 HBO	0.936	0.869	0.829
	9 Universiteit	0.915	0.937	0.934
MAIN ACTIVITY**				
	Weight	Weight	Weight	
	1 Employed-full time	1.034	0.970	0.956
	2 Employed-part time	0.936	1.065	0.956
	3 Employed < part-time	0.929	1.113	0.956
	4 Helping family member	0.917	0.811	0.956
	5 Unemployed	1.239	1.070	1.216
	6 Student,school,vocat.training	1.350	1.547	2.343
	7 Retired	0.925	0.872	0.889
	8 Housewife,-man,home duties	0.962	1.080	0.988
	9 Permanently disabled	1.176	2.099	1.143
	10 Other, not in labour force	0.915	0.894	n.a.
HHPOS**				
	Weight	Weight	Weight	
	1 Child	1.739	2.769	2.482
	2 Parent	0.939	1.011	0.890
	5 Other	1.023	1.292	2.637
	6 Single hh member	1.050	1.062	1.049
	7 Partner in couple hh	0.944	0.862	0.890

Sources: * Sampling frame, ** Household box

In summary, it can be said that one group was severely underrepresented in our effective sample: young adults, in particular in as far as they live in their parents' households. However, the highest marginal weight (2.6) is generated for respondents with foreign names. Note on the other hand, that the obtained sample is fairly representative with respect to education and main activity, even before post-stratification.