

ISSP 2012 Family and Changing Gender Roles IV: Questionnaire Development

Scholz, Evi; Jutz, Regina; Edlund, Jonas; Öun, Ida; Braun, Michael

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Arbeitspapier / working paper

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:
GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Scholz, E., Jutz, R., Edlund, J., Öun, I., & Braun, M. (2014). *ISSP 2012 Family and Changing Gender Roles IV: Questionnaire Development*. (GESIS-Technical Reports, 2014/19). Mannheim: GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-416182>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

ISSP 2012 Family and Changing Gender Roles IV: Questionnaire Development

*Evi Scholz, Regina Jutz, Jonas Edlund, Ida Öun,
Michael Braun*

GESIS–Technical Reports 2014|19

ISSP 2012
Family and Changing Gender Roles IV:
Questionnaire Development

*Evi Scholz, Regina Jutz, Jonas Edlund, Ida Öun,
Michael Braun*

GESIS-Technical Reports

GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften
Dauerbeobachtung der Gesellschaft
Monitoring Society and Social Change/Survey Programs/ISSP
Postfach 12 21 55
68072 Mannheim
Telefon: (0621) 1246 - 283
Telefax: (0621) 1246 - 100
E-Mail: evi.scholz@gesis.org

ISSN: 1868-9051 (Online)

Herausgeber,

Druck und Vertrieb: GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften
Unter Sachsenhausen 6-8, 50667 Köln

Contents

1	The International Social Survey Programme	5
2	ISSP Modules 1985-2015.....	7
3	ISSP Module Development	9
3.1	ISSP Module Development in General.....	9
3.2	Questionnaire Development of the Family and Gender Roles IV Module.....	10
4	Contents of the Family and Gender Roles IV Module and History of Items.....	13
5	Reasoning of the 2012 Module.....	19
5.1	Topic "Attitudes towards Family and Gender Roles".....	20
5.2	Topic "Attitudes towards Marriage"	21
5.3	Topic "Alternative Family Forms"	21
5.4	Topic "Attitudes towards Children"	22
5.5	Topic "Gender, Care, and Social Policy"	23
	"Attitudes about Parental Leave and Gender: Benefits, Length of Time, Division of Time"	23
	"Attitudes about Elderly Care and Child Care: Service Provider, Financing"	23
5.6	Topic "Preferred and Actual Division of Paid and Unpaid Work: Model Families".....	24
	"Preferred and Actual Division of Paid and Unpaid Work: Care Responsibilities for Respondent and Spouse"	25
5.7	Topic "Income in Partnership".....	26
5.8	Topic "Gendered Division of Household Work"	26
5.9	Topic "Power and Decision-Making within Partnership".....	26
5.10	Topic "Work-Family Conflict"	27
5.11	Topic "Happiness and Satisfaction"	27
5.12	Topic "Additional Demographics/ Background Variables"	27
6	Country Participation in ISSP 2012	29
7	References.....	31
8	Appendix 1: Peer-Reviewed Research Articles Using ISSP Family Modules.....	32
9	Appendix 2: ISSP 2012 Source Questionnaire.....	36

1 The International Social Survey Programme

The International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) is a continuing annual programme of cross-national collaboration. It brings together pre-existing social science projects and co-ordinates research goals, thereby adding a cross-national perspective to the individual national studies.

It started late in 1983 when SCPR,¹ London, secured funds from the Nuffield Foundation to hold meetings to further international collaboration between four existing surveys – the General Social Survey (GSS), conducted by NORC in the USA, the British Social Attitudes Survey (BSA), conducted by SCPR in Great Britain, the Allgemeine Bevölkerungsumfrage der Sozialwissenschaften (ALLBUS), conducted by ZUMA² in West Germany, and the National Social Science Survey (NSS), conducted by ANU in Australia. Prior to this, NORC and ZUMA had been collaborating bilaterally since 1982 on a common set of questions.

The four founding members agreed to (1) jointly develop modules dealing with important areas of social science, (2) field the modules as a fifteen-minute supplement to the regular national surveys (or a special survey if necessary), (3) include an extensive common core of background variables, and (4) make the data available to the social science community as soon as possible.

Each research organisation funds all of its own participation costs. There are no central funds. The merging of the data into a cross-national data set is performed by GESIS². Since 1996, the archive has been aided in its work by Analisis Sociologicos, Economicos y Politicos (ASEP), Madrid, one of the Spanish member institutes in the ISSP. Together with ASEP, the archive is responsible for merging the ISSP data and producing the international merged data sets.

In 2014, the ISSP has 49 members and covers more than 60% of the world population; the founding four – Australia, Germany, Great Britain and the United States – plus Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea (South), Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palestine, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

The ISSP is unique in a number of ways. First, the cross-national collaboration between organisations is not ad hoc or intermittent, but routine and continual. Second, by combining a cross-time with a cross-national perspective, two powerful research designs are being used to study societal processes. Third, the ISSP is one of the few cross-national studies to conduct and publish study monitoring reports of the annual studies. These are available for download from the ISSP microsite at the GESIS web pages³. Fourth, the ISSP has a very specific form of organization, most likely it is comparable to the United Nations organisation. There is an annual General Assembly that takes final decisions by majority vote, e.g. on new ISSP memberships or questionnaires. All active ISSP members have equal rights and duties and each ISSP member has one vote in elections (Smith 2009). The ISSP secretary serves as the chair of the General Assembly and is responsible for the day-to-day business. Several committees made of ISSP members support the ISSP secretariat in its tasks. The ISSP standing committee is elected to assist in making suggestions on membership, venues for future meetings, funding of joint activities, etc. The ISSP methodology committee is elected to assist in assessing and

¹ In 1999 SCPR became NCSR (National Centre for Social Research).

² In 2007 ZUMA (Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen) and ZA (Zentralarchiv) were integrated into GESIS and became GESIS departments.

³ <http://www.gesis.org/issp>

enforcing the technical standards of the ISSP as indicated in its working principles (http://www.issp.org/uploads/editor_uploads/files/WP_FINAL_9_2012_.pdf). Methodology sub-committees and working groups carry out various tasks. To give an example: The work group on demography has worked for several years on quality assessment and improvement of the ISSP background variables resulting in a revision of the ISSP demography part and ISSP background variables guidelines. Drafting groups are elected to work on the development of ISSP source questionnaires that are presented, discussed, and approved in the ISSP General Assembly. ISSP secretariat and committees are elected by the ISSP General Assembly according to the ISSP working principles for fixed terms.

2 ISSP Modules 1985–2015

The first ISSP module "Role of Government" was fielded in 1985 by the four ISSP founding members and by Austria, which has become member already in 1985, and Italy. Since then, the ISSP has run eleven different thematic modules; "Health and Health Policy" being the most recent achievement. Modules are usually replicated in a ten-year interval. Most of the ISSP modules are replication modules; some already have four waves.

1985	Role of Government I	Attitudes towards the government plus general political attitudes.
1986	Social Networks I	Ego-centred network in the Claude Fisher tradition ("to whom would you turn") plus a series of questions concerning the structure and composition of respondents' networks.
1987	Social Inequality I	Opinions and attitudes toward inequality in terms of rich and poor and privileged and underprivileged.
1988	Family and Changing Gender Roles I	Attitudes towards women as part of the labour force and possible conflicts with traditional roles of men and women in society, general attitudes to the family.
1989	Work Orientations I	General attitudes to work and leisure, work organisation and work content.
1990	Role of Government II	A partial replication of Role of Government I (1985), with new questions.
1991	Religion I	Attitudes towards traditional religious beliefs and topics connected with secular social ideologies.
1992	Social Inequality II	A partial replication of Social Inequality I (1987), with new questions.
1993	Environment I	Attitudes to the environment, nature and pollution, together with questions assessing knowledge of science and environmental issues.
1994	Family and Changing Gender Roles II	A partial replication of Family and Changing Gender Roles I (1988), with new questions.
1995	National Identity I	Questions on attitudes to aspects of national life and culture, citizenship, minorities in society and to foreigners.
1996	Role of Government III	A partial replication of the Role of Government modules I and II (1985 and 1990), with new questions.
1997	Work Orientations II	A partial replication of Work Orientations I (1989), with new questions.
1998	Religion II	A partial replication of Religion I (1991), with new questions.
1999	Social Inequality III	A partial replication of the Social Inequality modules I and II (1987 and 1992), with new questions.
2000	Environment II	A partial replication of Environment I (1993), with new questions.
2001	Social Networks II: Social Relations and Support Systems	Based on Social Networks I (1986), with new questions.
2002	Family and Changing Gender Roles III	A partial replication of the Family and Changing Gender Roles modules I and II (1988 and 1994), with new questions.
2003	National Identity II	A partial replication of National Identity I (1995), with new questions.
2004	Citizenship I	Questions on political and social participation, civic identity and social trust; attitudes to the political system and democracy.
2005	Work Orientations III	A partial replication of the Work Orientations modules I and II (1989 and 1997), with new questions.
2006	Role of Government IV	A partial replication of the Role of Government modules I-III (1985, 1990, 1996), with new questions.
2007	Leisure Time and Sports I	Questions on leisure time activities (e.g. sports); meaning of time and leisure; preferences regarding leisure time; sociological aspects of sports.
2008	Religion III	A partial replication of Religion I and II (1991 and 1998), with new questions.

2009	Social Inequality IV	A partial replication of Social Inequality I-III (1987, 1992, and 1999), with new questions.
2010	Environment III	A partial replication of Environment I and II (1993 and 2000), with new questions.
2011	Health and Health Policy I	Questions on health status, behaviour, and perceptions of health. Attitudes to health care systems and expenditures.
2012	Family and Changing Gender Roles IV	A partial replication of Family and Changing Gender Roles I-III (1988, 1994, 2002), with new questions.
2013	National Identity III	A partial replication of National Identity I and II (1995, 2003), with new questions.
2014	Citizenship II	A partial replication of Citizenship I (2004), with new questions.

Modules planned

2015	Work Orientations IV	A partial replication of the Work Orientations I-III (1989, 1997, 2005) with new questions.
2016	Role of Government V	A partial replication of the Role of Government modules I-IV (1995, 1990, 1996, 2006), with new questions.
2017	Social Networks and Social Resources	Based on Social Networks I (1986) and II (2001), with new questions.

3 ISSP Module Development

3.1 ISSP Module Development in General

ISSP modules are developed over a minimum period of two years during which a multi-national drafting group prepares several questionnaire drafts in accordance with the decisions taken at ISSP General Assembly meetings. The general way of proceeding is fixed by the ISSP Working Principles.

At its annual meetings, the ISSP General Assembly discusses and decides on the ISSP module which will be run three years after the respective annual meeting. A drafting group, usually made of six ISSP members, who cover different regions of the ISSP world, is elected to develop the ISSP source questionnaire. The drafting group is free to organize its work, e.g. by email, phone, etc. but usually meets in person in between the ISSP annual meetings to discuss important matters.

In the first year of the questionnaire development, the drafting group starts by theoretically and empirically considering the topics and subjects which should be covered. For replication modules⁴, research publications using ISSP data⁵ are scanned to find out about the use and value of items and the respective variables. Suggestions and comments by the scientific community are taken into account as well. The drafting group produces a report on the results of its investigation, which items have proven to be relevant and which are largely irrelevant for research, as well as which topics should be added to the module. This report is circulated in good time prior to the next ISSP meeting where it is presented by the drafting group and discussed in the plenary session. Then the ISSP General Assembly votes on priorities for new topics. During the second year, the drafting group develops and discusses a draft questionnaire in order to fix the items that should be pre-tested. Before the pre-test, this first draft of the source questionnaire is circulated among the ISSP to get feedback at an early stage of item and questionnaire development. The first draft is modified responding to the ISSP's suggestions and critics and the resulting pre-test questionnaire⁶ is then tested in several countries. Based on the pre-test results the drafting group reviews and revises the questionnaire into a second draft. Prior to the annual ISSP meeting (usually late April/early May of each year), the second draft is again circulated among the whole ISSP for comments and suggestions, accompanied by the reasoning behind it. In the plenary session, the drafting group reacts to the comments of ISSP members and discusses in detail the final draft. Afterwards the draft is voted on, question-by-question using majority rule. The final ISSP source questionnaire thus results from the discussion and decisions at the annual meeting. This means that while the respective drafting group develops the items, the final decision on an ISSP source questionnaire is made by the ISSP General Assembly who signs it off prior to the year of fielding. This source questionnaire is then translated and fielded by the individual ISSP member countries.

Every member country prepares and documents its own ISSP national data following the standards of preparation, documentation, and deposit of national ISSP data sets. The national data set is sent to the ISSP Archive at GESIS (<http://www.gesis.org/issp/overview/contacts/>) where, in collaboration with ASEP, it is checked and integrated into an international ISSP data set.

⁴ "For a module to qualify as a replication, two-thirds of the items must be taken from one or more of the previous questionnaires of that topical module." (INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SURVEY PROGRAMME (ISSP), WORKING PRINCIPLES, C6)

⁵ The ISSP continuously collects information on the use of its data in research publications. To be counted, the data has to be used for a comparison of at least two countries. This ISSP bibliography is available from the ISSP website.

⁶ The pre-test questionnaire does not always include all items of the planned ISSP source questionnaire and thus does not count as draft source questionnaire.

3.2 Questionnaire Development of the Family and Gender Roles IV Module

Questionnaire development started in 2009 at the General Assembly meeting in Vienna, with the ISSP's decision to replicate the Family and Gender Roles module 2012. China, Germany, Ireland, Mexico, Sweden, and Turkey were elected as members of the drafting group for the fourth wave of the family module. The group was additionally supported by an expert from Israel who was not a regular member of the ISSP team from Israel. Germany and Sweden were chosen as co-convenors by the group.

As the 2012 Family and Gender Roles IV Module is a replication module, following ISSP requirements, the ISSP 2012 source questionnaire should include 40 replicate items at minimum and 20 new items. From spring 2009 onwards the drafting group reviewed the most recent journal articles to get information about the use of the ISSP 2002 family module and the quality of its items. The estimated usage of the items was based on a literature review of 67 journal articles (see Appendix 1). Of course, by using peer-reviewed articles only, only a part of the total usage of the module was checked. However, peer-reviewed articles form a reliable base because they indicate that the items are regarded to be of sufficient quality and theoretical interest. The drafting group agreed that the replication of the module in 2012 should ensure that the opportunities to compare with previous modules are as large as possible, while at the same time the quality of items and their usage is taken into account. In addition, issues and debates in contemporary research on family and gender roles where ISSP data could provide useful information were also considered.

Drafting groups, according to ISSP working principles, are free how to organize their work. The group complied with general deadlines to inform the ISSP about the state of questionnaire development. Most of the ISSP 2012 drafting group's conversation was done by email and, between the co-convenors, by phone. In addition, the drafting group members met in person in January 2010 in Mannheim to discuss and finalize their proposal on replicate items and new topics. In early March 2010, the drafting group circulated a report inside the ISSP and asked for ISSP members' feedback.

Before the General Assembly in Lisbon in 2010, the drafting group met again to decide on its reaction to the comments and suggestions handed in by the ISSP. The group presented the results of its investigation and discussion to the General Assembly and distributed a list of 12 topics for the ISSP members to vote on. The General Assembly voted for a maximum of six topics to fix the priorities the drafting group should take into account when developing the questionnaire.

The results regarding the vote of topic priority in Lisbon is shown in Table 1. Top priority in questionnaire development was given to the drafting group's new topics 1, 2, 3. Medium priority went to new topics 6 and 7 as well as to "Alternative family forms", a topic that was brought in by the ISSP General Assembly in Lisbon. The other topics should not be considered in the questionnaire development process.

Table 1: New Topics and Voting Results

Topics	Votes
Gender, care, and social policy	28
Attitudes towards children	27
Preferred and actual division of paid and unpaid work: model families	25
Additional background variables and single items (power over social relations, time management in household, age of partner/spouse, duration of relationship)	18
Alternative family forms / Patchwork families, step and adopted children*	16
Reasons for marriage	14
Influences on partnership formation	10
Marital satisfaction*	6
Intra- and intergenerational support relations (siblings care for each other / help by grandparents)*	4
Factual life course, information on last marriage*	1
Labour force history / Desired work hours*	0

* brought in by members of the ISSP General Assembly

In 2010, the drafting group developed a first draft questionnaire and circulated the draft in the ISSP in October 2010 to get feedback before the questionnaire was pre-tested. In December 2010 and early January 2011, the pre-test was run as an online study in Germany (split into western and eastern Germany), Mexico, and Sweden, based on non-random internet access panels with quotas on sex, age, and education. In February 2011, the drafting group met in Stockholm to review and discuss the results of the pre-test and finalize the second draft questionnaire. In early March, the second draft was circulated in the ISSP together with the pre-test questionnaire, the results of the pre-test, and a reasoning report to outline the drafting group's proposal. Again, the group received a considerable amount of feedback, critique and suggestions from the ISSP prior to the annual meeting in Puerto Vallarta, Mexico in early May 2011.

Figure 1 charts the main steps in the two years' questionnaire development process distinguishing between replication and innovation. The small orange icon depicting a hypothetical parliament marks the steps where the ISSP General Assembly takes fundamental decisions on questionnaire development by democratic voting in plenum.

Taking ISSP 2002 as the base where the module contains 62 items⁷ (plus compulsory ISSP standard background variables⁸) and following ISSP rules on replication, at a minimum 41 (62*0,667) items should be kept. The ISSP decided to replicate 41 items from 2002 and to reinstate additional 2 items from 1994. This is a total of 43 replicate items. In summary, with the new 20 items, the 2012 ISSP module on "Family and Changing Gender Roles" contains of 63 items.

⁷ Not counting the ISSP 2002 optional background variable on the number of children R ever had.

⁸ Household composition and spouse/partner working hours




Figure 1: Development of the ISSP "Family and Gender Roles IV" Source Questionnaire.

4 Contents of the Family and Gender Roles IV Module and History of Items

The 2012 survey was the fourth of the Family and Gender Roles module and partially replicated the 1988, 1994, and 2002 surveys. The replicated and new questions are explained in Table 2.

The table below outlines the topics covered in the module and indicates which were new and which were replicated. The 2012 source questionnaire item numbers are given in the first column. The variables in the second column are those of the international ISSP data set (ZA5900; doi: 10.4232/1.12022) downloadable free of charge from the GESIS ISSP website (<http://www.gesis.org/issp/issp-modules-profiles/family-and-changing-gender-roles/2012/>) or from the GESIS data catalogue <https://dbk.gesis.org/DBKsearch/SDESC2.asp?no=5900&tab=3&db=E>. Recommended citation of the data is "ISSP Research Group (2014): International Social Survey Programme: Family and Changing Gender Roles IV - ISSP 2012. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA5900 Data file Version 2.0.0, doi: 10.4232/1.12022"

Table 2: Contents of the ISSP Family and Gender Roles Module 2012

2012			Abbreviated version of questions	1988 Study		1994 Study		2002 Study	
Question numbers	Variables	No. of Items		Question numbers	Variables	Question numbers	Variables	Question numbers	Variables
		9	Attitudes towards Family and Gender Roles						
1		5	Agree / Disagree ...	1		1		1	
a	V5		Working mother can have warm relation with child	a	V4	a	V4	a	V4
b	V6		Pre-school child suffers through working mother	b	V5	b	V5	b	V5
c	V7		Family life suffers through working mother	c	V6	c	V6	c	V6
d	V8		Women's preference: home and children	e	V8	d	V7	d	V7
e	V9		Being housewife is satisfying	f	V9	e	V8	e	V8
2a	V10	2	Both should contribute to household income	h	V11	2a	V11	2a	V10
2b	V11		Men's job is earn money, women's job household	i	V12	2b	V12	2b	V11
3		2	Should women work ...	2		3		3	
a	V12		With a pre-school child	b	V15	b	V16	b	V15
b	V13		After youngest child at school	c	V16	c	V17	c	V16
		4	Attitudes towards Marriage						
4		4	Agree / Disagree ...	5		4		4	
a	V14		Married people are generally happier	a	V27	a	V19	a	V18
b	V15		People who want children ought to marry	f	V32	e	V23	c	V20
d	V17		Divorce best solution when marriage problems			i	V27	g	V24

2012			Abbreviated version of questions	1988 Study		1994 Study		2002 Study	
Question numbers	Variables	No. of Items		Question numbers	Variables	Question numbers	Variables	Question numbers	Variables
		4	Alternative family forms						
4c	V16	1	Living together is ok without intention to marry			4g	V25	4e	V22
5		3	Agree/ Disagree ...						
a	V18		Single parent can raise child as well as two parents			4f	V24	4d	V21
b	V19		Lesbian couple can raise child as well as heterosexual couple						
c	V20		Gay couple can raise child as well as heterosexual couple						
		7	Attitudes towards Children						
6	V21	1	Ideal number of children	6	V37	5	V28		
7		6	Agree / Disagree ...	8		6		5	
a	V22		Watching children grow up is greatest joy	8b	V44	6a	V29	5a	V25
b	V23		Interfering with freedom of parents	8c	V45	6b	V30		
c	V24		Children financial burden						
d	V25		Having children restricts the employment and career chances						
e	V26		Having children increases people's social standing						
f	V27		Adult children are help for elderly parents						
		7	Gender, care, and social policy						
8	V28	1	Paid leave and preferred duration						
9	V29	1	Preferred paid leave funder						
10	V30	1	Preferred division of paid leave between mother and father						

2012			Abbreviated version of questions	1988 Study		1994 Study		2002 Study	
Question numbers	Variables	No. of Items		Question numbers	Variables	Question numbers	Variables	Question numbers	Variables
12	V33	1	Children under school age: childcare provider						
13	V34	1	Children under school age: childcare funder						
14	V35	1	Care for elderly people: provider						
15	V36	1	Care for elderly people: funder						
		6	Preferred and actual division of paid and unpaid work: model families						
11		2	Preferred division of work between mother and father						
a	V31		Best option						
b	V32		Worst option						
16a	V37	2	Actual hours spent on household work and family care R: household work					9a	V36
16b	V38		R: looking after family members						
17a	V39	2	Spouse / partner: household work					9b	V37
17b	V40		Spouse / partner: looking after family members						
		2	Income in partnership						
18	V41		Organizing income in partnership			17	V50	7	V29
22	V50		Who has the higher income?					14	V43

2012			Abbreviated version of questions	1988 Study		1994 Study		2002 Study	
Question numbers	Variables	No. of Items		Question numbers	Variables	Question numbers	Variables	Question numbers	Variables
		7	Gendered division of household work						
19		6	Division of household work, who ...			18		8	
a	V42		Does the laundry			a	V51	a	V30
b	V43		Makes small repairs about house			b	V52	b	V31
c	V44		Cares for sick family members			c	V53	c	V32
d	V45		Shops for groceries			d	V54	d	V33
e	V46		Does the household cleaning					e	V34
f	V47		Prepares the meals					f	V35
20	V48	1	Sharing household work between partners: Perceived fairness					10	V38
		2	Power and Decision-Making within Partnership						
21	V49	1	Who makes decisions about choosing weekend activities					13a	V41
31	V64	1	Who makes decisions about raising children					12	V40
		4	Work – Family Conflict						
23		4	How often ...					16	
a	V51		Is R too tired from work to do duties at home					a	V48
b	V52		Has R difficulty to fulfill family responsibilities					b	V49
c	V53		Is R too tired from housework to function in job					c	V50
d	V54		Has R difficulty to concentrate at work					d	V51

2012			Abbreviated version of questions	1988 Study		1994 Study		2002 Study	
Question numbers	Variables	No. of Items		Question numbers	Variables	Question numbers	Variables	Question numbers	Variables
		3	Happiness and Satisfaction...						
24	V55	1	with life in general					17	V52
25	V56	1	with main job					18	V53
26	V57	1	with family life					19	V54
		9	Additional Demographics / Background Variables						
27	V58	1	R's subjective health						
28	V59	1	Mother ever working for pay before R 14	15	V55	8	V35	20	V55
29		2	Respondent worked away from home when...	19		20		21	
a	V60		Child under school age	b	V60	b	V59	b	V57
b	V61		Youngest child started school	c	V61	c	V60	c	V58
30		2	Spouse / Partner worked away from home when...			21		22	
a	V62		Child under school age			b	V63	b	V61
b	V63		Youngest child started school			c	V64	c	V62
32	V65	1	Spouse degree: highest qualification					B	V70
33	V66	1	Age of Spouse						
34	V67	1	Duration of current relationship						

5 Reasoning of the 2012 Module

A review of the content in the 1988 module suggests that the main topics were consequences of female employment (the wellbeing of families and children); attitudes towards children; and attitudes towards marriage and divorce. Subsequently the module has developed towards a stronger emphasis on the division of labour within the household, in attitudinal as well as in behavioural terms. While the domains concerned with children and marriage has been toned down over time, consequences of female employment are still a major topic within the module.

Beyond that, contemporary debates in many societies are not primarily about whether or not women should be in paid work, but about the role of men when it comes to domestic unpaid work. This leads to a more general debate about gender equality in both spheres of life. An overarching goal for the 2012 module was to improve the already quite elaborated structure of the module by bringing in the role of men as well as of women, and relations between the partners with respect to both the sphere of domestic labour and paid labour.

Put somewhat crudely, while the initial 1988 module focused foremost on attitudes towards women's relation to paid employment and its consequences, the central overarching concept in the 2012 module follows the trend towards a widened focus on gender roles, power, and distribution within the household with respect to paid work, unpaid household work, and care responsibilities.

For the 2012 module, the ISSP intended to improve some of the ideas of the 2002 module, in which one of the most important features is to further de-emphasize the narrow study of women and employment (which implicitly assumes a static nature of male behaviour) and supplement it with a more comprehensive framework covering both men and women and their relations. By focusing on both sexes, the ISSP believes that the 2012 module can successfully bring in the role of men in the domestic sphere, as well as getting a more nuanced understanding about gender relations in the household (in terms of unpaid work and care) and consequences of these relations.

A distinctive feature of the family module is the comparatively strong emphasis on actual circumstances and behaviour which are keys for understanding the observed attitudes. Reviewing the literature (for instance, Daly & Rake 2003; Gornick & Meyers 2003; for an explicit criticism of ISSP, see Hook 2006), the ISSP decided to strengthen the block of information on actual circumstances and behaviour that were not adequately covered in the 2002 module; as these may be important sources for explaining differences in attitudes, e.g. differences in gender ideology or work-family conflict. The large majority of these items refer to the domain of household work and care responsibilities. However, as the literature review suggests, these items are also interesting in their own right; many of these issues are still unexplored in a cross-national perspective.

When selecting new topics for the 2012 module, the scholarly debates in contemporary research were considered. In general, the research areas reflect some common characteristics of contemporary modern society: a change towards smaller families and hence an increasing proportion of elderly citizens. Indeed, lowered fertility rates have been described as "one of the biggest issues currently plaguing many advanced industrialized countries" (Vos 2009). In addition, there are trends towards increased geographical mobility across generations and an enlarged number of dual-earner families. These processes, especially those related to the labour market, are supposed to have a profound impact on gender relations within the household – particularly when it comes to issues regarding the levels and distributions of time spent on paid work, unpaid work, and care. With the increasing number of dual-earner families time pressures resulting from various tasks and conflicts between partners might occur.

Political demands of how to mitigate these kinds of time pressures in dual-earner families might arise. However, it is likely that citizens' preferences on care responsibilities and service delivery differ across national contexts, as Korpi (2000) and Esping-Andersen (1999) show in their description of gender relations in different types of political economies. The ISSP believes that data in this area will be highly relevant for research and decided to study preferences about child care and elderly care with respect to service delivery (state, market, or family) and whether the service should be subsidized or not.

One central subject in the literature is about parental leave since the design of this particular policy has an impact on the work-family balance, on labour market attachment, and power-relations within the household (Daly & Rake 2003; Gornick & Meyers 2003; Mandel & Shalev 2009). The ISSP considers this to be an important topic to cover, particularly when it comes to attitudes about the participation of men (Harris & Bichler 1997; Hook 2006).

Another issue relevant against the background of changing fertility rates and greying societies is to study attitudes towards children. While previous research linked falling fertility rates with increasing female employment, recent research shows that this no longer is the case (see Vos 2009; Duvander et. al. 2010; and references cited therein). The variation in fertility rates across countries suggests that reasons for having or not having children depends on several factors, among these the availability of work-family policies and the role of men in the private caring sphere. These areas are also part of the 2012 module. In addition, the ISSP decided to dig further into this subject by studying citizens' attitudes towards children, and to identify perceptions of "child-constraints", i.e. reasons for not having children, as well as preferences for ideal family sizes.

5.1 Topic "Attitudes towards Family and Gender Roles"

The ISSP 2012 source questionnaire starts with two item batteries covering gender ideology (2012: Q1 and Q2). These items attempt to tap attitudes related to consequences of female employment for family life as well as consequences of employment for gender relations. All items have a long history and are highly used in research.

A global analysis of the correlation patterns across the ISSP 2002 items indicated that the items "Pre-school child suffers through working mother", "Family life suffers through working mother", "Women's preference: home and children", and "Men's job is earn money, women's job household" correlates quite strongly with each other, and that "Working mother can have warm relation with child" and "Being housewife is satisfying" are also related to these variables, but in a less clear manner. Depending on the countries selected for analysis, being able to create a number of indicators may ease the possibilities to construct a valid measure of the concept. In any event, if any of these items are dropped in the future, it is important to notice that the item "Working mother can have warm relation with child" serves as introduction to the battery and could minimize question-order effects when comparing attitudes over time.

The 2002 items on the role of men were not very useful and were therefore not replicated in 2012: They did not correlate strongly with any other item in the batteries and they were context-dependent, making them difficult to compare both across countries and over time. First, they were too easy to agree with, illustrated by the fact that a large majority of the respondents in most ISSP countries agreed with the statements, and very few disagreed. In more than 80% ("Men ought to do a larger share of household work than they do now") and 90% ("Men ought to do a larger share of childcare than they do now") of the countries, less than 20% of the respondents disagreed with the statements. Moreover, the items failed to distinguish between attitudes towards men taking a substantial part of domestic work and attitudes towards men that merely provide "a helping hand". The items seemed to assume an overarching female responsibility of domestic work.

In order to capture attitudes towards dual earner/dual carer families, the items from 2002 did not work either. The ISSP was not interested in whether the man should "help" the woman some more; the focus was on whether men should change their behaviour more drastically in the domestic sphere. Furthermore, these items had low usage in research. Also, the item "Having a job is the best way for a woman to be an independent person", which was originally designed to measure the economic-consequences dimension, was not replicated in ISSP 2012, as there were severe conceptual and empirical problems with the item.

While the 2002 attitudinal items on female employment over the life-cycle have been used a lot, in several papers they were used in tandem with the "Gender Ideology" batteries. The ISSP decided to keep the two items of the battery (2012: Q3) whether women should work outside the home full-time, part-time, or not at all which have a high analytical value ("When there is a child under school age"; "After the youngest child starts school").

Reducing the battery does not mean that the 2012 module weakens the issue about female employment and family. The important aspects of these attitudes are supposed to be covered in the new topics for the 2012 survey where the role of men is also included (see topic "Preferred and actual division of paid and unpaid work: model families"). Thus, the concept is widened to focus on "family formation and employment", rather than the narrow focus on "female employment" in 2002.

5.2 Topic "Attitudes towards Marriage"

The ISSP item battery on "Attitudes towards marriage" has a long history and is therefore quite large: In 1988 it started out with already ten items, and items got added and removed during the subsequent family modules. However, in relation to the long history of the items, the usage of these items has been quite low (two journal articles). There are additional arguments for reducing the battery: The 2002 item asking about a bad marriage correlates with other items against theoretical expectations and was dropped in 2012. The 2002 item that mixes marriage and cohabitation (still assuming that the latter will end with the former) was also dropped for the 2012 battery because these two living forms should be kept separated for analytical purposes.

The ISSP refined the measurement of the marriage concept and kept three items of the battery "Attitudes towards marriage" (2012: Q4a, b, c): "Married people are generally happier", "People who want children ought to get married", and "Living together is ok without intention to marry". Item Q4d "Divorce best solution when marriage problems" is the only item on divorce in the module and complements the battery

5.3 Topic "Alternative Family Forms"

The topic "Alternative family forms" was proposed by the ISSP as a new topic to consider but received only 16 votes by the ISSP General Assembly 2010 in Lisbon, which means a lower priority. The ISSP decided to cover this topic by two old and two new items. The old items are the acceptance of cohabitation ("Living together is ok without intention to marry") and single parents ("Single parent can raise child as well as two parents"). For the pre-test, several items were tested which were all constructed as comparisons of new family forms with the traditional family (consisting of a married heterosexual couple living together with their own children). Pre-test results showed that respondents seem to differentiate between alternative family forms which can be supposed to originate by choice and those which might be the result of fate. For example, living in a blended family as well as in a one-parent family might be the consequence of fate, while a cohabitation and same-sex relationships are more thought of as being the result of a deliberate choice. Two new items on same-sex

relationships were seen to be necessary, as in some countries people differentiate strongly between gays and lesbians.

The cohabitation item originates from the battery on "Attitudes towards marriage" where it was asked already in 2002 and 1994 (2012: Q4c). The comparisons between new family forms with the traditional family are asked in a new, separate battery (but with identical response categories), also containing the replicate item on single parents (2012: Q5).

5.4 Topic "Attitudes towards Children"

This topic received 27 votes by the ISSP General Assembly in Lisbon and became second priority. Similar to "Attitudes towards marriage", the items on attitudes towards children have been substantially reduced over time. Starting with six items in 1988, the main item battery on attitudes towards children was reduced to two items in 2002. Therefore, the 2002 module came under some criticism for the notion that attitudes towards children were insufficiently covered. For the 2012 family module, it was desired to revive this topic.

In many countries declines in fertility rates are an important issue; it seems therefore beneficial to the family module to bring in questions on ideal family size and reasons for not having children. Interestingly, there is not only a divide in fertility rates between highly industrialized and developing countries but there is also considerable variation within these two groups. Among the highly industrialized countries, there are several countries, such as the United States, France, and the Nordic countries, in which fertility is around replacement level (some 2.1 children per woman). In Germany as well as in many countries in Southern and Eastern Europe, however, fertility levels are around 1.3 children per woman. The fertility difference between highly industrialized and developing countries could, at least to some degree, be explained by direct costs and direct (financial) utility, as in developing countries working children provide an essential contribution to family income. Furthermore, they constitute old-age insurance for their parents when they grow old. However, direct costs cannot explain the differences among the industrialized countries. We hypothesize that opportunity costs are responsible for these differences: The fertility decline in these countries is likely to be driven by different opportunity costs. A lack of affordable extra-familial childcare, which weakens especially the position of women in the labour market, might be the dominant reason for lower fertility rates in countries such as Germany, but also for Eastern Europe.

A battery on attitudes towards children with four replicate and six potentially new items incorporating those theoretical ideas was tested in the pre-tests in Germany, Mexico, and Sweden. Wording and usage of the items in the original battery (1988: Q8) on attitudes towards children were thoroughly examined by the Drafting Group. Most of the statements constructed for the 1988 module imply a high probability to be answered in a socially desirable way. Moreover, in addition to being very general statements, they mostly refer to direct costs and utility (e.g. financial burden) but leave out the most important aspect of opportunity costs.

In the end, the item battery on attitudes towards children contains six items in total, five items as tested in the pre-test (two replicate items, three new items) and one item where wording was specified (Q7f: "Adult children are an important source of help for elderly parents") compared to the pre-test ("Adult children are a good support for parents in need").

Additionally, the question regarding the ideal number of children (2012: Q6) was reinstated.

5.5 Topic "Gender, Care, and Social Policy"

With 28 votes in the General meeting in Lisbon, the topic "Gender, care, and social policy" was given the highest priority for the 2012 module. While this vote means strengthening the issue of behaviour and attitudes with regard to gender, care, and social policy, the two items included in ISSP 2002 were dropped and replaced with a new battery of items designed to measure this concept more accurately, by including both partners within the household. The 2002 items were not used a lot and they did not cover the most relevant aspects when it comes to social policy and families; for example the first item referred only to women and the second item could be interpreted in different ways depending on the actual social policy context in the country and thus was problematic in terms of cross-national comparisons.

Across the countries that are part of ISSP, both the amount and gender division of care responsibilities for children and elderly vary greatly in terms of how societies have dealt with these issues. Different solutions require different levels of input from families. Among other things, the pressures on what has been termed "the sandwich generation" (couples with own children and dependent elderly parents) may be very different across countries. The items developed for this topic are designed to map these differences, as well as to capture respondents' preferences about different organisations of care responsibilities. The topic includes three subcategories: attitudes about parental leave; attitudes about the provision and financing of elderly care and child care; and care responsibilities (reported under the topic "Preferred and actual division of paid and unpaid work").

"Attitudes about Parental Leave and Gender: Benefits, Length of Time, Division of Time"

The 2002 items covering the issue of social policy directed toward families were replaced with a battery of items that treated the respondent's attitudes towards different aspects of paid parental leave. Parental leave (here including all types of paid leave when a child is born, i.e. also maternity and paternity leave) is a core component in social policies directed towards families, and would measure the concept of social policy more accurately. Another important argument is that the new battery includes both partners within the household, which is an important development of the 2012 module compared to previous versions of the module, which focussed on women only.

First, the 2012 questionnaire asks if families should receive some kind of financial support during parental leave and how extensive in time the paid parental leave period should be (2012: Q8). Second, it includes an item that measures who should finance it: the state, the employer, or both (2012: Q9). Last, it treats how the parental leave should be distributed between the parents (2012: Q10). This item order is well-considered to make the respondents think of a specific kind of parental leave that compensates for a rather large part of the parent's income loss during the leave. Responses should be avoided that blur the definition of parental leave by also including home care benefits and very long but poorly compensated parental leave arrangements. The responses to Q8, length of the parental leave period, should refer to the respondents' attitudes towards children's needs and wellbeing. Q10, about how the leave should be shared between the parents is put last with the aim that it should not influence the responses on items Q8 and Q9.

"Attitudes about Elderly Care and Child Care: Service Provider, Financing"

The societal trends of increasing female labour market participation and ageing population may contribute to the pressure for political solutions of both elderly care and child care. The salience of the issue and the preferences of citizens may however differ across societal contexts. In this topic, the ISSP decided to measure who should be the main provider of the services, and how the services should be financed. To control for context related differences between societies and families, the strategy is to

present a specific situation/case that the respondents should evaluate. The major line of division that should be measured is whether care provision and financing is seen as a purely private matter for the family to deal with or if it is seen as a societal/political matter.

The ISSP decided to ask four new items on this subject, two for each elderly care referring to the need of help in everyday lives (2012: Q12, Q13) and to child care for children under school-age (2012: Q14, Q15): Analyses of the pre-test data indicated that the items in general worked quite well in terms of item non-response and substance: The items were implemented with only minor changes in wording and response categories in the final source questionnaire.

5.6 Topic "Preferred and Actual Division of Paid and Unpaid Work: Model Families"

This topic was one of three new topics receiving high priority by voting in the ISSP General Assembly in Lisbon. The topic has the aim to capture gender relations within the household with regard to the family distribution of paid and unpaid work. The approach of measuring both actual circumstances and preferred circumstances will provide interesting data relevant for research on gender and work (Mandel & Shalev 2009; Gornick & Meyers 2003; Daly & Rake 2003). The strategy for covering the topic is to both make use of replicate items that have a long history in the ISSP family module and add new items as means of developing the gender dimension with regard to the attitudinal part.

The dimension regarding actual circumstances (behaviour) is covered by four old items (2012: Q29a, b and Q30a, b; see also 5.2.12 Topic "Additional Demographics/ Background Variables") measuring labour market behaviour during the life-cycle for respondent and partner/spouse. These questions are formulated in retrospective terms meaning that every respondent who ever had children will be able to answer questions on actual circumstances. The population universe for the behavioural items is thus everyone who ever had children in the household.

The attitudinal part measuring preferred circumstances of the topic is covered by two old items that measure attitudes towards mothers' employment during the life cycle (2012: Q3a, b; see also 5.2.1 Topic "Gender Ideology"), as well as two new items asking the respondent about best and worst scenarios with regard to the distribution of paid and unpaid work between partners. By using model families, time-constraints (presence of children) will be taken into account. The reason behind including both the respondents' best and worst alternative is to get a more nuanced picture of their preferences and to explore if this differs between national contexts.

With regard to the new items on the best and worst option to distribute paid and unpaid work between partners (2012: Q11a, b), results from the pre-test showed that even though respondents had more problems determining the worst alternative, the non-response rates for these items were about the same as for the attitudinal items included in the gender ideology battery indicating that the new items in general worked well.

A latent class analysis (LCA) of the respondents' views on how the division of labour should be organized revealed two main categories of responses. In the first category (on average 79% of the respondents), a comparatively less strong emphasis on fulltime employment was found, coupled with a traditional view on the gendered division of labour. In the second category (21%), there were respondents who seem to value a strong attachment of the family to paid labour while at the same time favouring a more equal gender division of labour.

By introducing a dual-earner/dual-carer dimension (together with the new topic "Gender, care, and social policy" which covers the respondents' preferred division of parental leave between the mother and the father), the 2002 questions on men's roles in housework and childcare were replaced. These

items were dropped because they were very vaguely formulated; they seemed very politically correct and were thus too easy to agree with; they were context dependent, i.e. relative to how much household work and childcare men do in different contexts; they had a low usage and, most importantly, they imply continued overarching female responsibility in the domestic sphere. The interesting issue here is not to know if the respondents think that men should do a little more housework and childcare, but rather if they should change their behaviour drastically in the domestic sphere.

The ISSP decided in favour of symmetrical response categories because the questions treat preferences, independent of the actual way families arrange their everyday life. The intention is to avoid the response categories in themselves to bias the respondents towards a specific family arrangement. In addition, applying a more long term perspective for the items, it is important to have symmetrical response categories, not reflecting the social organisation of families today, but leaving the issue open in the case of future social change.

"Preferred and Actual Division of Paid and Unpaid Work: Care Responsibilities for Respondent and Spouse"

There was a broad consensus among the ISSP members that issues concerning care responsibilities should be strengthened in the 2012 module. When focusing on care responsibilities, the ISSP is interested in how care responsibilities are distributed between the partners, and how much time is spent on care. Another objective is to assess the total burden of paid (covered by the ISSP standard background variable on paid working time) and unpaid work, and how this overall burden is distributed between the partners.

A general problem with the questions on care time is that it might be difficult for the respondent to estimate time and some error will most certainly occur, but probably not more error compared to the questions on "time spent on household work", already asked in ISSP 2002. However, it is important to note that some researchers, especially those interested in relations between the partners, are interested in the distribution of time between the partners – and it is quite likely that the estimates provided by the respondent on own and partner's time are similar.

In order to keep down the number of items, the strategy is to ask about the weekly average amount of time spent on care. It is important to note here that asking about child care only is not sufficient. In many cases respondents can be assumed to have other care responsibilities, for example upper middle-aged respondents may have care responsibilities for their parents, while older respondents may have care responsibilities for their partner. This is the point why questions on care included all types of care (for example child care, elderly care, care for sick family member/relatives etc.). One drawback with this strategy is that some care responsibilities may be difficult to separate from household work. In families with small children, parents are involved in child care most of their time at home. For example while cleaning the house the children are around playing with the vacuum-cleaner – is that childcare or cleaning? This is only one example where respondents might think differently about the same situation. The ISSP decided to ask questions about average hours spent on household work (replicated items Q16a and Q17a) and care responsibilities, both for respondents (Q16b) and their partners (Q17b).

Pooled country analysis of pre-test data showed that, firstly, almost no respondent skipped these questions. Second, the mean hours on these questions were quite realistic. Third, having children increased the total amount of time of work (paid and unpaid), but the gender gap is particularly pronounced among those having children, exactly what could be expected from previous research on the subject.

5.7 Topic "Income in Partnership"

The distribution of income in a relationship and the actual sharing of the income are important indicators of intra-household power relations considerably used in research articles. The management of income within a partnership is an established area within feminist research (for some examples, see: Ahrne & Roman 1998; Roman & Vogler 1999; Nyman 1997, 1999, and works cited therein). The ISSP thus decided to keep two ISSP 2002 items. While Q18 refers to how couples organize their shared income, Q22 asks about the actual distribution of the net income brought home by each of the partners.

5.8 Topic "Gendered Division of Household Work"

The distribution of household work between partners was an important topic of the 2002 family module. Two items were designed for the 2002 survey which attempt to measure perceptions of fairness and conflict behaviour related to this domain. However, these two items have not been used a lot (two journal articles) and therefore the ISSP decided to only keep the substantially better item of them- "Sharing household work between partners: Perceived fairness" (2012: Q20).

The item battery (2012: Q19) on the measures of actual distribution of household work between the partners differentiates six activities: laundry, repairs, care for sick family members, grocery shopping, cleaning, and preparing the meals. In this form, the battery was established in the 2002 family module and 13 journal articles use these items. The high usage signals that the battery should be retained in the 2012 module. Apparently, the items function in a satisfactory manner, theoretically as well as empirically. Moreover, they could be used as either explanatory or dependent variables, depending on the research question to be answered.

There are two further items stemming from 2002 concerning the division of household work which ask for the actual number of hours spent on household work by the respondent and by spouse/partner (2012: Q16a, 17a). They reached a medium usage with four journal articles. Complemented by the question regarding hours spent on care responsibilities for family members, those items are to find in the 2012 family module under the new topic "Preferred and Actual Division of Paid and Unpaid Work: Model Families".

5.9 Topic "Power and Decision-Making within Partnership"

The items on decision-making within the partnership were designed for the 2002 survey and have not been used a lot in research. However, the item about decisions "how to bring up children" (2012: Q31) is potentially a good item (for example about 26% of the female respondents in 2002 say they took most of the decisions about how to raise kids; among the male respondents, the figure is 5%).

There is research indicating that control and influence over household management and social relations tend to be female in character, complicating common assumptions that observed gender differences in household work are simply mirroring that men do not want to participate. The female gate-keeper role and power within the household over its management and social relations have proven to be significant (see references in Hook 2006: 655). These works have, however, not used international survey data, which speaks in favour to continue the collection of ISSP data in this specific domain. The ISSP decided to replicate the two items on who makes the decisions about bringing up children and who decides on shared weekend activities (2012: Q21) and decided to drop the ISSP 2002 item that focused solely on gender relations in the social area.

5.10 Topic "Work-Family Conflict"

Given the short history of the two item batteries on work-family conflict – they were established for the 2002 module – the items show a notable usage with five journal articles. The concept of work-family conflict got the highest vote among the new topics for the 2002 module, and the subject is still highly relevant in research (Crompton & Lyonette 2006; Edlund 2007).

The ISSP still considers work-family conflict as an important topic of the module, but extensive analysis of the eight items indicates that the concept is well covered by only one battery (2012: Q23) without any substantial loss of information when dropping the other battery.

5.11 Topic "Happiness and Satisfaction"

The items on satisfaction with life in general (2012: Q24), with the main job (2012: Q25), and with family life (2012: Q26) have a short history in the family module since they were introduced just in the 2002 module. Even though they are not yet often used (two journal articles), the items have proven to be useful for understanding and evaluating outcomes among different types of family conditions. For example, the relationship between the presence of work-family conflict and the degree of happiness/satisfaction is fairly complex, rejecting simple assumptions of a linear negative relationship (cf. Boye 2009; Grönlund & Öun 2010). Furthermore, each of the three items could serve as dependent variable.

5.12 Topic "Additional Demographics/ Background Variables"

In this section, two topics with priority 6 and 7 were combined: additional background variables and single items (such as subjective health). Together, they received 18 votes by the ISSP General Assembly in Lisbon in 2010. Several of the module-specific compulsory background variables in the 2002 module were declared compulsory ISSP standard background variables in 2010 and are therefore not counted as part of the module. This holds for the household list and for the number of working hours of the spouse.

The section of the "Additional Demographics/ Background Variables" starts with Q27 "R's subjective health". In order to increase usage of ISSP 2012, another potential dependent variable was thought to be helpful. Experiences with the European Social Survey show that the variable on respondent's subjective health is widely used in analyses. Especially regarding the effects of inequality of the household division of labour, the perceptions of unfairness, or regarding work-family conflict, this item presents an interesting dependent variable.

Questions on female employment over the life-cycle follow. Those items on actual behaviour of respondent and his or her spouse/ partner should be understood as complement to the attitudinal questions about female employment over the life-cycle under the topic "Attitudes towards Family and Gender Roles" (2012: Q3). Firstly, question Q28 "Mother ever worked for pay before R 14" may be seen as a role model variable. Indeed, an empirical analysis of the 2002 data shows that it influences both women's employment status over the life-cycle (2012: Q29 "Respondent worked away from home"), as well as women's and men's attitudes towards gender ideology (2012: item batteries Q1 and Q2, see above), all results under control for age. Q28 together with the highest qualification of the spouse (2012: Q32) provides vital information about the household, and thus seems to provide useful information for understanding attitudes and behaviour in a more comprehensive way.

The following questions "Respondent/ Partner worked away from home..." ask for the actual behaviour of the respondent (2012: Q29) and the spouse or partner (2012: Q30) with the two differentiations

"Child under school age" (Q29a, Q30a) and "Youngest child started school" (Q29b, Q30b). Out of the formerly four-item battery which existed in that form since 1994, only those two key items regarding children's age were kept. They are the most analytically interesting items since they cover the issue of female employment when children are in the household. The behavioural items were answered by those who ever had children, and, since they are retrospective, the response rates between Q29 (respondent) and Q30 (partner) were similar: in 2002, about 67% for items a and b (understandable given that many respondents still had children living at home).

Since researchers may be interested in using the two questions on "Respondent/ Partner worked away from home" as dependent variables, it is necessary to keep items related to both spouse and respondent, since the number of valid cases is relatively low. In cases where these questions are used as independent variables, information on respondent and spouse is vital for constructing families with different types of attachment to the labour market.

Those behavioural items are very important for the family module. Analysing data from previous modules, the relationships between the actual life-cycle variables (2012: Q29 and Q30) and gender ideology (2012: Q1 and Q2) suggest that behaviour has an influence on gender ideology. Differences have been particularly significant between women with strong and women with very weak attachment to the labour market. Furthermore, these variables have been interesting both as independent variables but also as dependent variables (particularly in relation to monitoring change across generations over time).

There are three additional compulsory background questions: Question Q32 asks for "Spouse degree: highest qualification", Q33 for "Age of spouse", and finally, Q34 for "Duration of current relationship". Usually in the ISSP, only the concept of background variables is given, but the wording of the question is subject to each member country's questionnaire design. While it was recommended to ask for degree and age of spouse in a parallel way to the questions regarding the respondent, there was a proposal made for the item on the duration of relationship in the source questionnaire.

The education of current spouse or partner (2012: Q32) was already included in the background variables of the 2002 family module. Age of spouse (2012: Q33) was for the first time included in the 2012 family module to test the age difference between the partners. In order to understand why gender inequality seems to be very persistent across countries and over time, Rothstein (2005) suggests that the initial difference in the age between the man and the woman in a relationship builds up a cumulative power difference over time. Taking its departure in why gendered power structures are still reproduced within Sweden, one of the most gender-equal societies in the world, Rothstein (2005) argues that one key is the age difference between the partners: the effect of "asymmetric mate selection". Men are on average three years older and thus already have a stronger position on the labour market when the couple is formed. This increases the risk that the woman will lose the first negotiations on how to divide household and wage labour when they have children. This again will probably lead to a situation of "increasing returns" for the man – even further increasing the risk that the woman will lose the following negotiations about the division of labour. What seems to be rational for both (increasing the total income for the family) results at the aggregate level in a disadvantage for women.

Also for the first time was Q34 "Duration of current relationship" included. Length of current relationship is a proxy for the stability of a relationship and related to adaptation of spouses to each other. It is a potentially important explanatory variable for a variety of domains covered in the questionnaire: (in)equality of household division of labour, division of income, and satisfaction.

6 Country Participation in ISSP 2012

ISSP studies are expected to be run by all ISSP members. However, the ISSP accepts members omitting one survey in the chronologic series of ISSP surveys. If ISSP members do not field two consecutive ISSP surveys, ISSP membership automatically lapses. The usual reason for members' failure to field an ISSP survey is caused by missing funds. The ISSP, in contrast to other cross-national survey programmes, does not have any central funds and many ISSP members have to raise funds for each individual ISSP survey. Hence, ISSP 2012 was not run by all 49 ISSP members but by 37 countries only. A first edition of the international data file was published in March 2014 including data from 24 countries, the final release is planned for summer 2014. Information on the national ISSP 2012 surveys can be found in the ISSP study monitoring report.

Data and documentation are free for download from the ISSP archive at GESIS:

for more information, see <http://www.gesis.org/issp/issp-modules-profiles/family-and-changing-gender-roles/2012/>

The ISSP 2012 is the fourth module on "Family and changing gender roles", previously fielded in 1988, 1994, and 2002. The 2012 module will offer opportunities for monitoring social change and deepen our understanding of contemporary societies across a wide range of issues: consequences of changing labour markets and increased female labour force participation; increased variation in family forms; as well as the issue of fertility rates and greying societies, just to mention a few key issues. Except for Italy, all countries participating in 1988 have fielded the subsequent modules in 1994 and 2002: Austria, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, the Netherlands, the United States, and Hungary (the only former socialist country from which pre-transformation data is available). Five countries are available for a 25 year comparison: Austria, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, and the United States.

By taking 1994 (the second wave) as the baseline, the number of countries where social change can be monitored increases to 17. For the latest decade, i.e., 2002-2012, the module allows the analysis of attitudinal change in 26 countries. Information which countries participated in the individual waves is listed below.

Participation in ISSP the Family and Gender
Roles Module 1988-2012

	Country / Year	1988	1994	2002	2012
1.	Argentina				X
2.	Australia	(X)	X	X	X
3.	Austria	X	X	X	X
4.	Belgium*			X	
	<i>Brazil</i>			X	
5.	Bulgaria		X	X	X
6.	Canada		X		X
7.	Chile			X	X
8.	China				X
9.	Croatia				X
	<i>Cyprus</i>			X	
10.	Czech Republic		X	X	X
11.	Denmark			X	X
	<i>Dominican Republic</i>				
12.	Estonia				
13.	Finland			X	X
14.	France			X	X
15.	Georgia				
16.	Germany	X	X	X	X
17.	Great Britain	X	X	X	X
18.	<i>Hungary</i>	X	X	X	
19.	Iceland				X
20.	India				X
21.	Ireland	X	X	X	X
22.	Israel		X	X	X
23.	<i>Italy</i>	X	X		
24.	Japan		X	X	X

	Country / Year	1988	1994	2002	2012
25.	Latvia			X	X
26.	Lithuania		(X)		X
27.	Mexico			X	X
28.	Netherlands	X	X	X	
29.	<i>New Zealand</i>		X	X	
	<i>Northern Ireland</i>		X	X	
30.	Norway		X	X	X
31.	<i>Palestine</i>				
32.	Philippines		X	X	X
33.	Poland		X	X	X
34.	Portugal			X	
35.	Russia		X	X	X
36.	Slovakia			X	X
37.	Slovenia		X	X	X
38.	South Africa				X
39.	South Korea				X
40.	Spain		X	X	X
41.	Suriname				
42.	Sweden		X	X	X
43.	Switzerland			X	X
44.	Taiwan			X	X
45.	Turkey				X
46.	<i>Ukraine</i>				
47.	<i>Uruguay</i>				
48.	USA	X	X	X	X
49.	Venezuela				X
	N of countries	8	23	34	37

* Belgium: Flanders ISSP member since 2002; Wallon accepted as co-member in 2012.

Country-specific data that are not included in the international ISSP data file are marked by (x) - not included in count.

Countries in italics are no longer members of the ISSP or membership status is unclear (date 04.7.2014)

Source: <http://www.gesis.org/issp/issp-modules-profiles/>

7 References

- Daly, Mary & Rake, Katherine. 2003. *Gender and the Welfare State. Care, Work and Welfare in Europe and the USA*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Duvander, Anne-Zophie, Lappegård, Trude & Andersson, Gunnar. 2010. Family policy and fertility: fathers' and mothers' use of parental leave and continued childbearing in Norway and Sweden. *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 45-57.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. 1999. *Social foundations of postindustrial economies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gornick, Janet & Meyers, Marcia. 2003. *Families that work: policies for reconciling parenthood and employment*. New York, N.Y.: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Harris, Phyllis & Bichler, Joyce. 1997. *Men Giving Care: Reflections of Husbands and Sons*. London: Routledge.
- Hook, Jennifer L. 2006. Care in Context: Men's Unpaid Work in 20 Countries, 1965-2003. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 71, No. 4, pp. 639-660.
- Korpi, Walter. 2000. Faces of Inequality: Gender, Class, and Patterns of Inequalities in Different Types of Welfare States. *Social Politics* Vol. 7, pp. 127-191.
- Mandel, Hadas & Shalev, Michael. 2009. Gender, Class, and Varieties of Capitalism. *Social Politics*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 161-181.
- Rothstein, Bo. 2005. *Modern Patriarchy - The Causal Mechanism. A Theory of Asymmetric Mate Selection*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington D.C.
- Smith, Tom. 2009. The ISSP: history, organization and members, working principles and outcomes: An historical-sociological account. In: Haller, Max et al.: *The International Social Survey Programme 1984-2009*. Routledge, Milton Park, pp. 2-27.
- Vos, Allison. 2009. Falling fertility rates: new challenges to the European welfare state. *Socio-Economic Review*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 485-503.

8 Appendix 1: Peer-Reviewed Research Articles Using ISSP Family Modules

- Albrecht, James W., Edin, Per-Anders & Vroman, Susan B. 2000. A Cross-Country Comparison of Attitudes towards Mothers Working and their Actual Labor Market Experience. *Labour*, Vol. 14, pp. 591-608.
- Alwin, Duane F., Braun, Michael & Scott, Jacqueline. 1992. The Separation of Work and Family: Attitudes Towards Women's Labor Force Participation in Britain, Germany, and the United States. *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 8, pp. 13-37.
- Batalova, Jeanne A. & Cohen, Philip N. 2002. Premarital Cohabitation and Housework: Couples in Cross-National Perspectives. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 64, No. 3, pp. 743-755.
- Blasius, Jorg & Thiessen, Victor. 2006. Assessing Data Quality and Construct Comparability in Cross-national Surveys. *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 22, pp. 229-242.
- Bolzendahl, Catherine & Olafsdottir, Sigrun. 2008. Gender Group Interest or Gender Ideology? Understanding U.S.? Support for Family Policy within the Liberal Welfare Regime. *Sociological Perspective*, Vol. 51, pp. 281-304.
- Braun, Michael, Lewin-Epstein, Noah, Stier, Haya & Baumgaertner, Miriam K. 2008. Perceived Equity in the Gendered Division of Household Labor. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 70, pp. 1145-1156.
- Braun, Michael, Scott, Jacqueline & Alwin, Duane A. 1994. Economic Necessity or Self-Actualization? Attitudes towards Women's Labor-force Participation in East and West Germany. *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 10, pp. 29-47.
- Breen, Richard & Cooke, Lynne Prince. 2005. The Persistence of the Gendered Division of Domestic Labor. *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 21, pp. 43-57.
- Cooke, Lynn Prince. 2006 'Doing Gender' in Context: Household Bargaining and the Risk of Divorce in Germany and the United States. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 112, pp. 442-472.
- Cooke, Lynn Prince. 2006. Policy, Preferences, and Patriarchy: The Division of Domestic Labor in East, West Germany and the US. Unpublished Report, Oxford University, 2003. Published in *Social Politics*, Vol. 13, 1-27.
- Crompton, Rosemary. 2006. Class and Family. *Sociological Review*, Vol. 54, pp. 658-677.
- Crompton, Rosemary, Brockmann, Michaela & Lyonette, Clare. 2005. Attitudes, Women's Employment, and the Domestic Division of Labour: A Cross-national Analysis in Two Waves. *Work, Employment, and Society*, Vol. 19, pp. 213-233.
- Crompton, Rosemary & Harris, Fiona. 1997. Women, Employment, and Feminism in the Czech Republic. *Gender, Work, and Organization*, Vol. 4, pp. 137-148.
- Crompton, Rosemary & Harris Fiona. 1997. Women's Employment and Gender Attitudes: A Comparative Analysis of Britain, Norway, and the Czech Republic. *Acta Sociologica*, Vol. 40, pp. 183-202.
- Crompton, Rosemary & Lyonette, Clare. 2005. The New Gender Essentialism - Domestic and Family 'Choices' and Their Relation to Attitudes. *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 56, No. 4, pp. 601-620.
- Crompton, Rosemary & Lyonette, Clare. 2006a. Some Issues in Cross-national Comparative Research Methods: A Comparison of Attitudes to Promotion and Women's Employment in Britain and Portugal. *Work, Employment and Society*, Vol. 20, pp. 403-414.
- Crompton, Rosemary & Lyonette, Clare. 2006b. Work-Life 'Balance' in Europe. *Acta Sociologica*, Vol. 49, pp. 379-393.

- Davis, Shannon N., Greenstein, Theodore N. & Gerteisen Marks, Jennifer P. 2007. Effects of Union Type on Division of Household Labor: Do Cohabiting Men Really Perform More Housework? *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 28, pp. 1246-1272.
- Diefenbach, Heike. 2002. Gender Ideologies, Relative Resources, and the Division of Housework in Intimate Relationships: A Test of Hyman Rodman's Theory of Resources in Cultural Context. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, Vol. 43, pp. 45-64.
- Diprete, Thomas A. et al. 2003. Do Cross-National Differences in the Costs of Children Generate Cross-National Differences in Fertility Rates? *Population Research and Policy Review*, Vol. 22, No. 5-6, pp. 439-477.
- Dykstra, Pearl A. 2007. Roads Less Taken: Developing a Nuanced View of Older Adults Without Children. *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 28, pp. 1275-1310.
- Edlund, Jonas. 2007. The Work-Family Time Squeeze: Conflicting Demands of Paid and Unpaid Work among Working Couples in 29 Countries. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, Vol. 48, No. 6, pp. 451-480.
- Evans, M.D.R., Kelley, Jonathan & Hayes, Bernadette. 2000. Family Values and Labor Force Participation: Ireland in International Perspective. Paper presented to the American Sociological Association, Washington, DC, August, 1991. Published in *Gender Issues*, Vol. 18, pp. 84-120.
- Fuwa, Makiko. 2004. Macro-Level Gender Inequality and the Division of Household Labor in 22 Countries. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 69, pp. 751-767.
- Fuwa, Makiko & Cohen, Philip N. 2007. Housework and Social Policy. *Social Science Research*, Vol. 36, pp. 512-530.
- Geist, Claudia 2005. The Welfare State and the Home: Regime Differences in the Domestic Division of Labour. *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 21, pp. 23-41.
- Goldberg, Christine. 1991. Von der Ehe als Institution zur Individuellen Partnerschaft [From Marriage as an Institution toward Individual Partnership]. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, Vol. 4, pp. 323-333.
- Gomilschak, Martin, Haller, Max & Hoellinger, Franz. 2000. Weibliche Erwerbstaetigkeit und Einstellungen zur Rolle von Frauen. Ein Vergleich Zwischen 20 Laendern [Gainful Employment of Women and Attitudes on the Role of Women : An International Comparison of 20 Countries]. *Oesterreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie [Austrian Journal of Sociology]*, Vol. 25, pp. 65-78.
- Hakim, C. 1996. The Sexual Division of Labour and Women's Heterogeneity. *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 47, pp. 178-188.
- Haller, Max & Hoellinger, Franz. 1994. Female Employment and the Change of Gender Roles: The Conflictual Relationship between Participation and Attitudes in International Comparison. *International Sociology*, Vol. 9, pp. 87-112.
- Hayes, Bernadette C. 1994. One Marriage-Two Divorces: International Comparison of Gender Differences in Attitudes. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, Vol. 6, pp. 13-34.
- Heimdal, Kristen R. & Houseknecht, Sharon K. 2003. Cohabiting and Married Couples' Income Organization: Approaches in Sweden and the United States. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 65, pp. 525-538.
- Hoellinger, Franz. 1991. Frauenerwerbstaetigkeit und Wandel der Geschlechtsrollen im Internationalen Vergleich, [Feminine Gainful Employment and Change in Gender Roles]. *Koelner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie [Cologne Journal of Sociology and Social Psychology]*, Vol. 43, pp. 753-771.
- Iversen, Torben & Rosenbluth, Frances. 2006. The Political Economy of Gender: Explaining Cross-national Variation in the Gender Division of Labor and the Gender Voting Gap. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 50, pp. 1-19.

- Jones, Rachel K. & Brayfield, April. 1997. Life's Greatest Joy: European Attitudes Towards the Centrality of Children. *Social Forces*, Vol. 75, pp. 1239-1270.
- Kangas, Olli & Rostgaard, Tine. 2007. Preferences or Institutions? Work-Family Life Opportunities in Seven European Countries. *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol. 17, pp. 240-256.
- Knudsen, Knud & Waerness, Kari. 2008. National Context and Spouses' Housework in 34 Countries. *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 24, pp. 97-113.
- Knudsen, Knud & Warness, Kari. 2001. National Context, Individual Characteristics, and Attitudes on Mothers' Employment: A Comparative Analysis of Great Britain, Sweden, and Norway. *Acta Sociologica*, Vol. 44, pp. 67-79.
- Kunovich, Robert M. 2008. Gender Dependence and Attitudes toward the Distribution of Household Labor: A Comparative and Multilevel Analysis. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, Vol. 49, pp. 395-427.
- Lewin-Epstein, Noah, Stier, Haya & Braun, Michael. 2006. The Division of Household Labor in Germany and Israel. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 68, pp. 1147-1164.
- Lewin-Epstein, Noah, Stier, Haya, Braun, Michael & Langfeldt, Bettina. 2000. Family Policy and Public Attitudes in Germany and Israel. *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 16, pp. 385-401.
- Lyonette, Clare, Crompton, Rosemary & Wall, Karin. 2007. Gender, Occupational Class, and Work-Life Conflict: A Comparison of Britain and Portugal. *Work & Family*, Vol. 10, pp. 283-308.
- MacInnes, John. 1998a. Analysing Patriarchy Capitalism and Women's Employment in Europe. *Innovation*, Vol. 11, pp. 227-248.
- MacInnes, John. 1998b. The Myth of the Macho Scotsman, Attitudes to Gender, Work, and the Family in the UK, Ireland, and Europe. *Scottish Affairs*, Vol. 23, pp. 108-124.
- MacInnes, John. 2006. Work-Life Balance in Europe: A Response to the Baby Bust or Reward for the Baby Boomers? *European Societies*, Vol. 8, pp. 223-249.
- Mano-Negrin, R. & Katz, R. 2003. Money Management Patterns of Dual-Earner Families in Israel. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, Vol. 24, pp. 49-72.
- Motiejunaite, Akvile & Kravchenko, Zhanna. 2008. Family Policy, Employment and Gender-Role Attitudes: A Comparative Analysis of Russia and Sweden. *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol. 18, pp. 38-49.
- Nordenmark, Mikael. 2004. Does Gender Ideology Explain Differences between Countries Regarding Women's and Men's Involvement in Paid and Unpaid Work? *International Journal of Social Welfare*, Vol. 13, pp. 233-243.
- Panayotova, Evelina & Brayfield, April. 1997. National Context and Gender Ideology: Attitudes toward Women's Employment in Hungary and the United States. *Gender & Society*, Vol. 11, 627-655.
- Robila, Mihaela & Krishnakumar, Ambika. 2004. The Role of Children in Eastern European Families. *Children and Society*, Vol. 18, pp. 30-41.
- Ruppanner, Leah. 2008. Fairness and Housework: A Cross-National Comparison. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, Vol. 39, pp. 509-526.
- Scott, Jacqueline. 1998a. Changing Attitudes to Sexual Morality: A Cross-national Comparison. *Sociology*, Vol. 32, pp. 815-845.
- Scott, Jacqueline. 1998b. Generational Changes in Attitudes to Abortion: A Cross-national Comparison. *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 14, pp. 177-190.
- Scott, Jacqueline. 1999. European Attitudes towards Maternal Employment. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, Vol. 19, pp. 151-186.
- Scott, Jacqueline, Alwin, Duane & Braun, Michael. 1996. Generational Changes in Gender-Role Attitudes: Britain in a Cross-National Perspective. *Sociology*, Vol. 30, pp. 471-492.

-
- Sjoberg, Ola. 2004. The Role of Family Policy Institutions in Explaining Gender-Role Attitudes: A Comparative Multilevel Analysis of Thirteen Industrialized Countries. *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol. 14, pp. 107-133.
- Stickney, Lisa T. & Konrad, Alison M. 2007. Gender-Role Attitudes and Earnings: A Multinational Study of Married Women and Men. *Sex Roles*, Vol. 57, pp. 801-811.
- Stier, Haya & Lewin-Epstein, Noah. 2007. Policy Effects on the Division of Housework. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, Vol. 9, pp. 235-259.
- Stier, Haya, Lewin-Epstein, Noah & Braun, Michael. 2001. Welfare Regimes, Family-Supportive Policies, and Women's Employment Along the Life-Course. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 106, pp. 1731-1760.
- Sundstrom, Eva. 1999. Should Mothers Work? Age and Attitudes in Germany, Italy, and Sweden. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, Vol. 8, pp. 193-205.
- Treas, Judith & Widmer, Eric D. 2000. Married Women's Employment over the Life Course: Attitudes in Cross-National Perspective. *Social Forces*, Vol. 78, pp. 1409-1436.
- Vogler, Carolyn, Brockmann, Michaela & Wiggins, Richard D. 2006. Intimate Relationships and Changing Patterns of Money Management at the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century. *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 57, pp. 455-482.
- Vogler, Carolyn, Lynette, Clare & Wiggins, Richard D. 2008. Money, Power and Spending Decisions in Intimate Relationships. *Sociological Review*, Vol. 56, pp. 117-143.
- Widmer, Eric, Treas, Judith & Newcomb, Robert. 1998. Attitudes toward Non-marital Sex in 24 Countries. *Journal of Sex Research*, Vol. 35, pp. 349-358.
- Yodanis, Carrie. 2005. Divorce Culture & Marital Gender Equality: A Cross-National Study. *Gender & Society*, Vol. 19, pp. 644-659.
- Yodanis, Carrie & Lauer, Sean. 2007a. Economic Inequality In and Outside of Marriage: Individual Resources and Institutional Context. *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 23, No. 5, pp. 573-583.
- Yodanis, Carrie & Lauer, Sean. 2007b. Managing Money in Marriage: Multilevel and Cross-national Effects of the Breadwinner Role. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 69, No. 5, pp. 1307-1325.

9 Appendix 2: ISSP 2012 Source Questionnaire

17th May 2011

FINAL SOURCE QUESTIONNAIRE

ISSP 2012

Family and Changing Gender Roles IV

**Drafting group: China (Yanjie Bian)
Germany (Michael Braun, Regina Jutz, Evi Scholz)
Ireland (Anne Cleary)
Mexico (Yasodhara Silva Medina; César Morones)
Sweden (Jonas Edlund, Ida Öun)
Turkey (Ali Carkoglu, Ersin Kalaycioglu)
& one expert from Israel (Haya Stier)**

Convenor: Germany and Sweden

Priority new items	Topic	Items	N of replicated items	N of new items	Total
	Gender ideology	1a-e, 2a, 2b	7		7
	Attitudes and behaviour on female employment over the life-cycle	3a, 3b, 29a, 29b, 30a, 30b	6		6
	Attitudes towards marriage	4a, 4b, 4d	3		3
	Organising income in a partnership	18, 22	2		2
	Gendered division of household work	19a-f	6		6
	Sharing of household work: fairness and conflict	20	1		1
	Power and decision-making within partnership	21, 31	2		2
	Work-family conflict	23a-d	4		4
	Happiness and satisfaction	24, 25, 26	3		3
1	Gender, care, and social policy	N8, N9, N10, N12, N13, N14, N15	0	7	7
2	Attitudes towards children	6 ⁺ , 7a, 7b ⁺ , N7c, N7d, N7e, N7f	3	4	7
3	Preferred and actual division of paid and unpaid work: model families (incl. time management in household)	N11a, N11b, 16a, N16b, 17a, N17b	2	4	6
5	Alternative family forms	4c, 5a, N5b, N5c	2	2	4
4	Additional demographic variables and single items (age of spouse/partner, duration of relationship, subjective health)	28, 32, N33, N34, N27	2	3	5
	Sum of items		43	20	63

Numbers of new item start with "N"; replicated items are displayed without any marks

+ items from 1994

New questions (N) = 20

Repeat questions (R) = 43

Repeat questions have question numbers for 2002/1994 in brackets.

Notes:

1) The 'R's, 'N's, and the 2002/1994 question numbers for the repeat questions are just meant to alert members to the fact that certain questions/items have already been asked in earlier modules. You should not retain this information in your questionnaire.

2) ISSP policy on questions which you have already translated for an earlier module is that members should not tinker with wording to make slight improvements. Only real mistakes in translation should be changed. These should be clearly documented in your study monitoring report.

3) All the substantive questions must be asked and asked in the order presented here. If, for any reason, you have to change question order, this should be clearly documented in your study monitoring report.

4) TN = translation note; Notes on question wording should help the understanding and the translation of the question; thus a translation of the note itself is not intended.

5) All the required background variables must be included in your fielding (not in a prescribed order) and must cover the information required, as outlined in the ISSP BV guidelines (Version of 2010-12-10).

6) All module-specific background variables are also obligatory and should be handled as ISSP background variables with regard to question wording. However, there are some recommendations that the ISSP 2012 drafting group politely asks to follow with regard to question order.

R 1. (2002:1a-e)

To begin, we have some questions about women.

To what extent do you agree or disagree...?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ON EACH LINE

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Can't choose
a	A working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
b	A pre-school child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
c	All in all, family life suffers when the woman has a full-time job.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
d	A job is all right, but what most women really want is a home and children.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
e	Being a housewife is just as fulfilling as working for pay.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8

TN: 1e: "Fulfilling" means "satisfying" and NOT "time consuming", "important", etc.

R 2. (2002: 2a, 2b) And to what extent do you agree or disagree...?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ON EACH LINE

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Can't choose
a	Both the man and woman should contribute to the household income.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
b	A man's job is to earn money; a woman's job is to look after the home and family.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8

R 3. (2002: 3b, 3c) Do you think that women should work outside the home full-time, part-time or not at all under the following circumstances?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ON EACH LINE

		Work full-time	Work part-time	Stay at home	Can't choose
a	When there is a child under school age.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
b	After the youngest child starts school.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 8

R 4. (2002: 4a, 4c, 4e; 4g) To what extent do you agree or disagree ...?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ON EACH LINE

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Can't choose
a	Married people are generally happier than unmarried people.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
b	People who want children ought to get married.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
c	It is all right for a couple to live together without intending to get married.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
d	Divorce is usually the best solution when a couple can't seem to work out their marriage problems.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8

N 5 (2002: 4d; 2 new) Children grow up in different kinds of families. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ON EACH LINE

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Can't choose
a	One parent can bring up a child as well as two parents together.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
b (N)	A same sex female couple can bring up a child as well as a male-female couple.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
c (N)	A same sex male couple can bring up a child as well as a male-female couple.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8

R 6 (1994: 5) All in all, what do you think is the ideal number of children for a family to have?

PLEASE WRITE THE NUMBER IN THE BOX.

--	--

N 7 (2002: 5a; 1994: 6b; 4 new)

To what extent do you agree or disagree...?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ON EACH LINE

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Can't choose
a	Watching children grow up is life's greatest joy.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
b	Having children interferes too much with the freedom of parents.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
c (N)	Children are a financial burden on their parents.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
d (N)	Having children restricts the employment and career chances of one or both parents.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
e (N)	Having children increases people's social standing in society.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
f (N)	Adult children are an important source of help for elderly parents.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 8

TN 6e: "Social standing" might be rendered by "social respect", "social status" (but not economic) or "prestige".

**N 8. Consider a couple who both work full-time and now have a new born child. One of them stops working for some time to care for their child.
Do you think there should be paid leave available and, if so, for how long?**

PLEASE ENTER THE NUMBER OF MONTHS OR TICK THE BOX

Yes, |_|_| months

No, there should be no paid leave 0 → Go to N 11a

TN: "Paid leave" can include paid maternity, paid paternity, and paid parental leave.

**PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS N 9 and N 10 IF YOU ARE IN FAVOUR OF PAID LEAVE.
OTHERWISE GO TO N 11a**

N 9. And who should pay for this leave?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| The government | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| The employer | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| Both the government and the employer | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 |
| Other sources | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| <hr/> | |
| Can't choose | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 |

TN: "Government" might also mean "state", "public sector"; both central or local government is included.

N 10. Still thinking about the same couple, if both are in a similar work situation and are eligible for paid leave, how should this paid leave period be divided between the mother and the father?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| The mother should take the entire paid leave period and the father should not take any paid leave. | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| The mother should take most of the paid leave period and the father should take some of it. | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| The mother and the father should each take half of the paid leave period. | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 |
| The father should take most of the paid leave period and the mother should take some of it. | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| The father should take the entire paid leave period and the mother should not take any paid leave. | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| <hr/> | |
| Can't choose | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 |

TN: "Paid leave" can include paid maternity, paid paternity, and paid parental leave.

FOR ALL

N 11a. Consider a family with a child under school age. What, in your opinion, is the best way for them to organise their family and work life?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- The mother stays at home and the father works full-time. 1
- The mother works part-time and the father works full-time. 2
- Both the mother and the father work full-time. 3
- Both the mother and the father work part-time. 4
- The father works part-time and the mother works full-time. 5
- The father stays at home and the mother works full-time. 6

Can't choose 8

TN: "Under school age" means under age of regular/compulsory school.

N 11b. And, in your opinion, which of these options would be the least desirable?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- The mother stays at home and the father works full-time. 1
- The mother works part-time and the father works full-time. 2
- Both the mother and the father work full-time. 3
- Both the mother and the father work part-time. 4
- The father works part-time and the mother works full-time. 5
- The father stays at home and the mother works full-time. 6

Can't choose 8

N 12. People have different views on childcare for children under school age. Who do you think should primarily provide childcare?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| Family members | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| Government agencies | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| Non-profit organisations (e.g. charitable organisations, churches/religious organisations) | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 |
| Private childcare providers (e.g. private crèche, nanny, babysitter) | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Employers | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| <hr/> | |
| Can't choose | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 |

TN: "Government" might also mean "state", "public sector"; both central or local government is included.

TN: "Under school age" means under age of regular/compulsory school.

N 13. Who do you think should primarily cover the costs of childcare for children under school age?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| The family | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| The government/public funds | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| The employers | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 |
| <hr/> | |
| Can't choose | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 |

TN: "Government" might also mean "state", "public sector"; both central or local government is included.

TN: "Under school age" means under age of regular/compulsory school.

N 14. Thinking about elderly people who need some help in their everyday lives, such as help with grocery shopping, cleaning the house, doing the laundry etc. Who do you think should primarily provide this help?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| Family members | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| Government agencies | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| Non-profit organisations (e.g. charitable organisations, churches/religious organisations) | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 |
| Private providers of this kind of help | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| <hr/> | |
| Can't choose | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 |

TN: "Government" might also mean "state", "public sector"; both central or local government is included.

N 15. And who do you think should primarily cover the costs of this help to these elderly people?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- The elderly people themselves or their family 1
 The government/public funds 2
-
- Can't choose 8

TN: "Public funds" include all compulsory social insurances.

Now thinking of your own situation:

R 16a (2002: 9a) On average, how many hours a week do you personally spend on household work, not including childcare and leisure time activities?

Hours

N 16b. On average, how many hours a week do you spend looking after family members (e.g. children, elderly, ill or disabled family members)?

Hours

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY LIVING WITH YOUR SPOUSE OR A PARTNER. OTHERWISE GO TO Question R 23)

R 17a (2002: 9b). And what about your spouse/partner?

On average, how many hours a week does he/she spend on household work, not including childcare and leisure time activities?

Hours

N 17b. And on average, how many hours a week does he/she spend looking after family members (e.g. children, elderly, ill or disabled family members)?

Hours

R 18. (2002: 7) How do you and your spouse/partner organise the income that one or both of you receive? Please choose the option that comes closest.

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- I manage all the money and give my spouse/partner his/her share 1
 My spouse/partner manages all the money and gives me my share 2
 We pool all the money and each take out what we need 3
 We pool some of the money and keep the rest separate 4
 We each keep our own money separate 5

R 19. (2002: 8a-f) In your household who does the following things...?**PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ON EACH LINE**

		Always me	Usually me	About equal or both together	Usually my spouse/ partner	Always my spouse/ partner	Is done by a third person	Can't choose
a	Does the laundry	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
b	Makes small repairs around the house	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
c	Cares for sick family members	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
d	Shops for groceries	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
e	Does the household cleaning	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
f	Prepares the meals	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 8

R 20. (2002: 10) Which of the following best applies to the sharing of household work between you and your spouse/partner?**PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY**

- I do much more than my fair share of the household work 1
- I do a bit more than my fair share of the household work 2
- I do roughly my fair share of the household work 3
- I do a bit less than my fair share of the household work 4
- I do much less than my fair share of the household work 5

TN: "Fair share" means what respondent thinks is an appropriate share.

R 21. (2002: 13a) When you and your spouse/partner make decisions about choosing shared weekend activities, who has the final say?**PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY**

- Mostly me 1
- Mostly my spouse/partner 2
- Sometimes me/sometimes my spouse/partner 3
- We decide together 4
- Someone else 5

R 22. (2002: 14) Considering all sources of income, between you and your spouse/partner, who has the higher income?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- My spouse/partner has no income 1
- I have a much higher income 2
- I have a higher income 3
- We have about the same income 4
- My spouse/partner has a higher income 5
- My spouse/partner has a much higher income 6
- I have no income 7
-
- Don't know 8

FOR ALL

R 23. (2002: 16a-d) How often has each of the following happened to you during the past three months?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ON EACH LINE

		Several times a week	Several times a month	Once or twice	Never	Doesn't apply/ no job
a	I have come home from work too tired to do the chores which need to be done.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
b	It has been difficult for me to fulfil my family responsibilities because of the amount of time I spent on my job.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
c	I have arrived at work too tired to function well because of the household work I had done.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
d	I have found it difficult to concentrate at work because of my family responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 0

R 24 (2002: 17) If you were to consider your life in general, how happy or unhappy would you say you are, on the whole?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Completely happy | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| Very happy | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| Fairly happy | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 |
| Neither happy nor unhappy | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Fairly unhappy | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Very unhappy | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |
| Completely unhappy | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 |
| <hr/> | |
| Can't choose | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 |

R 25. (2002: 18) All things considered, how satisfied are you with your (main) job?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Completely satisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| Very satisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| Fairly satisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Fairly dissatisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Very dissatisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |
| Completely dissatisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 |
| <hr/> | |
| Can't choose | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 |
| Doesn't apply/no job | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 |

R 26 (2002: 19) All things considered, how satisfied are you with your family life?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Completely satisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| Very satisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| Fairly satisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Fairly dissatisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Very dissatisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |
| Completely dissatisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 |
| <hr/> | |
| Can't choose | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 |

N 27 (ISSP 2011: 26) In general, would you say your health is...

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- Excellent 1
 - very good 2
 - Good 3
 - Fair 4
 - Poor 5
-
- Can't choose 8

R 28 (2002: 20) Did your mother ever work for pay for as long as one year, after you were born and before you were 14?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- Yes, she worked for pay 1
 - No 2
-
- Don't know 8

PLEASE ANSWER THIS QUESTION IF YOU HAVE EVER HAD CHILDREN. OTHERWISE GO TO R 32

R 29 (2002: 21b, 21c) Did you work outside the home full-time, part-time, or not at all...

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ON EACH LINE

		Worked full-time	Worked part-time	Stayed at home	Does not apply
a	When a child was under school age?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
b	After the youngest child started school?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 8

R 30 (2002: 22b, 22c) What about your spouse/partner at that time – did he or she work outside the home full-time, part-time, or not at all...

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ON EACH LINE

		Worked full-time	Worked part-time	Stayed at home	Does not apply
a	When a child was under school age?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
b	After the youngest child started school?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 8

R 31 (2002: 12) Who usually makes/made the decisions about how to bring up your children?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| Mostly me | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| Mostly my spouse/partner | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| Sometimes me/sometimes my spouse/partner | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 |
| We decide together/decided together | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Someone else | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| <hr/> | |
| Does not apply | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 |

ADDITIONAL COMPULSORY BACKGROUND QUESTIONS FOR THE 2012 MODULE**R 32 (2002: B)**

(If steady partner – including spouse) Education of current spouse/partner: parallel to nat_DEGREE to be harmonised into spouse_DEGREE

NOTE TO DESIGNERS: Recommended to ask after ISSP background question PARTLIV

Please consult the ISSP BV guidelines (Version of 2010-12-10)

N 33 Age of current spouse/partner: parallel to AGE

(If steady partner – including spouse) When was your spouse/partner born?

Please, write in the year of his/her birth (use four digits for the year).

|_|_|_|

NOTE TO DESIGNERS: Recommended to ask after ISSP background question PARTLIV

Please consult the ISSP BV guidelines (Version of 2010-12-10)

N 34 Duration of current relationship:

(If steady partner – including spouse) How long have you and your spouse/steady partner been living together?

Please, write in the number of years. Please give your best estimate.

|_|_| years

Less than one year

NOTE TO DESIGNERS: Recommended to ask after ISSP background question PARTLIV

Please consult the ISSP BV guidelines (Version of 2010-12-10)

TN: “Living together” means living as a couple regardless of whether in one household or not.