

United Nations
Economic Commission for Europe
Population Activities Unit

Generations and Gender: Research into their Behaviour and Quality of Life
Palais des Nations, Geneva, 3-5 July 2000

**SYNTHESIS AND ASSESSMENT
OF THE DOCUMENTATION AND THE DISCUSSIONS
OF THE GENEVA MEETING
ON THE PAU GENERATIONS AND GENDER PROGRAMME**

Robert Cliquet

Table of Contents

- **Introduction**
- **The Generations and Gender Programme**
 - *Aims*
 - *Methodology*
 - *Data sources*
 - *Organisation*
 - *Aims of the 3-5 July 2000 Meeting*
- **Synthesis of the four background papers**
 - *Concepts for a second round of fertility and family surveys in Europe, with particular attention to persons of reproductive/working age*
 - *PAU justification*
 - *Background paper by Jan Hoem et al.*
 - Sample design and questionnaire structure
 - Inter-survey comparison
 - Temporal dimension
 - Life histories
 - Other substantive issues
 - Contextual data
 - Population subgroups
 - *The behaviour and status of older persons*
 - *PAU justification*
 - *Background papers by Jacques Legaré and George C. Myers*
 - Demographic, socio-economic and health status of older persons
 - Living arrangements, housing and care provision
 - Measurement issues
 - Research designs and methods
 - *Behaviour and status of children, adolescents and young adults*
 - *PAU justification*
 - *Background paper by Martha S. Hill and Wei-Jun Jean Yeung*
 - Methodological issues for studies of children and youth
 - State of knowledge
 - Needs for new information
 - Relevant theory
 - Proposed new data collection and analysis
 - *Intergenerational relationships*
 - *PAU justification*
 - *Background paper by Gunhild Hagestad*
 - Family, age and history
 - Patterns of proximity and residence
 - Transfers
- **Critical comments of the general rapporteur on the background papers**

- *Focus of the project*
- *Operational strategy*
 - *Censuses and surveys*
 - *National surveys*
- *Inter-survey comparison*
- *Temporal dimension*
- *Life histories*
- *Other substantive issues proposed in the background papers*
- *Missing links*
- *Contextual data*
- *Population subgroups*
- **Summary of the meeting discussions**
 - *Discussion of the background papers*
 - *Focus of the project*
 - *Instruments*
 - *Survey*
 - Contents
 - Questionnaire design
 - Sample and sampling technique
 - *Censuses, registers and other sources*
 - *Contextual variables*
 - *Discussion of the recommendations of the meeting*
- **Comments of the general rapporteur on the discussions and recommendations**
- **References**
- **Appendix 1: Reports of the session rapporteurs**
- **Appendix 2: Recommendations of the meeting**

- **Introduction**

1. This synthesis of the background papers, the discussions and recommendations of the meeting on *Generations and Gender: Research into their Behaviour and Quality of Life*, held in Geneva 3-5 July 2000 was prepared by Robert Cliquet upon request of the UN/ECE/PAU. Robert Cliquet was appointed general rapporteur of the meeting.
2. The preparation of this synthesis paper was a process. The first draft of the paper was made available at the meeting of 3-5 July 2000. It summarised the proposals of the background papers and, in order to facilitate the debate at the meeting, raised questions related to the alternatives and needs for rigorous choices to be made regarding both the content and methodology of the project. The present document was completed with a summary of the discussions and the recommendations from the meeting.

The Generations and Gender Programme

Aims

3. In the documentation for the Geneva meeting and other PAU documents concerning the Generations and Gender Programme, the aims of the project are defined as follows:
 - promote research into the behaviour and social and economic conditions of individuals, both male and female, and of different generations, namely children and adolescents, working-age adults, and older persons;
 - shed new light on the degree to which the ideals are fulfilled in the field of
 - intergenerational solidarity;
 - gender equality.
 - monitor key demographic developments over time;
 - maintain a high degree of continuity with FFS 1;
 - guarantee comparability across countries;
 - open pathways to new research issues.

Methodology

4. The PAU defined the following methodological elements:
 - life course perspective;
 - micro-level information derived from population censuses and surveys:
 - latest round of population and housing censuses;
 - new round of comparable household/family sample surveys;
 - contextual setting:
 - individual's household;
 - society.

Data sources

5. The PAU intends to make use of three types of data sources :
- censuses;
 - surveys;
 - official statistics and public policy descriptions.

Organisation

6. The organisation of the project is presented as follows:
- PAU co-ordinator;
 - national population institutes and national statistical institutes of the ECE countries;
 - university departments or other institutions, including non-governmental organisations in the ECE countries where no government-sponsored population institutes exist;
 - independent population scholars invited in their capacity as consultants or advisers;
 - intergovernmental organisations and other regional actors.

Aims of the 3-5 July 2000 Meeting

7. The meeting was invited to formulate and adopt:
- a future research agenda for the programme;
 - the data-collection, standardisation and dissemination activities in support of future research;
 - a blueprint for pursuing research- and data-related work during 2000-2003;
 - explore participation of national institutes;
 - explore options for raising additional funds for the implementation of the programme.
8. The following solicited papers were commissioned:
- behaviour and status of older people;
 - behaviour and status of persons of reproductive/working age;
 - behaviour and status of children, adolescents and young adults;
 - intergenerational relationships;
 - synthesis paper.
9. The four background papers were expected to deal with the following issues:
- current state of knowledge based on research reflecting different disciplinary perspectives;
 - policy instruments used to affect the status of members of the various age groups;
 - need for new information and knowledge on the behaviour and status of the age groups, including those relevant to policy making;
 - required analysis and research to respond to these needs;
 - necessary census and survey data required to enable analysis and research;

- strategies to collect requisite survey information (design, instruments);
- help formulate hypotheses on the interactions between the behaviour and status of different age groups;
- identify theoretical/explanatory models.

Synthesis of the four background papers

Concepts for a second round of fertility and family surveys in Europe, with particular attention to persons of reproductive/working age

PAU justification

10. The PAU justified the inclusion of the population of working/reproductive age as follows (Conference of European Statisticians, 1999):
 - demographic behaviour of prime-age adults resulted in recent years in a variety of household and family forms and unprecedented fertility patterns, including sustained sub-replacement fertility. These developments are certain to continue during some time and should continue to be monitored and, wherever possible, explained;
 - topical interest of reproductive rights: need for monitoring and research.

Background paper by Jan Hoem et al.

11. The paper of Hoem *et al.* is an extensive piece of work that discusses – be it in a somewhat scattered order - most of the aspects PAU expected to be dealt with. Namely, the current state of knowledge for each of the issues to be addressed, needs for new information, types of required research, survey data required for analysis and research, strategies to collect requisite survey information (design, instruments), and hypothesis formulation.
12. Starting from the hypothesis that the ECE/PAU Generation and Gender Programme aims at producing survey questionnaires for each of the four major subjects identified – (1) behaviour and status of older people, (2) behaviour and status of persons of reproductive/working age, (3) behaviour and status of children, adolescents and young adults, and (4) intergenerational relationships – Hoem *et al.* have conceived their operational approach from the viewpoint that all of the four subjects can be organised as a single co-ordinated effort. Their paper has the merit that its proposed survey strategy takes into account the integrated and simultaneous surveying of the different age groups (at least adolescents, persons of working/reproductive age and elderly), aiming at the study of the relations between the various generations involved.
13. For the rest, Hoem *et al.* deal in some considerable detail with their own assigned topic. The bulk of the paper consequently deals mainly with the demographic behaviour at reproductive and working ages.

Sample design and questionnaire structure

14. The authors propose that all four components of the Generation and Gender Programme be brought together through a survey design that targets entire resident households as the sampling and data-collection units in all countries that participate in the programme.
15. In addition to a common household questionnaire, to be addressed to a reference person in the household, age-specific questionnaires are to be used for all eligible persons in each target household. They propose that at least both members of each index couple should be interviewed. The interviewing of the household members should be done individually, and preferably simultaneously.
16. The paper discusses the alternative formula of independent samples of men and women, but is clearly in favour of the former approach because the authors argue that it would allow a much broader and generation specific research approach.

Inter-survey comparison

17. The authors recommend that the FFS 2 be largely comparable in its major components, i.e. the life histories of partnership, reproductive behaviour and education-employment to the FFS 1.
18. In several subsections of the paper it is also recommended that FFS 2 should be conceived as a panel, i.e. should be followed by an FFS 3, some five years later.

Temporal dimension

19. In the minds of the authors, the temporal dimension forms the very essence of the conceptual and methodological approach.
20. Consequently they propose that, just as in the FFS 1, the survey would collect a number of life histories, the level of detail would be as in the most complete of the national surveys in the FFS 1. In addition data on current state situation and expectations about future events should be collected, so that past, present and future would be covered.

Life histories

21. The core of the life history approach would, just as in the FFS 1, consist of three biographies:
 - education-employment;
 - partnership;
 - reproduction.
22. In addition biographies about the following additional topics are proposed:
 - residence-migration (discussed as a possibility);
 - parental home;

- child care.

Other substantive issues

23. In addition to the biographies the authors suggest that FFS would also include information on
- values, norms, attitudes, preferences, perceptions, knowledge and beliefs;
 - financial and other assets;
 - consumption.

Contextual data

24. The authors propose that the Generations and Gender Programme would include a serious effort to gather temporally located contextual data on
- economic developments;
 - policy reforms.

Population subgroups

25. In the Hoem *et al.* paper, it is proposed that the survey would cover the following population subgroups:
- men – women;
 - age groups;
 - autochthones – foreigners;
 - heterosexual and non-heterosexual families.
26. As far as the age groups are concerned, the authors do not actually address the question whether children should be interviewed also. The paper gives the impression that one may limit the age range for interviews to adolescents, prime working age population and elderly.

The behaviour and status of older persons

PAU justification

27. Addressing the older persons is justified as follows:
- population ageing has brought into a sharp focus a variety of issues pertaining to behaviour and conditions of older persons:
 - living arrangements;
 - retirement;
 - health matters;
 - the past demographic, labour market and retirement behaviour of older persons and their current living circumstances and economic circumstances are interrelated;

- behaviour and conditions of older persons and their need for different forms of care are interrelated;
- private intergenerational transfers and the conditions of older persons interact.

Background papers by Jacques Legaré and George C. Myers

28. For the session on older persons two separate background papers were prepared: a paper by George C. Myers on “The Behaviour and Status of Older Persons” and a paper by Jacques Legaré on “Living conditions of older persons, care provision and living arrangements”.
29. Myers’ paper starts with introductory sections on population ageing and the demographic features of older persons, on their economic and social status, and their health characteristics and behaviour. They are considered to be substantive themes worthy of further primary data collection research. In the second part, the author deals with measurement issues of the themes highlighted. Finally, the author sketches a number of innovative research designs and methods that might be of interest for the Generation and Gender Programme.
30. Jacques Legaré’s paper dwells more extensively on living arrangements, living conditions and care provision of older persons. The author also comments briefly on the data collection.

Demographic, socio-economic and health status of older persons

31. Myers discusses population ageing as a major demographic feature of the 21st century in the ECE region, with growing numbers and proportions of the oldest old as longevity is extended. As is known, women not only represent a majority in the older population, but become ever more numerous with increasing age. The older population is also affected by the population and family dynamics occurring at younger ages. Increasing levels of survival at higher ages and fewer numbers of children per woman result in the so-called “beanpole family”, with more relatives from different generations alive, but fewer numbers in each generation.
32. In the economic field, the author draws attention to the pressures further population ageing will exert on the pension systems, among others requiring an adaptation of and a more flexible approach to age at retirement. He also highlights the importance of resource transfers in families for the economic status and well being of older persons.
33. With respect to the social status of older persons, the author draws attention to the growing importance that is given to their autonomy and full integration in society. Three aspects are considered:
- attitudes of and about older persons;
 - social participation;
 - political participation.

34. Myers considers health to be a ubiquitous aspect in the life conditions of older persons that is, moreover, deeply entwined in the other selected themes discussed in his paper. Three topics are highlighted:
- self-reported health;
 - functional capacity;
 - health behaviour.

Living arrangements, housing and care provision

35. In the introduction of Legaré's paper the attention is drawn on the desire of older persons to remain part of the community, to live independently and to postpone as much as possible their entry into the "fourth age".
36. In the section on living arrangements, he discusses the problems of
- institutionalisation;
 - living with non-kin;
 - living alone;
 - alternative living arrangements.
37. In the section on living conditions, several problems of housing are dealt with:
- housing conditions;
 - housing types.
38. In the section on care provision, four aspects of eldercare are treated:
- the context;
 - the actors;
 - the living arrangements;
 - the global environment.

Measurement issues

39. In Myers' paper a section deals with a few major strategies that have been proposed lately to measure some essential concepts in the fields of
- household/family;
 - current social issues;
 - key economic concepts;
 - health aspects.
40. In the field of households and families the author considers the recording of:
- complete listings of current household members;
 - rather complete socio-demographic characteristics of each kin;
 - retrospective information, as in life course investigations.
41. A less desirable alternative consists of selecting information about one or a few key relatives or to summarise information.

42. Concerning current social issues the author quotes several examples of recent survey efforts that can provide cross-national data on attitudes. He also draws the attention to time budget research aimed at assessing a broad range of information on activities, interests, contacts, and factors influencing time use.
43. Concerning the measurement of key economic concepts the author refers to recent well-established survey experience in the fields of
- derived harmonised measures of income and poverty;
 - consumption measures;
 - wealth and assets measures;
 - measures about subjective expectations by probabilistic means.
44. As far as concerns the measurement of health the author discusses three major approaches:
- measurement of self-reported health;
 - measures of functional capacity;
 - standardised measures for determining behaviours affecting health.

Research designs and methods

45. With regard to research designs and methods, Myers discusses several innovations that are transforming national data collection systems:
- census and survey data collection of information for multiple members of families and households;
 - longitudinal (temporal) efforts in both systems;
 - diverse types of data linkage;
 - new approaches to sampling.
46. With respect to multiple respondent household data collection systems, he discusses
- population censuses;
 - hybrid data collection ('census registers');
 - census samples.
47. With regard to multiple respondent surveys, he considers
- interviewing of respondents along with other individuals that have mentioned as important persons in their social network;
 - multiple generations of families;
 - special modules (in addition to core questionnaire components) that may relate to other household members and even require persons other than primary respondents to participate.
48. As far as concerns census linked record efforts, Myers discusses the link of information on individuals and families obtained from censuses with other censuses and other data sources. In some cases such efforts have been used to study differential mortality according to socio-economic status or complex networks over several generations.

49. In the last section of his paper Myers discusses the possible use of censuses for sampling purposes.
50. In Legaré's paper the advantages and limitations of censuses are discussed and the undertaking of specialised surveys that concentrate on life course transitions is advocated. The author also stresses the importance of community surveys and linkage of administrative files to survey records.

Behaviour and status of children, adolescents and young adults

PAU justification

51. In addressing the younger age groups, the PAU stresses the following:
- shrinking population group;
 - rearing and living conditions:
 - social and economic implications for children and adolescents of the plurality of family forms and the splitting of families through dissolution;
 - impact of economic difficulties on the economic position, health and education of children and adolescents;
 - impact of living arrangements on psychological development.

Background paper by Martha S. Hill and Wei-Jun Jean Yeung

52. The paper of Hill and Yeung discusses in a systematic and extensive way almost all of the major issues requested by PAU: methodological issues, state of knowledge, needs for new information, relevant theory, data collection and analysis.
53. In their introduction Hill and Yeung highlight the importance of studies on child well-being and the families in which they live.
54. In their draft the authors strongly relied on US experience and literature, but their final version will take a broader perspective.

Methodological issues for studies of children and youth

55. The authors identify the following key methodological issues in the study of children, adolescents and young adults:
- measuring quality of life through:
 - indicators of well-being:
 - at the individual level:
 - economic well-being;
 - physical well-being;
 - cognitive and educational well-being;
 - social well-being;
 - psychological and emotional well-being.

- at the family level;
- at the societal level;
- time use;
- approaches to studying children and youth:
 - gearing survey instruments to children and youth:
 - preschool children: unstructured methods of interviewing;
 - primary school age (7-10): semi-structured interviews;
 - adolescents (11+): adult designed surveys;
 - adapting interview practices;
 - ‘conversation’ approach: research ‘with’ children instead of ‘on’ children;
 - reporters of information;
- family and household:
 - construct a variety of different aggregations of people associated with children;
 - examine relationships within households.

State of knowledge

56. First, the authors list the major recent demographic and socio-economic trends characterising industrial societies that influence also the lives of children, adolescents and young adults.

57. Next they discuss several domains where those changes influence children’s well-being:

- child poverty and deprivation;
- family structure (more particularly single-parent families);
- parental investment patterns (intra-family resource allocation patterns; time squeeze; gender relations);
- information technology as a new resource.

58. Finally, they look at youth’s orientation to and behaviours in major life domains:

- family life:
 - marriage;
 - children;
- work;
- gender roles;
- nest-leaving.

Needs for new information

59. The authors give an extensive overview of indicators of well-being, drawn from several but mainly US sources. Several lists of such indicators are listed in appendices A to D.

60. Among priority research domains are mentioned

- family processes such as

- marital and non-marital union formation;
- fathering;
- family relationships beyond the residential unit;
- integration of childbearing and childrearing;
- altruism, empathy and caring;
- family flexibility;
- individuality and belongingness;
- sibling relationships;
- household establishment (\neq union formation);
- determinants of family and child well-being:
 - linkages of biological and social influences;
 - culture, values and preferences;
 - diversity and immigration;
 - influence of children on parents;
 - neighbourhood and community effects;
 - linkage between union formation, childbearing and childrearing:
 - dating and cohabitation;
 - factors influencing couple dissolution;
 - transformation of informal arrangements to marriages;
 - interconnections between education/work and family formation/dissolution;
 - gender differences;
- father involvement:
 - financial support;
 - father-child contact;
 - indirect forms of involvement;
 - quality of father involvement;
- positive youth development;
- dynamics of child well-being (panel studies);
- children's and youths' time use;
- policy-relevant issues:
 - gender equity;
 - support to working families;
 - low-skill labour market entrants;
 - childcare services;
 - state welfare initiatives.

Relevant theory

61. In the section on relevant theory, the authors first sketch an interdisciplinary theoretical framework for studying child well-being, combining a developmental psychology model of family processes and socio-economic perspectives and interrelating the following groups of characteristics:
- family characteristics;
 - child characteristics;
 - parental general values;

- child-specific attitudes and expectations;
- relation between spouses;
- parental investment behaviour:
 - time;
 - expenditure;
 - family process;
- children's well-being.

62. They emphasize four aspects in this model:

- the mechanism through which parents attach importance to children's development;
- the influence of children's characteristics on parents' resource allocation behaviour;
- the feedback effect of child well-being on parental investment behaviour;
- the effect of school and neighbourhood.

63. Second, the authors illustrate the breadth of data needed for the empirical investigation of the theoretical framework by the relevant content of the American Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) (since 1968) and its 1997 and 2001 waves Child Development Supplement (CDS), including the following components:

- PSID nationally representative sample of households and individuals;
- PSID high quality annual longitudinal data on the socio-economic characteristics of the family;
- CDS two-day time diaries for up to two children per household;
- CDS family process measures obtained from primary and secondary care givers;
- CDS data on children's psychological, emotional and intellectual well-being;
- CDS information on children's time use at school, school resources and teacher's assessment of children's ability;
- PSID information on neighbourhood.

Proposed new data collection and analysis

64. Not wanting to anticipate the conference discussions of the issues raised in their paper, the authors only briefly discuss the possibilities of censuses and national surveys to investigate the above-sketches framework.

65. In the mind of the authors census data are well-suited for measuring the following issues:

- socio-economic and demographic nature of communities and neighbourhoods;
- cultural context of a nation as a whole in terms of socio-economic and demographic features;
- overall patterns of households:
 - number and ages of household members;

- education, marital status, employment and occupation of household members;
- type of structure, utilities and amenities of dwelling;
- some aspects of work and family life.

66. Censuses are considered to be less well suited for measuring the following issues:

- subfamilies in households;
- family members residing in institutions;
- living arrangements of children and youth;
- income;
- characteristics of children;
- life satisfaction;
- teenage fertility.

67. As far as concerns national surveys, the authors stress the fact that the study of child well-being should be interrelated with issues such as:

- poverty;
- family structure;
- mother's employment;
- father's involvement with children;
- children's and youths' aspirations;
- children's and youths' time use.

68. With respect to the life goals for children and youth, the authors suggest to collect information regarding the thoughts of both young people and of relevant adults associated with them.

69. The authors consider the panel option as a crucial feature of the overall survey design. However, for the study of the dynamics of child well-being and related issues, the panel intervals should be relatively short.

70. Finally the authors advocate to complement the sample surveys by qualitative approaches such as the 'conversations' method.

Intergenerational relationships

PAU justification

71. The PAU documents refer to the following issues:

- Intergenerational bonds;
- Intergenerational contract:
 - Fairness;
 - Redefinition;
 - Significance for policies aiming at strengthening social cohesion.

Background paper by Gunhild Hagestad

72. The background paper on intergenerational relations gives a thought-provoking overview of major critical issues related to the dynamics of the relationships between changing age groups.
73. The paper includes three major sections:
- family, age and history;
 - patterns of proximity and co-residence
 - transfers.

Family, age and history

74. In this section the author describes the major demographic changes influencing intergenerational relations and draws the attention to the importance of historical events linked to subsequent cohorts. She elaborates more particularly on the new phenomenon of the verticalisation of family ties and related problems such as the generational squeeze.
75. The author pleads for studying the intergenerational structures by different methods and recommends that surveys would be sampled from a population of anchors to investigate their relations with ascendant and descendant kin.

Patterns of proximity and residence

76. The changing demographic and societal contexts, leading to the multiplication, dispersion and thinning of households, require the closer investigation of the spatial distance between generations and their degree of co-residence. The author pleads in this respect for recording residential histories across the life course.
77. An ignored issue is age segregation and its associated ageism.
78. The author considers it important to study intergenerational living arrangements against the background of cultural preferences and policy measures.

Transfers

79. The author argues that not only the generational transfers at different levels – public, family, life course – but also their interactions should be investigated. The latter will help to understand the intersection between family and other levels of social organisation.
80. Neglected issues are: multigenerational contexts, and more in particular grandparenthood, unregistered transfers, the effects of new family types on the flow of resources.
81. Contextual information, more in particular concerning policies, should duly be taken into consideration.

Critical comments of the general rapporteur on the background papers

82. The mechanical sum of all the proposals formulated by the authors of the background papers cannot be handled in one single survey. The background papers include at several places alternative options between which choices will have to be made. Considerable selection is required.

Focus of the project

83. All the background papers take a quite broad and interdisciplinary perspective. However, they appear to reflect some considerable differences in thematic orientation and research goals. Studying the well-being of children or the quality of life of older persons may have another finality than the population and family perspective that lies at the basis of the study of the population of reproductive/working age as addressed in the background papers.

84. PAU one will need to clarify the order of importance of aims of the Generations and Gender Project. It is not clear yet whether the main focus of the project is on:

- population and family development analysed against the broad social context in view of the improvement of the well-being of generations, or
- on topical aspects of the quality of life of specific population sub-groups analysed against demographic trends.

85. The question of the main focus is not of a semantic nature but of fundamental conceptual importance. The ultimate contribution of the project depends on whether the Population Activities Unit's project manages to address questions that have not so far been adequately dealt with in other projects. The status of children, working age population, aged, their behaviour, inter-relationships, living conditions, aspirations and expectations as well as patterning of welfare regimes have been extensively dealt with in numerous projects and many scientific disciplines.

86. So far, the salient specificity of this project, from the perspective of the framework papers, is the broadness of scope. Its specificity is blurred.

Operational strategy

Censuses and surveys

87. The background papers all agree that the Generations and Gender Programme should take advantage both of censuses and national surveys and that it should be endeavoured to link at the individual or household level the data from different data bases.

88. There seems also to be agreement on the fact that censuses or other administrative data bases are of limited value for the Generations and Gender Programme and that they should be complemented by specific sample surveys. The decision process on this issue will probably not raise major problems.

National surveys

89. As far as concerns the operational strategy with respect to national surveys, the Hoem *et al.* background paper on persons of reproductive/working age clearly proposes that all of the targeted age groups in the surveys of the Generations and Gender Programme be investigated via a single survey with a common questionnaire core and age-specific questionnaire modules. This is an idea that, in recent years, emerged in several population centres in Europe.
90. An example was the CBGS project ‘Families in Transition – An Integrated Survey on the Life Course of Flemish Families’ (FIT) in which it was aimed to streamline the next wave of the different CBGS sample surveys on children, adults and older persons and to integrate them in one whole as regards contents, methodology and organisation. So far, funding has not been found for such a broad scale survey.
91. Another example is the ‘Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (NKPS)’ and a related project on ‘Family Relationships: Ties that Bind’ of the NIDI and a number of Dutch university research institutes aiming at describing the nature and strength of solidarity in family and kin relationships, explaining variations in solidarity across individuals and social categories and examine consequences of solidarity for individual well-being. The funding of this project is under review.
92. After addressing the conceptual issues, a first practical matter on which PAU will need to decide is whether the project would be developed as
- a single venture, covering all targeted age groups, or
 - several age-specific projects (e.g. children, people of reproductive age, older persons).
93. A related matter is the question of the range of the age groups to be interviewed, and more particularly if children will be respondents. From the background paper of Hill and Yeung, it appears, indeed, that the required methodology, research instruments and partly even the conceptual focus of a children project is quite specific. Alternative approaches with respect to age variation might e.g. be:
- children and adolescents (6-17) : persons of reproductive/working age (18-64) : older persons (65+);
 - adolescents (e.g. 15-19) : persons of reproductive/working age (e.g. 20-64) : older persons (65+).
- NB. The limitation of the younger age group to adolescents might partially be compensated by a life history approach for that age group.
94. Likewise, there are different alternatives regarding the age ranges of the persons of reproductive/working age and the older persons to be interviewed. As is known, options are numerous.
95. Moreover, the above-mentioned age groups might or might not be further subdivided. The problems to be addressed and instruments to be used need to be adapted to the choice made in this respect. Alternatives could be:

- no subdivisions;
- subdivisions:
 - 6-17 → 6-12 and 13-17;
 - 18-64 → 18-44 and 45-64;
 - 65+ → 65-79 and 80+

96. In the Hoem *et al.* background paper the multiple respondent household method is proposed by which all or at least several household members would be interviewed. Although it is nowhere explicitly mentioned, the papers of Legaré and Myers implicitly seem to favour a household survey approach. Also the Hill and Yeung paper seems, on the basis of the examples given and some of the conceptual considerations made, to advocate the multiple respondent household approach. The Hagestad paper strongly advocates a different strategy: instead of sampling households, she proposes to sample from a population of individual anchors and ask them about ascendants and descendants.

97. While advantages of a multiple respondent household method are explicitly or implicitly dealt with in the background papers, the difficulties and the quality-price relationship between this and other approaches is not sufficiently developed.

98. The analytical power and the feasibility of the multiple respondent household approach should be clearly shown to be stronger than the classical individual-based approach. The higher investment in time and analytical complexity should result in an equally higher output. It should be well documented that more time and energy consuming analytical approaches will result in a better description or understanding of a phenomenon.

99. The multiple respondent household method, furthermore, raises several specific problems:

- in some sub-populations or even entire countries the multiple respondent household method might result in less reliable data on more intimate issues related to relational and/or reproductive behaviour (e.g. number of partnerships, quality of the partnership, abortions) or lead to a higher frequency of refusals. In some cases, this approach might even provoke within-family controversies (between partners, between adolescents and parents, between adults and elderly, more particularly in non-egalitarian families);
- the analysis of intergenerational relations between adults and older persons will have to take into account that three-or more-generational families/households with co-residing older persons are relatively rare in most ECE countries. The household sample approach will catch only a small number. In order to study intergenerational relations by interviewing kin, the sample will need to include separate households in which different generations of the same family live (e.g. the households of the ascendants, descendants, and former partners of the reference household or reference person);
- in some ECE countries and in most low-income households, the housing conditions may be a limiting factor for the simultaneous interviewing of

several family members. Even when the space is available the presence of small children may prevent both partners to respond simultaneously;

- in stress overburdened households the tense relationship and the general atmosphere may also be a limiting factor;
- a multiple respondent household survey might also miss the problem individuals or families in which we are particularly interested, e.g.:
 - older people in institutions;
 - separated families, or former family members living in a new household;
 - LAT-relations;
- the multiple respondent household approach also does not allow for a sequential realisation of the project (e.g. series of surveys on different age groups). This may be a problem in countries where the research capacity of the institutes is limited or the considerable financial resources needed cannot be obtained within one budgetary year. In such cases, it should be possible to interview the different age groups, obviously with integrated instruments and methodologies, in subsequent phases spread over several years. A few years ago, this solution was recommended by the CBGS Management Board to overcome the financial constraints associated with huge budgetary investment in one year.

100. Further project development consequently need to consider carefully the type of methodological approach it will advocate. Possible alternatives are:

- a multiple respondent household survey, possibly with extensions to kin-related households or at least gather information about the latter;
- a single-respondent household survey;
- a survey on anchors and their kin, living in the same or in different households.

101. The classical individual-based survey model does not prevent an intergenerational or gender-related set-up. Individuals of different age groups can be interviewed about their relations with and opinions about ascendants, partner(s), siblings and descendants.

102. Another choice that will need to be made concerns the time dimension within which the survey can be organised. Two alternatives appear also here:

- a single survey in which all age groups are included at the same time;
- several age-specific, subsequent surveys, spread over several calendar years.

Inter-survey comparison

103. The Hoem *et al.* background paper strongly argues in favour of inter-survey comparison, more particularly between the Fertility and Family Survey of the 90s (FFS) and the new Generation and Gender Survey (GGS). In view of the proposals in the background papers for including many new issues, PAU will need to decide on this matter. Alternatives can be:

- no comparison between FFS and GGS;

- a partial comparison between FFS and GGS;
- a strong comparison between FFS 1 and GGS.

104. In the background papers on children, people of working/reproductive age and the aged, it is argued in favour of a GGS panel design. In deciding on this matter, it needs to be taken into account that the desirable time interval for different age groups may vary. Alternatives can be:

- no GGS panel design;
- GGS panel design.

Temporal dimension

105. The Hoem *et al.* background paper strongly advocates a life history approach combined with the recording of current status data and expectations. The Hagestad paper also advocates the life history approach, more particularly for residence. The background papers on children, adolescents and young adults and on older persons do not explicitly deal with this matter, but the thematic issues they deal with seem to justify a broad temporal design.

Life histories

106. The Hoem *et al.* background paper recommends to record the life histories for the following:

- parental home;
- activities:
 - education;
 - occupation;
 - non-employment activities.
- partnership;
- reproduction:
 - childbearing;
 - contraception, abortion, sterilisation;
 - subfecundity;
- residence-migration (as a possibility);
- child care.

107. The Hagestad background paper recommends to include residential patterns across the life course and turnover.

108. The authors of the other background papers need to clarify which of the topics they recommend to be included in the GGS, ought to be recorded in biographical form.

109. The details of the selected biographies will have to be examined at a later stage by the expert group who will work out the questionnaire. The concrete Hoem *et al.* proposals undoubtedly will be subject to further refinements, additions and deletions. A few examples:

- the partnership biography could include data on multiple relations;

- the subfecundity section in the reproductive biography could include information on medically assisted fertility;
- other biographical events might be recorded that are perceived or experienced as crucial in the life course, etc.

Other substantive issues proposed in the background papers

110. The background papers include many other suggestions for data collection in the GGS. One will need to select a limited number.

111. The Hoem *et al.* paper proposes:

- values, attitudes, preferences;
- power relations between partners;
- income and assets;
- consumption.

112. The Legaré and Myers papers mention in addition:

- health:
 - measurement of self-reported health;
 - measures of functional capacity;
 - standardised measures for determining behaviours affecting health.
- intergenerational transfers;
- social and political participation;
- desired living arrangements;
- housing;
- care provision for older persons.

113. The Hill and Yeung paper lists the following additional issues:

- indicators of well-being;
- time use;
- information technology as a new resource;
- father involvement;
- family relationships beyond the residential unit;
- family processes;
- sibling relationships;
- ways children influence their parents;
- household establishment;
- child characteristics;
- child specific attitudes and expectations of parents;
- relations between spouses;
- parental investment behaviour;
- children's well-being.

114. The Hagestad paper includes the following suggestions:

- intergenerational structures and networks;
 - number of generations;
 - number of individuals in given generational locations;
 - balance old/young;
 - sex ratios;
 - span of time between generations;
 - generational distance;
 - retrospective information on deceased ancestors;
 - time of generation turn-over;
 - broken connections;
- patterns of proximity and co-residence:
 - spatial distance between generations;
 - co-residence;
 - residential patterns across the life course and turn-over;
 - subjective perceptions and future preferences;
 - age segregation;
- transfers;
 - financial transfers;
 - inheritance and transfers inter vivos;
 - non-financial transfers.

Contextual data

115. All background papers recommend to gather contextual data that could be, via multi-level analytic methods, related to the individual and household data in the GGS.

116. The Hoem *et al.* paper mentions in this respect:

- economic context (local and national);
- policy context (measures, reforms, etc.):
 - welfare policies;
 - family policies;
 - gender policies;
 - labour policies.

117. The Legaré paper refers to:

- services for the elderly;
- quality of life in the neighbourhood;
- institutional data on cure and care.

118. The Hill and Yeung paper includes suggestions on:

- schools;
- neighbourhoods;
- policy issues.

119. The Hagestad paper suggests:
- life course-regulating policies;
 - cultural norms;
 - relevant historical events;
 - transportation and communication means;
 - housing policies;
 - inheritance law;
 - public transfers;
 - tax laws;
 - age-specific services.
120. The magnitude, feasibility and time dimension of this task should be carefully examined. The selection of contextual variables is imminently tied to the theoretical context and the hypotheses to be tested.

Population subgroups

121. The Hoem *et al.* background paper is the only one that lists and discusses explicitly the desirability of selecting specific population subgroups for interviews, namely
- men – women;
 - specific age groups;
 - autochthones – foreigners;
 - hetero- and non-heterosexuals.
122. The need to interview both sexes and to have a broad age range in the Generations and Gender Survey is quite self-evident.
123. Involving foreigners (and possibly their second generation descendents) will require substantial over-sampling. Foreigners cannot be treated as one single group. Distinction needs to be made between ethnic groups that show a significant differential demographic behaviour. An example of such a set-up was the FFS which was undertaken in Brussels, where in addition to the French- and Dutch-speaking nationals, equally sized samples of other Europeans, Moroccans and Turks were investigated.
124. Non-heterosexual individuals or couples are such a small minority that it may not be worthwhile to include them as a special category in the GGS. Research on this population category requires a separate and specific sample. On the other hand, one should foresee the appropriate codes in questions related to sexual, relational and partnership behaviour, as suggested by Andersson & Neyer in Hoem's paper.

Integration and balance of the different age groups in the GGS

125. None of the background papers elaborates on how to integrate and balance the needed information on the specific age group dealt with in a general *Generation*

and Gender Survey (GGS), covering all age groups. (Only the Hoem *et al.* paper deals with this matter in some respects). This is not only a question of survey operationalisation, but also of goals and contents and will require serious consideration and consultation.

Summary of the meeting discussions

126. The meeting discussions were chaired by Charlotte Höhn, and vice-chairs G. Vukovich and J. Holzer. The discussions were organised in four sessions related to the four background papers and followed by a final general discussion on the draft recommendations. Each of the session discussions was briefly introduced with some critical comments and questions of the general rapporteur as reflected above. The session discussions were summarised by section rapporteurs whose reports are annexed to the present document:

- Report of Session 1: Behaviour and Status of Working/Reproductive Age Persons (Section Rapporteur: Lars Ostby);
- Report of Session 2: Behaviour and Status of Children, Adolescents and Young Adults (Chairman: Section Rapporteur: Kalev Katus);
- Report of Session 3: Behaviour and Status of Older Persons (Section Rapporteur: Jenny Gierveld);
- Report of Session 4: Intergenerational Relations (Section Rapporteur: Antonio Golini).

127. The general rapporteur made gratefully use of the session reports for the summary of the discussions.

Discussion of the background papers

Focus of the project

128. First, it must be acknowledged that the meeting accommodated a quite broad diversity of scientific and policy interests.

129. For some participants the main focus of a new survey round should be on relational and reproductive behaviour. It ought to be highly comparative with the FFS 1, although FFS 2 is to be an evolved version. It should methodologically be concentrated on the recording and analysis of detailed life event histories. Other participants were clearly more interested in topical research such as gender issues as such or in the living conditions of elderly people and intergenerational relations. Still others were mainly concerned about children and adolescents.

130. Notwithstanding this diversity of interests, there was a quite general agreement about the need to evolve with times and to take an innovative and integrated course (GGS), while at the same time maintaining continuity with the past (FFS).

131. Unanimity exists about the desirability to undertake an international comparative project. The European added value, in the scientific as well as in the policy field, of such an approach is beyond any doubt.

132. The comprehensive approach of the project, nevertheless, raised the concern of many that such an undertaking would be operationally too heavy and that it would require some considerable narrowing of the focus of the project and the specification of the research questions to be addressed. Some participants expressed serious doubts about the feasibility of the whole exercise as proposed in the framework documentation.

Instruments

133. In all of the sessions, it was stressed that the Generations and Gender Programme should make use of different sources of information, more particularly census and/or population register data and an internationally comparative *Survey on Generations and Gender, GGS*. The need for gathering and using contextual data in the project was also repeatedly recommended.

Survey

134. The bulk of the Geneva discussions concerned the Generations and Gender Survey, tentatively labelled with the acronym GGS.

135. The Recommendations define the GGS as “a unitary survey of both women and men, adolescents, persons of reproductive and working age and older persons”.

136. It was generally agreed that the age range of the new survey ought to be considerably broadened compared to the former FFS. The Recommendations explicitly mention 15 to 80 years. This would not only allow to investigate age groups which too often have been neglected (adolescents, pre-pensioners 45-64, and older persons of 65+), but to study different generations and their intergenerational relations with the same research instrument. Some participants also pleaded to extend the age range even further, but it was generally felt that children and the oldest old (80+) require methodologically specific data collection approaches.

137. Some participants pointed out that it will be necessary in their country to split up the survey in sub-surveys, e.g. on children, middle aged and older persons, - a solution which is also reflected in the recommendations. However, it remains essential that the questionnaires are thus conceived that intergenerational, inter-survey and international comparisons remain possible.

Contents

138. As far as concerns the content of the GGS, two major issues emerged from the debate:

- family development

- intergenerational relations.

139. During the discussions, several participants reminded the audience that the focus of the survey, and of the programme in general, should not only be relevant for innovative research but also for short- and long term policy goals.

140. It was generally accepted that one of the major components of the survey would consist of life event histories capturing the process of past, present and future family development, comparable to the ones in the FFS, i.e. activities, partnership, and reproduction.

141. Some participants supported the suggestions of some authors to include also other biographies, a.o. on residential patterns and crucial relational and reproductive and other life events which have effects on life situation and satisfaction in old age. However, this issue will have to be examined in more detail at a later stage.

142. The authors of the background paper on the persons of working/reproductive age strongly advocated the recording of detailed biographies since this approach resulted in the most insightful views. The discussions revealed the existence of a divergence of views on this issue, mainly because of the variety and volume of other issues which would have to be included in the survey. The degree of detail of the basic biographies – possibly differentiated according to age - will have to be carefully examined and weighed (and brought in balance with the other major components of the GGS). Several suggestions were made in this respect (cf. Report of Session 1).

143. The recording of the biographies was advocated for all age groups, so that experiences and effects within as well as between generations could be studied. (The Estonian FFS experience with the recording of biographies at older ages proved to be very positive in this respect). However, the desirable and feasible age-specific degree of detail will have to be examined during the elaboration of the questionnaire. Some participants pleaded for recording full histories of older people, identical to those of younger respondents; others on the other hand advocated a more selective recording of crucial life events (positive and negative), so that time would be left available for sections on intergenerational relations and transfers, problems of retirement, health, unmet care needs, etc.

144. General agreement appeared with respect to the necessity to include in the survey well developed sections on values, attitudes, motivations, perceptions, and perspectives.

145. The recording of (detailed) event histories on activities, partnership and reproduction as well as the desirability to include a well-developed section on values etc. clearly illustrated the strong interest of many participants in continuous research on fertility and more particularly the problems concerning sub-replacement fertility.

146. Several participants, more particularly from transition countries, stressed the importance of continuous research in the fields of sexual and reproductive health, and in particular on contraception and abortion.
147. A few participants pleaded for including information on household finances and assets. The possibility should exist to calculate equivalised household income so that it can be compared with other survey results such as those of the ECHP.
148. Some participants reminded the audience of the importance of recording data on parental antecedents, a.o. in relation to the phenomenon of the intergenerational transmission of demographic behaviour.
149. Obviously the theme of intergenerational relations and transfers came repeatedly to the fore, more particularly with respect to the ageing process. The Recommendations explicitly advocate to include a well-developed section on this issue.
150. The same applies for the gender issue, but with the exception for the older persons (cf. Report of Session 3), few concrete suggestions were made in this respect. A topic which was nevertheless and understandably mentioned was the gender constraints encountered in the relationship between work and family. Attention was also drawn on the gender dimension of parenting.
151. With respect to the behaviour and status of older persons, and also of the coming generations of older persons, the following items, as addition to what was already reported above, were discussed to be included in the survey:
- items related to retirement:
 - transition from employment to retirement;
 - pre-retirement regimes;
 - needs/desires for increasing age at retirement;
 - conditions of retirement;
 - willingness to work;
 - items related to health and care:
 - health deterioration;
 - care provision;
 - care needs;
 - unmet care (difference between care provision and care needs);
 - items related to other transitions in later life ;
 - items related to transfers;
 - items related to residential distance and age segregation.
152. Some participants drew attention to the necessity to consider several sources of differentiation at old age, and more particularly gender and age itself (e.g. coming generation of older persons (45-64), the young old persons (65-79) and the oldest old (80+)). It was also suggested to gather information on deceased kin and not to neglect institutionalised persons.

153. As was already mentioned, surveys were considered not to be a good instrument for studying the oldest old. Census and other data collection methods are more appropriate.

154. As far as regards the behaviour and status of children, adolescents and young adults, it was quite generally deemed that children require a methodologically specific data collection approach. The idea to extend the survey with a child development supplement was in principle welcomed, but its integration in the GGS was generally felt to be beyond the possibilities of such a survey. It was also thought that the inclusion of a section or module on time use would lead us beyond the basic scope of the survey.

155. On the contrary, it was generally agreed to include adolescents (at least from age 15) in the survey, partly with a module on age-specific issues. Many suggestions were made concerning the possible additional contents of the adolescent section:

- family experience, relations with parents, intra-family and household interaction;
- views, expectations and perspectives on family life;
- gender role development;
- life goals;
- teenage fertility, parenthood, meaning of fatherhood and motherhood.

156. Some suggestions concerning children (and adolescents) were also made to be included in the adult sections of the questionnaire:

- parenting;
- care of children;
- time spent with children;
- activities undertaken with children;
- social integration of children.

157. At several occasions special attention was drawn to the specific problems and developments in countries in transition. The Recommendations include even a special paragraph on this matter. During the discussions the attention was also drawn on some specific problems, e.g. concerning the living circumstances of some categories of old people, in Southern Europe.

Questionnaire design

158. As far as concerns the elaboration of the questionnaire, it was agreed that the survey be implemented by means of an as large as possible common core and with integrated age-specific questionnaire sections. Some specific issues might be dealt with in special modules. In view of international comparison, several participants strongly insisted on the acceptance of the complete common core and, in case of the adoption of a particular module, the application of the complete module.

Sample and sampling technique

159. As was already said, there was a general agreement to include in the survey both women and men, and a broad range of age groups, including adolescents, persons of reproductive and working age and older persons.
160. With respect to the sampling technique there appeared to be quite some divergence but perhaps also some misunderstandings in views: some advocated the sampling of households and the interviewing of several household members; others preferred the sampling of individuals, and possibly also some of their kin (partner, ascendants and descendants), living in the same or different households. This first sampling method obviously does not exclude the collection of information on kin living in other households.
161. The idea to extend the sample to kin, at least the partner, but possibly also ascendants and descendants living in the same or in different households, was generally welcomed, although not all countries would be able to realise this goal. The Recommendations advocate to strive towards including partners in the data collection – to be interviewed simultaneously with the anchor person! – and suggest to organise a sub-sample on the basis of anchors extended with horizontal (siblings) and vertical kin (ascendants and descendants) from the same or different households.
162. Several participants raised the question whether the GGS would be conceived as a single survey or as part of a longitudinal set up. Some participants also suggested to make a panel with the former FFS by re-interviewing the FFS respondents.
163. In one of the background papers suggestions were made to include foreigners as well as autochthones in the survey. This matter was not extensively dealt with in the discussions and the Recommendations of the Meeting only mention in this context that selected population subgroups could be over-sampled.

Censuses, registers and other sources

164. It was generally agreed that the Generations and Gender Programme would, just as in the past, make extensive use of census and population register data either for substantive goals or for sampling purposes. The Recommendations of the Meeting include a brief section on these issues, but they needed apparently no extensive discussion.
165. Several participants drew attention on the need to identify and relate the GGS to other international surveys such as the ECHP and the PPA.

Contextual variables

166. Repeatedly it was stressed that the GGS should include contextual variables of different nature – social, economic, cultural, ecological, policy – in its analyses. This important matter, however, was not discussed in detail.

Discussion of the recommendations of the meeting

167. The closing meeting was chaired by J. Holzer and discussed the draft recommendations prepared by the general rapporteur.
168. The draft was substantially amended and resulted in the annexed '*Recommendations of the meeting*' which were finalised after the meeting by the general rapporteur, in consultation with the PAU.
169. During the discussions concerning the meeting recommendations the PAU provided information about the present state of funding of the GGP, which is only partly covered by ECE, UNFPA and NIA. Additional funding for the elaboration and the co-ordination of the project is needed. A proposal has been worked out by a Generations and Gender Consortium, consisting of PAU and several research institutes and statistical offices in Europe and has been submitted for funding to the horizontal programme 'Improving human research potential and the socio-economic knowledge base' of the Fifth Framework Programme of the European Commission.
170. The discussions on the recommendations of the meeting also dwelled on the future organisation of the GGP activities. It was agreed that an Informal Working Group (IWG) would be set up, consisting of the representatives of all institutions participating in the GGP and the co-ordinators of the Network for Integrated European Population Studies (NIEPS) and the second round of the Population Policy Acceptance Group (PPA). The PAU would form a small Co-ordination and Implementation Group (CIG) consisting of the members of the GGP Consortium and other scholars from different disciplines. In addition Small Expert Groups (SEG) could be formed or participating institutions could be asked to carry out work on specific topics that need specialised work.
171. The recommendations of the meeting not only include this organisational framework, but lists also the major tasks to be performed by these various groups.
172. Finally the meeting recommended that a first gathering of the Informal Working Group would already be organised in autumn of this year.

Comments of the general rapporteur on the discussions and recommendations

173. The Recommendations of the Meeting include a set of valuable suggestions for the further elaboration of the project, but are at the same time bristled with pitfalls. Many points still have to be clarified and fundamental choices regarding priorities and feasibility to be made.
174. The diversity in scientific and policy interests which so clearly appeared in the background papers as well as in the discussions during the meeting is a major problem which will have to be duly dealt with in the further elaboration of the GGP. This diversity forms a major cause of the salient vagueness of some of the

recommendations of the meeting. Some of the goals formulated by PAU will not be easy to reconcile.

175. The discussions only confirmed what appeared already from the background papers, namely that the fundamental goals of the project need to be more sharply defined. The *Recommendations of the Geneva Meeting* drop a hint in this respect by stating that “the Generations and Gender Programme should be focused on population ageing and family development, analysed against the broad social context”. The specificity of the project as regards content and policy relevance, co-ordinated by the UN/ECE/PAU and carried out by national population institutes or population divisions of national statistical offices, has to be clearly distinguished from other social scientific research projects.
176. The Recommendations explicitly state that the survey should be conceptualised in an intergenerational and gender perspective with well developed sections on (a) intergenerational relations and transfers and (b) gender relations and equity. Whereas the background papers and the meeting discussions dwelled quite extensively on the intergenerational relations (and transfers), few concrete suggestions were made on gender relations and equity. The fact that it is recommended that both men and women (and their partner) be included in the survey will already allow some analytical work on gender relations, but the survey could include specific gender-targeted issues which would considerably enrich the study of this issue in the GGP.
177. The age range that GGS wants to address is a formidable challenge, scientifically as well as operationally (and financially!). However, it is also an opportunity to move with the times and to explore new research directions. The same applies for the proposal to compose a sample or sub-sample of anchors and interview them about or interview directly horizontally and vertically extended kin.
178. One of the major challenges consists of the integration of the FFS approach (detailed biographies on relational and reproductive behaviour) with the goals concerning intergenerational relations and transfers.
179. Another ticklish matter concerns the balance to be found between the scientific ambitions (e.g. detailed biographies!) and the short- and long-term policy relevance of the project.
180. In view of the task identified by PAU of addressing social cohesion in the GGS, there is a striking lack of a systematic approach in most of the framework papers to sociability. Indicators of means, perception and confidence-satisfaction are standard variables in the current research of social cohesion. This issue did not receive sufficient attention in the Geneva discussions.
181. Research of social inclusion-exclusion has documented that a significant proportion of the population has experienced episodes of material and non-material deprivation. It may not be necessary or possible to record income history in the GGS but some questions on exposure to risks of deprivation in the past and/or

experience of deprivation (including in the parental home) is needed. This aspect should be further developed by the working group.

182. All background papers and many participants insisted rightly upon the inclusion and use of relevant contextual data in the analysis of the GGS. However, this matter has practically not been discussed in concrete terms. A special effort – and probably a special working group – will be required to deal with this difficult issue, particularly in an international comparative context. Usually, the elaboration of the survey instruments absorbs so much energy, that no time or money is left to deal with additional issues. If contextual data are to be used in the GGS, this issue should be incorporated in the planning of the project from the very beginning.
183. During the discussions it was rightly pointed out by some participants that a great deal of the ultimate success of the project depends on the willingness to adopt the common core as a whole. This applies obviously also to modules which should be completely applied in case they are chosen.
184. The recommendation that particular attention should be given to problems and developments of the countries in transition is noteworthy.
185. There exists apparently a diversity in views but also some confusion about the sampling technique to be chosen. This matter has urgently to be further discussed, clarified and decided upon.
186. In order to maximise the analytic exploitation of the GGS data and facilitate international comparability in this respect, the GGS requires a thorough methodological and statistical guidance throughout the whole exercise, on the model that accompanied the WFS. This applies more particularly for the advanced analysis of detailed biographies .
187. The GGP should be planned in such a way that it can, unlike the FFS, be continued until the end of the international comparative analysis.
188. The results of the FFS Flagship conference and the FFS experience in general should be duly taken into consideration during the further elaboration of the GGP.
189. Close consultation and co-operation is needed between the PPA-2, the NIEPS and the GGP in order to co-ordinate, and, if possible, to merge their initiatives. Unnecessary competition and double use should absolutely be avoided. The Recommendations of the Meeting include a modest hint in this respect.
190. It is also necessary to involve all of the national institutes that will be responsible for undertaking and analysing the survey, - a suggestion which is fortunately included in the recommendations of the meeting.

References

- Bozon, M., H. Léridon (eds.) (1993), *Sexualité et sciences sociales. Les apports d'une enquête. Population*, 48, 5: 1173-1550.
- CBGS (1997), *Gezinnen in Verandering. Een geïntegreerde survey over de levensloop van Vlaamse gezinnen*. Manuscript. Centrum voor Bevolkings- en Gezinsstudie (CBGS), Vlaamse Wetenschappelijke Instelling, Brussel.
- CBGS (1998), *Families in Transition*. Manuscript. Centrum voor Bevolkings- en Gezinsstudie, Vlaamse Wetenschappelijke Instelling, Brussel.
- Cliquet, R.L., F. Deven, M. Corijn, M. Callens & E. Lodewijckx (1992), *Conceptual and Analytical Framework of the 1991 Fertility and Family Survey in Flanders (NEGO V)*, C.B.G.S. Werkdocument 82. Brussel: Centrum voor Bevolkings- en Gezinsstudie (CBGS).
- Gallie, D., S. Paugam (2000), *Welfare Regimes and the Experience of Unemployment in Europe*. Oxford: University Press.
- Hagestad, G.O. (2000), *Intergenerational Relations*. Agder University College Norway, Northwestern University, Illinois. Conference on Generations and Gender: Research into Their Behaviour and Quality of Life. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Population Activities Unit, 3-5 July 2000, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Hill, M.S., Wei-Jun Jean Yeung (2000), *Behavior and Status of Children, Adolescents and Young Adults*. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. Conference on Generations and Gender: Research into Their Behaviour and Quality of Life. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Population Activities Unit, 3-5 July 2000, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Hoem, J., in collaboration with Arnstein Aassve, Gunnar Andersson, Pau Baizán, Francesco Billari, Henriette Engelhardt, Alexia Fürnkranz-Prskawetz, Karsten Hank, Johannes Huinink, Hans-Peter Kohler, Annette Kohlmann, Michaela Kreyenfeld, Gerda Neyer, and Andres Vikat. *The ECE/PAU Generations and Gender Programme: Concepts for a second round of Fertility and Family Surveys in Europe, with particular attention paid to persons of reproductive/working age*. Conference on Generations and Gender: Research into Their Behaviour and Quality of Life. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Population Activities Unit, 3-5 July 2000, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Laumann, E.O., J.H. Gagnon, R.T. Michael, S. Michaels (1994), *The Social Organization of Sexuality. Sexual Practices in the United States*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Legaré, J. (2000), *The Behaviour and Status of Older Persons. Living Conditions of Older Persons, Care Provision and Living Arrangements*. Generations and Gender: Research into their behaviour and quality of life. Palais des Nations, Geneva, Switzerland, 3-5 July 2000.
- Myers, G.C. (2000), *The Behaviour and Status of Older Persons*. Generations and Gender. Research into their Behavioural and Quality of Life. Palais des Nations, Geneva, Switzerland, 3-5 July 2000.
- NIDI (2000), *Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (NKPS)*'. The Hague: Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute.

- NIDI (2000), *'Family Relationships: Ties that Bind'*. The Hague: Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute.
- Schoenmaeckers, R., M. Callens (Red.) (1999), *Gezinsvorming in Brussel. Resultaten van de Fertility and Family Survey (FFS) in het Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest*. Centrum voor Bevolkings- en Gezinsstudie (CBGS), Vlaamse Wetenschappelijke Instelling. Leuven-Appeldoorn: Garant.

Appendix 1: Reports of the Section Rapporteurs

Report of Session 1: Behaviour and Status of Working/Reproductive Age Persons

Section Rapporteur: Lars Ostby

(Insert report Ostby)

Report of Session 2: Behaviour and Status of Children, Adolescents and Young Adults

Section Rapporteur: Kalev Katus

(Insert report Katus)

Report of Session 3: Behaviour and Status of Older Persons

Section Rapporteur: Jenny Gierveld

(Insert report of Gierveld)

Report of Session 4: Intergenerational Relations

Section Rapporteur: Antonio Golini

(Insert report Golini)

Appendix 2: Recommendations of the Meeting

General rapporteur: Robert Cliquet

(Insert Recommendations of the Meeting)