

**CODEBOOK**  
**of the**  
**FAMILIES OF POLES IN THE**  
**NETHERLANDS (FPN)**  
**survey**

**Wave 2**  
**Version 1, August 2018**

Kasia Karpinska and Pearl A. Dykstra

**Acknowledgment:**

We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the European Research Council, Advanced Investigator Grant “Families in Context” (grant agreement no. 324211).



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Contributors</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Overview of the Families of Poles in the Netherlands study</b> .....	<b>3</b>
2.1	Design of the survey.....	3
2.2	Access to the data .....	4
<b>3</b>	<b>Questionnaire</b> .....	<b>4</b>
3.1	Preloading .....	4
3.2	Content.....	5
3.3	Translation of the questionnaire and other materials .....	6
3.4	Programming of the questionnaire.....	6
<b>4</b>	<b>Fieldwork</b> .....	<b>6</b>
4.1	Privacy.....	7
<b>5</b>	<b>Fieldwork</b> .....	<b>8</b>
5.1	Interviewers .....	8
5.2	Data collection .....	8
5.3	Incentives .....	9
5.4	Communication with respondents and helpdesk.....	9
<b>6</b>	<b>Fieldwork outcomes</b> .....	<b>9</b>
6.1	Response rate .....	10
6.2	Non-response.....	12
6.3	Response rate compared to other migrant studies .....	13
6.4	Web & CAPI .....	13
6.5	Average duration .....	14
6.6	Language of the data collection.....	14
6.7	Representativeness of the sample.....	14
6.8	Weights .....	17
<b>7</b>	<b>Documentation of the data sample</b> .....	<b>18</b>
7.1	Variable names.....	18
7.2	Technicalities and complex routings .....	18
7.2.1	<i>Geographical location of network members</i> .....	18
7.2.2	<i>Questions about parents</i> .....	19
7.2.3	<i>Network delineation</i> .....	19
<b>8</b>	<b>Appendix 1 Questionnaire mutations Wave 2</b> .....	<b>21</b>

## **1 Contributors**

The second wave of the Families of Poles in the Netherlands data collection was a joint work of the Families in Context researchers. Prof. dr. Pearl A. Dykstra is the primary investigator of the “Families of Poles in the Netherlands” survey. Dr. Kasia Karpinska was responsible for the scientific and practical coordination of the data collection. The Families in Context team members—Tineke Fokkema, Nina Conkova, Brett Ory, Maja Djundeva, Tom Emery and Alzbeta Bartova offered valuable comments on the questionnaire for the second wave. Juliette van der Kamp, a student assistant, provided assistance with the variables’ names and labels, and helped prepare the data set for release.

## **2 Overview of the Families of Poles in the Netherlands study**

The Families of Poles in the Netherlands (FPN) survey is a database which enables the examination of different aspects of Polish migrant family life, including family formation, generational interdependencies, espoused family obligations and life outcomes. The FPN has a panel character – the second wave of the survey was conducted in 2018, three years after Wave 1 (Karpinska, Fokkema, Conkova and Dykstra, 2016). The questionnaire in Wave 2 focuses on the changes that have taken place in the lives of the respondents and their families since the first wave.

The second wave of the FPN survey was carried out by the Erasmus University Rotterdam and is a part of Pearl Dykstra’s ERC Advanced Investigator project “Families in Context”. Similarly to the first wave, the survey was executed in cooperation with Statistics Netherlands (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, CBS). The fieldwork was commissioned to GfK Panel Services Benelux, a company experienced in the management of large-scale data collection projects. The GfK project team consisted of Frans Louwen, Bas Verhagen and Peter van Eijk. The fieldwork was executed between March and mid-May 2018.

### **2.1 Design of the survey**

A mixed-mode design was used to collect the FPN data: Web survey and Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) were applied. Different modes were made available so that potential respondents could access the questionnaire in through the manner most convenient for them. The sequential mixed-mode design (starting with Web and introducing CAPI at later stages of data collection) was applied once again. Based on the experience of Wave 1, interviewers

predominantly served to convince respondents to participate in the study and not necessarily to conduct an interview (although it was also possible). Similarly to the first wave of the data collection, the second survey was conducted in either Polish or Dutch. Dutch speaking interviewers were employed to participate in face-to-face interviews. Only respondents who in agreed in Wave 1 to be contacted for a follow-up study, were approached for Wave 2.

## **2.2 Access to the data**

The data of the second wave of the FPN survey are freely accessible via the websites of Gender and Generations Programme (<http://www.ggp-i.org/>) and Data Archiving and Networked Services (DANS, <http://www.dans.knaw.nl/>). No one has any exclusive right or priority to use the FPN to work on any research question. Research reports using the FPN data must include the following reference to the FPN data:

Karpinska, K., & Dykstra, P.A.(2018). *Families of Poles in the Netherlands (FPN) survey. Wave 2* DANS. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17026/dans-xze-q5bh>

Researchers using FPN data must also include the following acknowledgment in their manuscripts:

“The research presented here is based on Wave 2 data from the Families of Poles in the Netherlands survey (FPN). Financial support for this survey comes from the ERC Advanced Investigator Grant “Families in Context” (ERC, 324211).”

## **3 Questionnaire**

### **3.1 Preloading**

We used preloading, i.e. information about the respondent’s situation at the time of the first interview was programmed in the Wave 2 questionnaire. Where appropriate, the respondent was asked whether Wave 1 information was still correct or whether changes had taken place since that time. This strategy limited the strain on the respondents and allowed gathering information on the mutations that appeared between the waves.

Family and social network members were identified by their first name, as provided by the respondents during Wave 1. The Family in Context team was responsible for testing the Wave 2 questionnaire and the correct use of the preloaded information.

### 3.2 Content

The questionnaire for Wave 2 of the FPN started with the screening block, to ensure that the right person (participant in Wave 1) was participating in the interview. This is especially important, given self-administered WEB interviews. Respondents who appeared not eligible for the survey (based on probing questions), would be screened out of the survey and their access code became inactive. There were no such cases.

The substantive part of the questionnaire was divided into the following sections:

- A: Background information on respondent
- B: Visits to Poland
- C: Partnerships
- D: Household composition and organisation
- E: Parents and parental home
- F: Network delineation and support
- G: Health and well-being
- H: Respondent's activity and income
- I: Partner's activity and income
- J: Life in the Netherlands
- K: Household possessions, income and transfers
- L: Value orientations and attitudes

A new, short block was added to the Wave 2 questionnaire. It was designed only for respondents who had left the Netherlands and inquired into the motives of respondent's move. Respondents who were no longer registered in the Netherlands or indicated in the screening block that they do not live in the Netherlands (despite their resident status in the population registers) were invited to answer the few questions in this block.

Similarly to the Wave 1 questionnaire, we purposely gave respondents limited opportunities to provide the answer 'don't know'. Open questions were used scarcely; this format was used only in questions about respondents' and their family members' occupation, and in questions on geographical locations of family members. Note that regardless of the mode of data collection, skipping questions was not allowed, resulting in virtually no missing values. The web survey also allowed respondents to fill in the questionnaire at their own pace, to take breaks and return to the designated question at the respondent's convenience. Although Wave

2 of the FPN is a repeated measure of Wave 1, not all questions that were asked in Wave 1, were repeated in the Wave 2. Appendix 1 presents a comparison of the questions as posed in Wave 1 and Wave 2.

For the questionnaire and documentation, including show cards used during the CAPI interviews, please refer to the separate files that accompany the dataset.

### **3.3 Translation of the questionnaire and other materials**

The questionnaire for Wave 2 is largely derived from the Wave 1 questionnaire that was translated into Polish and Dutch for programming in the Web and CAPI software. Only mutations in the questionnaire (e.g., questions that inquired whether the information remained unchanged between the waves) were translated. The translation was performed by the coordinator of the FPN survey (a native speaker of Polish).

Letters to respondents and other correspondence were developed by GfK in Dutch in consultation with the coordinator, who also translated the documents into Polish.

### **3.4 Programming of the questionnaire**

GfK programmed the questionnaire. CAPI was highly suitable for data collection as it facilitates complex routings and loops that are part of the questionnaire. Also, it allows additional instructions to be included that are visible for both participants and interviewers. Despite different modes of data collection, the questionnaire that was employed was the same.

To overcome potential language problems, Polish and Dutch versions of the questionnaire were available at each computer that was used in the data collection. Also, an online version of the questionnaire was available in both languages.

## **4 Fieldwork**

SampleStatistics Netherlands updated the sample information. The preliminary check-up was executed in the autumn of 2017 to estimate the number of the Wave 1 respondents still residing in the Netherlands. The proximity of the country of origin and a high rate of return migration that characterise Polish migrants (Gijsberts, Andriessen, Nicolas and might lead to departure from the Netherlands, questioning a rationale of the follow-up study. At the beginning of October 2017, Wave 1 participants (N=1,131) were checked in the records of the so-called

Basic Registration Persons (BRP, the Dutch population registers) to determine Dutch residency status. N=3 respondents were no longer found in the BRP, N=125 respondents were no longer registered in the BRP (as a result of emigration). A total of N=1,003 respondents were still registered in the BRP and lived in the Netherlands at the time of this update. Out of this subsample, N= 994 had agreed in Wave 1 to be contacted for a follow-up survey.

In January 2018 information on those N= 994 respondents was again updated by Statistics Netherlands. Also, the most recent addresses were retrieved from the population registers. An additional N=122 potential respondents had left the Netherlands between the two updates, N=6 were institutionalized, and N=2 passed away. Contact information of N=23 respondents in the main sample and N=5 in the sample of those who left the country was not correct. While for the latter group no other ways of contact were available, the respondents still residing in the Netherlands received a letter inviting them to participate in the study (rather than an e-mail). The total sample that was approached in the Wave 2 consisted of N=864 of individuals who lived in the Netherlands (those respondents were invited to fill in the main part of the survey), and N=117 for the shorter survey inquiring into the motives of leaving the Netherlands.

#### **4.1 Privacy**

The data collection of the FPN survey followed the guidelines for privacy protection that are specified in the Code on Research and Statistics to which the GfK research agency adheres.<sup>1</sup> This privacy code stipulates that the data will be collected using pre-structured answer formats that serve as the basis of the data in the database. The database does not contain any personally identifying information, and respondents are assigned a unique code number that cannot be traced to an existing person. The sample members were informed that their privacy would be fully respected and that the information collected would not be used for any purposes other than scientific research.

As noted earlier, the names and addresses of the sample members were obtained from the population register. During the period of data collection only the GfK fieldwork coordinator and the team members directly involved in the data collection had access to the names and addresses of sample members. After the fieldwork, the names and addresses of all sample members were destroyed. Following privacy guidelines, the EUR team members did

---

<sup>1</sup> The Code on Research and Statistics is available at: <http://www.beleidsonderzoek.nl/uploads/documents/32.pdf>

not have access to either the sample or to the personal details of sample members. A public release file with anonymized data will be accessible to researchers affiliated with academic and (semi-) government organisations.

## **5 Fieldwork**

### **5.1 Interviewers**

Given the complexity of the survey and a difficult-to-reach population, selection of skilled interviewers was critical. Interviewers who conducted Wave 1 of the survey were again contracted to conduct the fieldwork for Wave 2. During the first wave of the data collection they gained the necessary experience to reach and convince potential respondents to participate in the study. In total 31 interviewers were hired, 7 of whom had participated in the fieldwork for Wave 1. This time only Dutch speaking interviewers were contracted. The strategy during the face-to-face stage of the fieldwork was to reach potential respondents and to convince them to participate online, not to conduct an interview. This strategy proved successful in Wave 1 and it did not require hiring Polish speaking interviewers.

### **5.2 Data collection**

The fieldwork started in March 2018 and lasted until mid-May 2018. The data collection procedure consisted of the following steps. First, an introductory email (in Polish and Dutch) was sent to all sample members who had participated in the first wave of the survey and had agreed to participate in a follow up study. The email was sent in December 2017 and it announced the start of the follow-up survey. In March 2018 an invitation (e-mail) was sent to all respondents eligible to participate in the Wave 2 and it contained an invitation to participate in the Web survey, the survey link and a personalized password to the questionnaire. The respondents were also informed that they could choose between Dutch and Polish when filling in the survey. For all emails, please see the Documentation file.

A week after sending the invitation email, reminders were sent to sample members who had not yet participated in the survey. In one more week, those who had not yet filled in the survey were approached again by means of another email.

Two weeks later another strategy was implemented: an interviewer was sent to the home address to personally invite the respondent to participate via the web or to make an appointment for a face-to-face interview. Call-me-back-cards with a request to contact the



interviewer for an appointment were deposited in the mailboxes of respondents who could not be reached. Interviewers were required to make at least 3 contact attempts to reach the sample members. On average, this target was met. For an example of a call-me-back card and a contact form to be filled in by the interviewer, see the Documentation file.

### **5.3 Incentives**

Each participant was awarded a gift worth 20 Euro as a token of appreciation. The respondents who participated via Web were asked to leave their account number and the reward was transferred to their bank account. The respondents were ensured that their account details would be exclusively used for the particular payment and would not be stored after the payment had been made. Participants who participated via CAPI, were offered VVV gift cards, also worth 20 Euro. The cards can be redeemed at a majority of retail locations in the Netherlands. Interviewers gave the gift cards to participants after the face-to-face interviews were finished. Respondents who participated in the Web survey received their rewards in batches. Once a month bank transfers were made to respondents who had completed the interview during that month. In the final stage of the fieldwork the reward was increased to 40 Euro.

### **5.4 Communication with respondents and helpdesk**

GfK opened the helpdesk to answer potential respondents' questions. The helpdesk could be reached via a toll-free number (open during working hours) or email. In total, only 10 respondents contacted the helpdesk. The majority of questions referred to technicalities in the questionnaire or were requests for a new access code after respondents had made mistakes while answering the screening questions.

## **6 Fieldwork outcomes**

In total N= 566 respondents participated in the main survey and N=9 in the shorter survey addressed to those who left the Netherlands. Given the low response on the returner survey, we do not report the details. Table 6.1 gives a short description of the main sample. The descriptive statistics of the entire dataset can be found in Appendix 1.

**Table 6.1.** FPN sample description

	Mean / %
Male	36.6
Age (range 25-61)	37.2
Education (ISCED)	
Primary	3.5
Lower secondary	15.9
Upper secondary	42.0
Postsecondary, non-tertiary	7.4
Tertiary	31.1
Employment	
Employed	77.3
Unemployed	6.4
Other	16.2
Partnership status	
No partner	12.5
Married	43.6
Registered partnership/legal contract	6.0
Cohabiting, without a legal contract	31.3
LAT	6.8
Partner lives in the Netherlands	92.7

One third of all respondents were male and on average, the respondents were 37 years old. The majority of respondents (approximately 59%) completed secondary education, 38.5% were highly educated, while the remaining 3.5% of respondents in Wave 2 completed primary education. 77% of respondents were employed and approximately 6% indicated to be unemployed. The remaining 16 are declared other status (parental or maternity leave, students or disabled). The majority of respondents have a partner (12.5% is single) and in most cases those partners live in the Netherlands. Among those with partners, married couples are the most prevalent – almost 44% of respondents were married, followed by cohabiting respondents (31%). Registered partnerships and respondents in LAT relationships are least frequent in the Wave 2 data.

### 6.1 Response rate

Table 6.2 provides information on both the response and retention rate for the main study (e.g., not the study on return migration). Overall as well as cooperation rates are shown. The overall rate is a function of the likelihood of being contacted (contact rate) and the likelihood of agreeing to be interviewed given that one has been contacted (cooperation rate). The response rate is the percentage that completed the Wave 2 interview, of those who were eligible to do so. ‘Eligible’ respondents (a) gave permission after Wave 1 to be re-contacted, (b) had not left

the Netherlands (78 percent of 1,131 respondents) and (c) were still alive and not institutionalised when fieldwork started. Of the eligible respondents, 4.2% were not contacted (not reached), and 28.5% refused to be participate, resulting in an overall response of 67.3%.

The retention rate is the percentage of all Wave 1 respondents who completed the Wave 2 interview. The overall retention rate is 50%. The attrition consists of 14.5 % noncontacts (not reached) and 10% refusals.

**Table 6.2.** Response and retention rate FPN study, Wave 2.

		Response rate <sup>(b)</sup>	Retention rate <sup>(c)</sup>
	Counts	%	%
Interview	566	65.4	50.0
Refusal			25.0
Wave 2	87	10.0	
No consent after Wave 1	9		
Noncontact			
No longer registered in BRP	247		21.8
No contact	125		11.0
Address not correct	28		2.4
Other <sup>(a)</sup>	32		1.9
Incomplete	27	3.1	
Screen out	10	1.1	
Total	1131	100	100
		(N=865)	

<sup>a</sup> The category ‘other’ includes deceased, institutionalized respondents and those whose contact information was not available.

<sup>b</sup> Response rates are only calculated for respondents who were still part of the sample when Wave 2 interviews commenced.

<sup>c</sup> Retention rates are calculated for all respondents from Wave 1

A number of respondents who did not agreed to be re-contacted was higher than showed in Table 6.2(N=137). There was an overlap between the no-contact and those who were no longer registered in population registers and therefore the total number given in table 6.2 refers only to those who were still registered in the population registers and decline permission to be re-contacted.

## 6.2 Non-response

Table 6.3 present the results of analyses of the non-response. Men were more likely not to respond in Wave 2 compared to women. There is no clear educational gradient in the non-response: only individuals with lower secondary education differed significantly from higher educated (reference category) and were less likely to participate in the follow up study. Neither age nor employment status were related to the non-response in the wave 2 study. Likelihood of non-response was lower for married, cohabiting and individuals in LAT relationships as compared to singles. Those who intended to stay in the Netherlands up to a year, were more likely not to participate in the Wave 2 study as compared to those who intended to stay in the Netherlands indefinitely. Please note however, that due to privacy considerations, we do not have information on those who had left the country. It is possible that these who intended to leave the Netherlands in Wave 1 actually did so and were not re-contacted for the follow up study. None of the variables measuring subjective physical and mental well-being was associated with non-response at Wave 2.

**Table 6.3.** Odds ratios from binary logistic regression predicting reasons of non-response (reference category is successful interview) (N=1,129)

	Odds Ratio	z-statistics
Male	1.31*	-2.00
Age category ( <i>ref.</i> <25)		
25-35	0.75	-1.35
>35	0.70	-1.60
Educational level ( <i>ref.</i> tertiary)		
Primary	1.11	0.29
Lower secondary	1.99***	3.85
Upper secondary	1.17	1.10
Employment status ( <i>ref.</i> employed)		
Unemployed	1.30	1.06
Other	1.07	0.41
Partner status ( <i>ref.</i> single)		
Married	0.64*	-2.28
Registered partnership	0.76	-0.99
Cohabiting	0.58**	-2.62
LAT	0.43**	-2.98

Intention to stay in the Netherlands ( <i>ref. forever</i> )		
Up to 1 year	9.98***	3.68
2-5 years	1.14	0.93
Self-rated happiness ( <i>ref. not happy</i> )	1.23	1.25
Satisfaction with life in NL	0.95	-1.17
Healthy ( <i>ref. not healthy</i> )	0.78	-1.36

---

### 6.3 Response rate compared to other migrant studies

The achieved response rate is comparable to or exceeds the response rate achieved for other longitudinal studies of Polish migrants in the Netherlands using population registers (i.e. *Gemeente Basis Administratie* (GBA), a predecessor of BRP) as a sampling frame. In the second wave of the ‘Socio-Cultural Integration Processes among new immigrants in Europe’ (SCIP) survey a response rate of 69 percent was achieved. The data collection for the SCIP survey was based exclusively on face-to-face interviews. Its first wave was executed in 2010 and included, among others, information on recent Polish migrants, aged 18-60. Migrants were interviewed within one and a half year after their registration in population registers and again after another year and a half, in 2012. While the FPN used simple random sampling (all population members have the same probability of being selected into the sample), the SCIP survey used stratified sampling—sample members lived in municipalities with at least 25 registered migrants. A 10 euro gift voucher was offered as an incentive.

The second wave of NIS2NL (New Immigrant Survey Netherlands) was conducted in 2015 and obtained a response rate of 55% for the Polish sample. The survey again used CAWI and paper and pencil modes of data collection. Analogous to earlier studies, a gift voucher worth 10 Euro was offered as a token of appreciation.

### 6.4 Web & CAPI

The FPN data were collected using a mixed-mode design. Similarly to Wave 1, respondents were at liberty to choose the most convenient mode of answering questions. As noted earlier, based on previous experiences, the main task of interviewers was to track respondents who had not yet participated in the study, and convince them to participate in the study online. Needless to say, respondents could make an appointment for a CAPI interview if they wished to. In total, N=566 respondents participated in the study, the vast majority (approximately 82%) filled in

the WEB version of the survey. The remaining 18% interviews were conducted by interviewers during a CAPI interview.

### **6.5 Average duration**

Unfortunately, it is not possible to measure the exact duration of the interview—due to technical problems the duration was not recorded properly in the Web interviews and the software in the CAPI form did not allow measuring the duration. This information is thus missing in the dataset. Based on the information gathered from interviewers who conducted interviews, it took approximately 60 minutes to fill in the CAPI interview. The Web interviews are likely to have taken less time. This is, however, an approximation.

### **6.6 Language of the data collection**

At the beginning of their interview (both Web and CAPI) respondents could choose the language in which they wished to answer the questions. Almost 90 percent of the questionnaires were filled in in Polish, compared to 80% in the Wave 1. The difference is most likely related to a predominant mode of data collection – most respondents chose to fill in the survey via Web, where it was easier to use Polish and at the same time, not necessary to use potential Dutch language skills to communicate with a Dutch speaking interviewer conducting the CAPI interview.

### **6.7 Representativeness of the sample**

A high degree of representativeness is a prerequisite for generalizing the findings to the target population. In order to make meaningful inferences, the characteristics of the sample should closely reflect the characteristics of the research population. Using the population registers and applying chi-square statistics, Statistics Netherlands compared the sample realized in Wave 2 to the population of Polish migrants in the age category 18-59. Both groups were compared with respect to the following characteristics: age, sex, household composition, personal income, socioeconomic status, nationality, region of the country, degree of urbanization, and length of stay in the Netherlands (e.g. time since official registration). Below we present the distribution of the main characteristics of the research population and the realized sample, and the ratio of the two.

The distribution by sex (Table 6.5) differs from the population proportions. Men in our sample are under-represented by around 8 percentage points. This is similar to the Wave 1 distribution.

**Table 6.4.** Distribution by sex for the population and the realized sample

	Realized sample	Population	RS/population
Gender	%	%	%
Men	36.7	48.7	0.8
Women	63.2	51.2	1.2

Table 6.5 depicts the age distribution of the realized sample in comparison to the population of Polish migrants registered in the Netherlands, for males and females. The table shows that the age patterns of non-response differ by sex by are not dependent on age—men are under-represented in all age categories, women are over-represented in all age categories.

**Table 6.5.** Distribution by age for the population and the realized sample, for men and women

Age	Man			Woman		
	Realized sample	Population	RS/population	Realized sample	Population	RS/population
	%	%	%	%	%	%
18-25	10.1	14.0	0.7	24.0	21.4	1.1
26-30	13.6	15.2	0.9	22.0	14.2	1.5
>31	13.0	19.5	0.7	17.4	15.6	1.1

Table 6.6 shows the representativeness in terms of household composition. Married with and without children, cohabiting with children and single parents are over-represented in our sample. One-person-households are under-represented.

**Table 6.6.** Distribution by household composition for the population and the realized sample

	Realized sample	Population	RS/population
Household composition	%	%	%
Living alone	23.1	36.7	0.6
Cohabiting, no children	19.5	19.5	1.0
Married, no children	12.0	8.3	1.4
Cohabiting, with children	13.2	11.2	1.2
Married, with children	27.0	19.4	1.4
Single parent	5.2	4.9	1.1

In our analysis we also looked at the respondents' region of residence and its level of urbanization (Tables 6.7 and 6.8 respectively). When looking at the distribution by region, it becomes clear that there is an under-representation of respondents in the southern regions of the Netherlands and over-representation in northern and eastern regions. West region is covered in accordance with the population proportions. The same holds for two out of the three biggest cities in the Netherlands: The Hague and Rotterdam. Respondents from Amsterdam are under-represented. Yet, when looking at the level of urbanization of the region of residence, there is an overrepresentation of respondents in rural places, while respondents living in (highly) urban locations are represented in accordance with the population registers.

**Table 6.7.** Distribution by region of residence in the Netherlands, for the population and the realized sample

Region	Realized sample	Population	RS/population
	%	%	%
North	3.3	2.7	1.2
East	14.3	11.9	1.2
West, excluding big cities	36.7	37.3	1.0
South	27.6	30.0	0.9
Big cities			
Amsterdam	2.6	3.1	0.8
The Hague	9.6	9.3	1.0
Rotterdam	5.9	5.8	1.0

**Table 6.8.** Distribution by level of urbanization of the region of residence for the population and the realized sample

Urbanization	Realized sample	Population	RS/population
	%	%	%
(1) Highly urban	28.2	28.6	1.0
(2)	22.6	21.6	1.0
(3)	19.8	22.1	0.9
(4)	22.1	18.8	1.2
(5) Highly rural	7.3	8.9	0.9

Finally, the realized sample was compared with the research population with respect to the length of stay in the Netherlands (e.g. the time since the official registration, Table 6.9). The numbers show that longer-term residents are over-represented in our survey.



**Table 6.9.** Distribution by length of stay in the Netherlands for the population and the realized sample

	Realized sample	Population	RS/population
Length of stay	%	%	%
<= 7 months	7.3	11.1	0.7
7-14 months	6.3	10.7	0.6
14-22 months	7.5	9.6	0.8
22-30 months	13.4	9.8	1.3
30-38 months	10.5	9.1	1.2
38-49 months	9.2	10.0	0.9
49-62 months	12.0	10.0	1.2
62-76 months	10.8	9.8	1.1
76-95 months	11.6	9.7	1.2
>=95 months	11.9	10.2	1.2

## 6.8 Weights

After the data were compared to the population statistics, a weight variable was constructed (WEIGHT). Statistics Netherlands compared the sample to the population with respect to the following auxiliary variables: sex, age (3 categories, two youngest categories were combined), time since registration in population registers (10 categories), household type (6 categories), personal income (8 categories), socioeconomic status (6 categories), nationality (2 categories), region of residence (7 categories), and urbanization level (5 categories).

The selection of auxiliary variables and combining them into a weighting model was done in two steps. First, response probabilities were modeled using the set of the auxiliary variables. In this model only significant auxiliary variables were included. This model then was used to weight the response data. In the second step, the earlier-non-significant auxiliary variables were again used in the weighting model, this time using previously weighted data. The procedure was repeated until the marginal distributions of each auxiliary variable were equal to those in the population. The resulting weight factor is a so-called analytical weight, meaning that the total sample size is unchanged (i.e. not inflated to population size).

## **7 Documentation of the data sample**

### **7.1 Variable names**

For the second wave, the same name giving scheme as in Wave 1 was used. The variable names were coded according to the same key as was used in Wave 1. Each variable was coded according to the following key:

- First letter (b) denotes the second wave of FPN data.
- Second letter (a thru m) identifies the block where the question was placed in the questionnaire (for details see section 3.1).
- The number is the number of the question in the questionnaire. Due to the large number of network questions, underscores and a number were used to identify different persons in the questionnaire.

Due to changes in the questionnaires between Wave 1 and Wave 2, however, some changes needed to be made with respect to the assignment of the question number in the questionnaires. We decided that if a question in Wave 2 is identical or almost identical to a question in Wave 1, the variable name of the question in Wave 2 is assigned the same question number as in Wave 1. If we asked confirmation of the information presented in Wave 1 (e.g., employment status, aa105) the variable name in Wave 2 had the same variable name as in wave 1 and the first letter denoted different wave of the data collection (ba105). Upon the contradictory answer, respondents were asked to indicate what had changed (and thus the original question was asked again). In such a situation, a new variable was constructed and it was labeled with the original variable name and an added “\_1” (denoting the question was asked in Wave 2; ba105\_1, following the example).

All variable labels are created following the original questions and are self-explanatory in their nature.

### **7.2 Technicalities and complex routings**

#### ***7.2.1 Geographical location of network members***

Respondents reported on the geographic location (e.g. country and place of residence) of network member who were not named in Wave 1. In the questionnaire, only the most common European countries were listed in a drop-down menu, which was followed by an open question

allowing other answers to be included. The first two entries in the list were ‘Poland’ and ‘The Netherlands’ (as we anticipated that those are the most common answers), followed by names of other countries. These are included in alphabetical order, according to their English names. For network members living in Poland, information on the province and city of residence was also collected. This information was not recoded, and the names of cities are presented in alphabetical order, according to their Polish names. For information on geographic location of respondents in the Netherlands, see section 7.3.

### **7.2.2 *Questions about parents***

Block E (Parents and parental home) included many questions on the circumstances of parents. To limit repetitions and lower respondent’s strain, a number of routings were introduced. The routing was identical as in Wave 1. When respondents indicated that both parents were alive and lived together, questions on the geographical location and living situation were asked for both parents simultaneously in one question. However, if respondent indicated that both parents were alive but not living together, these questions were asked separately for mother and father. If only one parent was alive, respondents were directed to questions pertaining to the living parent. In Wave 2, we only asked about the mutation in the situation of the parents and the same structure of the questions was used.

### **7.2.3 *Network delineation***

To make the name generation suitable for a self-administrated Web survey and given the limits of programming loops, we made use of the preloading of the information that was collected in Wave 1. We offered a drop-down menu including all names that were mentioned by the respondent in the previous survey (i.e. names of partners, children and parents, support networks) and inquired whether those people provided or received support from the respondents in the 12 months preceding the Wave 2 survey. The respondent could mark all appropriate names. Once the selection of previously named support providers and receivers was completed, the respondent was asked whether any other people provided to or received support from respondent. Upon a confirmatory answer, the respondent was directed to an open question, where he/ she could add up to two new names. This procedure was repeated for all support questions in block F. In each subsequent question following the opening question of block F, the names that appeared in the drop-down list were updated with the previously added

new names, so the new network members could be selected in the following support question (rather than being named again). After all support questions were completed, the loop with background questions was activated only for new names (e.g., not the names that were mentioned in Wave 1 or the earlier parts of the questionnaire).

## 8 Appendix 1 Questionnaire mutations Wave 2.

Question number Wave 1	New question asked Wave 2.	Mutation	Comments
	0.00	Added	Preferred language to complete the survey
0.01a			
0.01b			
0.01c			
0.02			
0.03			
0.04			
	0.05	Added	Interviewed last time?
	0.06	Added	Are you [R]
	0.07	Added	Birth date control
	0.08	Added	Birth place control
	0.09	Added	Still lives in the Netherlands
1.01		X	
1.02		X	
1.03		X	
1.04			
1.05			
1.06			
1.07			
2.01		X	
2.02		X	
2.03		X	
2.04		X	
2.05		X	
2.06		X	
2.07		X	
2.08		X	
2.09		X	
2.10		X	
2.11			
2.12			
3.01			
3.02a			
3.02b			
3.03			
3.04a			
3.04b			
3.04c			
3.04d			
3.05			

3.06			
3.07			
3.08			
3.09			
3.10a			
3.10b			
3.11			
3.12			
3.13			
3.14			
3.15			
3.16			
3.17			
3.18			
3.19			
3.20			
3.21			
3.22		X	
3.23		X	
3.24		X	
3.25		X	
3.26		X	
3.27		X	
3.28		X	
3.29		X	
3.30		X	
3.31		X	
3.32		X	
3.33		x	
3.34		X	
3.35		X	
3.36a		X	
3.36b		X	
3.37a			
3.37b			
3.38			
3.39			
3.40			
3.41			
3.42			
3.43			
3.44			

3.45			
3.46			
3.47			
3.48		X	
3.49		X	
3.50		X	
3.51		X	
4.01a			
4.01b			
4.02			
4.03			
4.04			
4.05			
4.06			
4.07			
4.08			
4.09		X	
4.10a			
4.10b			
4.10c			
4.11			
4.12			
4.13			
4.14			
4.15			
5.01			
5.02		X	
5.03a		X	
5.03b		X	
5.04		X	
5.05a		X	
5.05b		X	
5.06		X	
5.07a			
5.07b			
5.08			
5.09			
5.10			
5.11		X	
5.12			
5.13			
5.14			
5.15			
5.16			
5.17			

5.18			
5.19			
5.20			
5.21			
5.22			
5.23			
5.24		X	
5.25		X	
6.01a			
6.01b			
6.01c			
6.02a			
6.02b			
6.02c			
6.03			
6.04a			
6.04b			
6.04c			
6.05			
6.06			
6.07a			
6.07b			
6.07c			
6.08			
6.09			
6.10a			
6.10b			
6.10c			
6.11			
6.12			
6.13			
6.14a			
6.14b			
6.14c			
6.15			
6.16			
6.17			
6.18a			
6.18b			
6.18c			
6.19			
6.20			
6.21a			
6.21b			
6.21c			



6.22			
6.23a			
6.23b			
6.23c			
6.24			
6.25a			
6.25b			
6.25c			
6.26			
6.27			
6.28			
6.29			
6.30a			
6.30b			
6.30c			
6.31			
6.32			
6.33			
6.34			
6.35			
	6.101	Added	Brothers and sisters moved since the last survey?
	6.102	Added	Where do brothers and sisters live now?
7.01			
7.02			
7.03			
8.01		X	
8.02		X	
8.03			
8.04			
8.05		X	
8.06a		X	
8.06b		X	
8.07		X	
8.08		X	
8.09		X	
8.10		X	
8.11a		X	
8.11b		X	
8.12a			
8.12b			
8.13			
8.14			
8.15			
8.16		X	
8.17			

8.18			
8.19			
8.20			
8.21			
8.22			
8.23			
8.24			
8.25			
8.26			
8.27			
9.01		X	
9.02		X	
9.03a			
9.03b			
9.04			
9.05			
9.06			
9.07			
10.01			
10.02			
10.03a			
10.03b			
10.04			
10.05		X	
10.06			
10.07			
10.08			
11.01			
11.02		X	
11.03		X	
11.04			
12.01		X	
12.02			
12.03		X	
12.04		X	
12.05		X	
12.06			
12.07			
12.08			
12.09			
12.10			
12.11		X	
12.12		X	

	13.01	Added	Where does R live now?
	13.02	Added	What year left the Netherlands?
	13.03	Added	Reason to move out of the Netherlands?
	13.04	Added	End of the survey