

# Part One Survey Outline

## Chapter 1 Research Design Outline

### 1. Purpose of the Survey

To conduct an international comparative research on home education in order to clarify characteristics and to identify issues of home education in contemporary Japan through studies of such factors as changes in the home and the family, the actual conditions of home education, and parents' awareness in Japan and other countries. The term "home education" in this research study refers to the education given to children by parents and other adults in the home.

In 1994, the foundation of Japan Association for Women's Education (presently Japanese Women's Study foundation) conducted survey research of the same title, "International Comparative Research on Home Education", requested by the (former) Ministry of Education. This time, we have greatly reconsidered and improved the survey options based on the previous survey results as well as switched one survey subject country (U.K.→France).

For putting this report together, the Japanese Women's Study foundation has given a willing consent on our quoting the survey result from "Survey in 1994".

### 2. Target Survey Subject Countries and Individuals

#### (1) Survey Subject Countries

Japan, Republic of Korea (ROK), Thailand, U.S.A., France, and Sweden

#### (2) Survey Subject Individuals

Parents (or equivalent) living with children between the ages of 0 and 12 (regardless of gender and/or legal marital status; count as one subject respondent per household).

For the household with two or more children, we asked parents about the child whose birthday was closer to the day of the survey, and for twins, the one who was born first.

### 3. Survey Methods

#### (1) Sample Size and Sampling Methods

The principle for sample size was to collect 1,000 sample subjects from each country. The methods of selecting subject respondents and the results by the survey organizations that conducted the surveys in each country were as followings.

Table I-1-1 Sampling Meods and Results

Name of Country	Method of sampling	Number of location	No. of sample collected (response rate)
Japan	Stratified double stage sampling from Basic Electoral Register Randam sampling(region×cityscale)	100 locations nationwide	1,013 (69.9%)
Korea	Quota sampling (region × city scale)	124 locations nationwide	1,009
Thailand	Quota sampling (region × city scale)	128 locations nationwide	1,000
USA	Quota sampling (region × city scale)	100 locations nationwide	1,000
France	Quota sampling (region × city scale)	100 locations nationwide	1,001
Sweden	Quota sampling (region)	80 locations nationwide	1,026

**(2) Language used and translation**

The languages used for survey questionnaire were: Japanese in Japan, Korean in ROK, Thai in Thailand, English in U.S.A., French in France, Swedish in Sweden.

For translating the survey questionnaires into each country's language, initially the Japanese questionnaires were translated into English, and then English questionnaires were translated into each country's languages. Finally, necessary adjustments were made on respective questionnaires of each country and Japanese questionnaires. The final adjustments and translations to each language were done through cooperation of the survey research committee, the survey commission agents, and the local survey organizations.

### (3) Duration of Survey and Survey Method

Table I-1-2 Durations of Survey and Survey Methods

Name of country	Duration of Survey	Survey method
Japan	March 17 - April 3, 2005	Individual home visit interviews by researcher
Korea	June 8 - June 27, 2005	Individual home visit interviews by researcher
Thailand	June 8 - June 27, 2005 (Additional survey: Jan.14 - 31, 2006)	Individual home visit interviews by researcher
USA	April 25 - June 8, 2005	Individual home visit interviews by researcher
France	May 31 - June 20, 2005 (Additional survey: Aug.12 - 26, 2005)	Individual home visit interviews by researcher
Sweden	April 26 - June 1, 2005	Individual home visit interviews by researcher

For Thailand, there was an additional survey conducted, since the number of sample subjects of “male” and “rural” were greatly shorter than expected and those of “Female” and “Urban” exceeded greatly than expected during the first survey. In this case, according to the regional population proportions from the census, the lacking number of sample subjects were compensated by the additional survey and the exceeding number of sample subjects were removed.

The additional survey was conducted as well for France, since there was an outstanding bias with regard to “children’s age” during the first survey. In that case, we have replaced 91 responses based on the age component of Census.

### (4) Survey Commission Organization

The actual survey and data collection were commissioned to the New Information Center (Co.). In Japan, each member of the committee attended some part of the individual home visit interview. For the countries other than Japan, we have visited each survey organization and had hearings on the situation of survey implementation with the persons in charge.

Japan	New Information Center (Co.)
Korea	Gallup Korea
Thailand	AC Nielsen, Thailand
USA	Kane, Parson & Associates, Inc.
France	Synovate in France
Sweden	International Market Research Institute AB

#### 4. Survey Research Committee

##### [Members of Project Committee]

Chairperson:

Katsuko Makino (Professor emeritus, Ochanomizu University)

Committee members:

Hideki Watanabe (Professor, Keio University)

Keiko Funabashi (Professor, Shizuoka University)

Sae Etoh (Lecturer, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies)

Nami Otsuki (Assistant Professor, University of the Sacred Heart Tokyo and  
Visiting Researcher, National Women's Education Center, Japan)

Takashi Fujimoto (Visiting Researcher, National Women's  
Education Center, Japan)

Kazufumi Sakai (Visiting Researcher, National Women's  
Education Center, Japan)

Hiroe Nakano (Director, Office of Research and International  
Affairs, National Women's Education Center,  
Japan)

##### [Secretariat]

Hiroe Nakano (Director, Office of Research and International Affairs, National  
Women's Education Center, Japan)

Keiko Okamoto (Research Assistant, Office of Research and International Affairs,  
National Women's Education Center, Japan)

## 5. Composition of the survey subjects

### (1) Gender of the parents

Table I-1-3 Profile of parents according to gender

	Total (n)	Father		Mother	
		Number	%	Number	%
Japan	(1,013)	(438)	43.2	(575)	56.8
Korea	(1,009)	(506)	50.1	(503)	49.9
Thailand	(1,000)	(495)	49.5	(505)	50.5
USA	(1,000)	(478)	47.8	(522)	52.2
France	(1,001)	(466)	46.6	(535)	53.4
Sweden	(1,026)	(423)	41.2	(603)	58.8

### (2) Gender of the children

Table I-1-4 Profile of children according to gender

	Total (n)	Boys		Girls	
		Number	%	Number	%
Japan	(1,013)	(514)	50.7	(499)	49.3
Korea	(1,009)	(543)	53.8	(466)	46.2
Thailand	(1,000)	(480)	48.0	(520)	52.0
USA	(1,000)	(533)	53.3	(467)	46.7
France	(1,001)	(522)	52.1	(479)	47.9
Sweden	(1,026)	(537)	52.3	(489)	47.7

### (3) According to the regions

Table I-1-5 Sample Compositions

#### Japan

	(N/n)	Hokkaido / Tohoku	Kantou	Chubu	Kinki	Chugoku / Shikoku	Kyushu
Population Group	(15,268,894)	11.8	30.9	19.2	16.6	9.2	12.3
Effective Sample	(1,013)	11.5	29.0	19.4	17.0	9.6	13.4

	(N/n)	14 Major Cities	Cities >100K population	Cities <100K population	Suburban / Rural
Population Group	(15,268,894)	21.0	39.5	20.2	19.3
Effective Sample	(1,013)	19.9	39.5	20.7	19.8

#### Korea

	(N/n)	Seoul	Busan	Daegu	Incheon	Gwanju	Daejeon	Ulsan
Population Group	(9,345,157)	18.8	6.6	5.3	5.7	3.3	3.2	2.6
Effective Sample	(1,009)	18.9	6.5	5.4	5.8	3.3	3.2	2.5
	Gyeonggi	Gangwon	Chungbuk	Chungnam	Jeonbuk	Jeonnam	Gyeongbuk	Gyeongnam
	24.7	3.0	3.1	3.9	3.9	3.9	5.2	6.8
	24.8	3.0	3.1	3.9	4.0	3.9	5.2	6.7

	(N/n)	Major Cities	Mid/Small Cities / Suburban
Population Group	(9,345,147)	45.5	54.5
Effective Sample	(1,009)	45.6	54.4

#### Thailand

	(N/n)	Bangkok	Central	North	Northeast	South
Population Group	(60,606,947)	14.5	19.2	18.8	34.2	13.3
Effective Sample	(1,000)	14.5	19.2	18.7	34.2	13.4

	(N/n)	Urban	Rural
Population Group	(60,606,947)	32.8	67.2
Effective Sample	(1,000)	32.9	67.1

US

	(N/n)	New England Division	Middle Atlantic Division	East North Central Division	West North Central Division	Sou Atlantic Division	East South Central Division	West South Central Division	Mountain Division	Pacific Division
Population Group	(46,468,390)	4.4	12.5	15.2	9.6	18.3	6.4	12.3	8.6	12.7
Effective Sample	(1,000)	4.0	11.9	15.1	12.9	17.0	6.0	11.1	7.0	15.0

	(N/n)	Urban			Surrounding / Suburban Areas			Rural	Other
		> 500,000	> 100,000	< 100,000	> 50,000	> 250,000	< 10,000		
Population Group	(46,468,390)	11.0	13.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	3.0	23.0	18.0
Effective Sample	(1,000)	11.0	13.1	7.0	9.6	9.0	2.4	23.1	17.1

France

	(N/n)	East Parisian Basin	West Parisian Basin	East	North	West	Paris Area	Sou East	Mediterranean	South West
Population Group	(51,428,600)	8.3	9.8	9.0	7.3	12.7	20.0	11.9	11.4	9.6
Effective Sample	(1,001)	7.9	9.6	8.9	8.1	12.8	20.2	11.3	10.8	10.5

	(N/n)	Rural	<20,000 Population	20K-100K Population	>100,000 Population	Paris Area
Population Group	(51,428,600)	24.3	16.8	13.3	28.2	17.5
Effective Sample	(1,001)	25.4	17.3	12.2	27.6	17.6

Sweden

	(N/n)	North	Middle	East	Southeast	South	West	Unknown
Population Group	(9,024,186)	10.7	17.1	25.2	17.8	10.9	18.3	0.1
Effective Sample	(1,026)	11.5	16.7	24.1	20.4	9.1	18.3	-

	(N/n)	3 Major Cities	> 100,000	75K - 100K	50K - 75K	25K - 50K	10K - 25K	< 10,000
Population Group	(9,024,186)	16.8	12.8	11.3	12.7	20.7	19.8	5.9
Effective Sample	(1,026)	18.9	18.9	7.3	21.1	15.9	12.6	5.4

## 6. Notes for reading this report

(1) In the text, the total of response ratios for each option in single-answer questions (the percentage for each response) is given as 100%. This is because the response ratios have been rounded off to the whole number.

Meanwhile, the response ratios have been rounded off to the first decimal point in the case of diagrams, and the tabulation results attached to the report. For this reason the response ratios do not always add up to 100%.

(2) The meaning of symbols used in the text, diagrams, and compilation tables are as follows.

- ① n : The total number of respondents to a particular question, and the denominator for calculation proportional ratios, showing how many people constitute a total response ratio of 100%.
- ② 0.0 : The number of respondents was insufficient to reach 0.1
- ③ 0 : There were no respondents.
- ④ Cards : Cards on which each choice of answers to a question are printed (shown to the respondents who would then select their answers from these).

(3) In this survey, we selected sample subjects who had been fulfilling a role of parent, regardless of legal marital status. Therefore they are referred to as “spouse/partner”, rather than just “spouse”.

(4) In the report, “research in 1994”, “the previous survey”, “survey in 10 years ago”, all refer to the survey conducted by the foundation of Japan Association for Women’s Education (presently Japanese Women’s study foundation) as requested by the (former) Ministry of Education under the same title, “International Comparative research on Home Education”. In this survey report, we have made the comparisons on the equivalent and/or comparable questionnaires.

Moreover, the charts and figures which indicate “1994” were based on the data from “research in 1994”. Most of the data are available in “International Comparative Research on Home Education” that was published by Japan Association for Women’s Education in 1996. In case of the reused or quoted charts, figures or their data, it is indicated as below:

(Source from research in 1994 : Japan Association for Women’s Education, 1996)

(5) Regarding the comparison with the research in 1994

This time, we planned and designed the survey to be comparable with the research results in 1994, with the exception of France. Therefore, we studied the characteristics of the research sample subjects of this time.

① Sampling Method

Basically, we decided to use the same method as in “Research in 1994”; however, there were cases where different methods were used due to the circumstances of the commission research organization, or in order to capture population groups more accurately than “Research in 1994”. In such cases, we tried to employ the same standard sampling method used in that country for nationwide scale surveys such as a census and public opinion polls.

As a result, the sample subject populations in Thailand were particularly different. In the research in 1994, the ratio of urban and rural sample populations was urban/rural=40/60, quite biased towards the urban area, for the nationwide ratio was urban/rural=26/74.<sup>1</sup> In this survey, the samples were collected based on the nationwide proportions of regional/city-size scales and those of genders, and then we were able to collect population samples as in the expected proportions. Thus, the survey results this time represent Thailand’s nationwide population better than “Research in 1994.” This should be noted when comparing the survey results of 1994 and this time for Thailand.

As for Sweden, a stratified random sampling method based on the residence registration was used as a sampling frame in 1994, however, it was difficult to use residence registration as sampling frame this time. Thus, the regional basis quota sampling method was used for the survey, since it was pointed out that this method is now the leading sampling method. However, as with comparison between the survey research in 1994 and this time, this difference in the sampling methods do not affect the results as a major factor. There were no significant differences in terms of sampling for Japan, America and Korea.

② Characteristics of the research sample in comparison with a census from each country.

It would be difficult to collect data from a census in each country that could meet the condition of this research and its subjects, “parents or the equivalent living with children between the ages of 0 and 12 (regardless of gender and/or legal marital status; count as one

---

<sup>1</sup> It was likely because conducting survey in rural areas in Thai was quite difficult at the time.

per household). We therefore examined the characteristics of samples of this research survey particularly in terms of the following items on the basis of nationwide gender distribution in each country;

- Population composition of children between the ages of 0 and 12
- Spouse/Partner relationships (by gender), or family structure of a household
- Composition of final education levels of parents (by gender), and employment situation of parents (by gender)

When we compared our samples with the population composition of children between the ages of 0 and 12 of each country, the result distribution is very similar to the census data and no with large bias.

In evaluation of the samples with regard to spouse/partner relationships, we examined our samples against the census data of each country by excluding unmarried persons between the ages of 30 and 49. The number of samples for “divorce or loss of spouse/partner” in each country are slightly less than those of the census distribution. As to family structure of a household, the number of samples for “single parent families” is also slightly less than those of the census in each country. Similar sample distributions were found for the research in 1994, therefore it might be considered that this issue was related to the survey technique of home visit interviews.

There did not seem to be a huge gap in the employment situation of parents between the samples and the census in each country in both rate of unemployed women and proportion of employers within working populations.

Final education levels of parents tended to be higher for the samples than for the census of each country. Although there were very few numbers of sample subjects whose final educational level was compulsory education, a similar result was also found in the sample of research in 1994. Therefore, this is not a unique characteristic only for the sample subjects of this time.

In Japan, according to the “Employment Status Survey 2002,” the percentage of people with a final educational level at “junior high school” was about 7%, whereas that of our sample is about 3%. In the case of samples in Japan, the number of those with a final educational level at “junior college/vocational high school” was rather low. Because of this, “university/college graduate or higher” of men and “senior high school/vocational school” of women were quite high. This result is relatively close to the census distribution.

The sample subjects in Korea constitute a fairly higher educational attainment levels

than the census. Based on the census, “junior high school graduate” is about 25%, but the sample is merely about 3%. “University/College graduate or higher” is between 25% and 35% in the census, though the sample is about 40%. The sample of the research in 1994 had a similar trend, and there was more than a 10% difference between the census and sample in percentages of “junior high school graduate” and “university/college graduate or higher.” Moreover, it has to do with the rapid higher educational background trend in recent Korean society. For example, according to the “Population and Housing Census Report 2000,” the percentage of “junior high school graduates” for men between the ages of 30 and 34 was only 7%, whereas it was 23% for men between the ages of 40 and 44. The difference for women is even larger. Taking this point into account, though the Korean sample consisted of a somewhat higher proportion of high education level subjects, the sample can be considered to have almost the same characteristics as the Korean sample in 1994.

For the Thailand samples, the proportion of children who graduated from elementary school is about 10% less than that of the census, and the proportion difference of those “graduated from elementary school” is evenly distributed to other educational levels of schools. Therefore, like the sample subjects of Japan, the Thailand sample groups are relatively close to the census.

Although not so strong as Korea, the United States sample also shows a bias for higher educational attainment. The percentage of “graduated junior high school” is only about 4% of the sample population, whereas it is about 20% in the census. There is more than a 10% difference between the sample and the census in proportions of “graduated junior high school,” however there was a similar distribution seen in the research in 1994. Therefore, even though the U.S. sample is rather biased towards a higher level of educational attainment, the sample can be essentially considered as having similar characteristics as the sample of the research in 1994.

In the “Census 1999” of France, about 15% of the population was included in the category of “other or no answer.” Comparing the sample with the census by excluding this category, those who graduated from junior high school is about 10% less than that of the census.

For the sample of Sweden, the percentages of “basic school years 4-9” and “high school” are about 5 - 7% less than those of the census, and the difference is distributed to “university/college” and “graduate school”.

(Kazufumi Sakai)