

ESS CRONOS-2 Proposal

April 2021

| | |
|---|--|
| Proposed title for the module | In science we trust? Explaining (mis)trust in scientific disciplines across European countries |
| Single or repeated measurement within the panel | Single measurement |
| Principle applicant | Prof. dr. Peter Achterberg |
| Position | Professor of Sociology |
| Institution (including name of University School or Department) | Department of Sociology Tilburg University |
| Address for correspondence | Tilburg University PO Box 90153 5000LE Tilburg |
| Telephone: | +31134662246 |
| Email: | P.Achterberg@tilburguniversity.edu |

Relevance and rationale (max. 600 words)

Over two decades ago, Haerlin and Parr concluded in *Nature* that: '[t]he relationship between the scientific community and the general public has never been worse in living memory' (Haerlin & Parr, 1999, p. 49). By now, having witnessed an upsurge in literature dealing with the 'post-fact era', **issues of legitimacy of science, trust in scientific disciplines, and knowledge claims are as relevant as ever before** (Jasanoff & Simmet, 2017). If not even more so: Not only academically, as scholars try to explain individual, cross-national and longitudinal differences in the legitimacy of science among members of the general audience (Achterberg, de Koster, & van der Waal, 2017; Gauchat, 2012; Price & Peterson, 2016), but also for policymakers struggling to deal with societal implementation of scientific innovations and knowledge (Speed & Mannion, 2017). The issue is also relevant for members of the general audience, who are wondering what might explain public views on science of their fellow citizens (Lewandowsky, Ecker, & Cook, 2017).

Whereas in Europe systematic attempts to gather information on this issue remain scarce and, if available, are somewhat outdated (Eurobarometer 1989-2005), in this CRONOS-2-call we see a great opportunity to fill the gap with much needed comparative data on at least some of the issues that govern the scholarly field on trust in science. More specifically, there is a need for data that allows for a) explaining **cross-national variation** in levels of trust in science, b) explaining why levels of trust vary **from generalized trust in science** to trust in **specific scientific disciplines** and trust in **specific knowledge claims**, and c) explaining **why some people trust some scientific disciplines and knowledge claims while distrusting others**.

The proposed module includes three types of questions about trust in science, which focus on science at different levels of generalization (Rekker, 2021). First, we include three questions on generalized trust in scientific institutions. Secondly, we include six questions on trust in scientific disciplines. Thirdly, we include six questions on trust in specific scientific knowledge claims in those specific disciplines.

The availability of such data on trust in science in the countries within the CRONOS-2 framework, can be combined with information available from the core modules on human values, media and social trust, human values, politics, socio-demographics, gender, and subjective well-being in

future research. More specifically, we see two major areas in which the proposed data allow for research:

- 1) On societal polarization over science (Drummond & Fischhoff, 2017; Motta, 2018). The proposed module on (mis)trust in science, in combination with information on political background, would allow for testing hypotheses aimed at finding out whether left-wing and right-wing persons particularly polarize over science differently. Also, from this perspective, it can be understood why some left-leaning persons reject particular knowledge claims while accepting others and vice versa. The proposed module allows for examining whether and why trust in different knowledge claims and scientific disciplines are more politically polarized than trust in scientific institutions as a whole (Rekker, 2021).
- 2) On feminization of scientific disciplines and the prestige of scientific disciplines (García-Mainar, Montuenga, & García-Martín, 2018; LABOR, 2008). While labour force studies convincingly show that feminized occupations suffer from a lack of prestige (England, 1992), such devaluation mechanisms could also be at play in the scientific enterprise. The proposed module, in combination with national information on women's representation in specific disciplines, would allow for testing hypotheses predicting lower levels of trust in particularly feminized scientific disciplines, mirroring other finding about occupational prestige (Magnusson, 2009).

Word count: 578

Suitability for the CRONOS-2 (max. 400 words)

Our proposal builds on the ongoing ESS data collections, most explicitly through our use of **measures of trust in science which have been deliberately designed to resemble the repeatedly tested and widely used items on trust in (political) institutions from the core ESS modules** (namely, “please tell me on a score of 0-10 how much you personally trust each of the institutions I read out”). This allows for a more nuanced understanding of patterns in (mis)trust in distinct scientific disciplines, while also accounting for identically measured predispositions to mistrust people and institutions in general. In other words, this facilitates the explicit examination of actual (mis)trust in science, parsing out other (related) social trends.

Importantly for this proposal, the core ESS modules also include detailed, country-specific information on voting behaviours, political preferences, and engagement with politics of a nationally representative sample of participants. This feature of **the CRONOS-2 panel is crucial if we are to understand the possible polarization across the political spectrum in (mis)trust in science** as a whole, as well as, in more precise representations of science (i.e., specific scientific disciplines and scientific claims associated with these disciplines).

Incorporating the proposed module in the CRONOS-2 panel, provides several other invaluable opportunities. Foremost, the cross-national and nationally representative samples mean that we can **examine whether trends in (mis)trust in science can also be explained based on cohorts' compositional characteristics** (e.g., female representation in specific scientific disciplines as a test of the mechanisms stemming from devaluation theory; England, 1992). The cross-national and nationally representative samples ensure that we have enough power to examine this possible mechanism.

Importantly, the proposed module enhances the opportunities which the ESS data provide the scientific community. For example, this data collection will help **better contextualize the findings based on preceding ESS data collections on attitudes towards climate change** and

specific climate policies. Additionally, the proposed module can be an **important resource for those working in the field of science communication** as the data collection will allow for a better understanding of the roadblocks that we face as scientists in communicating with the general public.

The 15 questions elaborated on below are applicable in both EU and non-EU countries, as they do not refer to any specific (supra)national policies or features but rather, science as a whole, different agents of science, and disciplines which are represented across national educational systems.

Word count: 393

Research team (max. 250 words)

The research team is based in the Netherlands and Sweden.

Prof. dr. Peter Achterberg is a Professor of Sociology at Tilburg University, the Netherlands. He is interested in studying the public's understanding of and support for science. Previously he has coordinated various surveys focused on trust in institutions and science, democratization of science. He is now involved in a number of projects studying political polarization (Funded by NWO-Norface) and vaccination uptake (Funded by Tilburg University). He has published on trust in science, conspiracism, vaccination uptake and political polarization.

Dr. Roderik Rekker is affiliated with the department of political science of the University of Gothenburg (Sweden), where he examines political polarization over facts and science. This project is part of a multidisciplinary research program on '[Knowledge Resistance](#)' that was funded by the Swedish national bank (Riksbankens Jubileumsfond). Dr. Rekker has previously been the coordinator of the Dutch Parliamentary Election Study. In 2019 he was awarded a personal research grant (VENI) of 250.000 euro from the Dutch Research Council.

Dr. Katya Ivanova is an Assistant professor of Sociology at Tilburg University, the Netherlands. Though her main field of expertise is family sociology, her work also explores the wider societal repercussions of shifting gender dynamics in households and on the labour market, as well as, of the changing social construction of gender. Dr. Ivanova has been involved in designing and implementing large national data collections, such as the Dutch OKiN survey (Kalmijn, Ivanova et al. 2018).

Word count: 243

Feasibility of implementation (max. 800 words – excluding draft questions which can be in addition)

We aim to measure trust in science as a whole, trust in specific scientific disciplines, and trust in specific scientific claims using relatively straightforward questions. Identical or similar items have been used and validated in other surveys worldwide. Moreover, the general wording of our questions on trust has been adopted from the core module of the ESS. We therefore see no problems in administering these questions across the participating countries or other practical difficulties. The different timeframes are not a problem either, since we are interested in general patterns and relations between different concepts that are relatively constant over time.

Specifically, we propose the following 15 questions: (wording adopted from the ESS core module)

Using this card, please tell me on a score of 0-10 how much you personally trust each of the institutions I read out. 0 means you do not trust an institution at all, and 10 means you have complete trust. Firstly...

1. General trust in science

- A. The scientific method
- B. Universities
- C. Scientists

The first and the third item are adopted from Achterberg et al. (2017) yet instead of asking the respondents about the use of the scientific method, we ask them to indicate the level of trust in scientific methods. The second item is new. Answer categories are adapted to match those in the core ESS modules to measure trust in (political) institutions.

2. Trust in scientific disciplines

- A. Sociology
- B. Economics
- C. Physics
- D. Medical and health sciences
- E. Environmental science
- F. Agricultural technology

These items are adopted from the Eurobarometer survey, yet, instead of asking how scientific people deem these disciplines to be, we ask them to indicate the level of trust on a scale from 0-10

3. Trust in scientific statements

Using this card, please tell me on a score of 0-10 how much you personally trust each of the following statements from scientists.

- A. There are scientists who claim that upbringing by parents and the social environment have far greater significance for the development of sex differences than inborn differences in female and male brains. How much do you trust this claim?
- B. There are scientists who reject plans to redistribute wealth by taxing the rich, because people with high incomes would decide to work less if their income tax is raised beyond a certain point, leading to a decrease in tax revenues for public spending. How much do you trust this claim?
- C. There are scientists who claim that the universe expands at an increasing rate. How much do you trust this claim?
- D. There are scientists who claim that antibiotics are ineffective against viruses because they only kill bacteria. How much do you trust this claim?
- E. There are scientists who claim that the Earth's climate is changing rapidly as a result of greenhouse gas emissions by humans. How much do you trust this claim?

F. There are scientists who claim that genetically modifying organisms is a safe and effective way to improve the productivity of agriculture. How much do you trust this claim?

These statements were chosen such that two items (B and F) are controversial to the political Left (Berman & Milanes-Reyes, 2013; Smyth et al., 2017), whereas two others (A and E) are controversial to the Right (Dunlap et al., 2016; Skewes, Fine & Haslam, 2018), and the final two (C and D) are non-politicized. Regarding research ethics, it is important to emphasize that these statements do not contain any false or misleading information: all six statements are actual scientific claims (e.g., Hyde & Mertz, 2009; Dunlap et al., 2016; Berman & Milanes-Reyes, 2013; Smyth et al., 2017).

Word count: 603

Dissemination plans (max. 250 words)

Dissemination to the scientific community will be pursued via publications in peer-reviewed journals and presentations at relevant scientific conferences. A testimony to the wide appeal of the proposed data collection are the divergent interests within the team. Whereas Prof. Achterberg and Dr. Rekker are interested in understanding and explaining the process of (political) polarization over science, Dr. Ivanova will focus on avenues of explaining mistrust in science which stem from theories grounded in the cultural devaluation of women's work (England, 1992).

The data generated here will also be used by junior scholars who are currently pursuing their graduate studies (Rodrigo Cordova, 2nd year research master student at Tilburg University, working on politicization of science) or working on their doctoral dissertations (Mitchell Matthijssen, doctoral student at Tilburg University, examining vaccination hesitancy). Importantly, the new data will also be used for undergraduate and master-level theses at Tilburg University, supervised by Prof. Achterberg. Additionally, dissemination to non-European audiences will be pursued via podcasts such as Annex Sociology Podcast (based in Queens College, USA), which Dr. Ivanova has hosted.

Both Prof. Achterberg and Dr. Rekker have been actively involved in science communication to the general public, participating in outreach activities ranging from appearances in national and international media outlets (e.g., Al Jazeera English, VRT Nieuws, RTL Nieuws, NRC Handelsblad, De Volkskrant, EenVandaag Radio) to active engagement in widely read online platforms (e.g., the Public Understanding of Science Blog, Stuk Rood Vlees, Sociale Vraagstukken). These networks will be utilized in the outreach to non-academic audiences.

Word count: 250

References

- Achterberg, P., de Koster, W., & van der Waal, J. (2017). A science confidence gap: Education, trust in scientific methods, and trust in scientific institutions in the United States, 2014. *Public Understanding of Science*, 26(6), 704-720.
- Berman, E. P., & Milanes-Reyes, L. M. (2013). The politicization of knowledge claims: The “Laffer Curve” in the US Congress. *Qualitative Sociology*, 36(1), 53-79.
- Drummond, C., & Fischhoff, B. (2017). Individuals with greater science literacy and education have more polarized beliefs on controversial science topics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(36), 9587-9592.
- Dunlap, R. E., McCright, A. M., & Yarosh, J. H. (2016). The political divide on climate change: Partisan polarization widens in the US. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 58(5), 4-23.
- England, P. (1992). From status attainment to segregation and devaluation. *Contemporary Sociology*, 21, 643-647.
- García-Mainar, I., Montuenga, V. M., & García-Martín, G. (2018). Occupational prestige and gender-occupational segregation. *Work, employment and society*, 32(2), 348-367.
- Gauchat, G. (2011). The cultural authority of science: Public trust and acceptance of organized science. *Public Understanding of Science*, 20(6), 751-770.
- Gauchat, G. (2012). Politicization of Science in the Public Sphere: A Study of Public Trust in the United States, 1974 to 2010. *American Sociological Review*, 77(2), 167-187.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*: Stanford university press.
- Haerlin, B., & Parr, D. (1999). How to restore public trust in science. *Nature*, 400(6744), 499-499. doi:10.1038/22867
- Hyde, J. S. & Mertz, J. E. (2009). Gender, culture, and mathematics performance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106, 8801-8807.
- Jasanoff, S., & Simmet, H. R. (2017). No funeral bells: Public reason in a "post-truth" age. *Social Studies of Science*, 47(5), 751-770. doi:10.1177/0306312717731936
- Kalmijn, M., Ivanova, K., van Gaalen, R., de Leeuw, S. G., van Houdt, K., van Spijker, F., & Hornstra, M. (2018). A multi-actor study of adult children and their parents in complex families: Design and content of the OKiN survey. *European Sociological Review*, 34(4), 452-470.
- LABOR, S. S. O. S. (2008). 17 The Coming Gender Revolution in Science. *The Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*, 403.
- Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K., & Cook, J. (2017). Beyond misinformation: Understanding and coping with the “post-truth” era. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 6(4), 353-369.
- Magnusson, C. (2009). Gender, occupational prestige, and wages: A test of devaluation theory. *European Sociological Review*, 25(1), 87-101.
- Motta, M. (2018). The polarizing effect of the March for Science on attitudes toward scientists. *PS, Political Science & Politics*, 51(4), 782.
- Price, A. M., & Peterson, L. P. (2016). Scientific progress, risk, and development: Explaining attitudes toward science cross-nationally. *International Sociology*, 31(1), 57-80. doi:10.1177/0268580915614593
- Rekker, R. (2021). The nature and origins of political polarization over science. *Public Understanding of Science*, 0963662521989193.
- Skewes, L., Fine, C., & Haslam, N. (2018). Beyond Mars and Venus: The role of gender essentialism in support for gender inequality and backlash. *Plos One*, 13(7), e0200921.
- Smyth, S. J., Phillips, P. W., & Castle, D. (2017). (Mis) information and the politicization of food security. *Animal Frontiers*, 7(2), 33-38.

Speed, E., & Mannion, R. (2017). The rise of post-truth populism in pluralist liberal democracies: challenges for health policy. *International journal of health policy and management*, 6(5), 249.

Professor Peter Achterberg

Professor of Sociology

Department of Sociology, Tilburg University

email: P.Achterberg@tilburguniversity.edu

Google Scholar: <https://scholar.google.nl/citations?user=nrQ3NtEAAAAJ&hl=nl>

Education

- 2002 – 2006 PhD, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Department of Sociology
Considering Cultural Conflict: Class Politics and Cultural Politics in Western Societies
- 1998 – 2001 Master in Sociology, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Department of Sociology
- 1997 – 1998 Undergraduate in Sociology, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Department of Sociology

Employment history (since PhD defence)

- 2014 – present Professor of Sociology, Tilburg University, Tilburg school of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Department of Sociology
- 2010 – 2014 Associate professor, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Sociology
- 2009 Assistant professor (non-tenured), Erasmus University Rotterdam, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Sociology
- 2007 Visiting scholar, University of Chicago, Department of Sociology
- 2006-2008 Post-doctoral researcher, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Sociology

Supervision of PhD candidates

- 2020 – ongoing Promotor, Mitchell Matthijssen, *Understanding vaccine hesitancy*
- 2017 – ongoing Promotor, Michiel van Rijn, *Organizational forms and consequences of social entrepreneurship in international perspective*
- 2017 – ongoing Promotor, Angelica Maineri, *The digital divide and e-privacy*
- 2018 – ongoing Promotor, Annemarie Balvert, *Citizen-friendly data communication*
- 2020 – ongoing Promotor, Erik Zeltner, *Career mobility of non-European fulltime master's graduates from European higher education institutions*
- 2018 – ongoing Promotor, Erwin Gielens, *Unravelling the basic income debate*
- 2020 – ongoing Promotor, Francesco Marolla, *From losers of globalisation to winners of democracies; A comparative investigation of the recent populist wave*
- 2016 – 2020 Promotor, Ondrej Buchel, *Unequal but Fair? About the Perceived Legitimacy of the Standing Economic Order.*
- 2016 – 2020 Promotor, Francesca Zanasi, *Carers and careers: Grandparental care investment and its labour market consequences in Europe*
- 2014 – 2019 Promotor, Lorenzo D'Hooge, *Mind over matter: Causes and consequences of class discordance*
- 2011 – 2017 Co-promotor, Egbert Ribberink, *"There is probably no God" A quantitative study of anti-religiosity in Western Europe.*

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 2009 – 2015 | Co-promotor, Katerina Manevska, <i>Beyond the ethnic divide</i> |
| 2007 – 2012 | Co-promotor, Judith Raven, <i>Popular Support for Welfare Reforms: On Welfare State Preferences and Welfare State Reforms in the Netherlands</i> |

Data collections relevant to current proposal

- Balvert, A., Van Weelden, L., & **Achterberg, P.** (2020) Survey on Citizen-Friendly Data Communication, Tilburg, CentERdata.
- Van der Waal, J., **Achterberg, P.**, & De Koster, W. (2014) CROCUS Survey on Worldviews in the U.S.: Relationship Between Neighbourhood Ethnic Composition and Fear of Crime Study, Rotterdam: GFK.
- Achterberg, P.**, & Houtman, D. (2013) CROCUS Survey on Worldviews in the Netherlands IV: Anti-Institutionalism, Trust in Science and Technology & Politics. Rotterdam/Tilburg: CenterData.
- Achterberg, P.**, Manevska, K., De Koster, W., Aupers, S., Mascini, P., & Van der Waal, J. (2012) CROCUS Survey on Worldviews in the Netherlands III: Religion, Politics, and Anti-Institutionalism. Rotterdam/Tilburg: CentERdata.
- Achterberg, P.** (2012) CROCUS Survey on Worldviews in the Netherlands II: Political Personalization. Rotterdam/ Tilburg: CentERdata.
- Achterberg, P.**, & Houtman, D. (2008) CROCUS Survey on Worldviews in the Netherlands I: Worldviews and Technology. Rotterdam/ Tilburg: CentERdata.

Selection of international peer reviewed publications

- Van Rijn, M, Haverkate, M, **Achterberg, P.** & Timen, A. (2019) The public uptake of information about antibiotic resistance in the Netherlands, In: *Public Understanding of Science*, 28(4): 486-503.
- Makarovs, K. & **Achterberg, P.** (2018) Science to the People: A 32-nation survey. In: *Public Understanding of Science*, 27 (7) 876-896.
- Achterberg, P.**, De Koster, W., & Van der Waal, J. (2017) A Science Confidence Gap: Education, Trust in Scientific Methods, and Trust in Scientific Institutions in the United States, 2014. In: *Public Understanding of science*, 26(6):704-720.
- Makarovs, K. & **Achterberg, P.** (2017) Contextualizing educational differences in “vaccination uptake”: a thirty nation survey. In: *Social Science & Medicine*, 188: 1-10
- Achterberg, P.** (2015) The Changing Face of Public Support for Hydrogen Technology Explaining Declining Support among the Dutch (2008-2013). *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 33(11), 18711-18717.
- Achterberg, P.** (2014) Knowing hydrogen and loving it too? Informational provision, cultural predispositions, and support for hydrogen technology among the Dutch. *Public Understanding of Science* 23(4), 445-453.

Grants & Fellowships (Selection)

| | | |
|------|--|----------|
| 2020 | TiU/TSB research grant, <i>Understanding Vaccine Hesitancy</i> | €250,000 |
| 2020 | NOW/Norface, <i>Threat, identity, and dissent: Understanding and addressing political polarisation in European democracies</i> | €190,000 |
| 2018 | NWO-Research talent, <i>Unravelling the basic income debate</i> | €225,000 |
| 2017 | TiU/Impact research grant, <i>Citizen-friendly data communication</i> | €250,000 |

Roderik Rekker, PhD

Political Scientist and Psychologist
 Department of Political Science, University of Gothenburg
 email: roderik.rekker@gu.se
 Google Scholar: <https://scholar.google.nl/citations?user=KSV2VJ4AAAAJ>

Education

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 2011 – 2016 | PhD, Utrecht University: Department of Pedagogical Sciences <i>Interdisciplinary dissertation on the role of social inequality in juvenile delinquency and political socialization</i> |
| 2008 – 2011 | Research Master Psychology (<i>cum laude</i>), University of Amsterdam <i>Specializations: Methodology and Clinical Psychology</i> |
| 2005 – 2008 | Bachelor in Psychology (<i>with honour</i>), University of Amsterdam <i>Specialization: Clinical Psychology</i> |
| 2004 – 2008 | Bachelor in Political Science, University of Amsterdam <i>Specialization: Political Theory and Behaviour</i> |

Employment history (since PhD defence)

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| 2019 – present | Postdoctoral researcher, University of Gothenburg: Department of Political Science. <i>Examining political polarization over facts and science</i> |
| 2020 – present | Researcher on VENI-grant (NWO), University of Amsterdam: Department of Political Science, <i>Examining generational differences in vote choice</i> |
| 2017 – 2018 | Postdoctoral researcher, University of Amsterdam: Department of Communication Science, <i>Examining the impact of legal action against anti-immigration parties</i> |
| 2016 – 2019 | Postdoctoral researcher & lecturer, University of Amsterdam: Department of Political Science. Co-coordinating and methodologically evaluating the Dutch Parliamentary Election Study (NKO); lecturing and coordinating courses on research methods |

Supervision of PhD candidates

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| 2020 – present | Co-promotor, Thomas Jocker, PhD candidate, University of Amsterdam: Department of Political Science |
| 2017 – 2021 | Co-promotor, Sijfra de Leeuw, PhD candidate, University of Amsterdam: Department of Communication Science (<i>PhD awarded cum laude</i>) |

Data collection

Rekker, R., Van der Kolk, H., Van der Brug, W., & Van der Meer, T. (2018). Dutch Parliamentary Election Study 2017: Research description and codebook

International peer reviewed publications

- Rekker, R.** (2021). The nature and origins of political polarization over science. *Public Understanding of Science*, 1-16.
- Rekker, R.,** & van Spanje, J. (2021). Hate speech prosecution of politicians and its effect on support for the legal system and democracy. *British Journal of Political Science*, 1-22.
- Van der Brug, W., & **Rekker, R.** (2021). Dealignment, realignment and generational differences in The Netherlands. *West European Politics*, 44, 776-801.
- De Leeuw, S. E., Azrout, R., **Rekker, R.,** & Van Spanje, J. H. (2020). After all this time? The impact of media and authoritarian history on political news coverage in twelve Western countries. *Journal of Communication*, 70, 744-767.
- De Leeuw, S. E., **Rekker, R.,** Azrout, R., & van Spanje, J. H. (2020). Are would-be authoritarians right? Democratic support and citizens' left-right self-placement in former left-and right-authoritarian countries. *Democratization*, 1-20.
- Rekker, R.,** & Rosema, M. (2019). How (often) do voters change their consideration sets? *Electoral Studies*, 57, 284-293.
- Rekker, R.,** Keijsers, L., Branje, S., & Meeus, W. (2019). The formation of party preference in adolescence and early adulthood: How and when does it occur in the multiparty context of the Netherlands? *Young*, 27, 48-68.
- Rekker, R.** (2018). Growing up in a globalized society: Why younger generations are more positive about the European Union. *Young*, 26, 56-77.
- Rekker, R.,** Keijsers, L., Branje, S., Koot, H., & Meeus, W. (2017). The interplay of parental monitoring and socioeconomic status in predicting minor delinquency between and within adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 59, 155-165.
- Rekker, R.,** Keijsers, L., Branje, S., & Meeus, W. (2017). The dynamics of political identity and issue attitudes in adolescence and early adulthood. *Electoral Studies*, 46, 101-111.
- Rekker, R.** (2016). The lasting impact of adolescence on left-right identification: Cohort replacement and intracohort change in associations with issue attitudes. *Electoral Studies*, 44, 120-131.
- Rekker, R.,** Pardini, D., Keijsers, L., Branje, S., Loeber, R., & Meeus, W. (2015). Moving in and out of poverty: The within-individual association between socioeconomic status and juvenile delinquency. *PLoS one*, 10, 1-17.
- Rekker, R.,** Keijsers, L., Branje, S., & Meeus, W. (2015). Political attitudes in adolescence and emerging adulthood: Developmental changes in mean level, polarization, rank-order stability, and correlates. *Journal of Adolescence*, 41, 136-147.

Grants & Fellowships

| | | |
|------|--|----------|
| 2019 | VENI grant, awarded by the Dutch Research Council (NWO). <i>Proposal:</i> Are millennials transforming politics? A study on generational differences in voting | €250 000 |
| 2012 | Pittsburgh Youth Study Research Fellowship, awarded by the University of Pittsburgh: Department of Psychiatry. <i>Proposal:</i> The within-individual association between socioeconomic status and juvenile delinquency | €5 000 |

Katya Ivanova, PhD

Assistant Professor of Sociology
 Department of Sociology, Tilburg University
 email: k.o.ivanova@tilburguniversity.edu
 web: www.katyaivanova.eu

Education

- 2012, March PhD in Sociology, University of Groningen
 Promoters: Prof. dr. Melinda Mills and Prof. dr. René Veenstra
- 2007, May Research Master, Development and Socialization in Childhood and
 Adolescence, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Utrecht
 University
- 2005, May BA (*magna cum laude*), Mount Holyoke College, MA, USA
 Major: Psychology; Minor: Politics

Employment history

- 09/2019 – Assistant professor (tenure track), Department of Sociology, Tilburg
 current University (**.5fte teaching + administrative tasks**)
- 08/2016 – Project coordinator and postdoctoral researcher, Department of Sociology,
 08/2019 University of Amsterdam
- 09/2014 – Postdoctoral researcher, Department of Public Administration and
 07/2016 Sociology, Erasmus University Rotterdam (**.35fte teaching**)
- 10/2011 – Postdoctoral researcher, project “Remarriage in comparative perspective”
 08/2014 (**.25fte teaching**)
 09/2012 – 08/2014: Department of Sociology, University of Amsterdam
 10/2011 – 08/2012: Department of Sociology, Tilburg University

Supervision of PhD candidates

- 2017 - current Co-promotor, Maaïke Hornstra, PhD candidate, NIDI / University of
 Amsterdam
- 2016 - 2021 Co-promotor, Kirsten van Houdt, PhD candidate, NIDI / University of
 Amsterdam

Data collection

Kalmijn, M., **Ivanova, K.**, Van Gaalen, R., De Leeuw, S., Van Houdt, K., Van Spijker, F.,
 Moonen, L., & Woolderink, M. (2017). Ouders en Kinderen in Nederland (OKiN).
 [Parents and Children in the Netherlands]. Release 1.0. Dataset. Amsterdam/The
 Hague/Heerlen: University of Amsterdam/Statistics Netherlands.

Publications (last two years)

- Van Houdt, K., Kalmijn, M., & **Ivanova**, K. (2020) Perceptions of closeness in adult parent- child dyads: Asymmetry in the context of family complexity. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*, 75, 2219-2229.
- Ivanova**, K., & Kalmijn, M. (2020). Parental involvement in youth and closeness to parents during adulthood: Stepparents and biological parents. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 34, 794-803.
- Hornstra, M., Kalmijn, M., & **Ivanova**, K. (2020). Fatherhood in complex families: Ties between adult children, biological fathers, and stepfathers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82, 1637-1654.
- Ivanova**, K. & Kalmijn, M. (2020). Heterogeneous effects of family complexity in youth on mental health: Testing the “good divorce” and the “good stepparent” hypotheses. In M. Kreyenfeld & H. Trappe (Eds.), *Parental life courses after separation and divorce in Europe*. Berlin: Springer.
- Ivanova**, K. (2020). My children, your children, our children, and my well-being: Life satisfaction of 'empty nest' biological parents and stepparents. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 21, 613-633.
- van Houdt, K., Kalmijn, M., & **Ivanova**, K. (2019). Stepparental support to young adults: The diverging roles of stepmothers and stepfathers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82, 639-656.
- Kalmijn, M., de Leeuw, S., Hornstra, M., **Ivanova**, K., van Gaalen, R., & van Houdt, K. (2019). Family complexity into adulthood: The central role of mothers in shaping intergenerational ties. *American Sociological Review*, 84, 876-904.
- Savickaitė, R., Dijkstra, J. K., Kreager, D., **Ivanova**, K., & Veenstra, R. (2019). Friendships, perceived popularity, and adolescent romantic relationship debut. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 40, 377-399.
- Ivanova**, K. & Balbo, N. (2019). Cementing the stepfamily? Biological and stepparents' relationship satisfaction after the birth of a common child in stepfamilies. *Journal of Family Issues*, 40, 1346-1363.

Grants & Fellowships (since PhD defence)

| | | |
|------|--|----------|
| 2020 | Herbert Simon Research Institute seed funding <i>Proposal:</i> Who remains childless? Combining sociology and psychology in the study of nonparenthood | €10 000 |
| 2020 | COVID-19 data collection grant, Tilburg School of Social and Behavioural Sciences <i>Proposal:</i> Fertility and fear of the future | €7 500 |
| 2019 | ODISSEI Microdata Access Grant application <i>Proposal:</i> Suicidal acts in the Dutch context | €8 000 |
| 2015 | EUR Fellowship, Erasmus University Rotterdam, the Netherlands <i>Aim:</i> A competitive fellowship intended to finance highly rated by the NWO Governing Board Veni proposals | €135 000 |
| 2014 | Incoming postdoctoral fellowship, Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium <i>Proposal:</i> Relationships in complex stepfamilies and family members' well-being | €100 000 |