

**Netherlands
ISSP 2008 – Religion III
Study Description**

**INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SURVEY PROGRAMME –
NETHERLANDS 2008**

MODULE 2007: Leisure and Sports

MODULE 2006: Religion IV

Data documentation

Harry B.G. Ganzeboom [Principal Investigator]

Heike Schroeder [Fieldwork Manager]

First edition: August 22 2009

Table of contents

Study description
Questionnaire development and post-processing
General procedures
Fieldwork and response
Post-stratification weights

INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SURVEY PROGRAMME NETHERLANDS – 2008 fieldwork

MODULE 2007: Leisure and Sports

MODULE 2008: Religion IV

STUDY DESCRIPTION

Study title:	“ISSP-NL 2007+2008: Vrije Tijd. Levensovertuigingen.”
Fieldwork dates:	March–December 2008
PI:	Harry B.G. Ganzeboom Heike Schroeder (fieldwork manager)
Sample type	(Step 1:) Simple random address sample, (Step 2:) random date selection of household member (*)
Response:	33.4% (*)
Fieldwork agency	Free University Amsterdam
Fieldwork Methods	Postal survey
Sample size	2843
Language	Dutch
Weights	post-stratification (*)

(*) See further below.

The data will appear in the ISSP publicly released data as two independent data-files. The user should be aware that the social background variables are identical between these modules. However the units do not overlap.

The user should also be aware that the complete data file (described in this documentation), including all the collected information on demography and social background, as well as the standardized ISSP variables has been archived at DANS [Data Archiving and Networked Services] in The Hague, the successor to the Steinmetz Archive. The appropriate bibliographic reference to this file will be:

Ganzeboom, Harry B.G. [principal investigator] & Heike Schroeder, “ISSP 2007 + 2008: Vrije Tijd. Levensovertuigingen.” [machine-readable data file]. The Hague: DANS. To be archived.

Introduction

The modules 2007 (“Leisure and Sports”) and 2008 (“Religion IV”) of the International Social Survey Programme in the Netherlands [ISSP-NL] were conducted in 2008 as a stand-alone postal survey at the Free University Amsterdam [VUA] (Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social Research Methodology) by Harry B.G. Ganzeboom [principal investigator] and Heike Schroeder [fieldwork manager]. As of 2005, VUA has taken over the national ISSP membership for the Netherlands, formerly held by the Social and Cultural Planning Office [SCP] in The Hague, with Jos Becker as principal investigator. Funding for the 2007-2008 data collection was supplied by the VUA and Radboud University Nijmegen. Nijmegen’s contribution made it possible to double the number of respondents for the Religion module, as well as expand the number of questions asked in this module, in order to collect data for the NORFACE project 'Extending and enhancing the ISSP 2008 module on religion' [PI: David Voas, University of Manchester; Dutch Partner: Ariana Need, Radboud University Nijmegen].

The data-collection followed very much the same methodology as for the ISSP_NL 2003&2004 and ISSP 2005&2006. The data collection process can be summarized as follows:

- While the data for the two modules were collected with exactly the same procedure, the questionnaires of the two modules were separated (split ballot). The two questionnaires share the same social background questions (start with Z), but cover different topics. The Leisure & Sports variables start with E, the Religion variables with F (ISSP module) and FF (Norface addition).
- Translation of the ISSP questionnaire documents was conducted by ourselves. The translation for the items in the Religion module was copied from the earlier version, when applicable.
- The standard ISSP questions are complemented with a large number of demographic variables, most of them on social mobility.
- A simple random sample was drawn from the complete list of addresses in the Netherlands, maintained by Cendris, a subsidiary of the national postal service. For about 65.1% of the addresses there is an associated family name and about 39.5% have a phone number (matched with the national phone register). The sampling frame [i.e. the list of address] is known to be very accurate and complete.
- All respondents were approached using (A) advance letter, (B) first questionnaire, (C) first postcard reminder, (D) second reminder by letter, (E) second questionnaire.
- All the questionnaires received were screened on completeness and double responses. All alphanumerical information was transferred to a coding file.
- The remaining (numerical) information was keypunched (single punching) by a professional agency (InDat).
- The alphanumerical information for country of origin and occupations was coded using standard international classifications.
- The keypunched data were checked and labeled and merged with the coded alphanumerical information.

- A post-stratification weight was developed using (A) information from the sampling frame, (B) information from the household roster. No national benchmark was used.

Respons

Table 1 details the various steps taken to (re)approach the respondents and its results in terms of received questionnaires.

Throughout the fieldwork, respondents could call (in fact: call an answering machine) to ask further information, refuse participation or make comments. Once respondents had expressed non-willingness to participate, either by phone or (e-)mail, they were not contacted again. General information on the ISSP project and the data-collection was also provided on a website, that was referred to on the questionnaire and all the information sent to the respondent.

After the first campaign (in June 2008) we were unhappy with the response and decided to re-contact after the summer all non-respondents that had not been contacted in the phone reminder before the Summer. We also implemented a new incentive system for this last round.

Week	Event Date	Action	E	F	Total	%
2	8-Jan	Advance letter				
3	14/16 Jan	First Questionnaire				
4	22-Jan		0	448	448	15.8%
5	29-Jan	Reminder postcard	424	1127	1551	54.6%
6	4-Feb	Reminder letter	567	1303	1870	65.8%
7	11-Feb		613	1367	1980	69.6%
8	18-Feb		658	1495	2153	75.7%
9	25-Feb		675	1519	2194	77.2%
10	3-Mar	Second questionnaire F	683	1540	2223	78.2%
11	10-Mar	Second questionnaire E	684	1655	2339	82.3%
12	17-Mar		831	1835	2666	93.8%
13	24-Mar		863	1895	2758	97.0%
14	31-Mar		872	1918	2790	98.1%
18	28-Apr		886	1930	2816	99.1%
22	26-May		892	1951	2843	100.0%

Sample

The sample was drawn from the national addresses list of Cendris, a subsidiary of TPG, the Dutch national postal agency. The specifications called for a systematic random sample of N=9000. For over 65%, the addresses are associated with a family name – the remaining 35% were addressed as “To main occupant [hoofdbewoner]”.

Sampling within households was conducted by random date selection. The addresses were stratified in 12 random date groups and the addressed was invited to have the questionnaire completed by the household member whose birthday was closest to the date specified.

	Together 2007&2008		Leisure and Sports 2007		Religion IV 2008	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
	Initial sample	9000	100.0%	3000	100.0%	6000
Undeliverable	289	3.2%	98	3.2%	191	3.2%
Net sample	8711	100.0%	2902	100.0%	5809	100.0%
Valid response	2843	32.6%	892	30.7%	1951	33.5%
Explicit refusal	983	11.3%	311	10.7%	672	11.5%
No response	4885	56.1%	1699	58.5%	3186	54.8%

POST-STRATIFICATION WEIGHTS

There are four pieces of information that can inform us about selectivity that occurs because of non-response, and can be used to post-stratify the data.

Sample-frame information

- Location of the sampled address. It is to be expected that response in urban areas, and in particular in the four major cities (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague, Utrecht) is lower than elsewhere.
- Name: for about 35% of the sample there was no access to a name of the inhabitants. This has decreased the response.
- Phone: for about 61% of the sample there was no access to a phone number. Apart from obstructing the opportunity to use the third (phone) reminders, it is to be expected that not being listed in the phone-register is a strong correlate of willingness to participate.
- Foreign family name: Family names in the Netherlands can with considerable accuracy be classified as foreign and non-foreign. In particular Moroccan and Turkish names are easy to recognize, this is much harder for Surinamese and Antillean names.

In 25 cases, the respondents had removed their identification number from the mailed back questionnaire, although they supplied useable information. These questionnaires cannot be connected to the sample frame information and thus cannot be post-stratified in this respect (and these respondents kept receiving reminders to the very end...)

Ecological information (neighbourhood characteristics)

- Neighbourhood characteristics (connected to the detailed postal code in the sample frame) can be expected to predict response patterns
- This information has not been used for post-stratification. Its usefulness is left for future investigation.

Household box information

Selectivity may also occur within responding households. Each respondent was asked to complete a household box, which gives access to information of all household members with respect to:

- Sex
- Age

- Position in household
- Main activity
- Highest completed / current education.

In addition, we have information on:

- Total number of persons in household eligible for the sample (i.e. all household members of 16 and older).

Using this information, a synthetic population can be formed that consists of all household members in the designated age bracket (16-75+). The actual sample should be representative of this synthetic population. All this information was used to develop the post-stratification weight.

The weights have been constructed by taking the inverse of the expected probabilities from a logistic regression that predicted response from (A) sample frame characteristic, (B) constructed sample from household roster

Table 4: Benchmark distributions, unweighted sample data and weights			
URBANIZATION*		Weight	
1 minder dan 5000 inwoners		0.925	
2 5000 - < 10000 inwoners		0.909	
3 10000 - < 20000 inwoners		0.938	
4 20000 - < 50000 inwoners		0.973	
5 50000 - < 100000 inwoners		1.017	
6 100000 - < 150000 inwoners		1.053	
7 150000 - < 250000 inwoners		1.020	
8 250000 inwoners of meer		1.183	
NAME*		Weight	
No name		.953	
With name		1.108	
FOREIGN NAME*		Weight	
Dutch name		.983	
Foreign name		1.913	
PHONE*		Weight	
No phone listed		1.117	
Phone listed		.861	
AGE **		Weight	
18-24		1.581	
25-34		1.060	
35-44		0.975	
45-54		0.984	
55-64		0.950	
65-74		0.955	
75-hi		0.931	

EDUCATION**		Weight	
1	Basisonderwijs	1.108	
2	LBO-VBO-VMBOb	1.094	
3	MAVO-MULO-VMBOt	0.962	
4	HAVO-MMS	1.192	
5	VWO-HBS-Athen-Gymn	1.038	
6	kMBO	1.055	
7	MBO	0.980	
8	HBO	0.936	
9	Universiteit	0.915	
MAIN ACTIVITY**		Benchmark	Weight
1	Employed-full time		1.034
2	Employed-part time		0.936
3	Empl-< part-time		0.929
4	Helpg family member		0.917
5	Unemployed		1.239
6	Studt,school,vocat.traing		1.350
7	Retired		0.925
8	Housewife,-man,home duties		0.962
9	Permanently disabled		1.176
10	Other, not in labour force		0.915
HHPOS**			
1	Child		1.739
2	Parent		0.939
5	Other		1.023
6	Single hh member		1.050
7	Partner in couple hh		0.944
Sources: * Sampling frame, ** Household box			

In summary, it can be said that one group was severely underrepresented in our effective sample: young adults, in particular in as far as they live in their parents' households. Among these, the younger children (16 year olds) are particularly underrepresented. However, the highest marginal weight (1.9) is generated for respondents with foreign names. Note on the other hand, that the sample is fairly representative with respect to education and main activity. An unexpected finding is that the four large cities are only moderately underrepresented and that some underrepresentation occurs in rural areas.

Appendix: The Questionnaires