ZUMA Methodenbericht 2003/03

ISSP Study Monitoring 1999

Report to the ISSP General Assembly
on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP
by ZUMA, Germany

Janet Harkness, Sabine Klein and Evi Scholz

February 2003
ISSN 1610-9953

ZUMA
Quadrat B2, 1
Postfach 12 21 55
D- 68072 Mannheim

Telephone: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-284
Telefax: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-100
E-mail: Harkness@zuma-mannheim.de
Klein@zuma-mannheim.de
Scholz@zuma-mannheim.de

lntroduction

This report is based on the study monitoring survey conducted by ZUMA for the ISSP in 2000 and 2001 on the 1999 Social Inequality module.

Twenty-four member countries archived the 1999 Social Inequality module and all returned the monitoring questionnaire. Details of the individual answers members provided are presented in the summary chart which follows here. The latest version of the study monitoring questionnaire is appended.

We have done our best to summarise the answers we received and to check the information with members. Members were also given the opportunity to make corrections before the report was added as a supplement to the Archive codebook for the 1999 study, available on the Archive web site.

Summary of the findings

The questionnaire (see pages 1–2 of the Findings Chart)

In the questionnaire for the 1999 and subsequent modules, members were asked whether they had checked or evaluated their translations. Of the twenty-two countries that translated the questionnaire, three did not check or evaluate the translation and fourteen did not pre-test the translated questionnaire. Several countries fielded in English plus one other language. One member fielded in five languages, another in two other languages. Four members reported translation problems.

Survey context and question coverage (see pages 2–3 of the Findings Chart)

In 1999, sixteen countries fielded the ISSP module as part of a larger survey. Seven members did not include all the core items (Japan had permission to do so). Two members omitted questions from both the module and the background variables; the other members omitted background variables.

Sampling (see pages 4–7 of the Findings Chart)

The sampling procedures and details reported for the 1999 module differ little from those reported for the years before. Two countries had a lower age cut-off of 16 years of age; other members all had a lower age cut-off of 18 years of age. Three countries reported an upper age cut-off (at 79, at 80, and 85 years).

Two countries reported using quota procedures at different stages, eleven reported using substitution of different kinds.

Fieldwork (see pages 8–12 and 17–18 of the Findings Chart)

Three countries combined several modes in fielding, usually as a result of fielding the ISSP module together with another study and administering the background variables for both studies face-to-face and the ISSP as self-completion. Five countries using an interviewer-administered mode had mail components, such as advance and reminder letters.

Dates of fielding range from 1998 to 2000: late 1998 (1 country); 1999 (16 countries); between 1999-2000 (3 countries); 2000 (4 countries). In twelve of eighteen countries using interviewer-administered modes, interviewers approached addresses or households at different times of day and at different days of the week; in three countries at different times of day only, and in one country at different days in the week only. Two countries did not specify. The minimum number of calls at an address or a household ranges from none to ten. Nine countries supervised interviews (proportions ranging between: 5%-90%), while sixteen back-checked interviews (proportions ranging between: 5%-65%).

Six countries conducted their survey by mail (see table on page 17). Two countries had four mailings, one had three mailings, one had two, and the fifth had one mailing. (The number of mailings is usually seen as relevant for enhancing response rates, Dillman 2000.) The study monitoring questionnaire for Australia does not specify how many mailings were involved.

Information on response and outcome figures (see pages 13–14 of the Findings Chart)

Response rates are difficult to calculate for reasons mentioned in the Park and Jowell report (1997) and expanded in the overview of the 1996-1998 monitoring studies (Harkness, Langfeldt, and Scholz 2001). Quota procedures, substitution and, in some cases, a lack of sufficient detail are the three main obstacles to calculating response rates. Members also differ in their definitions of outcome codes – of what counts as “eligible“, “ineligible”, or “partially completed interviews”, and so forth. The raw figures for eligible samples and final outcomes indicate, nevertheless, that the range is considerable – from below 20% to over 90% .

Data (see pages 15–16 of the Findings Chart)

The findings reported on coding reliability and weighting change little over the period 1995 to 1999. The great majority of members employed various measures of coding reliability, for the most part logic or consistency checks and range checks, followed by either individual or automatic corrections or both.

Roughly one half applied subsequent weights or post-stratification to correct for errors of selection or response bias.

References

Dillman, D.A. (2000): Mail and Internet Surveys. The Tailored Design Method. 2. Edition. New York: Wiley.

Harkness, J., Langfeldt, B. and Scholz, E. (2001): ISSP Study Monitoring 1996-1998, Reports to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by ZUMA, Germany, Mai 2001. (available online with the 1996-1998 codebooks)

Park, A. and Jowell, R. (1997): Consistencies and differences in a cross-national survey. The International Social Survey Programme (1995). (available online with the 1995 codebook)

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2001

(based on Archive and ZUMA documentation, February, 2003: Australia to Ireland)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Australia (1984)	1996	✓	No
	1997	No	
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	No	✓
Austria (1985)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	No
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
Bangladesh (1997)	1996		
	1997	✓	No
	1998	No	
	1999	No	
	2000	(TP)	No
	2001		
Brazil (1999)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	No	
	2001	(TP)	(✓)
Bulgaria (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001		
Canada (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
Chile (1997)	1996		
	1997		
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	No
Cyprus (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	No
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	No

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Czech Republic (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
Denmark (1998)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓
	2001		
Finland (2000)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
France (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	No
Germany (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001		
Great Britain (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	No
Hungary (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓
Ireland (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	(TP)	(✓)
	1998	✓	No
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	No
	2001	No	

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2001

(based on Archive and ZUMA documentation, February, 2003: Israel to Spain)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Israel (1988)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
Italy (2001, re-instated)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	(No)	
	2000	(No)	
	2001		
Japan (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
Latvia (1997)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No	
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	No
Mexico (2000)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000	✓	✓
	2001		
Netherlands (1985)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓
	2001		
New Zealand (1990)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
Norway (1988)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Philippines (1989)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
Poland (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	No	✓
Portugal (1995)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001		
Russia (1990)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	No
	2001		
Slovakian Republic (1996, re-instated)	1996	No	
	1997	No	
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	No
	2000	No	
	2001		
Slovenia (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	No	✓
South Africa (2001, re-instated)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000		
	2001	✓	No
Spain (1993)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2001

(based on Archive and ZUMA documentation, February, 2003: Sweden to USA)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Sweden (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001		
Switzerland (1999)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	No
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	No	✓

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
USA (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	No	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

Monitoring Findings Chart
1999

for

Austria (A)
Australia (AUS)
Bulgaria (BG)
Canada (CDN)
Chile (CL)
Cyprus (CY)
Czech Republic (CZ)
Germany (D)
Spain (E)
France (F)
Great Britain (GB)
Hungary (H)
Israel (IL)
Japan (J)
Latvia (LV)
Norway (N)
New Zealand (NZ)
Portugal (P)
Poland (PL)
Philippines (RP)
Russia (RUS)
Sweden (S)
Slovenia (SLO)
United States of America (USA)

The questionnaire

	A[1]	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	F	GB	H	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Was the questionnaire translated?																								
Yes, translated:		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- by specialist					X			X					X						X					
- by research team		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		X			X	X	X	
- other				X																X				
No, not translated											X						X							
Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?																								
Yes:		X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
- group discussion			X		X	X		X	X				X			X		X	X			X	X	
- expert checked it			X					X											X		X			
- back translation										X														
- other												X		X	X					X				
No				X			X																	X
Not applicable											X						X							

[1] Austria used the German ZUMA translation and did not provide information on anything they may have produced themselves

The questionnaire (continued)

	A[1]	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	F	GB	H	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Was the questionnaire pre-tested?																								
Yes			X			X		X				X						X		X				
No	X			X	X		X		X	X			X	X	X	X			X		X	X	X	
Not answered		X																						X
Not applicable											X						X							
Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?																								
Yes		X						X						X									X	
No			X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X
Not applicable											X						X							
How was the ISSP module fielded?																								
Individual survey						X	X			X		X	X	X	X							X		
Larger survey:	X	X	X	X	X			X	X		X					X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
- with ISSP at start			X	X							X					X	X						X	
- with ISSP in middle		X			X				X									X						
- with ISSP at end	X							X											X	X	X			X

[1] Austria used the German ZUMA translation and did not provide information on anything they may have produced themselves

The questionnaire (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	F	GB	H	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Were the ISSP questions asked in the prescribed order?																								
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
No														X					X					
Were all the core ISSP items included?																								
Yes, all included	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X		X	X	X	
No, not all included:																								
- from module				X										X										
- background items				X		X					X			X				X		X				X

Sampling

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	F	GB	H	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Was your sample designed to be representative of the entire adult population?																								
Yes		X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X		
No	X				X					X			X						X		X		X	X
Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in private and in institutional accommodation?																								
Private	X			X	X			X		X									X		X			
Private and institutional																X	X					X		
Question not asked		X	X			X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X			X		X			X	X
Lower age cut-off																								
18	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
16														X							X			

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	F	GB	H	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Was there an upper age cut-off?																								
Yes															X	X						X		
Age															85	79						80		
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X
How many of the stages were based purely on probability or random sampling?[2]																								
Some															X					X				
All	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X	X	X
Not answered																		X						
What probability of selection did every member of the population sampled have?																								
Known and equal	X	X	X			X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	
Known and not equal				X	X				X	X	X								X	X				X
Unknown probability																								

[2] The information some countries give about sampling procedures, adherence to probability sampling, and their use of quotas is contradictory

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	F	GB	H	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
What was the issued sampled unit?																								
Address	X		X				X			X	X				X				X		X			
Household						X																		X
Named individual		X		X				X				X		X		X	X	X				X	X	
Other					X				X				X							X				
What selection method was used to identify a respondent?																								
Kish grid	X		X		X	X			X		X		X						X	X				X
Quota																		X			X			
Birthday method				X			X			X					X						X			
Other																								
Not answered																								
Not applicable		X						X				X		X		X	X					X	X	

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	F	GB	H	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage in the survey?																								
Yes	X[2]				X[1,2,3]	X[2]		X[3]	X[1,2]			X[2]			X[2]			X[2]		X[1,2]	X[1,2]		X[1,2]	
No		X	X	X			X			X	X		X	X		X	X		X			X		X
Were stratification factors used during sampling?																								
Yes	X		X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X			X
No		X					X			X						X			X			X	X	
Not answered				X																				

x[1] substitution of refusals
x[2] substitution of 'not at homes' (non-contacts), people away during survey period, etc.
x[3] substitution of sample points (documented in both cases; in the German dataset the cases can be subtracted)

Fieldwork

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	F	GB	H	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Fieldwork method ***(ISSP module)***																								
Face-to-face	X		X		X	X	X		X			X	X		X			X		X	X		X	
Self-completion (via Interviewer)								X			X			X					X					X
Self-completion (postal)		X		X						X						X	X					X		
*Fieldwork method (**ISSP background variables**)*																								
Face-to-face	X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X			X		X	X		X	X
Self-completion (via Interviewer)														X					X					
Self-completion (postal)		X		X						X						X	X					X		

Fieldwork

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	F	GB	H	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Were postal, self-completion (or telephone) methods used at any point during fieldwork?																								
Yes	X	X		X				X		X	X			X		X	X		X			X		
No			X		X	X	X		X			X	X		X			X		X	X		X	X
Were reminder letters/calls used?																								
Yes		X		X							X					X	X					X		
No	X							X		X				X					X					
Not applicable			X		X	X	X		X			X	X		X			X		X	X		X	X
Were interviewers paid according to perfor-mance?																								
Yes	X		X		X	X	X	X	X[3]		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	
No																								X
Not applicable		X		X						X						X	X					X		

[3] Interviewers were paid per day and per performance

Fieldwork

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	F	GB	H	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Which of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address or house-hold?																								
Call at different time of day			X			X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X		X	X
Call on different days in week			X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X					X				X	X
Neither of above							X																	
Not answered	X																	X						
Not applicable		X		X						X						X	X					X		
Were a minimum number of calls required?																								
Yes:	X		X		X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X		X	X
Minimum number of required calls	4		3		3		4	4	3		4	3	3		2			3	3	2	3		5	10
No						X								X										
Not answered																								
Not applicable		X		X						X						X	X					X		

Fieldwork

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	F	GB	H	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Were any interviews supervised?																								
Yes:			X		X	X			X		X	X						X		X				X
Approximate proportion (%)			10		12	20			30			90						5		10				5
No	X						X	X					X	X	X				X		X		X	
Not applicable		X		X						X						X	X					X		
Were any interviews back-checked?																								
Yes:			X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X		X	X
Approximate proportion (%)			5		18	10	15	25	30		10	20	30		5			5		20	14		65	20
No														X										
Not answered	X																							
Not applicable		X		X						X						X	X					X		

Fieldwork (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	F	GB	H	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Length of fieldwork																								
2 weeks or less									X			X		X										
Over 2 wks, < 1 month					X										X					X	X			
1 month, < 2 months	X						X											X	X				X	
2 months, < 3 months						X																		
3 months or more			X					X			X		X											X
Not applicable (mail surveys)		X		X						X						X	X					X		
Year of fieldwork																								
1998																							X	
1999		X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
2000	X	X		X	X			X					X											X

Information on response and outcome figures

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D[9]	E	F	GB	H
Figures based on reported figures												
Issued sample (n)	1606	4166	1200	4500	1505	1348	3748	2558/1172	1230	11015	2000	1871
Ineligible (n)	76	1386[4]	29	938			252	373/145		55	196	43
Eligible (n)	1530	2780	1171	3562	1505	1348	3496	2185/1027	1230	10960	1804	1828
- refusal (n)	242	363	10	4	72	162	725	916/409	12	8928	772	267
- non-contact (n)	272	745	49	2561	63		523	51/10	7	55	100	134
- other unproductive (n)			10	13	8	178	386	141/80		44	128	219
- completed cases (n)	1016	1672	1102	984[5]	1503/1362[6]	1008[7]	1862[8]	921/511	1211	1889	804	1208

[4] Deceased, ill, and non-English speaking included
[5] Ten partially completed interviews included
[6] First count includes substituted interviews
[7] Includes eigth partially completed interviews
[8] Twenty-eight partially completed interviews included
[9] Western federal states followed by eastern federal states

Information on response and outcome figures (continued)

	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Figures based on reported figures												
Issued sample (n)	3485	1800	1955	2500	2100	1707	1707	1200	4155	1999	3118	2489
Ineligible (n)	98	29	57	32		65			72	119	268	391
Eligible (n)	3387	1771	1898	2468	2100	1642	1707	1200	4083	1880	2850	2098
- refusal (n)	1618	177	267	38	121	105	432		1170	258	443	527
- non-contact (n)	225	132	487	1077	603		131		1096	373	197	
- other unproductive (n)	336	137	44	85	268	393	9		98	99	186	173
- completed cases (n)	1208	1325	1100	1268	1108	1144	1135	1200	1719[10]	1150	2024/ 1018[11]	1398/ 1272[12]

[10] Includes fourteen partially completed interviews
[11] ISSP 99 was administered in a split to half the sample (1018)
[12] First figure is the number of GSS (General Social Survey) interviews completed, the second figure, the ISSP questionnaires completed

Data

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	F	GB	H	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Were any measures of coding reliability employed?																								
Yes	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X		X		
No											X						X		X		X		X	X
Not answered		X	X																					
Were reliability checks made on derived variables?																								
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
No							X					X	X					X					X	
Data checks/edits on:																								
- filters	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- logic or consistency	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
- ranges	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Data (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	F	GB	H	IL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Were data errors corrected?																								
Yes:																								
- individually	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- automatically	X	X	X						X			X		X		X	X	X				X		X
No																								
Were the data weighted or post-stratified?																								
Yes	X			X	X					X	X	X						X	X	X	X			
No		X	X			X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X					X	X	X

Mail Surveys

	AUS	CDN	F	N	NZ	S
What was sent out in the first mailing?						
Questionnaire		X	X	X	X	X
Data protection information		X		X		X
Explanatory letter		X	X	X	X	X
Other material					X	
Not answered	X					
What was sent out in the second mailing?						
Thank you and reminder combined		X		X		X
Thank you sent only to respondents						
Reminder sent only to non-respondents					X	
Questionnaire					X	
Data protection information						
Explanatory letter					X	
Other material					X	
No second mailing			X			
Not answered	X					
What was sent out in the third mailing?						
Questionnaire				X	X	X
Data protection information				X		X
Explanatory letter				X	X	X
Other material					X	
No third mailing		X	X			
Not answered	X					

Mail Surveys

	AUS	CDN	F	N	NZ	S
What was sent out in the fourth mailing?						
Questionnaire				X		X
Data protection information				X		X
Explanatory letter				X		X
Other material						
No fourth mailing		X	X		X	
Not answered	X					

INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SURVEY PROGRAMME

Study Monitoring Questionnaire

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE
SOCIAL INEQUALITY 1999 ISSP MODULE AS YOUR REFERENCE.

RETURN TO: Janet Harkness, ZUMA, PO Box 12 21 55, D-68072 Mannheim, harkness@zuma-mannheim.de

1a. Please enter the name of your institute and your country:

Institute: ☐ Country: ☐

1b. Please enter the name of the principal investigator and your contact person for questions about the study:

Principal Investigator: ☐ Contact Person: ☐

2a. What kind of institute fielded the module?

An institute principally doing market research ☐

An institute principally doing academic research ☐

An institute doing both market and academic research ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

2b. Which institute carried out the fielding?

Our ISSP member institute itself ☐ OR Institute name: ☐

3a. Was the questionnaire fielded ...

only in English ☐ → Question 10

in English plus other language(s) ☐ → Question 3b

only in translation ☐ → Question 3b

3b. Please enter the language(s) the module was fielded in.

Please write in:

3c. Were questionnaires available for each language fielded?

Yes ☐ →Question 4

No ☐ →Question 3d

3d. Please give details of how you fielded without a questionnaire for one or more languages.

4. Who carried out the translation(s) for your questionnaires? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

5. Was the translation checked or evaluated?

Yes ☐ →Question 6

No ☐ →Question 7

6. How was the translation checked or evaluated?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

7. Was the translated questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

8. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ →Question 10

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

9. What did you do about any problems?

Please enter details:

10. What data collection methods were used for the module (substantive and background questions)?

Face-to-face ☐

Self-completion (with some interviewer involvement in delivering or collecting) ☐

'Mixed mode': part self-completion, part face-to-face (please write in details) ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

If 'mixed mode' or other, please write in:

11. Were postal or telephone components used (e.g. advance contacts)?

Yes (please write in details) ☐

No ☐

If postal/telephone components are used, please write in:

12. How was the ISSP module fielded in your country?

As an individual survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey) ☐ →Question 14

As part of a larger survey ☐ →Question 13

13. What was the approximate position of the Social Inequality module in the larger questionnaire?

Start of questionnaire ☐

Middle of questionnaire ☐

End of questionnaire ☐

14. Were the substantive questions in the Social Inequality module all asked in the prescribed order?

Yes ☐

Yes, apart from omissions ☐

No ☐

15. Were all the core ISSP questions included in your questionnaire (by core we mean all items except those that were optional)?

No – substantive question(s) from Social Inequality module not included ☐ →Question 16

No – required background ISSP question(s) not included ☐ →Question 16

Yes – all Social Inequality questions and background questions included ☐ →Question 17

16. Please write in details of the items and the reasons why questions were not included.

ISSP source questionnaire: question number or description of question:
Reason(s) not included:

17. Was your sample designed to be representative of ...

... only adult citizens of your country? ☐

... adults of any nationality able to complete the questionnaire / interview? ☐

18. Was your sample designed to be representative of ...

... only adults living in private accommodation? ☐ → Question 19

... adults living in private and in institutional accommodation (e.g., residential homes for the elderly, asylum accommodation)? ☐

Please enter details in box below.

Please enter in:

19. What was the lower age cut-off for your sample?

WRITE IN : ☐☐

20. Was there any upper age cut-off for your sample?

Yes - please write in cut-off ☐☐

No cut-off ☐

21. Were any groups excluded or under-represented in your sample design, apart from the age cut-offs or citizenship requirements just asked about?

No ☐

Yes (please write in details) ☐

If yes, write in details:

22. What were the different stages in your sampling procedure?

Please write in:

23. How many of the stages were based purely on probability sampling methods - that is, with no 'quota controls' employed?

None ☐

Some ☐

All ☐

24. What probability of selection did every member of the population sampled have?

A known and equal probability ☐ → Question 26

A known and not equal probability ☐ → Question 25

An unknown probability of selection ☐ → Question 25

25. In what way was probability of selection not equal or not known?

Please write in:

26. What was the final number of issued clusters or sampling points?

No clusters / sampling points ☐

WRITE IN NUMBER: ☐☐☐

27. What was the sampled unit that emerged from office sampling?

Address ☐ →Question 28

Household ☐ →Question 28

Named individual ☐ →Question 30

Other (please write in details) ☐ →Question 28

---

28. What selection method was used to identify a respondent?

Kish grid ☐ →Question 30

Last (or next) birthday ☐ →Question 30

Quota ☐ →Question 29

Other (please write in details) ☐ →Question 30

---

29. Please describe your quota procedures

Please write in:

30. Was substitution or replacement permitted at any stage of your selection process or during fieldwork?

Yes ☐ →Question 31

No ☐ →Question 32

31. In what way was substitution or replacement permitted?

Please write in:

32. Did you use any stratification factors when drawing your sample?

Yes ☐ →Question 33

No ☐ →Question 34

33. What stratification factors were used, and at what stage(s) of selection?

Please write in:

34. All in all, what are the known limitations (biases) of your achieved sample? For example: is there differential coverage of particular groups, either because of sample design or response differences?

Please write in:

35. Please fill in the following details about your issued sample. If some categories do not apply, please complete to the highest level of detail possible and use the 'other' box to give more information.

Total number of starting or issued names/addresses	
- addresses which could not be traced at all selected respondents who could not be traced	
- addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings	
- selected respondent too sick/incapacitated to participate	
- selected respondent away during survey period	
- selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey	
- no contact at selected address	
- no contact with selected person	
- refusal at selected address	
- proxy refusal (on behalf of selected respondent)	
- personal refusal by selected respondent	
- other type of unproductive (please write in full details in the box below)	
- full productive interview	
- partial productive interview	

More information or Other type of unproductive reaction

Please write in:

36. Here we ask for information about interviewer procedures.

a. Were interviewers paid according to performance (for example, according to the number of interviews they obtained)?

Yes ☐

No ☐

b. Which, if any, of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address/household? *PLEASE TICK THOSE THAT APPLY*

Calls/visits must be made at different times of day ☐

Calls/visits must be made on different days of week ☐

Neither of the above ☐

c. Were interviewers <u>required</u> to make a certain number of calls/ visits before they stopped approaching an address or household?

Minimum number of calls/visits required - please write in number ☐☐

No minimum call requirement ☐

d. Were any interviews supervised (that is, supervisor accompanies interviewer)?

Yes - please write in approximate proportion ☐☐ %

No ☐

e. Were any interviews back-checked (e.g. supervisor checks later whether interview conducted)?

Yes - please write in approximate proportion ☐☐ %

No ☐

37. Please write in the approximate start and end dates of fieldwork.

	D D	**M M**	**Y Y**
Start date	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐
End date	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐

38. Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes ☐

No ☐

39. Was keying of the data verified?

Yes - please write in approximate level of verification ☐☐☐ %

No ☐

40. Were any reliability checks made on derived variables (that is variables constructed on the basis of other variables collected)?

Yes ☐

No ☐

41. Were data checked/edited to ensure that filter instructions were followed correctly?

Yes ☐

No ☐

42. Were data checked/edited for logic or consistency?

Yes ☐

No ☐

43. Were data checked/edited to ensure they fell within permitted ranges?

Yes ☐

No ☐

If you answered YES for <u>any</u> question from Q38 to Q43, continue with Question 44.
If you answered NO for <u>all</u> questions Q38 to Q43, continue with Question 45.

44. Were errors corrected individually or automatically (through, for example, a 'forced' edit)? Please tick all that apply.

Yes - individual correction ☐

Yes - automatic correction ☐

No - not corrected ☐

45. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes ☐ → Question 46

No ☐ → Please read the instruction after Question 46.

46. Please briefly describe the weighting or post-stratification strategy used.

Please write in:

NOW PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE ADDRESS ON THE FRONT PAGE

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SURVEY PROGRAMME

Study Monitoring Questionnaire

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE
Social inequality 1999 ISSP MODULE AS YOUR REFERENCE.

RETURN TO: Janet Harkness, ZUMA, PO Box 12 21 55, D-68072 Mannheim, harkness@zuma-mannheim.de

1a. Please enter the name of your institute and your country:

Institute: ☐ Country: ☐

1b. Please enter the name of the principal investigator and your contact person for questions about the study:

Principal Investigator: ☐ Contact Person: ☐

2a. What kind of institute fielded the module?

An institute principally doing market research ☐

An institute principally doing academic research ☐

An institute doing both market and academic research ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

2b. Which institute carried out the fielding?

Our ISSP member institute itself ☐ OR Institute name: ☐

3a. Was the questionnaire fielded ...

Only in English ☐ → Question 10

In English plus other language(s) ☐ → Question 3b

Only in translation ☐ → Question 3b

3b. Please enter the language(s) the module was fielded in.

Please write in:

4. Who carried out the translation(s) for your questionnaires? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

---

5. Was the translation checked or evaluated?

Yes ☐ →Question 6

No ☐ →Question 7

6. How was the translation checked or evaluated?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

47. Was the translated questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

48. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating?

Please tick all that apply

No problems ☐ →Question 10

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

49. What did you do about any problems

Please enter details:

50. Here we ask for details of how your mail survey was fielded.

a. Were incentives offered?

Yes ☐

No ☐

b. Were pre-contacts (calls, visits, post) made?

Yes ☐

No ☐

c. How many mailings were sent out during fielding? Please enter number: ☐

d. What were the dates of mailings? (with multiple mailings, provide dates for the first three and the last)

1 d d m m y y y y

2 d d m m y y y y

3 d d m m y y y y

4 d d m m y y y y

e. What was sent out in each mailing? Please check all that apply.

1. Mailing:

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	☐	☐
Data protection information	☐	☐
Explanatory letter	☐	☐
Other material (Please write in details)	☐	☐

_____

2. Mailing:

	YES	NO
Thank you and reminder combined	☐	☐
Thank you sent only to respondents	☐	☐
Reminder sent only to non-respondents	☐	☐
Questionnaire	☐	☐
Data protection information	☐	☐
Explanatory letter	☐	☐
Other material (Please write in details)	☐	☐

_____

3. Mailing:

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	☐	☐
Data protection information	☐	☐
Explanatory letter	☐	☐
Other material (Please write in details)	☐	☐

_____

4. Mailing (or last, if more than four mailings):

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	☐	☐
Data protection information	☐	☐
Explanatory letter	☐	☐
Other material (Please write in details)	☐	☐

_____

11. How was the ISSP module fielded in your country?

As an individual survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey) ☐ →Question 13

As part of a larger survey ☐ →Question 12

12. What was the approximate position of the Social Inequality module in the larger questionnaire?

Start of questionnaire ☐

Middle of questionnaire ☐

End of questionnaire ☐

13. Were the substantive questions in the Social Inequality module all asked in the prescribed order?

Yes ☐

Yes, apart from omissions ☐

No ☐

14. Were all the core ISSP questions included in your questionnaire (by core we mean all items except those that were optional)?

No – substantive question(s) from Social Inequality module not included ☐ →Question 15

No – required background ISSP question(s) not included ☐ →Question 15

Yes – all Social Inequality questions and background questions included ☐ →Question 16

15. Please write in details of the items and the reasons why questions were not included.

ISSP source questionnaire: question number or description of question:

Reason(s) not included:

16. Was your sample designed to be representative of ...

... only adult citizens of your country? ☐

... adults of any nationality able to complete the questionnaire / interview? ☐

17. Was your sample designed to be representative of ...

... only adults living in private accommodation? ☐ → Question 18

... adults living in private and in institutional accommodation (e.g., residential homes for the elderly, asylum accommodation)? ☐

Please enter details in box below.

Please enter in:

18. What was the lower age cut-off for your sample?

WRITE IN : ☐☐

19. Was there any upper age cut-off for your sample?

Yes - please write in cut-off ☐☐

No cut-off ☐

20. Were any groups excluded or under-represented in your sample design, apart from the age cut-offs or citizenship requirements just asked about?

No ☐

Yes (please write in details) ☐

If yes, please write in details:

21. What were the different stages in your sampling procedure?

Please write in:

22. How many of the stages were based purely on probability sampling methods - that is, with no 'quota controls' employed?

None ☐

Some ☐

All ☐

23. What probability of selection did every member of the population sampled have?

A known and equal probability ☐ → Question 25

A known and not equal probability ☐ → Question 24

An unknown probability of selection ☐ → Question 24

24. In what way was probability of selection not equal or not known?

Please write in:

25. What was the final number of issued clusters or sampling points?

No clusters / sampling points ☐

WRITE IN NUMBER: ☐☐☐

26. What was the sampled unit that emerged from office sampling?

Address ☐ →Question 27

Household ☐ →Question 27

Named individual ☐ →Question 29

Other (please write in details) ☐ →Question 27

27. What selection method was used to identify a respondent?

Kish grid ☐ →Question 29

Last (or next) birthday ☐ →Question 29

Quota ☐ →Question 28

Other (please write in details) ☐ →Question 29

28. Please describe your quota procedures

Please write in:

29. Was substitution or replacement permitted at any stage of your selection process or during fieldwork?

Yes ☐ →Question 30

No ☐ →Question 31

30. In what way was substitution or replacement permitted?

Please write in:

31. Did you use any stratification factors when drawing your sample?

Yes ☐ →Question 32

No ☐ →Question 33

32. What stratification factors were used, and at what stage(s) of selection?

Please write in:

33. All in all, what are the known limitations (biases) of your achieved sample?
For example: is there differential coverage of particular groups, either because of sample design or response differences?

Please write in:

34. Please fill in the following details about your issued sample. If some categories do not apply, please complete to the highest level of detail possible and use the 'other' box to give more information.

Total number of starting or issued names/addresses	
- addresses which could not be traced	
- addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings	
- details of address wrong (street numbers, post codes, etc.)	
- addresses with no letter boxes	
- selected respondent unknown at address	
- selected respondent moved, no forwarding address	
- selected respondent too sick/incapacitated to participate	
- selected respondent deceased	
- selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey	
- selected respondent away during survey period	
- refusal by selected respondent	
- refusal by another person	
- implicit refusals (empty envelopes, empty questionnaires returned)	
- other type of unproductive reaction (please write in details in box below)	
- completed returned questionnaires	
- partially completed returned questionnaires	
- no contact	

Other information or other type of unproductive reaction

Please write in:

35. Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes ☐

No ☐

36. Was keying of the data verified?

Yes - please write in approximate level of verification ☐☐☐ %

No ☐

37. Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?

Yes ☐

No ☐

38. Were data checked/edited to ensure that filter instructions were followed correctly?

Yes ☐

No ☐

39. Were data checked/edited for logic or consistency?

Yes ☐

No ☐

40. Were data checked/edited to ensure they fell within permitted ranges?

Yes ☐

No ☐

If you answered YES for <u>any</u> question from Q35 to Q40, continue with Question 41.
If you answered NO for <u>all</u> questions Q35 to Q40, continue with Question 42.

41. Were errors corrected individually or automatically (through, for example, a 'forced' edit)? Please tick all that apply.

Yes - individual correction ☐

Yes - automatic correction ☐

No - not corrected ☐

42. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes ☐ → Question 43

No ☐ → Please read the instruction after Question 43.

43. Please briefly describe the weighting or post-stratification strategy used.

Please write in:

NOW PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE ADDRESS ON THE FRONT PAGE

THANK YOU VERY MUCH