ISSP Study Monitoring 2000

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

Sabine Klein and Janet Harkness (ZUMA)

Obernai, April 26, 2003 - April 30, 2003

lntroduction

This report is based on the study monitoring survey conducted by ZUMA for the ISSP in 2001 and 2002 on the 2000 Environment module.

Twenty-six member countries archived the 2000 Environment module and 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 given the opportunity to make corrections before the report was added as a supplement to the Archive codebook for the 2000 study and made available on the Archive web site.

Summary of the findings

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

From 1999 on, the Study Monitoring Questionnaire (SMQ) asks whether members checked or evaluated their translations. Of the twenty-two countries that produced translations, the United States did not check or evaluate the translation and Austria did not indicate whether they did. Sixteen countries did not pre-test the translated questionnaire (Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Norway, the Netherlands, Portugal, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, and Slovenia). The Philippines fielded in five languages, Switzerland in three languages, and Finland, Israel, and Latvia in two languages. Canada and the United States fielded in one other language besides English. Germany, Finland, and Norway were the only members who reported translation problems.

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

In 2000, eighteen countries fielded the ISSP module as part of a larger survey. Six members did not include all the core items (Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Japan, Latvia, and the Netherlands). Denmark omitted substantive and background variables; Latvia omitted substantive questions, the other members omitted background variables. Questions were usually omitted by mistake. On occasion members stated they cut them to save money.

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

The sampling procedures and details reported for the 2000 module are for the most part similar to those reported in earlier years. Three countries reported using quota procedures at

different stages (the Netherlands, the Philippines, and Russia), nine reported using substitution of different kinds.

Finland and Switzerland had a lower age cut-off of 15 years, Japan and the Netherlands had a cut-off of 16 years; all other members all had a lower age cut-off of 18 years of age. Five countries reported an upper age cut-off (Denmark and Finland at 74, Norway and Sweden at 79, and Latvia at 85 years).

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

MODES

Five 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 (Bulgaria, Germany, Northern Ireland, the Netherlands, and Switzerland). Switzerland used both mail and interviewer modes.

Four countries using an interviewer-administered mode had mail components, such as advance and reminder letters (Germany, Northern Ireland, the Netherlands, and Slovenia). Three countries using a mail approach had telephone contacts in the form of prenotifications or reminders (Denmark, Sweden, and Switzerland). In Denmark a few interviews were collected by telephone (the mode variable identifies these), in Switzerland, a fair number of background variables were collected by telephone (a variable identifies these). The Methodology Committee discussed this deviation from ISSP procedures with the Swiss, who have now changed their design.

Seven countries conducted their survey by mail (see table on page 17). Four countries had four mailings, and the other had three mailings. The number of mailings is usually seen as relevant for enhancing response rates, Dillman 2000.

FIELDING DATES

Dates of fielding range from 2000 to 2002:

2000	18 countries
2000-2001	1 country
2001	5 countries
2001-2002	1 country
2000-2002	1 country[1].

Japan had the shortest fielding period, with seven days, Mexico had the longest, with eight months.

[1] Switzerland fielded three samples, two from 2000 to 2001 and one in 2002.

In sixteen of twenty countries using interviewer-administered modes, interviewers approached addresses or households at different times of day and at different days of the week; in two countries at different times of day only, and in one country at different days in the week only. Switzerland made no specifications.

Countries differ considerably in the number of required contact attempts. The minimum required number of calls at an address or a household ranges from none (Japan) to fifteen (Switzerland). Seven countries supervised interviews (proportions ranging between 3%-30%), and 17 countries back-checked interviews (proportions ranging between 0.5%-70%).

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

Quota procedures, substitution, and, in some cases, a lack of sufficient detail are the three main obstacles to calculating response rates for some of the ISSP 2000 studies (cf. 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). 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 in the ISSP – from below 30% to over 80% for the module.

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

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)

Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2001

(based on Archive and ZUMA documentation, June, 2003: Australia - Great Britain)

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

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Cyprus (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	No
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓
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	✓	✓
Germany (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
Great Britain & Northern Ireland (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓

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

Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2001

(based on Archive and ZUMA documentation, June, 2003: Hungary - Russia)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Hungary (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓
Ireland (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	(TP)	(✓)
	1998	✓	No
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	No	
Israel (1988)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
Italy (2001, re-instated)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999		
	2000		
	2001	No	
Japan (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
Latvia (1997)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No	
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
Mexico (2000)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	No	

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
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	✓	✓
Philippines (1989)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
Poland (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓
Portugal (1995)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	No	
Russia (1990)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓

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

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2001

(based on Archive and ZUMA documentation, June, 2003: Slovakian Republic - USA)

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

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Sweden (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	No	
Switzerland (1999)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	No
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
USA (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓

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

Monitoring Findings Chart
2000

for

Austria (A)
Bulgaria (BG)
Canada (CDN)
Switzerland (CH)
Chile (CL)
Czech Republic (CZ)
Germany (D)
Denmark (DK)
Spain (E)
Finland (FIN)
Great Britain (GB)
Israel (IL)
Ireland (IRL)
Japan (J)
Latvia (LV)
Mexico (M)
Norway (N)
Northern Ireland (NIR)
Netherlands (NL)
New Zealand (NZ)
Portugal (P)
Philippines (RP)
Russia (RUS)
Sweden (S)
Slovenia (SLO)
United States of America (USA)

The questionnaire

	A	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	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	X
- by specialist			X	X	X		X		X	X		X										X				
- by research team		X		X	X	X	X	X		X				X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	
No, not translated											X		X					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		X	X	
- expert checked it		X					X			X													X			
- back translation			X													X						X				
- other								X	X					X												
No																										X
Not answered	X																									
Not applicable											X		X					X		X						

The questionnaire (continued)

	A	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Was the questionnaire pre-tested?																										
Yes		X							X							X						X				
No			X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X		X	X		X		X		X		X	X	X	
Not answered	X																									X
Not applicable											X		X					X		X						
Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?																										
Yes							X			X							X									
No	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X		X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Not applicable											X		X					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		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	X			X

The questionnaire (continued)

	A	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	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
Yes, apart from omissions				X							X				X											
No										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	X	X	X
No, not all included:						X		X		X				X	X				X							
- from module								X							X											
- background items						X		X		X				X					X							

Sampling

	A	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
The sample was designed to be representative of…																										
…only adult citizens of country	X				X																	X	X			
…adults of any nationality able to complete the questionnaire / interview		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
Was your sample designed to be representative of…																										
…only adults living in private accommodation	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X		X		X	X		X			X	X	X		X	
…adults living in private and institutional accommodation								X									X			X				X		
Q not in version of SMQ		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							
15				X						X																

Sampling (continued)

	A	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Was there an upper age cut-off?																										
Yes								X		X					X		X							X		
Age								74		74					85		79							79		
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?																										
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	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	X	
Known and <u>not</u> equal				X	X	X	X				X		X									X				X
Not answered																					X					

Sampling (continued)

	A	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
What was the issued sampled unit?																										
Address	X	X									X		X		X								X			
Household				X		X												X			X					X
Named individual			X[1]				X	X		X				X			X		X	X				X	X	
Other					X				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	X[2]			
Birthday method			X	X									X		X				X		X		X			
Other	X																									
Not applicable							X	X		X				X			X			X				X	X	

[1] Telephone directory.
[2] Information taken from the Study Description Sheet.

Sampling (continued)

	A	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage in the survey?																										
Yes	X[2]				X[1,2,3]	X[1]	X[3]		X[2]						X[2]				X[2,3]			X[1,2]	X[1,2]			
No		X	X	X				X		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	X		X	X
No	X			X				X		X							X		X					X		

x[1] substitution of refusals
x[2] substitution of non-contacts, people away during survey period, etc.
x[3] substitution of sample points (documented in Germany and Chile, cases can be excluded for analysis)

Fieldwork

	A	BG	CDN	CH[3]	CL	CZ	D	DK[3]	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
What data collection methods were used for the module (substantive and background questions)?																										
Face-to-face	X			X[b]	X	X	X[b]		X			X	X	X	X	X		X[b]	X[b]		X	X	X		X	X[b]
Self-Completion (with some interviewer involvement in de-livering or collecting)				X[s]			X[s]				X							X[s]	X[s,b]							X[s]
Self-completion by mail			X	X[s]				X[s,b]		X							X			X				X		
Telephone				X[b]				X[s,b]																		

[3] The Methodology Committee discussed Danish and Swiss implementations. Danish cases can be identified and are above minimum number required by ISSP. Switzerland has changed its design.
[s] substantive variables
[b] background variables

Fieldwork (continued)

	A	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	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	X			X
Were reminder letters/calls used?																										
Yes			X	X				X[4]		X							X			X				X[5]		
No																		X							X	
Not applicable	X	X			X	X	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	X	X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X		X	
No				X												X										X
Not applicable			X					X		X							X			X				X		

[4] Telephone contact after the last mailing; 3.8% of the resulting interviews were collected by telephone.
[5] A telephone reminder between the third and fourth mailing.

Fieldwork (continued)

	A	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Which of the following were required in approaching an address or household?																										
Call at different time of day	X	X				X	X		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	X		X	X			X	X
Neither of above				X																						
Not applicable			X					X		X							X			X				X		
Were a minimum number of calls required?																										
Number of calls required	5	3		15	3	5	4		3		4	3	5		2	3		3	3		3	2	3		5	10
No														X												
Not applicable			X					X		X							X			X				X		

Fieldwork (continued)

	A	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Were any interviews supervised?																										
Yes:		X			X	X					X					X						X				X
Approximate proportion (%)		8			3	30										20						10				5
No	X			X			X		X			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	X
Approximate proportion (%)	15	3		20	27	30	25		10		0.5	30	10		10				10		20	20	15		70	20
No														X		X										
Not answered																		X								
Not applicable			X					X		X							X			X				X		

Fieldwork (continued)

	A	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Length of fieldwork																										
2 weeks or less									X					X								X	X			
Over 2 wks, < 1 month					X										X											
1 month, < 2 months	X	X																							X	
2 months, < 3 months						X							X					X	X		X					
3 months or more				X			X				X	X				X										X
Not applicable (mail surveys)			X					X		X							X			X				X		
Year of fieldwork for 2000 module																										
2000		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
2001	X		X	X				X		X			X			X								X		
2002				X									X													

Information on response and outcome figures

	A	BG	CDN	CH[7]			CL	CZ	D[9]	DK	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL
Response figures based on reported figures				1st sample	2nd sample	3rd sample									
Issued sample (n)	1606	1200	3000	6875	1205	2052	1505	2271	2533/1173	1979	1500	2500	2067	3300	2224
Inelegible (n)	79	43	288	2973	392	905	0	13	320/134	53	105	4	226	148	128
Eligible (n)	1527	1157	2712	3902	813	1147	1505	2258	2213/1039	1926	1395	2496	1841	3152	2096
- refusal (n)	249	51	29	2530	487	687	74	546	847/400	93	324	13	512	1353	447
- non-contact (n)	253	47	1549	111	0	0	63	276	146/25	0	113	950	59	145	0
- other unproductive (n)	14	46	7	621	138	282	6	192	246/87	764	0	5	137	449	346
- completed cases (n)	1011	1013	1127[6]	640	188	178	1503[8] / 1362	1244	974/527	1069[10]	958	1528	1133[11]	1205	1273[12]
					1006										

[6] Twelve partially completed questionnaires included.
[7] Fielding problems resulted in 800 cases. Further sample drawn to increase number of cases.
[8] First count includes substituted interviews.
[9] Western federal states followed by eastern federal states.
[10] 38 interviews were collected by telephone.
[11] Two partially completed interviews included.
[12] 41 partially completed interviews included.

Information on response and outcome figures (continued)

	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Response figures based on reported figures													
Issued sample (n)	1800	1716	1800	2500	2850	9582	2000	1917		3569	2000	3389	2488
Inelegible (n)	16	69	51	0	42	0	165	42		152	136	238	382
Elegible (n)	1784	1647	1749	2500	2808	9582	1835	1875		3467	1864	3151	2106
- refusal (n)	175	230	220	0	428	2493	54	564		913	248	471	517
- non-contact (n)	168	390	229	1005	554	1505	628	306		689	436	187	0
- other unproductive (n)	261	27	38	43	26	3975	41	5		92	113	319	170
- completed cases (n)	1180	1000	1262	1452	1800	1609	1112	1000	1200	1723[13]	1067	2174[14]	1419/1276 [15]

[13] 23 partially completed interviews included.
[14] ISSP 2000 was administered in a split to half the sample (1077); 105 partially completed interviews included.
[15] First figure is the number of General Social Survey interviews completed, the second figure, the ISSP questionnaires completed.

Data

	A	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	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	X		X	X	X
No			X	X							X									X			X			
Not answered		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
No	X		X	X				X				X		X	X										X	
Not answered																					X					
Not applicable																						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	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		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	X

Data (continued)

	A	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	FIN	GB	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
Were data errors corrected?																										
Yes:	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X		X		X
- individually	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																			X							
Were the data weighted or post-stratified?																										
Yes	X		X	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

Mail Surveys

	CDN	CH	DK	FIN	N	NZ	S
What was sent out in the first mailing?							
Prenotifcation		X				X	
Questionnaire	X		X	X	X		X
Data protection information	X		X	X	X		X
Explanatory letter	X		X	X	X		X
What was sent out in the second mailing?							
Thank you and reminder combined	X			X	X		X
Reminder sent only to non-respondents			X				
Questionnaire		X[16]				X	
Data protection information		X	X				
Explanatory letter		X				X	
What was sent out in the third mailing?							
Reminder sent only to non-respondents		X				X	
Questionnaire	X		X	X	X		X
Data protection information	X		X	X	X		X
Explanatory letter	X		X	X	X		X
What was sent out in the fourth mailing?							
Reminder sent only to non-respondents		X					
Questionnaire					X	X	X
Data protection information					X		X
Explanatory letter					X	X	X
No fourth mailing	X		X	X			

[16] There were two parallel fields: one drop-off and one mail for the substantive questions. Some background variables were either face-to-face or by telephone; as noted, Switzerland has now changed its procedures to conform with ISSP requirements.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SURVEY PROGRAMME

Study Monitoring Questionnaire

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE
ENVIRONMENT 2000 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 Environment module in the larger questionnaire?

Start of questionnaire ☐

Middle of questionnaire ☐

End of questionnaire ☐

14. Were the substantive questions in the Environment 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 Environment module not included ☐ →Question 16

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

Yes – all Environment 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 exluded 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
ENVIRONMENT 2000 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:

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. 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 Environment module in the larger questionnaire?

Start of questionnaire ☐

Middle of questionnaire ☐

End of questionnaire ☐

13. Were the substantive questions in the Environment 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 Environment module not included ☐ →Question 15

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

Yes – all Environment 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 ☐

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, 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 ☐

22. 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