

ISSP Study Monitoring 2002
Report to the ISSP General Assembly
on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP
by ZUMA, Germany
Bled, April 19, 2004 – April 21, 2004

Sabine Klein and Janet Harkness

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

Telephone: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-284,-272

Telefax: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-100

E-mail: Harkness@zuma-mannheim.de
Klein@zuma-mannheim.de

Introduction

This report is based on the study monitoring survey conducted by ZUMA for the ISSP on the 2002 Family and Changing Gender Roles module.

Thirty-four member countries archived the 2002 Family and Changing Gender Roles module, all of them have completed the monitoring questionnaire. Details of the individual answers members provided are presented in the summary chart which follows here. 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 is made available on the Archive web site as a supplement to the 2002 Codebook.

The Study Monitoring Questionnaire (SMQ) has been modified from year to year. Questions on fieldwork, translation, and sampling have, for example, changed and questions on documentation been added. The latest version of the study monitoring questionnaire is appended. Some members used old versions of the SMQ they had kept. This means that some information for these countries is missing in the report. In order to avoid this in future, members are requested to contact ZUMA for the latest questionnaire in either online or word file format.

Summary of the findings

Language(s) and translation (see pages 1–6 of the Findings Chart)

From 1999 on, the SMQ asks whether members checked or evaluated their translations. All of the twenty-seven countries that produced translations checked or evaluated them (the Swiss Italian translation is an exception). Fourteen countries did not pre-test the translated questionnaire (Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Japan, Latvia, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, and Sweden). The Philippines fielded in five languages, Switzerland in three languages and Finland, Israel, and Latvia in two languages. All the other member countries fielded in one language.

More countries reported translation problems than in the past (Chile, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Flanders, Germany, Hungary, Mexico, Norway, and Taiwan).

Survey question coverage and context (see pages 7–8 of the Findings Chart)

All countries included all of the core items. Eleven members omitted background variables, usually by mistake.

In 2002, twenty-two countries fielded the ISSP module as part of a larger survey. A new question in the SMQ asking for information about accompanying studies (topic, study title, etc.) is included in the report (see appendix).

Sampling (see pages 9–12 of the Findings Chart)

The sampling procedures and details reported for the 2002 module are for the most part similar to those reported in earlier years. Four countries seem to be using quota procedures at different stages; Brazil, the Slovak Republic, the Netherlands, and the Philippines. The Slovak Republic intends to change to a random sample in 2004 (for the National Identity module). Eleven reported using substitution of different kinds; Austria, Chile, Cyprus, Flanders, Hungary, Latvia, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Russia, Slovak Republic, and Spain.

Finland and Switzerland had a lower age cut-off at 15 years, Japan and the Netherlands had a cut-off at 16 years; all other members had a lower age cut-off at 18 years of age. Five countries reported an upper age cut-off (Finland at 74, Latvia at 75, Norway and Sweden at 79, and Flanders at 85 years).

Data collection (see pages 13-17 of the Findings Chart)**MODES**

Essentially the ISSP questionnaires are administered as face-to-face interviews or in a self-completion format. 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, Flanders, Northern Ireland, and Poland).

Two countries using an interviewer-administered mode had two advance contacts, letter and telephone call (Switzerland and the United States). Nine countries had advance letters (Germany, Flanders, Great Britain, Hungary, Japan, Northern Ireland, Poland, Portugal, and Slovenia), the Netherlands had a telephone pre-contact. In Flanders interviewers delivered the questionnaire and respondents were asked to return them by post. Flanders therefore used three reminders, two by mail and one by telephone. Seven countries conducted their survey by mail (see table on page 17). Of these, Australia had six mailings, New Zealand and Norway had four, Finland and Sweden had three, Denmark and France had two mailings. The number

of mailings is usually seen as relevant for enhancing response (Dillman 2000). Sweden and Denmark had a telephone reminder. In Denmark, about 20% (256 of 1377) of the interviews were collected by telephone; the mode variable identifies these. Telephone interviews are not permitted in the ISSP.

INCENTIVES

Eight countries reported they had used incentives (Chile, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Norway, Taiwan and the United States). This information was not collected in the SMQ until the 2001 module.

FIELDING DATES

Dates of fielding for the 2002 module range from 2001 to 2004:

2001	1 country
2001-2002	2 countries
2002	19 countries
2001 (end) – 2003 (beginning)	1 country
2002-2003	4 countries
2003	6 countries
2003-2004	1 country

Spain had the shortest fielding period, with five days, Australia had the longest, with more than a year.

In twenty-four of twenty-seven 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 (Latvia, Spain), and in one country at different days in the week only (Slovak Republic).

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 (Cyprus, Slovak Republic, Switzerland, and the United States) to ten (Germany). Thirteen countries supervised interviews (proportions ranging between 1%-100%). With one exception (Japan), countries using interviewer-administered modes back-checked interviews (proportions ranging between 3%-95%).

Information on response and outcome figures (see pages 18–19 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 2002 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 ISSP Nonresponse methods group is currently working on standard definitions for the ISSP.

The raw figures for eligible samples and final outcomes indicate, nevertheless, that the range in the ISSP is considerable – from about 20% to over 80% for the module.

Data (see pages 20–21 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.

Sixteen of thirty-four countries applied subsequent weights or post-stratification to correct for errors of selection or response bias.

Documentation (see page 22 of the Findings Chart)

Nineteen countries reported they had a national methods report available (Australia, Austria, Brazil, Chile, Czech Republic, Germany, Spain, Flanders, Great Britain, Hungary, Norway, Northern Ireland, Poland, Russia, Taiwan, the Philippines, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States). This information was not collected in the SMQ until the 2001 module.

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 1996–2002¹
(based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, May, 2004: Australia to Denmark)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Australia (1984)	1996	✓	No	Canada (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No			1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	No	
Austria (1985)	1996	No	No	Chile (1997)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓		1997		
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
Bangladesh (1997) - (2003)	1996		No	Cyprus (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	No		1997	✓	✓
	1998	No			1998	✓	No
	1999	No			1999	✓	✓
	2000	(TP)	No		2000	No	
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
Brazil (1999)	2002	No		Czech Republic (1991)	2002	✓	✓
	1996				1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	✓	✓
	1998	(TP)	(✓)		1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)		1999	✓	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
Bulgaria (1991)	2001	✓	✓	Denmark (1998)	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	1996	✓	✓		1996		
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	(TP)	(✓)
2000	✓	✓	2000	✓	✓		
2001	No		2001	✓	✓		
2002	✓	✓	2002	✓	✓		

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

¹ South Korea, Uruguay and Venezuela are not included in this table because they have not archived their data yet. Venezuela joined the ISSP in 1999; South Korea and Uruguay in 2003.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2002¹
 (based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, May, 2004: Finland to Japan)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Finland (2000)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Flanders (2000)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000		
	2001		
	2002	✓	✓
France (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Germany (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Great Britain & Northern Ireland (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Hungary (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Ireland (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	(TP)	(✓)
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓
Israel (1988)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Italy (2001, re-instated)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	(No)	
	2000	(No)	
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	No	
Japan (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓

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

¹ South Korea, Uruguay and Venezuela are not included in this table because they have not archived their data yet. Venezuela joined the ISSP in 1999; South Korea and Uruguay in 2003.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2002¹
 (based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, May, 2004: Latvia to Slovak Republic)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Latvia (1997)	1996	✓	✓	Philippines (1989)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No			1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
Mexico (2000)	1996			Poland (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	✓	✓
	1998				1998	✓	✓
	1999				1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
2002	✓	✓	2002	✓	✓		
Netherlands (1985)	1996	No		Portugal (1995)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
2002	✓	✓	2002	✓	✓		
New Zealand (1990)	1996	✓	✓	Russia (1990)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
2002	✓	✓	2002	✓	✓		
Norway (1988)	1996	✓	✓	Slovak Republic (1996, re-instated)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓		1997	No	
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
2002	✓	✓	2002	✓	✓		

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

¹ South Korea, Uruguay and Venezuela are not included in this table because they have not archived their data yet. Venezuela joined the ISSP in 1999; South Korea and Uruguay in 2003.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2002¹
 (based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, May, 2004: Slovenia to USA)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Slovenia (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
South Africa (2001, re-instated)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000		
	2001	✓	✓
2002	No		
Spain (1993)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Sweden (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Switzerland (1999)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	No
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Taiwan (2001)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000		
	2001		
2002	✓	✓	
USA (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓

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

¹ South Korea, Uruguay and Venezuela are not included in this table because they have not archived their data yet. Venezuela joined the ISSP in 1999; South Korea and Uruguay in 2003.

**Monitoring Findings Chart
2002
for**

**Austria (A)
Australia (AUS)
Bulgaria (BG)
Brazil (BR)
Switzerland (CH)
Chile (CL)
Cyprus (CY)
Czech Republic (CZ)
Germany (D)
Denmark (DK)
Spain (E)
France (F)
Finland (FIN)
Flanders (FL)
Great Britain (GB)
Hungary (H)
Israel (IL)
Ireland (IRL)
Japan (J)
Latvia (LV)
Mexico (MEX)
Norway (N)
Northern Ireland (NIR)
Netherlands (NL)
New Zealand (NZ)
Portugal (P)
Poland (PL)
The Philippines (RP)
Russia (RUS)
Sweden (S)
Slovak Republic (SK)
Slovenia (SLO)
Taiwan (TW)
United States of America (USA)**

Language(s) and translation

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	German	English	Bulgarian	Portuguese	German	Spain	Greek	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	France	Finnish	Dutch	English	Hungary	Hebrew
Language 2 (L2)					French								Swedish				Arab
Language 3 (L3)					Italian												
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>																	
Yes, translated:	X ^A																
- by member(s) of research team			X		L1, L2		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	
- by translation bureau						X								X			
- by specially trained translator(s)				X	L3				X				X				X
No, not translated		X													X		

^A Austria used the German (ZUMA) translation.

Translation (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	TW	SLO	USA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	English	Dutch	English	Portu- guese	Poland	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Mandarin	Slovenian	English
Language 2 (L2)			Russian								Ilocano						
Language 3 (L3)											Bicolano						
Language 4 (L4)											Cebuano						
Language 5 (L5)											Ilonggo						
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>																	
Yes, translated:																	
- by member(s) of research team		X	X		X		X		X	X	L1		X	X		X	
- by translation bureau		X															
- by specially trained translator(s)				X						X		X	X		X		
- other											L1-5						
No, not translated	X					X		X									X

Translation (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	German	English	Bulgarian	Portuguese	German	Spain	Greek	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	France	Finnish	Dutch	English	Hungary	Hebrew
Language 2 (L2)					French								Swedish				Arab
Language 3 (L3)					Italian												
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>																	
Yes:																	
- group discussion			X	X	L1, L2	X	X	X	X			X	X				X
- expert checked it			X						X		X	X	X	X		X	
- other										X							
No					L3												
Not applicable	(X) ^A	X													X		

^A Austria used the German (ZUMA) translation.

Translation (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	English	Dutch	English	Portuguese	Poland	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Mandarin	English
Language 2 (L2)			Russian								Ilocano						
Language 3 (L3)											Bicolano						
Language 4 (L4)											Cebuano						
Language 5 (L5)											Ilonggo						
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>																	
Yes:																	
- group discussion			X		X				X	X	L1, L2, L3, L4		X	X	X	X	
- expert checked it										X		X		X			
- back translation				X							L1-5						
- other		X					X										
Not applicable	X					X		X									X

Translation (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	German	English	Bulgarian	Portu- guese	German	Spain	Greek	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	France	Finnish	Dutch	English	Hungary	Hebrew
Language 2 (L2)					French								Swedish				Arab
Language 3 (L3)					Italian												
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>																	
Yes			X	X	X		X		X				X	X		X	X
No						X		X		X	X	X					
Not applicable	(X) ^A	X													X		
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>																	
Yes						X	X	X	X					X		X	
No			X	X	X					X	X	X	X				X
Not applicable	(X) ^A	X													X		

^A Austria used the German (ZUMA) translation.

Translation (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	English	Dutch	English	Portuguese	Poland	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Mandarin	English
Language 2 (L2)			Russian								Ilocano						
Language 3 (L3)											Bicolano						
Language 4 (L4)											Cebuano						
Language 5 (L5)											Ilonggo						
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>																	
Yes				X							X			X		X	
No		X	X		X		X		X	X		X	X		X		
Not applicable	X					X		X									X
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>																	
Yes				X	X												X
No		X	X				X		X		X	X	X	X	X		
Not applicable	X					X		X		X							X

Survey context

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>																																			
Individual survey				X			X	X		X	X	X	X				X		X		X									X	X				
Larger survey:																																			
- with ISSP at start																X				X		X			X	X						X			
- with ISSP in middle		X	X			X									X			X										X	X					X	
- with ISSP at end	X				X				X					X									X	X			X								X

Question coverage and order

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	
<i>Were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order?</i>																																			
Yes	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	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No		X																																	
<i>Were all the core ISSP items included?</i>																																			
Yes, all included		X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X		X	X		X	X		X	
No, not all included:																																			
- background items	X							X	X		X			X					X					X	X		X			X			X		

Sampling

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>																																			
...only adult citizens of country	X	X				X	X		X		X		X	X	X		X		X					X			X	X	X				X		
...adults of any nationality			X	X	X		X		X		X					X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X			X	X	X		X		
<i>Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in...</i>																																			
...private accommodation only	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X	
...private & institutional accommodation		X								X			X	X					X			X			X				X						
Question not asked			X																											X					
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>																																			
18	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	X	X	X	X	X	X
16																		X						X											
15					X								X																						

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA		
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>																																				
Yes																																				
Age													74	85							75		79									79				
No	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	X	X	X		
<i>Did you use any variables for stratification?</i>																																				
Yes			X		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	X		X		X					X		X	X				X					X		
<i>How many stages does your sampling design have?</i>																																				
One stage		X								X			X									X			X						X					
Two stages			X				X		X			X		X					X				X	X			X				X		X	X		
Three stages					X	X		X			X			X	X	X	X			X	X							X ^{RP}				X	X			
Four or more stages	X			X																								X ^{RP}	X ^{RP}	X						
Question not asked																										X										

^{RP} The Philippines used two different sampling methods; see Study Description Sheet for information.

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	
<i>Does your sampling frame consist of...</i>																																			
Addresses			X								X			X			X		X	X			X	X			X							X	
Households				X	X		X	X															X												
Named individuals (target persons)	X	X							X	X			X	X		X			X			X			X				X		X	X			
Areas											X						X				X						X			X					
Something else						X																													
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>																																			
Kish grid	X		X		X	X	X	X			X			X		X					X		X				X	X						X	
Birthday method											X						X			X			X					X							
Quota				X																				X				X		X					
Not applicable		X							X	X			X	X		X			X			X			X				X		X	X			

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>																																			
Yes	X ^{1,2}					X ^{1,2,3}	X ²				X ^{1,2}			X ^{1,2}		X ²				X ²				X ^{1,2}					X ^{1,2,3}	X ^{1,2}		X ¹			
No		X	X	X	X			X	X	X		X	X	X			X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X			X			X	X	X

¹ Substitution of refusals

² Substitution of non-contacts, people away during survey period, etc.

³ Substitution of sample points

Data collection

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?</i>																																			
Face-to-face	X		X ^{s,b}	X	X	X	X	X	X ^b		X			X ^b		X	X	X	X	X	X		X ^b			X	X ^{s,b}	X	X		X	X	X		
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)			X ^{s,b}						X ^s					X ^s	X								X ^s	X			X ^s							X	
Self-completion by mail		X								X ^{s,b}		X	X									X			X					X					
Telephone										X ^{s,b}																									
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>																																			
2 weeks or less				X							X					X			X		X										X				
Over 2 wks < 1 month						X		X												X						X	X	X							
1 month < 2 mths	X		X				X						X									X								X		X	X		
2 months < 3 mths																	X	X					X		X										
3 mths or more		X			X				X	X		X		X	X									X		X									X
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>																																			
2001		X	X																X					X											
2002		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	X
2003	X	X		X	X				X	X			X							X	X		X			X							X		
2004	X																																		

^s substantive variables
^b background variables

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement

	A	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	NIR	NL	P	PL	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>																											
Yes - postal components: - advance letter				X				X		X	X	X			X			X		X	X				X		X
- reminder & thank you letters										X																	
Yes - telephone components				X						X									X								X
No	X	X	X		X	X	X		X				X	X		X	X					X	X	X		X	
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>																											
Yes					X			X							X			X	X							X	X
No	X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X				X	X				X	X	X		X		
Question not asked		X											X	X						X				X			
<i>Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?</i>																											
Yes	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X ^{SK}	X	X
No					X												X					X					X

^{SK} Interviewers paid per day and per performance.

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)

	A	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	NIR	NL	P	PL	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Which of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address or household?</i>																											
Call at different time of day	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	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	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Were a minimum number of calls required?</i>																											
Yes:																											
Minimum number of required calls	5	3	3		3		5	10	3	4	4	3	3	5	3	2	3	3	3	4	3	2	4		5	3	
No				X		X																		X			X
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>																											
Yes:																											
Approximate proportion (%)		7	20		28	20	3		X		14						25			1		10		4		100	5
No	X			X				X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X		X		

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)

	A	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	NIR	NL	P	PL	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA	
<i>Were any interviews back-checked?</i>																												
Yes:																												
Approximate proportion (%)	15	3	20	20	16	10	30	95	10	60	10	25	15	10		10	5	10	10	20	10	30	20	4	60	30	20	
No															X													

Data collection: mail

	AUS	DK	F	FIN	N	NZ	S
<i>Were any contacts made by telephone or interviewer?</i>							
Yes:							
- reminders by telephone		X ^{DK}					X ^S
No	X		X	X	X	X	
<i>What was sent out in the first mailing?</i>							
Questionnaire	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Data protection information	X	X	X	X	X		X
Explanatory letter	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Incentive					X		
Other material	X					X	
<i>What was sent out in the second mailing?</i>							
Thank you and reminder combined	X		X	X	X		X
Reminder sent only to non-respondents		X				X	
Questionnaire			X			X	
Data protection information			X				
Explanatory letter			X				
Other material							X

	AUS	DK	F	FIN	N	NZ	S
<i>What was sent out in the third mailing?</i>							
Questionnaire	X			X	X	X	X
Data protection information	X			X	X		X
Explanatory letter	X			X	X	X	X
Other material	X						
No third mailing		X	X				
<i>What was sent out in the fourth (or last) mailing?</i>							
Questionnaire					X	X	
Data protection information					X		
Explanatory letter	X				X	X	
Reminder only to non-respondents							
No fourth mailing		X	X	X			X

^{DK, S} Denmark and Sweden used a telephone reminder after last mailing

Information on response and outcome figures

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D ^D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																	
Issued sample (n)	3400	2981	1200		3280	1505	1400	2298	2277/ 1043	2100	2500	10000	2498	2125	4133	1728	3610
Ineligible (n)	197	623	47		210	9		64	79/36	18	8	403	10	61	375	104	109
Eligible (n)	3203	2358	1153		3070	1496	1400	2234	2198/ 1007	2082	2492	9597	2488	2064	3758	1624	3501
- refusal (n)	515	159	56		1485	131	151	489	642/301	374	10		15	386	967	264	1396
- non-contact (n)	641	684	49		215	75	245	220	80/58		5	7621	1111	102	178	211	451
- other unproductive (n)		111	45		331	16		236	526/221	329	6		9	216	301	126	445
- completed cases (n)	2047	1352	1003	2000	1008	1505/1274 _{CL}	1004	1289	936/431	1377 ^{DK}	2471	1951	1353	1360	2304	1023	1209
- partially completed (n)		52			31				14/0	2		25			8		

^{CL} First count includes substituted interviews.

^D Western federal states followed by eastern federal states.

^{DK} 256 telephone interviews included.

Information on response and outcome figures (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																	
Issued sample (n)	2224	1800	1805	1812	2500	2973	5050	2075	2154	2004		5645	2000		1612	3735	2463
Ineligible (n)	127	118	96	6	50	80		298	174	143		169	111		102	78	387
Eligible (n)	2097	1682	1709	1806	2450	2893	5050	1777	1980	1861		5476	1889		1510	3657	2076
- refusal (n)	490	253	285	152	111	688	2450	60	501	354	363	2373	187	202	204	428	700
- non-contact (n)		141	377	50	815	405	1347	626	375	146	850	1089	517		101	396	40
- other unproductive (n)	351	156	47		49		151	66		109	177	187	105		112	850	165
- completed cases (n)	1241	1132	994	1496	1475	1800	1249/1102 ^{NL}	1025	1094	1252	1200	1798	1080	1133	1092	1983	1171
- partially completed (n)	15		6	108					10			29			1		

^{NL} First figure includes 147 questionnaires completed by a second household member (two questionnaires in one household).

Data

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA			
<i>Were any measures of coding reliability employed?</i>																																					
Yes	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	X	X	X	X	X		
No				X	X									X					X					X										X			
<i>Was the keying of the data verified?</i>																																					
Yes:																																					
Approximate proportion (%)					100	100	10	100	100		100		1	100	100	100	15		100			95	20				100		100		10			100			
No	X	X	X	X						X		X						X		X			X	X	X		X		X			X		X		X	
Not answered																																X					
<i>Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?</i>																																					
Yes		X	X	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					X					X		X		X	X												X	X				
Not applicable																													X								

Data (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA			
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>																																					
- 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	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	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	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Were data errors corrected?</i>																																					
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	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																																	
Not answered																								X													
<i>Were the data weighted or post-stratified?</i>																																					
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	X	X	X		X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	

Documentation

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	
<i>Is a national methods report available for your study?</i>																																			
Yes	X	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	X	X				X										
Question not asked			X														X	X						X		X					X				

Appendix

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
1	Austria	"Social Change in Austria"
2	Australia	na
3	Switzerland	The ISSP was fielded together with the "Eurobarometer in Switzerland (EBCH)". The topic of the EBCH of 2002 was Biotechnology which corresponds to the EB58.0 of the European Union.
4	Bulgaria	na
5	Chile	The ISSP study was part of the second National Public Opinion Study 2002 about politics, economy and corruption.
6	Germany	ISSP is part of the ALLBUS (German General Social Survey). The ALLBUS 2002 deals with various topics, such as religiousness, values and value orientations.
7	Flanders	Survey on Social-Cultural Changes in Flanders including the standard background variables
8	Great Britain	British Social Attitudes Survey, 2002
9	Hungary	The ISSP Family and Gender Roles module was placed in the beginning of the questionnaire, just after the questions on gender and year of birth. The whole module was asked in one block. It was followed by some other questions on family issues. Subsequent blocks related to 1. opinions about the Euro and the Hungarian currency 2. schooling problems of children coming from low class and gypsy population.
10	Ireland	The Family and Changing Gender Roles module was included as part of a larger survey addressing general social and political attitudes in Ireland.
11	Latvia	ISSP module was fielded together with ISSP module "National Identity" (topic B) and these were followed by questions on medical care.
12	Norway	1. Grandparents' role 2. Relationship parents-children 3. the ESRC project 'Employment and the Family'
13	Northern Ireland	Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey (NILT, 2002). Other topics included in the survey were Women in Politics, Attitudes/knowledge of the European Union, Political Attitudes, Community Relations, Rights of the Child.
14	Netherlands	Cultural Changes Survey 2002; ISSP module on Social Networks

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
15	New Zealand	Some additional questions on the roles of men and women in society, and attitudes to abortion and euthanasia, were added after the ISSP module.
16	Portugal	na
17	Poland	Polish General Social Survey (PGSS)
18	The Philippines	Quality of life indicators, electoral preferences for May 2004, attributes of candidates, trust rating of selected personalities and political parties, domestic violence, polling on polls, media credibility, awareness of tuberculosis, most admired men and women.
19	Russia	General social and political problems of the Russian society
20	Slovenia	ISSP module National Identity - national survey Attitudes on Local Democracy
21	Taiwan	Taiwan Social Change Survey: the Third Survey of the Fourth Cycle. In addition to core ISSP questions, the themes related to gendered body-consciousness, attitudes toward sexuality, women in civil participation, and couple's marital satisfaction and lives.
22	USA	2002 General Social Survey

ISSP 2002, Family and Changing Gender Roles: Study Monitoring Survey for Face-to-face Interviews and Drop-offs

Thank you for completing the study monitoring questionnaire for the 2002 module,
Family and Changing Gender roles.

Here you have the opportunity to view your entries (and print them out).

NOTE: As we cannot produce a linear printout of entries, we strongly recommend you to print out a copy for your records.

Please enter the name of your country.

Country: Germany

Please enter the name of your institute.

Institute: ZUMA

Who is (are) your principal investigator(s)?

Name: Prof. Dr. Peter Ph. Mohler

Name: Dr. Janet Harkness

Name: /.

Who is your contact person for questions about the study?

Name: Dr. Janet Harkness

Which institute carried out the fielding?

Our ISSP member institute itself: /.

Institute name:  Infas, Bonn

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)

Was the questionnaire fielded ...

... only in English

... in English plus other language(s)

... only in translation

How many languages was the module fielded in?

One language

Two languages

Three languages

Four languages

Five languages

Please enter the language the module was fielded in.

Language: 11

Who carried out the German translation for your questionnaire?

A member or members of the research team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A translation bureau	<input type="checkbox"/>
One or more specially trained translators	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other (please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Was the German translation checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Yes, only the new questions	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

How was the German translation checked?

Group discussion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Expert checked it	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Back translation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Was the German questionnaire pretested?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into German ?

No problems	<input type="checkbox"/>
Answer scales	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Instructions	<input type="checkbox"/>
Whole questions	<input type="checkbox"/>
Words or concepts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other problems	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide details of problems with Answer scales, Words or concepts in your German translation and what you did to solve them.

Please write in: [see additional file](#)

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

Face-to-face	<input type="checkbox"/>
Self-completion (with some interviewer involvement in delivering or collecting)	<input type="checkbox"/>
"Mixed mode": part self-completion, part face-to-face	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please write in details of your mixed mode or other form of data collection.

Please write in: ISSP module was self-completion, BVs face-to-face. Interviewers were instructed to present ISSP as self-completion.

Were postal or telephone components used at any point (e.g., advance

contacts)?

Yes - postal	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes - telephone	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please give details of the postal components.

Please write in: Respondents were informed about the survey by an advance letter.

Were incentives offered?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Was your ISSP module fielded as ...

... an <u>individual</u> survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey)?	<input type="checkbox"/>
... part of a <u>larger</u> survey?	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).

Please write in: ISSP is part of the ALLBUS (German General Social Survey). The ALLBUS 2002 deals with various topics, such as religiousness, values and value orientations.

What was the approximate position of the Family module in the larger survey?

Start of the survey	<input type="checkbox"/>
Middle of the survey	<input type="checkbox"/>
End of the survey	<input type="checkbox"/>

Were all the core ISSP questions included in your questionnaire?

Yes - all substantive and background questions <u>included</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No - substantive question(s) <u>missing</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No - required background question(s) <u>missing</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide details of the questions missing and indicate why they are missing.

ISSP source questionnaire, question number or description of question:	URBRURAL
Reason(s) why missing:	omitted by mistake

Were the substantive questions in the Family module all asked in the prescribed order?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes, apart from omissions	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Here we ask questions on sampling.

First, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

... only adult citizens of your country?	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------

... adults of any nationality residing in your country?

Second, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

... only adults living in private accommodation?

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

Third, what was the lower age cut-off for your sample:

Please enter: 18

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

Yes - please write in cut-off

No

Were any groups excluded or under-represented in your gross sample, apart from age cut-offs, citizenship requirements or those in institutional accommodation?

Yes

No

Did you use any variables for stratification?

Yes

No

Please describe the stratification variables used.

Please enter: Micro-stratification of municipalities: stratified according to federal states (Bundesländer), smaller regional administrative districts (Regierungsbezirk, Kreis), and smaller regional units, as necessary, cities according to BIK city regions and municipalities.

How many stages does your sample design have?

One stage

Two stages

Three stages

Four stages

Does your sampling frame consist of ...?

... Addresses

... Households

... Named individuals (the target persons)

... Named individuals (not the target persons)

... Areas

... Something else (please write in details)

Please describe your sampling frame (e.g., population register, electoral roll, telephone directory and its coverage and updating).

Describe your sampling frame: (Local) Population Registers of Communities. Updated continuously.

Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units of the first

stage.

Please enter: Probability sampling for eastern and western Germany separately. Random selection of communities/ sample-points, western Germany: 105 communities with 111 sample-points, eastern Germany: 46 communities with 51 sample-points.

Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units of the second stage.

Please enter: Random sample of persons officially registered ("Einwohnermelderegister-Stichprobe")(with 40 personal addresses per sample-point).

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

Yes
No

What, if any, are the known limitations (biases) of your net sample?

Please enter: Under-representation of less educated according to corresponding figures from the 2000 (?) Microcensus.

Please fill in the following details about your issued sample.

Total number of <u>starting</u> or <u>issued</u> names / addresses (gross sample size)	3324
addresses which could not be traced at all / selected respondents who could not be traced	60
addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings	36
selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate	119
selected respondent away during survey period	./.
selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey	49
no contact at selected address	48
no contact with selected person	90
personal refusal by selected respondent	943
proxy refusal (on behalf of selected respondent)	./.
other refusal at selected address	./.
other type of unproductive reaction (please write in full details in the box below)	598
full productive interview (net sample size)	1367
partial productive interview	14

Questions on interviewer procedures.

Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?

Yes
No

Did any of these rules govern how an interviewer approached an address / a household?

Calls / visits must be made at different times of day

Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No	<input type="radio"/>

Calls / visits must be made on different days of week

Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No	<input type="radio"/>

Were interviewers required 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:	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	10
No minimum call required	<input type="radio"/>	./.

Were any interviews supervised (i.e., supervisor accompanied interviewer)?

Yes - please write in approximate proportion (%):	<input type="radio"/>	
No	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	

Were any interviews back-checked or validated?

Yes - please write in approximate proportion (%):	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	95
No	<input type="radio"/>	./.

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

Start date (dd)	21
Start date (mm)	02
Start date (yyyy)	2002
End date (dd)	18
End date (mm)	08
End date (yyyy)	2002

Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No	<input type="radio"/>

Was the keying of the data verified?

Yes - write in approximate level of verification (%)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	100
No	<input type="radio"/>	./.

Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?

Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No	<input type="radio"/>

Were data checked or edited ...

... to ensure that filter instructions were followed correctly?	
Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No	<input type="radio"/>
... for logic or consistency?	
Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

No	
... to ensure they fell within permitted ranges?	
Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No	

Were errors corrected?

Yes - individually	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Yes - automatically	
No - not corrected	

Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes	
No	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Is a national methods report available for your study?

Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No	

If there is anything you would like to comment on, please do so here.

Please comment:

© ZUMA

ISSP 2002, Family and Changing Gender Roles: Study Monitoring Survey for Mail Mode

Thank you for completing the study monitoring questionnaire for the 2002 module,
Family and Changing Gender roles.

Here you have the opportunity to view your entries (and print them out).
NOTE: As we cannot produce a linear printout of entries,
we strongly recommend you to print out a copy for your records.

Please enter the name of your country.

Country Norway

Please enter the name of your institute.

Institute NSD

Who is (are) your principal investigator(s)?

Name: Knut Kalgraff Skjåk
Name: /.
Name: /.

Who is your contact person for questions about the study?

Name: Knut Kalgraff Skjåk

Which institute carried out the fielding?

Our ISSP member institute itself /.
Institute name: Norwegian Gallup

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)

Was the questionnaire fielded ...

... only in English
... in English plus other language(s)
... only in translation

How many languages was the module fielded in?

One language
Two languages
Three languages
Four languages

Please enter the language the module was fielded in.

Language 16

Who carried out the Norwegian translation for your questionnaire?

A member or members of the research team

A translation bureau	
One or more specially trained translators	
Other (please write in details)	

Was the Norwegian translation checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Yes, only the new questions	
No	

How was the Norwegian translation checked?

Group discussion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Expert checked it	
Back translation	
Other (please write in details)	

Was the Norwegian questionnaire pretested?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into Norwegian ?

No problems	
Answer scales	
Instructions	
Whole questions	
Words or concepts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other problems	

Please provide details of problems with Words or concepts in your Norwegian translation and what you did to solve them.

Please write in: N11. Concept "fair share" N15. "rarely stressful"

Here we ask questions on your mail survey.

Were any contacts made by telephone or interviewer?

Yes - precontacts by telephone	
Yes - precontacts by personal visit	
Yes - reminders by telephone	
Yes - reminders by personal visit	
Other - please write in:	
No - no telephone or personal (visit) contacts at all	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

How many mailings were sent out during fielding?

One	
Two	
Three	

Four or more 

What was the date of the first mailing?

Day (dd)	04
Month (mm)	09
Year (yyyy)	2002

What was the date of the second mailing?

Day (dd)	11
Month (mm)	09
Year (yyyy)	2002

What was the date of the third mailing?

Day (dd)	25
Month (mm)	09
Year (yyyy)	2002

What was the date of the fourth mailing?

Day (dd)	09
Month (mm)	10
Year (yyyy)	2002

What was sent out in the first mailing?

Questionnaire	
Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No	<input type="radio"/>
Data protection information	
Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No	<input type="radio"/>
Explanatory letter	
Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No	<input type="radio"/>
Incentive	
Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No	<input type="radio"/>
Other material	
Yes	<input type="radio"/>
No	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

What was sent out in the second mailing?

Thank you and reminder combined	
Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No	<input type="radio"/>
Thank you sent only to respondents	
Yes	<input type="radio"/>

No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reminder sent only to non-respondents	
Yes	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Questionnaire	
Yes	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	
Yes	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	
Yes	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	
Yes	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other material	
Yes	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

What was sent out in the third mailing?

Questionnaire	
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	
Data protection information	
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	
Explanatory letter	
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	
Incentive	
Yes	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other material	
Yes	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

What was sent out in the fourth mailing?

Questionnaire	
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	
Data protection information	
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	

Explanatory letter	
Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No	<input type="radio"/>
Incentive	
Yes	<input type="radio"/>
No	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Other material	
Yes	<input type="radio"/>
No	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

When did the fielding period finish officially?

Day (dd)	05
Month (mm)	11
Year (yyyy)	2002

Was your ISSP module fielded as ...

... <u>individual</u> survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
... part of a <u>larger</u> survey	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).

Please write in:	1. Grandparents' role 2. Relationship parents-children 3. the ESRC project 'Employment and the Family'
-------------------------	--

What was the approximate position of the Family module in the larger survey?

Start of the survey	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Middle of the survey	<input type="radio"/>
End of the survey	<input type="radio"/>

Were all the core ISSP questions included in your questionnaire?

Yes - all substantive and background questions <u>included</u>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No - substantive question(s) <u>missing</u>	<input type="radio"/>
No - required background question(s) <u>missing</u>	<input type="radio"/>

Were the substantive questions in the Family module all asked in the prescribed order?

Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Yes, apart from omissions	<input type="radio"/>
No	<input type="radio"/>

Here we ask questions on sampling.

First, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

... <u>only adult citizens of your country?</u>	<input type="radio"/>
... adults of any nationality residing in your country?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Second, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

... <u>only adults living in private accommodation?</u>	<input type="radio"/>
---	-----------------------

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



Your sample was designed to be representative of adults living in private and in institutional accommodation.

Please enter in: All persons living in institutions with addresses available from the Central Register of Persons, i.e. not including addresses protected out of privacy concerns.

Third, what was the lower age cut-off for your sample:

Please enter: 18

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

Yes - please write in cut-off	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	79
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	.

Were any groups excluded or under-represented in your gross sample, apart from age cut-offs, citizenship requirements or those in institutions?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Did you use any variables for stratification?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

How many stages does your sample design have?

One stage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Two stages	<input type="checkbox"/>
Three stages	<input type="checkbox"/>
Four stages	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please describe your sampling frame (e.g., population register or electoral roll and its coverage and updating).

Describe your sampling frame:	The Central Register of Persons (comprehensive and updated)
--------------------------------------	---

Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units.

Please enter: Simple random sample

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

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

What, if any, are the known limitations (biases) of your net sample?

Please enter: Bias towards higher education among men

Please enter the following details about your issued sample.

Total number of <u>starting</u> or <u>issued</u> names addresses (gross sample size)	2500
addresses which could not be traced	J.
addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings	J.
details of address wrong (street numbers, post codes, etc.)	J.
addresses with no letter boxes	J.
selected respondent unknown at address	J.
selected respondent moved, no forwarding address	50
selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate	7
selected respondent deceased	J.
selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey	J.
selected respondent away during survey period	J.
refusal by selected respondent	111
refusal by another person	J.
implicit refusals (empty envelopes, empty questionnaires returned)	J.
other type of unproductive reaction	52
completed returned questionnaires (net sample size)	1475
partially completed returned questionnaires	J.
no contact	815

Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Was the keying of the data verified?

Yes - write in approximate level of verification (%)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	J.

Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Were data checked or edited ...

... to ensure that filter instructions were followed correctly?	
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
... for logic or consistency?	
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to ensure they fell within permitted ranges?	
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Were errors corrected?

Yes - individually	<input type="radio"/>
Yes - automatically	<input type="radio"/>
No - not corrected	<input type="radio"/>

Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes	<input type="radio"/>
No	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Is a national methods report available for your study?

Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
No	<input type="radio"/>

If there is anything else you would like to comment on, please do so here.

Please comment: