

International Social Survey Programme

Study Monitoring 2010

Environment III

**Report to the ISSP General Assembly
on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP
by the Methodology Committee**

July 2012

Phil Gendall
Massey University
Private Bag 11-222
Palmerston North 4442
New Zealand

philip.gendall@otago.ac.nz

International Social Survey Programme

Contents

Introduction	3
Monitoring Findings Chart.....	4
Appendix: Information about other studies the ISSP was fielded with	38
Calculation of Response Figures Based on Reported Figures	41

Introduction

The aim of ISSP monitoring and reporting is twofold: to record for internal ISSP purposes how ISSP studies were conducted in each country and how implementations met or failed to meet ISSP requirements as defined by the ISSP Working Principles. These aims are related to the pursuit of basic good or best practices in ISSP studies but also to comparability of data across ISSP datasets.

For users of ISSP data, the Study Monitoring Reports bring together information of relevance for analysis not otherwise available in such a compact form. The documentation provided on major aspects of each member's fielding and outcomes goes a considerable way towards guiding researchers on which differences between ISSP countries they might ignore and which they should consider.

This report is based on the study monitoring survey conducted by Methodology Committee of the ISSP for the 2010 Environment module. Twenty-five member countries completed the monitoring questionnaire for this module. Details of the individual answers members provided are presented in the summary charts which follow. The information we received was checked with members, who were given the opportunity to make corrections. The report is available on the ISSP Archive web site.

Monitoring Findings Chart

2010

for

Argentina (AR)
Austria (AUT)
Bulgaria (BUL)
Canada (CAN)
Chile (CL)
Switzerland (CH)
Czech Republic (CZ)
Germany (D)
Spain (ESP)
Finland (FI)
Belgium (Flanders) (FL)
Great Britain (GB)
Croatia (HR)
Japan (J)
Lithuania (L)
Latvia (LV)
Norway (N)
New Zealand (NZ)
Philippines (PH)
South Korea (ROK)
Sweden (S)
Slovakia (SK)
Slovenia (SLO)
Taiwan (TW)
United States of America (USA)

Language(s) and translation

	AR	AUT	BUL	CAN	CH	CL	CZ	D	ESP	FI	FL	GB	HR
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>													
Language 1 (L1)	Spanish	German	Bulgarian	English	German	Spanish	Czech	German	Spanish	Finnish	Dutch	English	Croatian
Language 2 (L2)				French	French					Swedish			
Language 3 (L3)					Italian								
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>													
Yes, translated:													
- by member(s) of research team	X	X	X	L2		X	X		X		X		X
- by translation bureau											X		
- by specially trained translator(s)			X		L1-L3			X		L1-L2			
- other													
No, not translated												X	

Translation (continued)

	J	L	LV	N	NZ	PH	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>												
Language 1 (L1)	Japanese	Lithuanian	Latvian	Norwegian	English	Filipino	Korean	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	English
Language 2 (L2)			Russian			Cebuano			Hungarian			Spanish
Language 3 (L3)						Ilocano/ Iluco						
Language 4 (L4)						Ilonggo/ Hiligaynon						
Language 5 (L5)						Maguindanaon						
Language 6 (L6)						Bicolano						
Language 7 (L7)						Waray						
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>												
Yes, translated:												
- by member(s) of research team	X	X	L1-L2	X		L1-L7	X	X	L1	X	X	
- by translation bureau												
- by specially trained translator(s)	X								L2			L2
- other												
No, not translated					X							L1

Translation (continued)

	AR	AUT	BUL	CAN	CL	CH	CZ	D	ESP	FI	FL	GB	HR
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>													
Language 1 (L1)	Spanish	German	Bulgarian	English	Spanish	German	Czech	German	Spanish	Finnish	Dutch	English	Croatian
Language 2 (L2)				French		French				Swedish			
Language 3 (L3)						Italian							
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>													
Yes:													
- group discussion		X	X	L2	X	L1-L3	X	X					X
- expert checked it					X			X	X	L1-L2	X		
- back translation													X
- other	X ^{AR}										X ^{FL}		
No													
Not applicable												X	

^{AR} The researchers exchanged comments with people linked to ISSP in Spain, Mexico and Chile.

^{CH} Translation by two professional translators, then comparison between the two versions in a group discussion and adjudication of best translation by a reviewer of the team. The three language versions are then compared and some adjustments made.

^{FL} First phase: - expert check within institute Flanders (Belgium)

Second phase: - The ISSP module 2010 was independently translated by the institute in Flanders (Belgium) and the Netherlands. Both translations were compared to each other and in a discussion with H. Ganzeboom, H. Schröder and A. Carton the differences were clarified and final decisions were taken although respecting “local” differences in use of language.

Translation (continued)

	J	L	LV	N	NZ	PH	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>												
Language 1 (L1)	Japanese	Lithuanian	Latvian	Norwegian	English	Filipino	Korean	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	English
Language 2 (L2)			Russian			Cebuano			Hungarian			Spanish
Language 3 (L3)						Ilocano/ Iluko						
Language 4 (L4)						Ilonggo/ Hiligaynon						
Language 5 (L5)						Maguindanaon						
Language 6 (L6)						Bicolano						
Language 7 (L7)						Waray						
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>												
Yes:												
- group		X		X		L1-L7	X	X	L1	X	X	L2
- expert checked	X		L1-L2						L2			L2
- back translation												
- other						L1-L7 ^{PH1}						
Not applicable					X							L1

^{PH} Cognitive testing with Field Anchors. Pre-tested on 12 randomly selected adults of different ages, sex and classes and then an assessment discussion with those who pre-tested the module.

Translation (continued)

	AR	AUT	BUL	CAN	CH	CL	CZ	D	ESP	FI	FL	GB	HR
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>													
Language 1 (L1)	Spanish	German	Bulgarian	English	German	Spanish	Czech	German	Spanish	Finnish	Dutch	English	Croatian
Language 2 (L2)				French	French					Swedish			
Language 3 (L3)					Italian								
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>													
Yes	X		X	L2	L1-L3	X		X			X		
No		X					X		X	X			X
Not applicable												X	
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>													
Yes				L2									
No	X	X	X		L1-L3	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Not applicable												X	

Translation (continued)

	J	L	LV	N	NZ	PH	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>												
Language 1 (L1)	Japanese	Lithuanian	Latvian	Norwegian	English	Filipino	Korean	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	English
Language 2 (L2)			Russian			Cebuano			Hungarian			Spanish
Language 3 (L3)						Ilocano/ Iluko						
Language 4 (L4)						Ilonggo/ Hiligaynon						
Language 5 (L5)						Maguindanaon						
Language 6 (L6)				X		Bicolano						
Language 7 (L7)						Waray						
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>												
Yes		X		X			X				X	L2
No	X		L1-L2			L1-L7		X	L1, L2	X		
Not applicable					X							L1
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>												
Yes												
No	X	X	L1-L2			L1-L7	X	X	L1, L2	X	X	L2
Not applicable					X							L1

Survey context

	AR	AUT	BUL	CAN	CH	CL	CZ	D	ESP	FI	FL	GB	HR
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>													
Individual survey									X	X			
Larger survey:													
- with ISSP at start		X	X	X			X						X
- with ISSP in middle	X				X	X						X	
- with ISSP at end								X			X		

	J	L	LV	N	NZ	PH	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>												
Individual survey	X			X				X				
Larger survey:												
- with ISSP at start			X		X					X	X	
- with ISSP in middle		X					X		X			X
- with ISSP at end						X						

Question coverage and order

	AR	AUT	BUL	CAN	CH	CL	CZ	D	ESP	FI	FL	GB	HR
<i>Were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order?</i>													
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No													
<i>Were all the core ISSP items included?</i>													
Yes, all included	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X
No, not all included:													
- from module													
- background items									X ^{ESP}	X ^{FI}		X ^{GB}	

^{ESP} SEMPREL and SPWRKHRS – omitted by mistake
^{FI} FI_ETHN and FI-REG computed from register data
^{GB} PARTLIV - not part of the BSA marital status set
 SPWRKHRS, SPSWRKSUP – not asked because unreliable
 TOPBOT- not asked. VOTE_LE – not available

Question coverage and order (continued)

	J	L	LV	N	NZ	PH	ROK	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
No												
<i>Were all the core ISSP items included?</i>												
Yes, all included		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No, not all included:												
- from module				X								
- background items	X ^J				X ^{NZ}							

^J NSUP, TYPORG1, TYPORG2, MAINSTAT, PARTLIV, SPWRKHRS, SPEMPREL, SPWRKSUP, SPMAINST, HHCHILDR, HHTOD, HOMPOP omitted by mistake.

^{NZ} NSUP, TYPORG1, TYPORG2, MAINSTAT, PARTLIV, SPWRKHRS, SPEMPREL, SPWRKSUP, SPMAINST, HHCHILDR, HHTOD, HOMPOP omitted by mistake.

Sampling

	AR	AUT	BUL	CAN	CH	CL	CZ	D	ESP	FI	FL	GB	HR
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>													
...only adult citizens of country						X	X			X			X
...adults of any nationality	X	X	X	X	X			X	X		X	X	
<i>Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in...</i>													
...<u>private accommodation only</u>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
...<u>private & institutional accommodation</u>											X		
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>													
18	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
17													
16		X											
15										X			

Sampling (continued)

	J	L	LV	N	NZ	PH	ROK	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	
...adults of any nationality		X	X	X	X					X		X
<i>Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in...</i>												
...<u>private</u> accommodation <u>only</u>		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
...<u>private & institutional</u> accommodation	X			X	X							
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>												
19												
18		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
17												
16	X											
15												

Sampling (continued)

	AR	AUT	BUL	CAN	CH	CL	CZ	D	ESP	FI	FL	GB	HR
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>													
Yes													
Age										74			
No	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
No			X								X		
<i>How many stages does your sampling design have?</i>													
One stage					X					X			
Two stages				X				X	X		X		
Three stages	X	X	X			X	X					X	X
Four or more stages													

Sampling (continued)

	J	L	LV	N	NZ	PH	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>												
Yes												
Age			74	79				79				
No	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
No		X		X			X	X	X			
<i>How many stages does your sampling design have?</i>												
One stage				X				X				
Two stages	X	X			X				X	X		
Three stages			X				X				X	
Four or more stages						X						X

Sampling (continued)

	AR	AUT	BUL	CAN	CH	CL	CZ	D	ESP	FI	FL	GB	HR
<i>Does your sampling frame consist of...</i>													
Addresses							X					X	
Households		X											X
Named individuals (target persons)				X	X			X	X	X	X		
Named individuals (not the target persons)													
Areas	X		X										
Something else						X ^{CL}							
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>													
Kish grid		X				X	X					X	
Birthday method	X		X										X
Quota													
Other													
Not applicable				X	X			X	X	X	X		

^{CL} Use of census data; for urban areas: list of population by province, borough, district, zone and block; for rural areas: list of population by province, borough, district, locality and entity.

Sampling (continued)

	J	L	LV	N	NZ	PH	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Does your sampling frame consist of...</i>												
Addresses		X										X
Households			X				X					
Named individuals (target persons)	X			X	X			X		X	X	
Named individuals (not the target persons)												
Areas						X			X			
Something else												
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>												
Kish grid						X						X
Birthday method		X	X				X		X			
Quota												
Other												
Not applicable	X			X	X			X		X	X	

Sampling (continued)

	AR	AUT	BUL	CAN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DEN	FI	FL	GB	HR
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>													
Yes								X ^D					
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X

	J	L	LV	N	NZ	PH	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>												
Yes									X ^{SK}			
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X

D

^{SK} If a selected respondent could not or did not want to participate in the survey or if the interviewer was unable to establish contact with a selected household during 4 visits, the interviewer was admitted to substitute the respondent by another one chosen according to the rules defined by the random walk procedure used.

Data collection

	AR	AUT	BUL	CAN	CH	CL	CZ	D	ESP	FI	FL	GB	HR
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?</i>													
Face-to-face	X ^{AR}	X	X		X ^{CH}	X	X	X ^b	X		X ^b		X
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)								X ^s			X ^a	X	
Self-completion by mail				X						X ^{FI}			
Telephone													
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>													
2 weeks or less													
Over 2 weeks < 1 month				X		X			X				X
1 month < 2 mths		X	X				X						
2 months < 3 mths										X			
3 mths or more					X			X			X	X	
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>													
2010	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
2011			X	X									X

^{AR} Note: Respondents were offered a blank questionnaire, in order to read questions at the same time the interviewer was reading them.

^b background variables

^s substantive variables

^{CH} If no contact could be established after 5 face-to-face contact attempts, all sample units with fixed-line telephone number were contacted by telephone to fix an appointment for the face-to-face interview.

^{FI} Mixed mode: part mail, part on-line.

Data collection (continued)

	J	L	LV	N	NZ	PH	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?</i>												
Face-to-face		X	X			X	X		X	X	X	X
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)	X											
Self-completion by mail				X ^{N1}	X			X				
Telephone												
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>												
2 weeks or less	X					X						
Over 2 weeks < 1 month			X						X			
1 month < 2 mths												
2 months < 3 mths		X		X			X	X			X	
3 mths or more					X					X		X
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>												
2009									X			
2010	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X
2011		X	X	X								

^N Respondents offered option of completing questionnaire on-line.

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

	AR	AUT	BUL	CH	CL	CZ	D	ESP	FL	GB	HR
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>											
Yes - postal components:											
- advance letter		X		X			X	X	X	X	
- reminder & thank you letters									X	X	
Yes - telephone components				X					X		
No	X ^{AR}		X		X	X					X
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>											
Yes:											
- to respondent				X			X			X	
- to interviewer		X									
No	X		X		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
No											

^{AR} Note: If no one answered when interviewers rang, or if the selected respondent was not at home, a letter with a description of the aims of the project was left.

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

	J	L	LV	PH	ROK	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>									
Yes - postal components:									
- advance letter	X						X	X	X
- reminder & thank you letters									
Yes - telephone components				X	X		X	X	
No		X	X			X			X
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>									
Yes:									
- to respondent	X				X			X	X
- to interviewer	X				X	X			
No		X	X	X			X		
<i>Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?</i>									
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
No									X

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

	AR	AUT	BUL	CH	CL	CZ	D	ESP	FL	GB	HR
<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
Call on different days in week	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
None of these											
<i>Were a minimum number of calls required?</i>											
Yes:											
Minimum number of required calls	2	3	3	5	3	3	4	3	5	6	5
No											
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>											
Yes:											
Approximate proportion (%)			5		20					10	
No	X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X

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

	J	L	LV	ROK	PH	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
Call on different days in week	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
None of these									
<i>Were a minimum number of calls required?</i>									
Yes:									
Minimum number of required calls	3	4	3	5	3	4	5	3	
No									X ^{USA}
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>									
Yes:									
Approximate proportion (%)				6.5	20			1	X ^{USA2}
No	X	X	X			X	X		

^{USA} GSS makes many attempts to contact HUs, often more than 10, but there is no set minimum

^{USA2} Direct in-person supervision in the field is rare. Less than 1% probably.

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

	AR	AUT	BUL	CH	CL	CZ	D	ESP	FL	GB	HR
<i>Were any interviews back-checked?</i>											
Yes:											
Approximate proportion (%)	20	10	5	20	60	40	100	25	X ^{FL}	10	20
No											

	J	L	LV	PH	ROK	SK	SLO	TW	USA ^{US}
<i>Were any interviews back-checked?</i>									
Yes:									
Approximate proportion (%)	25	10	10	20	100	5	60	44	10
No									

^{FL} - 33% of the respondents in the face-to-face interviews received a telephone call to validate the quality of the interview.

- 27% of the respondents who refused a face-to-face interview received a telephone call to check whether the interviewer got in touch with the respondent and whether it was a real refusal.

- All respondents received a prepaid control card with some questions to validate the quality of the interview; 64% of the respondents send the card back.

^{US} All interviewers are validated and all cases that trigger certain criteria as checked. Beyond that a random 10% are checked

Data collection: mail

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

^N Information letter with URL, Username and Password to the web questionnaire.

Data collection: mail (continued)

	CAN	FI	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	
Incentive					
Other material	X	X			
No third mailing					
<i>What was sent out in the fourth (or last) mailing?</i>					
Questionnaire		X	X		X
Data protection information		X	X		X
Explanatory letter		X	X	X	
Reminder only to non-respondents					
Incentive					
Other material		X			
No fourth mailing	X				

Information on response and outcome figures ⁺

	AR	AUT	BUL	CAN	CH	CL	CZ	D ^D	ESP	FI	FL	GB ^{GB}	HR
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>													
Issued sample (n)	2340	1736	2275	5000	2409	1800	2200	3142/1422	4000	2500	2365	2260	2576
Ineligible (n)	405	91	260	372	54		81	330/134	406	7	87	232	
Eligible (n)	1935	1645	2015	4625	2355	1800	2119	2812/1288	3594	2493	2278	2028	2576
- refusal (n)	497	338	522	27	649	163	511	1462/721	433	12	651	655	1010
- non-contact (n)	301	192	463	3613	11	197	130	190/74	436	1267	174	107	353
- other unproductive (n)	7	93	27		519	4	48	165/71	165	3	311	113	3
- completed cases (n)	1130	1019	1003	985	1176	1436	1428	989/418	2560	1211	1142	1118	1210
- partially completed (n)		3					2	6/4				2	
Response Rate (%)	58.4 ^{AR}	62.0	49.8	21.3	49.9	79.8	67.4	35.2/32.5	71.2	48.6	50.1	55.1	47.0

⁺ for calculation of response figures, see appendix, p. 42.

^{AR} The Environment III Module was fielded at the same time as Social Inequality IV, but with different survey instruments (although the background variables were practically the same). That is, a person would be asked one or the other module, not both. From a total of 2263 net sample size for both questionnaires, 1133 answered the Social Inequality module, 1130 the Environment one.

^D Western federal states followed by eastern federal states.

^{GB} Numbers do not add up because it is impossible to tell which of the CAPI non-responders would or would not have returned a self-completion questionnaire.

Information on response and outcome figures (continued)⁺

	J	L	LV	N	NZ	PH	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA^{US}
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>												
Issued sample (n)	1800	3805	2034	3600	2520	2863	2500	2001	1925	1800	4602	3613
Ineligible (n)	77	991	75	80	77		73	23	125	128	194	645
Eligible (n)	1723	2814	1959	3520	2443	2863	2427	1978	1800	1672	4408	2968
- refusal (n)	180	1182	289	61	51	949	307	128	536	396	613	714
- non-contact (n)	44	458	521	2025	1199		368	579	82	84	1491	52
- other unproductive(n)	192	122	149	20	21	623	176	90	23	110	95	158
- completed cases (n)	1307	1023	1000	1382	1172	1200	1576	1181	1159	1081	2209	2044
- partially completed (n)		29		32		91				1		
Response Rate (%)	75.9	36.4	51.0	39.3	48.0	41.9	64.9	59.7	64.4	64.7	50.1	68.9

⁺ for calculation of response figures, see appendix, p. 42.

^{US} The ISSP questions were administered to a random two-thirds of the 2010 GSS sample. The figures above apply to the entire 2010 GSS. There were a total of 1430 cases in the ISSP study. The GSS sub-samples non-respondents. The numbers above have been appropriately adjusted to reflect that fact.

Data

	AR	AUT	BUL	CAN	CH	CL	CZ	D	ESP	FI	FL	GB	HR
<i>Were any measures of coding reliability employed?</i>													
Yes	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No				X	X ^{CH}								
<i>Was the keying of the data verified?</i>													
Yes:													
Approximate proportion (%)	20		10			100	100			1	100	100	30
No		X		X	X ^{CH}			X	X				
<i>Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?</i>													
Yes		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No													
No derived variables	X												

^{CH} CAPI fielding means these questions do not apply.

Data (continued)

	J	L	LV	N	NZ	PH	ROK	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
No	X				X							
<i>Was the keying of the data verified?</i>												
Yes:												
Approximate proportion (%)	100	100		10		100	100	10			20	
No			X		X				X	X		X ^{USA}
<i>Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?</i>												
Yes	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X
No			X							X		
No derived variables									X			

^{USA} Not possible with CAPI.

Data (continued)

	AR	AUT	BUL	CAN	CH	CL	CZ	D	ESP	FI	FL	GB	HR
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>													
- filters	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
- ranges	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
- automatically			X	X			X		X	X		X	
No													
<i>Were the data weighted or post-stratified?</i>													
Yes		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	
No	X							X					X

Data (continued)

	J	L	LV	N	NZ	PH	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>												
- filters	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
- ranges	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
- automatically	X	X		X	X			X	X	X		
No												
<i>Were the data weighted or post-stratified?</i>												
Yes		X				X			X		X	X
No	X		X	X	X		X	X		X		

Documentation

	AR	AUT	BUL	CAN	CH	CL	CZ	D	ESP	FI	FL	GB	HR
<i>Is a national methods report available for your study?</i>													
Yes		X			X	X		X	X		X		
No	X		X	X			X			X		X	X

	J	L	LV	N	NZ	PH	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Is a national methods report available for your study?</i>												
Yes				X		X	X	X	X		X	X
No	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	Argentina	The ISSP 2010 module was fielded with a survey on health services utilization and expenditures.
2	Austria	The ISSP 2010 Environment III module was fielded together with ISSP 2009 Social Inequality IV.
3	Belgium (Flanders)	Yearly survey 'Social-cultural changes in Flanders-Belgium' since 1996. Apart from the classical background variables of respondent and partner, the face-to-face questionnaire contained following themes: module on gender roles, scale of individualism, social trust, membership different organizations, volunteer work module on environment (attitudes, facts, knowledge); subjective health condition module on ICT literacy and media use, social network, module on politics with political efficacy scale, (un)conventional political participation, interest in politics party preference, scale on pressure of time, importance of issues in society, trust in government and institutions, satisfaction with policies on different governmental levels, leisure time; well-being, expectations for the future.
4	Bulgaria	The Bulgarian questionnaire has the following structure : A1 – A42 - ISSP Module Environment'2010 B1 – B30 - ISSP Module Health'2011 C1 – C15 - BG additional questions on Health R1 – R34 - ISSP Module Gender and Family'2012 L1 – L13, D34 - Bulgarian General Social Survey D1 – D33 - ISSP Socio demography T3 – T4 - ISSP settlements info
5	Chile	The ISSP 2010 module was carried out together with questions relating to Chilean political, economic and social attitudes.
6	Croatia	The ISSP 2010 Environment module was fielded with the 2011 Health Module.
7	Czech Republic	Additional Czech specific questions on social inequality were attached at the end of the module.
8	Germany	ISSP 2010 was fielded with ALLBUS 2010 (30 years of ALLBUS: selection of best replications). See ALLBUS 2010 methods report.
9	Great Britain	ISSP 2010 was fielded with British Social Attitudes 2010.
10	Lithuania	ISSP 2010 was fielded with ISSP module Social Inequality 2009 and Monitoring of Social Problems (with special emphasis on e.social networks).
11	Latvia	Additional questions on social activities were included after the ISSP module.
12	New Zealand	Some additional questions about The New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme and the mining of conservation land were added to the questionnaire between the ISSP questions and the demographic questions.

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
13	Philippines	The ISSP 2010 module was fielded with questions on corruption, human rights, media coverage in the hostage crisis, awareness/trust rating of personalities, awareness/trust rating of countries and institutions, RP-US relations, peace process, views on Islam, and crime victimization.
14	Slovakia	The ISSP modules 2009 and 2010 were fielded together. The modules appeared in the questionnaire in the following order: ISSP 2009 and ISSP 2010 questions. Some country specific questions were added.
15	Slovenia	The ISSP 2010 module was fielded together with: - another ISSP module (Health 2011), - National social survey on work-family relations and national survey on mobbing.
16	South Korea	Four topical modules- the '2010 ISSP 'Environment III' and the 2010 Special Topical module 'Health in East Asia' and the 2010 Special Topical module 'Musculoskeletal Disease in Korea' and the 2010 Special Topical module 'International Migration in Korea' were fielded as part of the 2010 KGSS (Korean General Social Survey).
17	Spain	The ISSP 2010 module was run as part of the monthly national survey run by ASEP since 1986 on Public Opinion of Spaniards.
18	Switzerland	The ISSP 2010 on environment module was fielded together with the ISSP 2011 health module and another module in the MOSAiCH 2011 survey. The whole interview lasted about 60 minutes.
19	Taiwan	The ISSP 2010 module was fielded with Taiwan Social Change Survey 2010 (Q2: Environment). Other survey topics include values, physical environment and other environment-related topics.
20	USA	The ISSP 2010 module was fielded as part of the biennial General Social Survey. Two ISSP modules are part of each General Social Survey. The GSS covers a very wide range of topics.

Calculation of Response Figures Based on Reported Figures

Report Category	Face-to-Face Questionnaire Category	Mail Questionnaire Category
Issued sample (n)	Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)	Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)
Ineligible (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 deceased
Eligible (n)	Issued sample minus Ineligible	Issued sample minus Ineligible
Refusal (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Personal refusal at selected address - Proxy refusal (on behalf of selected respondent) - Other refusal at selected address 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Refusal by selected respondent - Refusal by another person - Implicit refusals (empty envelopes, empty questionnaires returned)
Non-contact (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No contact at selected address - No contact with selected person 	No contact
Other unproductive (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate - Selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey - Selected respondent away during survey period - Other type of unproductive reaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate - Selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey - Selected respondent away during survey period - Other type of unproductive reaction
Completed cases (n)	Full productive interview	Completed returned questionnaires (net sample size)
Partially completed (n)	Partial productive interview	Partially completed returned questionnaires

