

ISSP study monitoring 2006: report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by GESIS-ZUMA, Germany

Scholz, Evi; Faaß, Timo; Harkness, Janet; Heller, Marleen

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Verzeichnis, Liste, Dokumentation / list

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Scholz, E., Faaß, T., Harkness, J., & Heller, M. (2008). *ISSP study monitoring 2006: report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by GESIS-ZUMA, Germany*. (GESIS-Methodenberichte, 11/2008). Mannheim: GESIS-ZUMA. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-206947>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

GESIS-Methodenberichte Nr. 11/2008

ISSP Study Monitoring 2006
Report to the ISSP General Assembly
on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP
by GESIS-ZUMA, Germany
Evi Scholz, Timo Faaß, Janet Harkness and Marleen Heller
August 2008

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

Telephone: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-283
Telefax: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-100
E-mail: evi.scholz@gesis.org

GESIS-Methodenberichte

Die GESIS ist ein Institut der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft.

ISSN:
Herausgeber, Druck
und Vertrieb:

1865-7567 (print) 1865-7575 (online)
GESIS
Postfach 12 21 55, 68072 Mannheim

Printed in Germany

Contents

Introduction	3
Summary of the findings	5
Language(s) and translation	5
Survey question coverage and context	5
Sampling.....	6
Data collection.....	6
Information on response and outcome figures	7
Data	7
Documentation	8
References	8
Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2006	10
Monitoring Findings Chart.....	16
Appendix	52
Calculation of Response Figures Based on Reported Figures	55
ISSP Study Monitoring Questionnaires for Face-to-Face and Mail Surveys.....	56

Introduction

Standards of “best practices for survey and public opinion research” such as published by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) call for quality checks at each stage of the survey process lifecycle. Defining standards and establishing benchmarks for good or best practices is an important step towards enabling quality to be assessed. A similarly critical step involves defining the criteria by which one or the other category or standard is to be defined. The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) guidelines on best practices and its definitions of nonresponse (The American Association for Public Opinion Research 2006) are good examples of such guidelines and definitions. Without documentation, however, quality assessment is impossible and quality improvement unlikely (Harkness 1999, Mohler and Uher 2003). Reporting outcomes is also a useful way of encouraging improvement in procedures (Lynn 2001). In numerous instances, the ISSP Study Monitoring documentation has resulted in improved standards in the ISSP.

Study monitoring involves collecting information on study design and every stage of implementation, requiring researchers to disclose their procedures and outcomes. If conducted while a study is happening, monitoring is the key to intervention which can reduce survey error. It is critical in controlling the quality of procedures and outcomes and plays an important role in helping projects improve design and implementation. Timely and ongoing lifecycle process monitoring is an important tool to reduce survey error during the relevant stage of implementation, whether this be design, data collection or data editing. However, as Mohler, Pennell and Hubbard (2008) note; “Standards in survey documentation have evolved in parallel with the technological and methodological developments in survey research. In just a few decades, paper documents describing the contents of rectangular data files (i.e., codebooks) have been replaced with on-line access to documents that both describe and facilitate analysis of complex hierarchical and/or relational databases. Despite these advances, examples of complete or even adequate survey documentation remain surprisingly rare.”

Cross-national study monitoring as pioneered in the ISSP represents a special case of survey documentation and study monitoring. ISSP Study Monitoring and Study Monitoring Reports as carried out by GESIS-ZUMA is monitoring *after the event*. The aim of ISSP monitoring and reports is at least twofold. From the beginning (cf. Park and Jowell 1997), one goal was to monitor and 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. Data quality in cross-

national studies is not only a matter of quality procedures but also of comparability across data sets and across the procedures resulting in these data sets (Harkness 1999, Mohler and Uher 2003, Scholz and Klein 2003). Comparability in this context operates on many levels (cf. Lyberg et al. 1997, Lynn et al. 2006, Harkness 2008).

For users of ISSP data, the Study Monitoring Reports bring together information of relevance for analysis not otherwise available in such 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. We note that the study documentation available for the European Social Survey, supported by EU funding and introduced in a different historical context, has benefited from but also goes beyond the documentation provided by the ISSP.

The ISSP is a collaborative survey programme with members from all over the world with an annual module on a topic important for social science research. The programme started more than 20 years ago with four General Social Surveys as founding members and counts 44 member countries in 2008. Figure 1 lists the current ISSP members and illustrates which different cultural contexts ISSP covers nowadays.

Figure 1: ISSP Member Countries 2008



The following report is based on the study monitoring survey conducted by GESIS-ZUMA for the ISSP on the 2006 Role of Government module.

Thirty-three member countries archived the 2006 Role of Government 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 2006 codebook.

Summary of the findings

Language(s) and translation

(see pages 17–25 of the Findings Chart)

From 1999 on, the SMQ asks whether members checked or evaluated their translations. All of the twenty-nine countries that produced translations checked or evaluated them. Twenty countries did not pre-test the translated questionnaire¹ (Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Israel, Japan, Latvia, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, Portugal, Russia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Uruguay). The Philippines and South Africa fielded in five languages, Switzerland and Israel in three languages and Canada, Finland, Latvia, and the USA in two languages. All the other member countries fielded in one language.

Some countries reported translation problems (Dominican Republic, Norway and Sweden).

Survey question coverage and context

(see pages 26–28 of the Findings Chart)

One country (the Dominican Republic) did not include all of the core items. Four members (Australia, Canada, Poland, and Venezuela) omitted background variables, usually by mistake.

In 2006, twenty-six countries fielded the ISSP module as part of a larger survey. A question in the SMQ asking for information about studies (topic, study title, etc.) the ISSP was fielded with is included in the report (see appendix).

¹ Finland did a pre-test for the Finnish but not for the Swedish version. The Philippines did a pre-test for Filipino but not for the other four languages the survey was fielded in. Switzerland did a pre-test for the German and French version but not for the Italian. South Africa did a pre-test for Afrikaans but not for the other four languages the survey was fielded in.

Sampling

(see pages 29–35 of the Findings Chart)

The sampling procedures and details reported for the 2006 module are for the most part similar to those reported in earlier years. None of the countries seem to be using quota procedures at the stage of respondents' selection. Two reported using substitution of different kinds: Chile and Russia.

Finland and France had a lower age cut-off at 15 years, Japan, Russia and South Africa had a cut-off at 16 years; Uruguay, Sweden, Venezuela had a cut-off at 17 years; all other members had a lower age cut-off at 18 years of age. Four countries reported an upper age cut-off (Finland and Latvia at 74, Norway and Sweden at 79).

Data collection

(see pages 36-44 of the Findings Chart)

MODES

Essentially the ISSP questionnaires are administered as face-to-face interviews or in a self-completion format. Two 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 (Germany, Great Britain).

Four countries using an interviewer-administered mode had two advance contacts, letter and telephone call (Spain, Switzerland, Taiwan, and the USA). Five countries had advance letters (Germany, Hungary, Japan, Poland, and Slovenia); three countries had a telephone pre-contact (the Dominican Republic, Portugal, and South Korea). Nine countries conducted their survey by mail (see table on page 43-44). Of these, Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden had four or more, Finland and New Zealand had three and Denmark and France had two mailings. The number of mailings is usually seen as relevant for enhancing response (Dillman 2000). The Netherlands and Sweden had a telephone reminder. In Denmark, about 3% of the interviews were collected by telephone; the mode variable identifies these. Telephone interviews are not permitted in the ISSP.

INCENTIVES

Nine countries reported they had used incentives (Great Britain, Dominican Republic, Japan, South Korea, Russia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Taiwan, and the USA): two countries had used incentives to both respondents and interviewers (Great Britain and South Korea), two countries incentives to interviewers (the Dominican Republic and Slovenia) and five countries

have given incentives to respondents (Japan, Russia, Switzerland, Taiwan, and the USA). This information was not collected in the SMQ until the 2001 module.

FIELDING DATES

Dates of fielding for the 2006 module range from 2006 to 2008:

2005-2006	1 country
2006	23 countries
2006-2007	1 country
2007	6 countries
2008	2 countries

The Philippines had the shortest fielding period, with seven days, the Netherlands had the longest, with more than eight months.

In all countries using interviewer-administered modes, interviewers approached addresses or households at different times of day and at different days of the week.

Countries differ considerably in the number of required contact attempts. The minimum required number of calls at an address or a household ranges from two (Latvia) to 10 (USA). Nine countries supervised interviews (proportions ranging between 1%-55%). All countries using interviewer-administered modes back-checked interviews (proportions ranging between 5%-100%).

Information on response and outcome figures

(see pages 45-46 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 2006 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 in the ISSP is considerable – from about 20% to over 90% for the module.

Data

(see pages 47-50 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.

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

Documentation

(see page 51 of the Findings Chart)

Nineteen countries reported they had a national methods report available (Australia, Canada, Chile, Germany, Dominican Republic, Spain, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Norway, the Philippines, Russia, Slovenia, South Korea, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, the USA and Venezuela). This information was not collected in the SMQ until the 2001 module.

References

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (2006): *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys*. 4th edition. Lenexa, Kansas: AAPOR. (available online http://www.aapor.org/uploads/standarddefs_4.pdf)

American Association for Public Opinion Research (2008): *Best Practices for Survey and Public Opinion Research*. (available online <http://www.aapor.org/bestpractices>)

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

Harkness, J. (2008) "Comparative Survey Research: Goals and Challenges." Foundation chapter" in De Leeuw, E., Hox, J. and Dillman, D. (eds.) *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*, Hyattsville, VA: Erlbaum.

Harkness, J. (1999): In Pursuit of Quality: Issues for Cross-national Survey Research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 2: 125-140.

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)

Lyberg, L., Biemer, P. P., Collins, M., De Leeuw, E. D., Dippo, C., Schwarz, N., Trewin, D. (1997): *Survey Measurement and Process Quality*. New York: Wiley.

Lynn, P., Japac, L., and Lyberg, L. (2006): What's So Special About Cross-National Surveys? In J. A. Harkness (ed.) *Conducting Cross-National and Cross-Cultural Surveys. Papers from the 2005 Meeting of the International Workshop on Comparative Survey Design and Implementation (CSDI)*. Mannheim: ZUMA-Nachrichten Spezial, 12: 7-20.

Lynn, P. (2001): *Developing Quality Standards for Cross-National Survey Research: Five Approaches*, Working Papers of the Institute for Social and Economic Research, paper 2001-21. Colchester: University of Essex.

Mohler, P. Ph., B.-E. Pennell, and Hubbard, F. (2008): "Survey Documentation: Towards Professional Knowledge Management in Sample Surveys" in De Leeuw, E., Hox., J. and Dillman, D. (eds.) *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*, Hyattsville, VA: Erlbaum.

Mohler, P. Ph. and Uher, R. (2003): *Documenting Comparative Surveys for Secondary Analysis*, in J. A. Harkness, F. J. R. Van de Vijver, and P. Ph. Mohler (ed.) *Cross-Cultural Survey Methods*, New York: Wiley.

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)

Scholz, E. and Klein, S. (2003): *Study Monitoring in the ISSP*, ZUMA-Nachrichten, 52: 139-152.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2006

(based on GESIS documentation, August, 2008: Australia to Croatia)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Australia (1984)	1996	✓	No	Bulgaria (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No			1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
2006	✓	✓	2006	No			
Austria (1985)	1996	No		Canada (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	No		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	No			2005	✓	✓
2006	No		2006	✓	✓		
Bangladesh (1997) - (2003)	1996			Chile (1997)	1996		
	1997	✓	No		1997		
	1998	No			1998	✓	✓
	1999	No			1999	✓	✓
	2000	(TP)	No		2000	✓	✓
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
2002	No		2002		✓	✓	
Brazil (1999) - (2006)	1996				2003	✓	✓
	1997				2004	✓	✓
	1998	(TP)	(✓)		2005	No	
	1999	(TP)	(✓)	2006	✓	✓	
	2000	No		Croatia (2005)	1996		
	2001	✓	✓		1997		
	2002	✓	✓		1998		
	2003	No			1999		
	2004	✓	✓		2000		
	2005	No			2001		
2006	No		2002				
			2003				
			2004				
			2005				
			2006	✓	✓		

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 1996–2006
(based on GESIS documentation, August, 2008: Cyprus to Germany)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Cyprus (1995)	1996	✓	✓	Finland (2000)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓		1997		
	1998	✓	No		1998		
	1999	✓	✓		1999		
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	No			2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
2006	No		2006	✓	✓		
Czech Republic (1991)	1996	✓	✓	Flanders (2000)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓		1997		
	1998	✓	✓		1998		
	1999	✓	✓		1999		
	2000	✓	✓		2000		
	2001	✓	✓		2001		
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	No	
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
2006	✓	✓	2006	(TP)	No		
Denmark (1998)	1996			France (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
2006	✓	✓	2006	✓	✓		
The Dominican Republic (2006)	1996			Germany (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	✓	✓
	1998				1998	✓	✓
	1999				1999	✓	✓
	2000				2000	✓	✓
	2001				2001	✓	✓
	2002				2002	✓	✓
	2003				2003	✓	✓
	2004				2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
2006	✓	✓	2006	✓	✓		

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 1996–2006
(based on GESIS documentation, August, 2008: Great Britain to Mexico)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Great Britain & Northern Ireland* (1984)	1996	✓	✓	Italy (2001-2004; re-instated in 2007)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	(No)	
	2000	✓	✓		2000	(No)	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓		2003		
	2004	✓	✓		2004		
	2005	✓	✓		2005		
2006	✓	✓	2006				
Hungary (1986)	1996	✓	✓	Japan (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
2005	✓	✓	2005	✓	✓		
2006	✓	✓	2006	✓	✓		
Ireland (1986)	1996	✓	✓	Latvia (1997)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	(TP)	(✓)		1997	No	
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
2005	✓	✓	2005	✓	✓		
2006	✓	✓	2006	✓	✓		
Israel (1988)	1996	✓	✓	Mexico (2000)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓		1997		
	1998	✓	✓		1998		
	1999	✓	✓		1999		
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	No	
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
2006	✓	✓	2006	No			

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

* 1997, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 without Northern Ireland

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2006
(based on GESIS documentation, August, 2008: Netherlands to Slovak Republic)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Netherlands (1985)	1996	No		Poland (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	No*	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	(TP)	No		2005	No	
2006	✓	✓	2006	✓	✓		
New Zealand (1990)	1996	✓	✓	Portugal (1995)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
2005	✓	✓	2005	✓	✓		
2006	✓	✓	2006	✓	✓		
Norway (1988)	1996	✓	✓	Russia (1990)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
2005	✓	✓	2005	✓	✓		
2006	✓	✓	2006	✓	✓		
Philippines (1989)	1996	✓	✓	Slovak Republic (1996, re-instated)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓		1997	No	
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
2005	✓	✓	2005	No			
2006	✓	✓	2006	No			

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

* data delivery late; not integrated in common data file

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2006
(based on GESIS documentation, August, 2008: Slovenia Republic to Uruguay)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Slovenia (1992)	1996	✓	✓	Sweden (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
2006	✓	✓	2006	✓	✓		
South Africa (2001, re-instated)	1996			Switzerland (1999)	1996		
	1997				1997	✓	✓
	1998				1998	✓	No
	1999				1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000				2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	No			2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
2005	✓	✓	2005		✓	✓	
2006	✓	✓	2006	✓	✓		
South Korea (2003)	1996			Taiwan (2001)	1996		
	1997				1997		
	1998				1998		
	1999				1999		
	2000				2000		
	2001				2001		
	2002				2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
2005	✓	✓	2005		✓	✓	
2006	✓	✓	2006	✓	✓		
Spain (1993)	1996	✓	✓	Uruguay (2003)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓		1997		
	1998	✓	✓		1998		
	1999	✓	✓		1999		
	2000	✓	✓		2000		
	2001	✓	✓		2001		
	2002	✓	✓		2002		
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	No	
2006	✓	✓	2006	✓	✓		

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 1996–2006
 (based on GESIS documentation, August, 2008: USA to Venezuela)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
USA (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Venezuela (1999)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999	No	
	2000	No	
	2001	No	
	2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓
	2005	No	
2006	✓	✓	

Monitoring Findings Chart

2006
for

Australia (AUS)
Canada (CDN)
Switzerland (CH)
Chile (CL)
Czech Republic (CZ)
Germany (D)
Denmark (DK)
Dominican Republic (DO)
Spain (E)
France (F)
Finland (FIN)
Great Britain (GB)
Hungary (H)
Croatia (HR)
Israel (IL)
Ireland (IRL)
Japan (J)
Latvia (LV)
Norway (N)
Netherlands (NL)
New Zealand (NZ)
Poland (PL)
Portugal (P)
South Korea (ROK)
Uruguay (ROU)
The Philippines (RP)
Russia (RUS)
Sweden (S)
Slovenia (SLO)
Taiwan (TW)
United States of America (USA)
Venezuela (YV)
South Africa (ZA)

Language(s) and translation

	AUS	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	English	English	German	Spanish	Czech	German	Spanish	Danish	Spanish	French	Finnish
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	X	X	X	X	L1
- by translation bureau											
- by specially trained translator(s)		L2	L1-L3	X		X					L1
- other			L1-L3 ^{CH}								L2 ^{FIN}
No, not translated	X	L1									

^{CH} Double translation.

^{FIN} Translated by a translation unit inside Statistics Finland.

Translation (continued)

	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	English	Hungarian	Croatian	Hebrew	English	Japanese	Latvian	Norwegian	Dutch	English	Portuguese
Language 2 (L2)				Arabic			Russian				
Language 3 (L3)				Russian							
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>											
Yes, translated:											
- by member(s) of research team		X	X			X	L1, L2	X	X		X
- by translation bureau						X					
- by specially trained translator(s)				L1-L3							
- other											
No, not translated	X				X					X	

Translation (continued)

	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	Polish	Korean	Spanish	Filipino	Russian	Swedish	Slovenian	Chinese	English	Spanish	Afrikaans
Language 2 (L2)				Ilocano					Spanish		Tsonga
Language 3 (L3)				Bicolano							Venda
Language 4 (L4)				Cebuano							Xhosa
Language 5 (L5)				Ilonggo							Zulu
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>											
Yes, translated:											
- by member(s) of research team	X	X	X	L1			X	X			
- by translation bureau											
- by specially trained translator(s)	X				X	X			L2	X	L1-L5
- other				L2-5 ^{RP}							
No, not translated									L1		

^{RP} Translated by field anchors, whose native languages are Ilocano, Bicolano, Cebuano and Ilonggo respectively, and who have practice in translating.

Translation (continued)

	AUS	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	English	English	German	Spanish	Czech	German	Spanish	Danish	Spanish	French	Finnish
Language 2 (L2)		French	French								Swedish
Language 3 (L3)			Italian								
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>											
Yes:											
- group discussion			L1-L3	X	X	X	X			X	L1, L2
- expert checked it			L1-L3			X			X	X	L1, L2
- back translation		L2									
- other								X ^{DK}			
No											
Not applicable	X	L1									

^{DK} Two members of the research team carried out a translation of the questionnaire independently of each other. On the basis of these two translations a third member of the research team made the final translation.

Translation (continued)

	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	English	Hungarian	Croatian	Hebrew	English	Japanese	Latvian	Norwegian	Dutch	English	Portuguese
Language 2 (L2)				Arabic			Russian				
Language 3 (L3)				Russian							
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>											
Yes:											
- group discussion		X	X	L1-L3			L1, L2	X	X		X
- expert checked it									X		
- back translation											
- other						X ^J					
Not applicable	X				X					X	

^J An English bilingual checked the translation.

Translation (continued)

	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	Polish	Korean	Spanish	Filipino	Russian	Swedish	Slovenian	Chinese	English	Spanish	Afrikaans
Language 2 (L2)				Ilocano					Spanish		Tsonga
Language 3 (L3)				Bicolano							Venda
Language 4 (L4)				Cebuano							Xhosa
Language 5 (L5)				Ilonggo							Zulu
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>											
Yes:											
- group discussion	X	X	X	L1 ^{RP}		X	X	X	L2	X	
- expert checked it	X				X			X	L2		L1-L5
- back translation											
- other				L1-L5 ^{RP}							
Not applicable									L1		

^{RP} L1: Group discussion with field anchors, pre-tested on 10 randomly selected adults of different age, sex, and class.

L1-L5: Discussion with field interviewers who can speak the language, i.e., those assigned to implement the questionnaire in the area where the language is spoken.

Translation (continued)

	AUS	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	English	English	German	Spanish	Czech	German	Spanish	Danish	Spanish	French	Finnish
Language 2 (L2)		French	French								Swedish
Language 3 (L3)			Italian								
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>											
Yes			L1, L2	X		X	X				L1
No		L2	L3		X			X	X	X	L2
Not applicable	X	L1									
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>											
Yes							X				
No		L2	L1-L3	X	X	X		X	X	X	L1, L2
Not applicable	X	L1									

Translation (continued)

	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	English	Hungarian	Croatian	Hebrew	English	Japanese	Latvian	Norwegian	Dutch	English	Portuguese
Language 2 (L2)				Arabic			Russian				
Language 3 (L3)				Russian							
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>											
Yes		X									
No			X	L1-L3		X	L1, L2	X	X		X
Not applicable	X				X					X	
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>											
Yes								X			
No		X	X	L1-L3		X	L1, L2		X		X
Not applicable	X				X					X	

Translation (continued)

	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	Polish	Korean	Spanish	Filipino	Russian	Swedish	Slovenian	Chinese	English	Spanish	Afrikaans
Language 2 (L2)				Ilocano					Spanish		Tsonga
Language 3 (L3)				Bicolano							Venda
Language 4 (L4)				Cebuano							Xhosa
Language 5 (L5)				Ilonggo							Zulu
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>											
Yes	X	X		L1				X	L2	X	L1
No			X	L2-L5	X	X	X				L2-L5
Not applicable									L1		
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>											
Yes						X					
No	X	X	X	L1-L5	X		X	X	L2	X	L1-L5
Not applicable									L1		

Survey context

	AUS	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>																
Individual survey							X		X	X	X				X	
Larger survey:																
- with ISSP at start	X				X			X								X
- with ISSP in middle		X	X	X									X	X		
- with ISSP at end						X						X				

	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>																	
Individual survey	X											X					
Larger survey:																	
- 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

Question coverage and order

	AUS	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
<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					X ^{CZ}		X	X ^{DK}								
<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
No, not all included:																
- from module							X									
- background items	X	X														

^{CZ} Prescribed order changed by adding items.

^{DK} Prescribed order changed by adding items.

Question coverage and order (continued)

	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<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
No																	
<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
No, not all included:																	
- from module																	
- background items							X									X	

Sampling

	AUS	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>																
...only adult citizens of country	X	X		X	X										X	
...adults of any nationality			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
...private & institutional accommodation	X							X								
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>																
18	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
17																
16																
15										X	X					

Sampling (continued)

	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>																	
...only adult citizens of country	X							X		X	X	X		X			X
...adults of any nationality		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
...private & institutional accommodation	X		X		X												
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>																	
18		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X		
17									X			X				X	
16	X										X						X
15																	

Sampling (continued)

	AUS	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
<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	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
No								X		X						
<i>How many stages does your sampling design have?</i>																
One stage	X							X			X					
Two stages		X				X				X			X			
Three stages			X	X			X		X					X		X
Four or more stages					X							X			X	

Sampling (continued)

	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>																	
Yes																	
Age		74	79									79					
No	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
No			X	X				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									X	X	X				X		

Sampling (continued)

	AUS	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
<i>Does your sampling frame consist of...</i>																
Addresses										X		X			X	X
Households		X	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					X			X	
Birthday method		X								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	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Does your sampling frame consist of...</i>																	
Addresses				X													
Households		X				X		X			X				X		X
Named individuals (target persons)	X		X		X		X					X	X	X			
Named individuals (not the target persons)																	
Areas									X	X						X	
Something else																	
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>																	
Kish grid										X					X	X	X
Birthday method		X		X		X		X	X		X						
Quota																	
Other																	
Not applicable	X		X		X		X					X	X	X			

Sampling (continued)

	AUS	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>																
Yes				X ¹²³												
No	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>																	
Yes											X ^{1,2}						
No	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.

³ Substitution of sample points.

Data collection

	AUS	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?</i>																
Face-to-face			X	X	X	X ^b	X		X			X ^b	X	X	X	X
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)						X ^s						X ^s				
Self-completion by mail	X	X						X		X	X					
Telephone																
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>																
2 weeks or less																
Over 2 weeks < 1 month				X			X						X			
1 month < 2 mths					X						X					
2 months < 3 mths								X	X					X		
3 mths or more	X	X	X			X				X		X			X	X
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>																
2005																X
2006		X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X
2007	X		X						X						X	
2008								X								

^b background variables

^s substantive variables

Data collection (continued)

	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?</i>																	
Face-to-face		X				X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)	X										X						
Self-completion by mail			X	X	X							X					
Telephone																	
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>																	
2 weeks or less	X									X							
Over 2 weeks < 1 month		X					X				X					X	
1 month < 2 mths									X								X
2 months < 3 mths			X		X			X				X	X	X			
3 mths or more				X		X									X		
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>																	
2005																	
2006	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
2007		X				X					X						
2008							X										

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

	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	E	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>											
Yes - postal components:							X				
- advance letter	X ^{CH}			X		X		X			
- reminder & thank you letters											
Yes - telephone components	X				X	X					
No		X	X						X	X	X
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>											
Yes:											
- to respondent	X						X				
- to interviewer					X		X				
No		X	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											

^{CH} In Switzerland, advance letter and telephone call were followed by a conversion letter with a prepaid incentive of 60 CHF.

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

	J	LV	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>													
Yes - postal components:													
- advance letter	X			X					X	X	X		
- reminder & thank you letters													
Yes - telephone components			X		X					X	X		
No		X				X	X	X				X	X
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>													
Yes:													
- to respondent	X				X			X		X	X		
- to interviewer					X				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	X
No											X		

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

	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	E	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
<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
Call on different days in week	X	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	5	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
No											
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>											
Yes:											
Approximate proportion (%)		7			55		2				
No	X		X	X		X		X	X	X	X

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

	J	LV	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<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
Call on different days in week	X	X	X	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	3	2	4	3	5	4	3	3	5	3	10	3	3
No													
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>													
Yes:													
Approximate proportion (%)					6		10			1	10	25	10
No	X	X	X	X		X		X	X				

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

	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	E	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
<i>Were any interviews back-checked?</i>											
Yes:											
Approximate proportion (%)	20	31	34	100	100	100	10	10	60	30	10
No											

	J	LV	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Were any interviews back-checked?</i>													
Yes:													
Approximate proportion (%)	27	10	36	5	100	32	30	20	65	30	20	25	15
No													

Data collection: mail

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

^{DK} If respondents had not responded after two mailings respondents were contacted by telephone and telephone interviews were conducted. If a respondent was not reached on the first call the survey institute contacted the respondent at least five times before the respondent was given up.

^{NL} Flyer with general information

Data collection: mail (continued)

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

Information on response and outcome figures *

	AUS	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D ^D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																
Issued sample (n)	6666	3500	2255	1716	2654	3210/1442	2880	2500	4000	10000	2500	2220	2228	3038	1834	1840
Ineligible (n)	329	384	46	16	93	353/132	144	9	56	229	18	231	49	29	112	99
Eligible (n)	6337	3116	2209	1700	2561	2857/1310	2736	2491	3944	9771	2482	1989	2179	3009	1722	1741
- refusal (n)	909	40	712	97	664	1356/630	155	613	460		8	669	517	1445	432	243
- non-contact (n)	2622	2108	399	89	482	192/82	340	105	715	7761	1278	65	150	333	201	422
- other unproductive (n)	23		95	9	214	197/67	135	405	248		7	178	502	31	51	75
- completed cases (n)	2781	933	1003	1505	1201	1112/531	2106	1362 ^{DK}	2517	1917	1189	1072	1010	1200	1038	1001
- partially completed (n)	2	35						6	4	93		5				

* for calculation of response figures, see appendix.

^D Western federal states followed by Eastern federal states.

^{DK} 40 telephone interviews included (2,9% of interviews completed)

Information on response and outcome figures (continued)*

	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																	
Issued sample (n)	1800	1960	2700	2500	2250	2832	2495	2500	1414	2565	6438	2000	1515	5032	2545	1380	3500
Ineligible (n)	104	178	64	80	107	71	268	33			203	28	100	229	413	42	116
Eligible (n)	1696	1782	2636	2420	2143	2761	2227	2467	1414	2565	6235	1972	1415	4803	2132	1338	3384
- refusal (n)	231	294	118	279	62	526	301	705	211	377	2665	208	206	818	497	36	305
- non-contact (n)	37	399	1140	1148	758	260	223	98	142	320	707	486	33	1666	24	31	127
- other unproductive(n)	197	18	48		60	138	410	33	30	668	456	84	169	347	93	71	13
- completed cases (n)	1231	1069	1330	993	1263	1837	1293	1605	1031	1200	2407	1194	1003	1972	1518	1200	2910
- partially completed (n)		2						26					4				29

* for calculation of response figures, see appendix.

Data

	AUS	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
<i>Were any measures of coding reliability employed?</i>																
Yes	X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X
No		X	X					X				X				
<i>Was the keying of the data verified?</i>																
Yes:																
Approximate proportion (%)				100	100		100		100		2	100	10	100	15	
No	X	X	X			X		X		X						X
<i>Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?</i>																
Yes	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		
No		X													X	
No derived variables								X	X							X

Data (continued)

	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Were any measures of coding reliability employed?</i>																	
Yes		X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X
No	X			X	X						X		X				
<i>Was the keying of the data verified?</i>																	
Yes:																	
Approximate proportion (%)	100		25			100		100		100		10		100		40	100
No		X		X	X		X		X		X		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		X
No		X		X												X	
No derived variables													X				

Data (continued)

	AUS	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>																
- filters	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
- ranges	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
- automatically					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
No	X					X	X	X	X					X	X	

Data (continued)

	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>																	
- filters	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
- ranges	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	
- automatically	X		X		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
No	X	X	X		X			X	X			X	X				

Documentation

	AUS	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
<i>Is a national methods report available for your study?</i>																
Yes	X	X	X	X		X	X		X			X	X			X
No					X			X		X	X			X	X	

	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Is a national methods report available for your study?</i>																	
Yes			X					X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
No	X	X		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	Australia	The Australian Survey of Social Attitudes (AuSSA) 2007: a biennial general social survey of Australian attitudes on subjects including work, politics, families, crime, community, and taxes and government spending.
2	Canada	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with the ISSP 2005 module on Work Orientations.
3	Chile	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with questions relating to Chilean political, economic and social attitudes.
4	Croatia	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with the ISSP 2007 module on Leisure Time and Sports.
5	Czech Republic	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with a set of country specific questions related to the topic of Role of Government, which were added at the end of the ISSP module. Topics of questions were social capital, governmental policy preferences, party identification, attitudes on major Czech political parties, social inequality and justice, satisfaction with political and economical situation, satisfaction with democracy, political efficacy, political knowledge.
6	Denmark	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with a set of country specific questions related to the topic of Role of Government, which were mostly added at the end of the ISSP module.
7	Germany	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with ALLBUS (German General Social Survey). ALLBUS 2006 mainly deals with ethnic groups but also covers topics such as religiosity, attitudes towards politics and economy, family, and trust in people and politicians.
8	Great Britain	ISSP 2006 was fielded as part of the 24 th British Social Attitudes Survey, 2006.
9	Hungary	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded as a part of the regular Omnibus survey of TARKI in January 2006.
10	Ireland	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with the ISSP 2005 Work Orientations module.
11	Latvia	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with the ISSP 2007 Leisure time and sports module.
12	Netherlands	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with the ISSP 2005 module on Work Orientations.

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
13	Norway	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with a survey on government performance and government responsibilities vs. privatisation, local democracy and local public services.
14	New Zealand	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with some New Zealand-specific questions added between the ISSP module and the demographics. These questions were concerned with various measures to address the problems of smoking, drinking and obesity.
15	Portugal	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with the ISSP 2005 Work Orientations module and a Portuguese module on Labour Relations.
16	Poland	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with the Polish General Social Survey 2008.
17	The Philippines	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with a survey including quality of life indicators, awareness of news events, performance rating of government officials and institutions, and opinion on current issues.
18	Russia	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with a regular omnibus survey.
19	Slovenia	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with the ISSP 2007 Leisure time and sports module and a general national social survey on perception of social and economic conditions, values, political attitudes, etc.
20	South Africa	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with the South African Social Attitudes Survey. Topics included service delivery, issues of governance, education, health, crime, social grants etc.
21	South Korea	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with the 2006 EASS (East Asian Social Survey) on 'Families in East Asia' as part of the 2006 KGSS (Korean General Social Survey).
22	Switzerland	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with the ISSP 2007 Leisure time and sports module. These two ISSP modules were part of a larger Swiss survey named MOSAiCH, which contains some questions about politics and demographics and a rotating module, this year, about labour.
23	Taiwan	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with the Taiwan Social Change Survey (TSCS). Other topics are listed as follows: daily life and globalization, government corruption, social welfare, family, work, income.
24	Uruguay	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with the Corporate Social Responsibility Survey.

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
25	USA	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with the General Social Survey (GSS) which includes core GSS variables and several topical modules. The 2006 module was asked on a version of the 2006 GSS that contained the 2005 and 2006 ISSP modules, the International Mental Health Stigma Study, some other modules, and demographics required for the ISSP. The full range of GSS core items and demographics were not administered to this version..
26	Venezuela	The ISSP 2006 module was fielded together with a survey on violence and victimization (Violencia Interpersonal y Percepción Ciudadana de la Situación de Seguridad en Venezuela).

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

ISSP Study Monitoring Questionnaires for Face-to-Face and Mail Surveys

***INTERNATIONAL
SOCIAL
SURVEY
PROGRAMME***

Study Monitoring Questionnaire

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE
ROLE OF GOVERNMENT 2006 ISSP MODULE AS YOUR REFERENCE.

RETURN TO: issp@gesis.org

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 39

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: **Language 1 to Language X**

4. Was the questionnaire for language 1 ...?

- a written translation (a questionnaire/application) → Question 5
an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) → Question 11

5. Who carried out translation 1? 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)

6. Was translation 1 checked?

- Yes, all of the questionnaire → Question 7
Yes, only the new questions → Question 7
No → Question 8

7. How was translation 1 checked?

- Group discussion
Expert checked it
Back translation
Other (please write in details)

Please write in:

8. Was the translation 1 questionnaire pre-tested?

- Yes
No

9. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 1? Please tick all that apply.

- No problems → Question 11
Answer scales
Instructions
Whole questions
Words or concepts
Other (please write in details)

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

10. What did you do about any problems in translation 1?

Please enter details:

11. Was the questionnaire for language 2 ...? **(answer only if you have two or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39)**

- a written translation (a questionnaire/application) → Question 12
an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) → Question 18

12. Who carried out translation 2? 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)

13. Was translation 2 checked?

- Yes, all of the questionnaire → Question 14
Yes, only the new questions → Question 14
No → Question 15

14. How was translation 2 checked?

Group discussion

Expert checked it

Back translation

Other (please write in details)

Please write in:

15. Was the translation 2 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes

No

16. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 2? Please tick all that apply.

No problems → Question 18

Answer scales

Instructions

Whole questions

Words or concepts

Other (please write in details)

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

17. What did you do about any problems in translation 2?

Please enter details:

18. Was the questionnaire for language 3 ...? **(answer only if you have three or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39)**

- a written translation (a questionnaire/application) → Question 19
an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) → Question 25

19. Who carried out translation 3? 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)

20. Was translation 3 checked?

- Yes, all of the questionnaire → Question 21
Yes, only the new questions → Question 21
No → Question 22

21. How was translation 3 checked?

- Group discussion
Expert checked it
Back translation
Other (please write in details)

Please write in:

22. Was the translation 3 questionnaire pre-tested?

- Yes
No

23. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 3? Please tick all that apply.

- No problems → Question 25
Answer scales
Instructions
Whole questions
Words or concepts
Other (please write in details)

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

24. What did you do about any problems in translation 3?

Please enter details:

25. Was the questionnaire for language 4 ...? **(answer only if you have four or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39)**

- a written translation (a questionnaire/application) → Question 26
an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) → Question 32

26. Who carried out translation 4? 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)

27. Was translation 4 checked?

- Yes, all of the questionnaire → Question 28
Yes, only the new questions → Question 28
No → Question 29

28. How was translation 4 checked?

Group discussion

Expert checked it

Back translation

Other (please write in details)

Please write in:

29. Was the translation 4 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes

No

30. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 4? Please tick all that apply.

No problems → Question 32

Answer scales

Instructions

Whole questions

Words or concepts

Other (please write in details)

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

31. What did you do about any problems in translation 4?

Please enter details:

32. Was the questionnaire for language 5 ...? **(answer only if you have five or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39)**

- a written translation (a questionnaire/application) → Question 33
an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) → Question 39

33. Who carried out translation 5? 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)

34. Was translation 5 checked?

- Yes, all of the questionnaire → Question 35
Yes, only the new questions → Question 35
No → Question 36

35. How was translation 5 checked?

- Group discussion
Expert checked it
Back translation
Other (please write in details)

Please write in:

36. Was the translation 5 questionnaire pre-tested?

- Yes
No

37. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 5? Please tick all that apply.

- No problems → Question 39
- Answer scales
- Instructions
- Whole questions
- Words or concepts
- Other (please write in details)

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

38. What did you do about any problems in translation 5?

Please enter details:

39. 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:

40. Were postal or telephone components used at any point (e.g., advance contacts)?

Yes - postal → Question 41

Yes - telephone → Question 41

No → Question 42

41. Please give details of the postal and/or telephone components.

Please enter details:

42. Were incentives offered?

Yes, to respondent

Yes, to interviewer

No, neither to respondent nor to interviewer

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

As an individual survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey) → Question 46

As part of a larger survey → Question 44

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

Please enter:

45. What was the approximate position of the Role of Government module in the larger questionnaire?

Start of questionnaire

Middle of questionnaire

End of questionnaire

46. Were the substantive questions in the Role of Government module all asked in the prescribed order?

Yes → Question 48

Yes, apart from omissions → Question 47

No → Question 47

47. Why was the question order changed?

Please enter:

48. Were all the core ISSP questions included in your questionnaire (by core we mean all required substantive and background questions)?

Yes – all Role of Government questions and background questions included → Question 50

No – substantive question(s) from Role of Government module missing → Question 49

No – required background ISSP question(s) missing → Question 49

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

ISSP source questionnaire: question number or description of question:

Reason(s) why missing:

Here we ask questions on sampling.

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

Only adult citizens of your country?

Adults of any nationality residing in your country?

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

Only adults living in private accommodation? → Question 52
Adults living in private and in institutional accommodation
(e.g., residential homes for the elderly, asylum accommodation)?

If private and institutional, please enter details in box below.

Please enter in:

52. Third, what was the lower age cut-off for your sample?

WRITE IN :

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

Yes - please write in cut-off

No cut-off

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

No

Yes (please write in details)

If yes, write in details:

55. Did you use any variables for stratification?

Yes → Question 56

No → Question 57

56. Please describe the stratification variables used?

Please write in:

57. How many of stages does your sampling design have?

- One stage
- Two stages
- Three stages
- Four stages

58. 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)

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

Please write in:

60. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the first stage?

Please write in:

61. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the second stage?

(only if you have two or more stages, otherwise continue with question 64)

Please write in:

62. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the third stage?
(only if you have three or more stages, otherwise continue with question 64)

Please write in:

63. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the fourth stage?
(only if you have four stages, otherwise continue with question 64)

Please write in:

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

Please tick all that apply. (do not answer if your sampling frame consists of named individuals – which are the target persons. Then continue with question 66)

Kish grid

Last (or next) birthday

Quota

Other (please write in details)

65. Please describe your quota procedures. (only if you used quota, otherwise continue with question 66)

Please write in:

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

Yes →Question 67

No →Question 68

67. Please provide details of the substitution or replacement procedures used.

Please write in:

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

Please write in:

69. Please fill in the following details about your issued sample.

Some categories may well not apply, but please complete to the highest level of detail possible.

- Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)
- 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
- personal refusal at selected address
- 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)
- full productive interview (net sample size)
- partial productive interview

More information or Other type of unproductive reaction

Please write in:

70. Here we ask for information about interviewer procedures.

a. Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?

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 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

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

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

D D M M Y Y

Start date

End date

72. Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes

No

73. Was keying of the data verified?

Yes - please write in approximate level of verification %

No

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

Yes

No

No derived variables

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

**If you answered YES for any question from Q72 to Q77, continue with Question 78.
If you answered NO for all questions Q72 to Q77, continue with Question 79.**

78. Were errors corrected?
Please tick all that apply.

Yes - individually

Yes - automatically

No - not corrected

79. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes

→ Question 80

No

→ Question 81

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

Please write in:

81. Is a national methods report available for your study?

Yes

No

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

Please write in:

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

***INTERNATIONAL
SOCIAL
SURVEY
PROGRAMME***

Study Monitoring Questionnaire

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE
ROLE OF GOVERNMENT 2006 ISSP MODULE AS YOUR REFERENCE.

RETURN TO: issp@gesis.org

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 34
- 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: **Language 1 to Language X**

4. Who carried out translation 1? 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 translation 1 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire → Question 6

Yes, only the new questions → Question 6

No → Question 7

6. How was translation 1 checked?

Group discussion

Expert checked it

Back translation

Other (please write in details)

Please write in:

7. Was the translation 1 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes

No

8. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 1? 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 in translation 1?

Please enter details:

10. Who carried out translation 2? Please tick all that apply.

(answer only if you have two or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)

A member or members of the research team

A translation bureau

One or more specially trained translators

Other (please write in details)

11. Was translation 2 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire → Question 12

Yes, only the new questions → Question 12

No → Question 13

12. How was translation 2 checked?

Group discussion

Expert checked it

Back translation

Other (please write in details)

Please write in:

13. Was the translation 2 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes

No

14. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 2? Please tick all that apply.

No problems → Question 16

Answer scales

Instructions

Whole questions

Words or concepts

Other (please write in details)

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

15. What did you do about any problems in translation 2?

Please enter details:

16. Who carried out translation 3? Please tick all that apply.

answer only if you have three or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)

A member or members of the research team

A translation bureau

One or more specially trained translators

Other (please write in details)

17. Was translation 3 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire → Question 18

Yes, only the new questions → Question 18

No → Question 19

18. How was translation 3 checked?

Group discussion

Expert checked it

Back translation

Other (please write in details)

Please write in:

19. Was the translation 3 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes

No

20. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 3? Please tick all that apply.

No problems → Question 22

Answer scales

Instructions

Whole questions

Words or concepts

Other (please write in details)

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

21. What did you do about any problems in translation 3?

Please enter details:

22. Who carried out translation 4? Please tick all that apply.

(answer only if you have four or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)

A member or members of the research team

A translation bureau

One or more specially trained translators

Other (please write in details)

23. Was translation 4 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire → Question 24

Yes, only the new questions → Question 24

No → Question 25

24. How was translation 4 checked?

Group discussion

Expert checked it

Back translation

Other (please write in details)

Please write in:

25. Was the translation 4 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes

No

26. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 4? Please tick all that apply.

No problems →Question 28

Answer scales

Instructions

Whole questions

Words or concepts

Other (please write in details)

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

27. What did you do about any problems in translation 4?

Please enter details:

28. Who carried out translation 5? Please tick all that apply.

(answer only if you have five or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)

A member or members of the research team

A translation bureau

One or more specially trained translators

Other (please write in details)

29. Was translation 5 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire →Question 30

Yes, only the new questions →Question 30

No →Question 31

30. How was translation 5 checked?

Group discussion

Expert checked it

Back translation

Other (please write in details)

Please write in:

31. Was the translation 5 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes

No

32. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 5? Please tick all that apply.

No problems → Question 34

Answer scales

Instructions

Whole questions

Words or concepts

Other (please write in details)

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

33. What did you do about any problems in translation 5?

Please enter details:

34. Here we ask questions on your mail survey.

a. Were any contacts made by telephone or interviewer?
Please tick all that apply.

- Yes - precontacts by telephone
- Yes - precontacts by personal visit
- Yes - reminders by telephone
- Yes - reminders by personal visit
- Yes - Other (please write in details)

- No** - no telephone or personal (visit) contacts at all

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

c. 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	<input type="text"/>
2	d d m m y y y y	<input type="text"/>
3	d d m m y y y y	<input type="text"/>
4	d d m m y y y y	<input type="text"/>

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

1. Mailing:

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Mailing (answer only if you have two or more mailings, otherwise continue with question 34e):

	YES	NO
Thank you and reminder combined	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thank you sent only to respondents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reminder sent only to non-respondents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Mailing (answer only if you have three or more mailings, otherwise continue with question 34e):

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Mailing (or last, if more than four mailings) (answer only if you have three or more mailings, otherwise continue with question 34e):

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

e. When did the fielding period finish officially?

d	d	m	m	y	y	y	y

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

As an individual survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey) →Question 38

As part of a larger survey →Question 36

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

Please enter:

37. What was the approximate position of the Role of Government module in the larger questionnaire?

Start of questionnaire

Middle of questionnaire

End of questionnaire

38. Were the substantive questions in the Role of Government module all asked in the prescribed order?

Yes →Question 40

Yes, apart from omissions →Question 39

No →Question 39

39. Why was the question order changed?

Please enter:

40. Were all the core ISSP questions included in your questionnaire (by core we mean all required substantive and background questions)?

Yes – all Role of Government questions and background questions included → Question 42

No – substantive question(s) from Role of Government module missing → Question 41

No – required background ISSP question(s) missing → Question 41

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

<i>ISSP source questionnaire: question number or description of question:</i>
<i>Reason(s) why missing:</i>

Here we ask questions on sampling.

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

Only adult citizens of your country?

Adults of any nationality residing in your country?

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

Only adults living in private accommodation? → Question 44

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

If private and institutional, please enter details in box below.

<i>Please enter in:</i>

44. Third, what was the lower age cut-off for your sample?

WRITE IN :

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

Yes - please write in cut-off

No cut-off

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

No

Yes (please write in details)

If yes, write in details:

47. Did you use any variables for stratification?

Yes

→Question 48

No

→Question 49

48. Please describe the stratification variables used?

Please write in:

49. How many of stages does your sampling design have?

One stage

Two stages

Three stages

Four stages

50. 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)

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

Please write in:

52. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the first stage?

Please write in:

53. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the second stage?
(only if you have two or more stages, otherwise continue with question 56)

Please write in:

54. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the third stage?
(only if you have three or more stages, otherwise continue with question 56)

Please write in:

55. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the fourth stage?
(only if you have four stages, otherwise continue with question 56)

Please write in:

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

Please tick all that apply. (do not answer if your sampling frame consists of named individuals – which are the target persons. Then continue with question 58)

Kish grid

Last (or next) birthday

Quota

Other (please write in details)

57. Please describe your quota procedures. (only if you used quota, otherwise continue with question 58)

Please write in:

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

Yes

→Question 59

No

→Question 60

59. Please provide details of the substitution or replacement procedures used.

Please write in:

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

Please write in:

61. Please fill in the following details about your issued sample.

Some categories may well not apply, but please complete to the highest level of detail possible.

- Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)
- 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
- partial productive interview
- implicit refusals (empty envelopes, empty questionnaires returned)
- other type of unproductive reaction (please write in full details in the box below)
- completed returned questionnaires (net sample size)
- partially completed returned questionnaires
- **no contact**

More information or Other type of unproductive reaction

Please write in:

62. Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes

No

63. Was keying of the data verified?

Yes - please write in approximate level of verification %

No

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

Yes

No

No derived variables

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

**If you answered YES for any question from Q62 to Q67, continue with Question 68.
If you answered NO for all questions Q62 to Q67, continue with Question 69.**

68. Were errors corrected?
Please tick all that apply.

Yes - individually

Yes - automatically

No - not corrected

69. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes → Question 70

No → Question 71

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

Please write in:

71. Is a national methods report available for your study?

Yes

No

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

Please write in:

THANK YOU VERY MUCH