ISSP Study Monitoring 2001: report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by ZUMA, Germany

Klein, Sabine; Harkness, Janet

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:
Klein, S., & Harkness, J. (2003). *ISSP Study Monitoring 2001: report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by ZUMA, Germany.* (ZUMA-Methodenbericht, 2003/14). Mannheim: Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen -ZUMA-. https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-52689-9

ZUMA Methodenbericht 2003/14

ISSP Study Monitoring 2001

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

Sabine Klein and Janet Harkness

December 2003
ISSN 1610-9953

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

Telephone: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-284,-272
Telefax: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-100
E-mail: Harkness@zuma-mannheim.de
Klein@zuma-mannheim.de

lntroduction

This report is based on the study monitoring survey conducted by ZUMA for the ISSP on the 2001 Social Networks module.

Twenty-nine member countries archived the 2001 Social Networks module and returned the monitoring questionnaire. Details of the individual answers members provided are presented in the summary chart which follows here. The latest version of the study monitoring questionnaire is appended.

We have done our best to summarise the answers we received and to check the information with members. Members are given the opportunity to make corrections before the report is made available on the Archive web site as a supplement to the 2001 Codebook.

The Study Monitoring Questionnaire (SMQ) has been modified from year to year. Questions on fieldwork, translation, and sampling have, for example, changed and questions on documentation been added.

Summary of the findings

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

From 1999 on, the SMQ asks whether members checked or evaluated their translations. All of the twenty-three countries that produced translations checked or evaluated them. Seventeen countries did not pre-test the translated questionnaire (Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Israel, Japan, Latvia, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Russia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain and Switzerland). The Philippines fielded in five languages, Switzerland in three languages, and Finland, Israel, and Latvia in two languages. Besides English, South Africa fielded in 10 other languages, Canada in one other language. All the other member countries fielded in one language.

Germany, Finland, Japan, and Norway were the only members who reported translation problems.

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

In 2001, nineteen countries fielded the ISSP module as part of a larger survey. Six members did not include all the core items (Cyprus, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway and the USA). Cyprus and Germany omitted substantive and background variables; Norway omitted a substantive question, the other members omitted background variables. Questions were usually omitted by mistake.

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

The sampling procedures and details reported for the 2001 module are for the most part similar to those reported in earlier years. Two countries reported using quota procedures at different stages (Brazil and the Netherlands), twelve reported using substitution of different kinds (Austria, Chile, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Russia, South Africa and Spain).

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

Fieldwork (see pages 8–12 and 18-19 of the Findings Chart)

MODES

Four 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, Northern Ireland, Poland and the United States).

Two countries using an interviewer-administered mode had two advance contacts, letter and telephone call (Switzerland and the United States). Six countries had advance letters (Germany, Hungary, Japan, Northern Ireland, Poland, and Slovenia), the Netherlands had a telephone pre-contact. Seven countries conducted their survey by mail (see tables on page 18-19). Of these, Australia had six mailings, New Zealand and Norway had four, Canada had three, Denmark had two mailings, and France had one mailing. The number of mailings is usually seen as relevant for enhancing response rates (Dillman 2000). Denmark had a telephone reminder after the second and last mailing, a few interviews were collected by telephone (the mode variable identifies these).

INCENTIVES

Seven countries reported they had used incentives (Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Norway, Switzerland and the United States). This information was not collected in earlier versions of the SMQ.

FIELDING DATES

Dates of fielding range from 2000 to 2003:

2000	1 country
2001	19 countries
2001-2002	1 country
2002	7 countries
2002-2003	1 country.

Hungary had the shortest fielding period, with seven days, Germany had the longest, with about six months.

In nineteen of twenty-two countries using interviewer-administered modes, interviewers approached addresses or households at different times of day and at different days of the week; in two countries at different times of day only (Latvia, Russia), and in one country at different days in the week only (Chile).

Countries differ considerably in the number of required contact attempts. The minimum required number of calls at an address or a household ranges from none (Cyprus and the United States) to ten (Germany and Switzerland). Nine countries supervised interviews (proportions ranging between 3%-20%), and all countries using interviewer-administered modes back-checked interviews (proportions ranging between 5%-95%).

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

Quota procedures, substitution, and, in some cases, a lack of sufficient detail are the three main obstacles to calculating response rates for some of the ISSP 2001 studies (cf. reasons mentioned in the Park and Jowell report (1997) and expanded in the overview of the 1996-1998 monitoring studies, Harkness, Langfeldt, and Scholz, 2001). Members also differ in their definitions of outcome codes – of what counts as “eligible“, “ineligible”, or “partially completed interviews”, and so forth.

The raw figures for eligible samples and final outcomes indicate, nevertheless, that the range is considerable in the ISSP – from below 15% to over 90% for the module.

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

The great majority of members employed various measures of coding reliability, for the most part logic or consistency checks and range checks, followed by either individual or automatic corrections or both.

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

Documentation (see page 17 of the Findings Chart)

Four countries reported they had a national methods report available (Germany, Great Britain, Northern Ireland, and the United States). Latvia did not specify. This information was not collected in earlier versions of the SMQ.

References

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

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

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

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2002[1]

(based on Archive and ZUMA documentation, November, 2003: Australia to Denmark)

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

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Canada (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002		
Chile (1997)	1996		
	1997		
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Cyprus (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	No
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	(S)	No
Czech Republic (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Denmark (1998)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002		

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

[1] Venezuela is not included in this table because they have not delivered to the ISSP archive yet. Venezuela joined the ISSP in 1999.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2002[1]

(based on Archive and ZUMA documentation, November 2003: Finland to Japan)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Finland (2000)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Flanders (2000)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000		
	2001		
	2002	✓	✓
France (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Germany (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Great Britain & Northern Ireland (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	(✓)*	(✓)*

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Hungary (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Ireland (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	(TP)	(✓)
	1998	✓	No
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓
Israel (1988)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Italy (2001, re-instated)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	(No)	
	2000	(No)	
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	No	
Japan (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓

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

[1] Venezuela is not included in this table because they have not delivered to the ISSP archive yet. Venezuela joined the ISSP in 1999.
* Northern Ireland archived and reported.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2002[1]

(based on Archive and ZUMA documentation, November, 2003: Latvia to Slovakian Republic)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Latvia (1997)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No	
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002		
Mexico (2000)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓
Netherlands (1985)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
New Zealand (1990)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Norway (1988)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Philippines (1989)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	(S)	No
Poland (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Portugal (1995)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	No	
	2002		
Russia (1990)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002		
Slovakian Republic (1996, re-instated)	1996	No	
	1997	No	
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓

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

S: Sent to Archive.

[1] Venezuela is not included in this table because they have not delivered to the ISSP archive yet. Venezuela joined the ISSP in 1999.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2002[1]

(based on Archive and ZUMA documentation, November, 2003: Slovenia to USA)

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

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

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

[1] Venezuela is not included in this table because they have not delivered to the ISSP archive yet. Venezuela joined the ISSP in 1999.

Monitoring Findings Chart

2001

for

Austria (A)
Australia (AUS)
Brazil (BR)
Canada (CDN)
Switzerland (CH)
Chile (CL)
Cyprus (CY)
Czech Republic (CZ)
Germany (D)
Denmark (DK)
Spain (E)
France (F)
Finland (FIN)
Great Britain (GB)
Hungary (H)
Italy (I)
Israel (IL)
Japan (J)
Latvia (LV)
Norway (N)
Northern Ireland (NIR)
Netherlands (NL)
New Zealand (NZ)
Poland (PL)
Philippines (RP)
Russia (RUS)
Slovenia (SLO)
United States of America (USA)
South Africa (ZA)

The questionnaire

	A	AUS	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	I	IL	J	LV	N	NIR	NL	NZ	PL	RP	RUS	SLO	USA	ZA
Was the questionnaire translated?																													
Yes, translated:	X[A]		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X
- by member(s) of the research team			X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X		X	X		X		X
- by specially trained translator(s)				X	X	X			X				X				X							X		X			
No translation		X												X							X		X					X	
Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?																													
Yes:			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X		
- group discussion			X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X		X	X				X	X		X		
- expert checked it									X		X		X			X								X		X			
- back translation				X																					X				
- other																		X				X							
No																													X
Not applicable	(X)[A]	X												X							X		X					X	

[A] Austria seems to have used the German (ZUMA) translation.

The questionnaire (continued)

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

[A] Austria seems to have used the German (ZUMA) translation.

The questionnaire (continued)

	A	AUS	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	I	IL	J	LV	N	NIR	NL	NZ	PL	RP	RUS	SLO	USA	ZA
Were the ISSP questions asked in the prescribed order?																													
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes, apart from omissions							X															X							
No																				X									
Were all the core ISSP items included?																													
Yes, all included	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X
No, not all included:							X		X									X		X		X						X	
- from module							X		X											X									
- background items							X		X									X				X						X	

Sampling

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

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	I	IL	J	LV	N	NIR	NL	NZ	PL	RP	RUS	SLO	USA	ZA
Was there an upper age cut-off?																													
Yes								X					X						X	X									
Age								75					74						85	79									
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
How many of the stages were based purely on probability or random sampling?																													
Some																			X						X				X
All	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
What probability of selection did every member of the population sampled have?																													
Known and equal		X								X			X		X	X		X		X			X			X		
Known and <u>not</u> equal	X[A]		X	X[CDN]	X	X	X[CY]	X	X		X	X		X			X[IL]		X[LV]		X[NIR]	X[NL]		X	X	X[RUS]		X	X

[A,CDN,CY,IL,LV,NIR,NL,RUS] In samples with households as the sampling unit and one respondent per household, probability of selection is not equal. We adjusted the information here accordingly.

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	I	IL	J	LV	N	NIR	NL	NZ	PL	RP	RUS	SLO	USA	ZA
Were stratification factors used during sampling?																													
Yes			X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No	X	X								X		X	X							X		X							
What was the issued sampled unit?																													
Address	X											X		X					X			X		X		X		X	
Household			X		X		X	X													X								X
Named individual		X		X[CDN]					X	X			X		X	X		X		X			X				X		
Other						X					X						X								X				
What selection method was used to identify a respondent?																													
Kish grid	X				X	X	X	X			X			X			X				X			X	X			X	X
Quota			X																			X							
Birthday method				X								X							X			X				X			
Not applicable		X							X	X			X		X	X		X		X			X				X		

[CDN] Telephone book

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	I	IL	J	LV	N	NIR	NL	NZ	PL	RP	RUS	SLO	USA	ZA
Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage in the survey?																													
Yes	X[2]					X[1,2,3]	X[2]	X[1,2]			X[1,2]				X[1,2]	X[1]			X[2]			X[1,2]			X[1,2]	X[1,2]			X[1,2]
No		X	X	X	X				X	X		X	X	X			X	X		X	X		X	X			X	X	

x[1] substitution of refusals
x[2] substitution of non-contacts, people away during survey period, etc.
x[3] substitution of sample points

Fieldwork

	A	AUS	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	I	IL	J	LV	N	NIR	NL	NZ	PL	RP	RUS	SLO	USA	ZA
What data collection methods were used for the module (substantive and background questions)?																													
Face-to-face	X		X		X	X	X	X	X[b]		X				X	X	X		X		X[b]			X[b]	X	X	X	X[b]	X
Self-Completion (with some interviewer involvement)									X[s]					X				X			X[s]	X		X[s,b]				X[s]	
Self-completion by mail		X		X						X[s,b]		X	X							X			X						
Telephone										X[s,b]																			

[s] substantive variables
[b] background variables

Fieldwork (continued)

	A	AUS	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	I	IL	J	LV	N	NIR	NL	NZ	PL	RP	RUS	SLO	USA	ZA
Were postal or telephone methods used at any point during fieldwork?																													
Yes - postal		X[M]		X[M]	X[P]				X[P]	X[M]		X[M]	X[M]		X[P]			X[P]		X[M]	X[P]		X[M]	X[P]			X[P]	X[P]	
Yes - telephone					X[TC]					X[DK]												X[TC]						X[TC]	
No	X		X			X	X	X			X			X		X	X		X						X	X			X
Were reminder letters/telephone calls used?																													
Yes – letters		X[M]		X[M]						X[M]			X[M]							X[M]			X[M]						
Yes – telephone calls										X[DK]																			
No					X				X			X[M]			X			X			X	X		X			X	X	
Not applicable	X		X			X	X	X			X			X		X	X		X						X	X			X

[M] Mail Survey
[P] Prenotification
[TC] Telephone contact to make an appointment.
[DK] Telephone contact after the last mailing; 9.3% of the resulting interviews were collected by telephone.

Fieldwork (continued)

	A	AUS	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	I	IL	J	LV	N	NIR	NL	NZ	PL	RP	RUS	SLO	USA	ZA
Were incentives offered?																													
Yes					X				X									X		X	X	X						X	
No	X		X	X				X		X		X	X	X		X							X	X					X
Not answered																			X										
Question not asked		X				X	X				X				X		X								X	X	X		
Were interviewers paid according to performance?																													
Yes	X		X			X	X	X	X		X[E]			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X		X
No					X															X								X	
Not applicable		X		X						X		X	X							X			X						
Which of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address or household?																													
Call at different time of day	X		X		X		X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Call on different days in week	X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X			X	X		X	X		X	X	X
Not applicable		X		X						X		X	X							X			X						

[E] Interviewers paid per day and per performance.

Fieldwork (continued)

	A	AUS	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	I	IL	J	LV	N	NIR	NL	NZ	PL	RP	RUS	SLO	USA	ZA
Were a minimum number of calls required?																													
Yes:	X		X		X	X		X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X		X
Minimum number of required calls	5		3		10	3		5	10		3			4	3	3	3	3	2		3	3		3	2	3	5		3
No							X																					X	
Not applicable		X		X						X		X	X							X			X						
Were any interviews supervised?																													
Yes:			X			X	X	X			X			X[GB]											X			X	X
Approximate proportion (%)			20			3	20	3			15														10			10	15
No	X				X				X						X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X		
Not applicable		X		X						X		X	X							X			X						
Were any interviews back-checked?																													
Yes:	X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Approximate proportion (%)	15		20		20	27	10	30	95		15			5	20	10	30	20	10		10	10		10	20	20	70	20	15
Not applicable		X		X						X		X	X							X			X						

[GB] New interviewers are supervised. Experienced interviewers are accompanied at least twice a year.

Fieldwork (continued)

	A	AUS	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	I	IL	J	LV	N	NIR	NL	NZ	PL	RP	RUS	SLO	USA	ZA
Length of fieldwork																													
2 weeks or less			X								X				X			X										
Over 2 wks, < 1 month						X										X			X					X	X	X			X
1 month, < 2 months	X						X	X																			X		
2 months, < 3 months										X		X					X				X		X						
3 months or more		X			X				X					X								X						X	
Not applicable*				X									X							X									
Year of fieldwork																													
2000																											X		
2001	X		X	X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X			X
2002		X			X	X			X	X						X						X		X				X	
2003																						X							

* End of fieldwork period for mail surveys not asked in the older version of the Study Monitoring Questionnaire.

Information on response and outcome figures

	A	AUS	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D[D]	DK	E	F	FIN	GB
Response figures based on reported figures														
Issued sample (n)	1606		2000	3000	3291	1505	1290	1841	2291/1036	1944	1274	10000	2500	2066
Ineligible (n)	64			295	147	7		26	255/104	27		333	9	206
Eligible (n)	1542			2705	3144	1498	1290	1815	2036/932	1917	1274	9667	2491	1860
- refusal (n)	249			29	1507	111	112	399	620/318	566	21	8230	8	480
- non-contact (n)	253			1549	222	67		128	96/53		30	4	1044	80
- other unproductive (n)	29				414	18	172	88	363/126	56	9	35		203
- completed cases (n)	1011			1115	1001	1504/1302[CL]	1006	1200	936/433	1293[DK]	1214	1398	1439	1092
- partially completed (n)				12					21/2	2				5
Not answered		X												

[CL] First count includes substituted interviews.
[D] Western federal states followed by eastern federal states.
[DK] 120 telephone interviews included.

Information on response and outcome figures (continued)

	H	I	IL	J	LV	N	NIR[NIR]	NL	NZ	PL	RP	RUS	SLO	USA	ZA
Response figures based on reported figures															
Issued sample (n)	2677	1120	3714	1800	1728	2500	2820	5050	2200	2004		4936	3389	2463	2700
Ineligible (n)	124	42	148	106	72	51	145		262	133		88	238	391	
Eligible (n)	2553	1078	3566	1694	1656	2449	2675	5050	1938	1871		4848	3151	2072	2700
- refusal (n)	406	39	1505	161	261	164	482	2450	127	371		827	471	520	
- non-contact (n)	185	25	384		379	719	363	1347	607	150		1827	187	30	
- other unproductive (n)	438	15	470	212	16	6	30	151	58	129		160	319	150	
- completed cases (n)	1524	999	1207	1321	1000	1560	1407	1249/1102[NL]	1146	1221	1200	2000	2069[SLO]	1372/ 1149[USA]	2563
- partially completed (n)												34	105		

[NIR] There are 393 cases missing, no further information provided.
[NL] First figure includes 147 questionnaires completed by a second household member (two questionnaires in one household).
[SLO] ISSP 2001 was administered in a split to half the sample (1077).
[USA] First figure is the number of GSS (General Social Survey) interviews completed, the second figure, the ISSP questionnaires completed.

Data

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

Data (continued)

	A	AUS	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	I	IL	J	LV	N	NIR	NL	NZ	PL	RP	RUS	SLO	USA	ZA
Were data errors corrected?																													
Yes:																													
- individually	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X
- automatically	X	X									X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X		X				X	X	X
Not answered				X																		X							
Were the data weighted or post-stratified?																													
Yes	X			X	X	X		X				X	X	X	X	X					X			X	X	X	X		X
No		X	X				X		X	X	X						X	X	X	X		X	X					X	

Documentation

	A	AUS	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	I	IL	J	LV	N	NIR	NL	NZ	PL	RP	RUS	SLO	USA	ZA
Is a national methods report available for your study?																													
Yes									X					X							X							X	
No			X				X			X		X				X							X	X				X
Not answered																			X										
Question not asked	X	X		X	X	X		X			X		X		X		X	X		X		X			X	X	X		

Mail Surveys

	AUS	CDN	DK	F	FIN	N	NZ
Were any contacts made by telephone or interviewer?							
Yes:							
- reminders by telephone			X				
No	X			X			
Question not asked		X			X	X	X
What was sent out in the first mailing?							
Questionnaire	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Data protection information	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Explanatory letter	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Other material	X			X			X
What was sent out in the second mailing?							
Thank you and reminder combined		X	X		X	X	
Reminder sent only to non-respondents	X						X
Questionnaire			X				X
Explanatory letter			X				X
Other material							X
No second mailing				X			
What was sent out in the third mailing?							
Questionnaire	X	X			X	X	X
Data protection information	X	X			X	X	
Explanatory letter	X	X			X	X	X
Other material	X						X
No third mailing			X	X			

Mail Surveys

	AUS	CDN	DK	F	FIN	N	NZ
What was sent out in the fourth mailing?							
Questionnaire						X	
Data protection information						X	
Explanatory letter	X					X	X
No fourth mailing		X	X	X	X		

INTERNATIONAL

SOCIAL

SURVEY

PROGRAMME

Study Monitoring Questionnaire

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE
SOCIAL NETWORKS 2001 ISSP MODULE AS YOUR REFERENCE.

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

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

Institute: ☐ Country: ☐

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

Principal Investigator: ☐ Contact Person: ☐

2a. What kind of institute fielded the module?

An institute principally doing market research ☐

An institute principally doing academic research ☐

An institute doing both market and academic research ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

_____

2b. Which institute carried out the fielding?

Our ISSP member institute itself ☐ OR Institute name: ☐

3a. Was the questionnaire fielded ...

only in English ☐ → Question 10

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

only in translation ☐ → Question 3b

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

Please write in:

3c. Were questionnaires available for each language fielded?

Yes ☐ →Question 4

No ☐ →Question 3d

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

Please write in:

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

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

_____

5. Was the translation checked or evaluated?

Yes ☐ →Question 6

No ☐ →Question 7

6. How was the translation checked or evaluated?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

7. Was the translated questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

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

No problems ☐ →Question 10

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

9. What did you do about any problems?

Please enter details:

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

Face-to-face ☐

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

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

Other (please write in details) ☐

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

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

Yes (please write in details) ☐

No ☐

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

11a. Were incentives offered?

Yes ☐

No ☐

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

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

As part of a larger survey ☐ →Question 13

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

Start of questionnaire ☐

Middle of questionnaire ☐

End of questionnaire ☐

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

Yes ☐

Yes, apart from omissions ☐

No ☐

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

... only adult citizens of your country? ☐

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

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

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

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

Please enter details in box below.

Please enter in:

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

WRITE IN : ☐☐

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

Yes - please write in cut-off ☐☐

No cut-off ☐

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

No ☐

Yes (please write in details) ☐

If yes, write in details:

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

Please write in:

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

None ☐

Some ☐

All ☐

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

A known and equal probability ☐ → Question 26

A known and not equal probability ☐ → Question 25

An unknown probability of selection ☐ → Question 25

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

Please write in:

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

No clusters / sampling points ☐

WRITE IN NUMBER: ☐☐☐

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

Address ☐ →Question 28

Household ☐ →Question 28

Named individual ☐ →Question 30

Other (please write in details) ☐ →Question 28

_____

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

Kish grid ☐ →Question 30

Last (or next) birthday ☐ →Question 30

Quota ☐ →Question 29

Other (please write in details) ☐ →Question 30

_____

29. Please describe your quota procedures

Please write in:

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

Yes ☐ →Question 31

No ☐ →Question 32

31. In what way was substitution or replacement permitted?

Please write in:

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

Yes ☐ →Question 33

No ☐ →Question 34

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

Please write in:

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

Please write in:

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

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

More information or Other type of unproductive reaction

Please write in:

36. Here we ask for information about interviewer procedures.

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

Yes ☐

No ☐

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

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

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

Neither of the above ☐

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

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

No minimum call requirement ☐

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

Yes - please write in approximate proportion ☐☐ %

No ☐

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

Yes - please write in approximate proportion ☐☐ %

No ☐

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

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

38. Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes ☐

No ☐

39. Was keying of the data verified?

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

No ☐

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

Yes ☐
No ☐

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

Yes ☐
No ☐

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

Yes ☐
No ☐

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

Yes ☐
No ☐

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

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

Yes - individual correction ☐
Yes - automatic correction ☐
No - not corrected ☐

45. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes ☐ → Question 46
No ☐ → Question 47

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

Please write in:

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

Yes ☐

No ☐

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

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SURVEY PROGRAMME

Study Monitoring Questionnaire

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE
SOCIAL NETWORKS 2001 ISSP MODULE AS YOUR REFERENCE.

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

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

Institute: ☐ Country: ☐

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

Principal Investigator: ☐ Contact Person: ☐

2a. What kind of institute fielded the module?

An institute principally doing market research ☐

An institute principally doing academic research ☐

An institute doing both market and academic research ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

2b. Which institute carried out the fielding?

Our ISSP member institute itself ☐ OR Institute name: ☐

3a. Was the questionnaire fielded ...

Only in English ☐ → Question 10

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

Only in translation ☐ → Question 3b

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

Please write in:

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

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

---

5. Was the translation checked or evaluated?

Yes ☐ →Question 6

No ☐ →Question 7

6. How was the translation checked or evaluated?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

7. Was the translated questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

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

Please tick all that apply

No problems ☐ →Question 10

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

9. What did you do about any problems

Please enter details:

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

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

Yes - precontacts by telephone ☐

Yes - precontacts by person ☐

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

2 d d m m y y y y

3 d d m m y y y y

4 d d m m y y y y

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

1. Mailing:

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

_____

2. Mailing:

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

_____

3. Mailing:

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

_____

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

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

_____

e. When did the fielding period finish officially?

d	d	m	m	y	y	y	y

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

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

As part of a larger survey ☐ →Question 12

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

Start of questionnaire ☐

Middle of questionnaire ☐

End of questionnaire ☐

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

Yes ☐

Yes, apart from omissions ☐

No ☐

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

... only adult citizens of your country? ☐

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

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

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

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

Please enter details in box below.

Please enter in:

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

WRITE IN : ☐☐

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

Yes - please write in cut-off ☐☐

No cut-off ☐

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

No ☐

Yes (please write in details) ☐

If yes, please write in details:

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

Please write in:

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

None ☐

Some ☐

All ☐

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

A known and equal probability ☐ → Question 25

A known and not equal probability ☐ → Question 24

An unknown probability of selection ☐ → Question 24

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

Please write in:

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

No clusters / sampling points ☐

WRITE IN NUMBER: ☐☐☐

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

Address ☐ →Question 27

Household ☐ →Question 27

Named individual ☐ →Question 29

Other (please write in details) ☐ →Question 27

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

Kish grid	☐	→Question 29
Last (or next) birthday	☐	→Question 29
Quota	☐	→Question 28
Other (please write in details)	☐	→Question 29

_____

28. Please describe your quota procedures

Please write in:

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

Yes	☐	→Question 30
No	☐	→Question 31

30. In what way was substitution or replacement permitted?

Please write in:

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

Yes	☐	→Question 32
No	☐	→Question 33

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

Please write in:

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

Please write in:

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

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

Other information or other type of unproductive reaction

Please write in:

35. Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes ☐

No ☐

36. Was keying of the data verified?

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

No ☐

37. Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?

Yes ☐

No ☐

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

Yes ☐

No ☐

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

Yes ☐

No ☐

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

Yes ☐

No ☐

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

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

Yes - individual correction ☐

Yes - automatic correction ☐

No - not corrected ☐

42. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes ☐ → Question 43

No ☐ → Question 44

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

Please write in:

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

Yes ☐

No ☐

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

THANK YOU VERY MUCH