### 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

# Die GESIS ist ein Institut der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft.

ISSN: Herausgeber, Druck und Vertrieb:

**GESIS-Methodenberichte** 

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	
Information on response and outcome figures	7
Data	7
Documentation	
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 lifecyle. 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 questionnaire<sup>1</sup> (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).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 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 precontact (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, Domenican 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., Japec, 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
	1996	✓	No	1	,	1996	✓	✓
Australia	1997	No			Bulgaria	1997	✓	$\checkmark$
(1984)	1998	✓	✓		(1991)	1998	✓	$\checkmark$
	1999	✓	✓			1999	✓	$\checkmark$
	2000	No				2000	✓	$\checkmark$
	2001	✓	✓			2001	No	
	2002	✓	$\checkmark$			2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓			2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	$\checkmark$			2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	$\checkmark$			2005	✓	$\checkmark$
	2006	✓	✓			2006	No	
	1996	No				1996	<b>√</b>	✓
Austria	1997	✓	No		Canada	1997	✓	$\checkmark$
(1985)	1998	✓	✓		(1991)	1998	✓	$\checkmark$
, ,	1999	✓	✓		, ,	1999	✓	$\checkmark$
	2000	✓	✓			2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓			2001	✓	$\checkmark$
	2002	✓	✓			2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓			2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓			2004	✓	$\checkmark$
	2005	No				2005	✓	✓
	2006	No				2006	✓	✓
	1996			1		1996		
Bangladesh	1997	✓	No		Chile	1997		
(1997)	1998	No	110		(1997)	1998	✓	✓
-	1999	No			(1))	1999	<b>✓</b>	<b>√</b>
(2003)	2000	(TP)	No			2000	✓	✓
( )	2001	No				2001	<b>✓</b>	✓
	2002	No				2002	<b>✓</b>	✓
						2003	✓	✓
						2004	✓	✓
						2005	No	
						2006	<b>√</b>	✓
	1996			1	Croatia	1996		
Brazil	1997				(2005)	1997		
(1999)	1998	(TP)	(√)		( = == )	1998		
-	1999	(TP)	( <b>√</b> ) ( <b>√</b> )			1999		
(2006)	2000	No	` /			2000		
	2001	<b>✓</b>	$\checkmark$			2001		
	2002	✓	<b>✓</b>			2002		
	2003	No				2003		
	2004	✓	✓			2004		
	2005	No				2005		
	2006	No				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
Ź	1996	✓	✓	1	Ź	1996		
Cyprus	1997	✓	✓		Finland	1997		
(1995)	1998	✓	No		(2000)	1998		
	1999	✓	$\checkmark$			1999		
	2000	No				2000	✓	✓
	2001	<b>✓</b>	✓			2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	$\checkmark$			2002	✓	✓
	2003	No	,			2003	✓	✓
	2004	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>			2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓ N	✓			2005	✓	✓
	2006	No				2006	✓	✓
	1996	✓	✓			1996		
Czech	1997	✓	✓		Flanders	1997		
Republic	1998	✓	$\checkmark$		(2000)	1998		
(1991)	1999	✓	$\checkmark$			1999		
	2000	✓	$\checkmark$			2000		
	2001	✓	$\checkmark$			2001		
	2002	✓	$\checkmark$			2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓			2003	No	,
	2004	✓	✓			2004	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>
	2005	<b>✓</b>	✓			2005	✓ (TED)	<b>✓</b>
	2006	✓	✓			2006	(TP)	No
	1996				_	1996	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>
Denmark	1997	<b>✓</b>	<b>√</b>		France	1997	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>
(1998)	1998	<b>✓</b>	✓		(1995)	1998	<b>√</b>	<b>✓</b>
	1999	(TP)	<b>(</b> ✓ <b>)</b>			1999		<b>~</b>
	2000	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>			2000	No	
	2001	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>			2001	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>
	2002	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>			2002 2003	<b>∨</b> ✓	<b>∨</b> ✓
	2003 2004	✓ ✓	✓ ✓			2003	<b>∨</b> ✓	<b>√</b>
	2004	<b>✓</b>	<b>√</b>			2004	<b>∨</b> ✓	<b>∨</b> ✓
	2003	<b>∨</b> ✓	<b>∨</b> ✓			2003	<b>∨</b> ✓	<b>∨</b> ✓
		<b>V</b>	<u> </u>	-			<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>
The	1996 1997				Germany	1996 1997	<b>∨</b>	<b>∨</b> ✓
Dominican	1997				(1984)	1997	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>
Republic	1999				(1704)	1999	·	<b>√</b>
(2006)	2000					2000	·	<b>√</b>
(2000)	2000					2000	·	<b>√</b>
	2002					2002	·	· ✓
	2002					2002	·	✓
	2004					2004	<b>✓</b>	✓
	2005	✓	✓			2005	<b>✓</b>	✓
	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
	1996	✓	✓		1996	✓	✓
Great Britain	1997	✓	✓	Italy	1997	✓	$\checkmark$
&	1998	✓	✓	(2001-2004;	1998	✓	$\checkmark$
Northern	1999	✓	✓	re-instated in	1999	(No)	
Ireland*	2000	✓	✓	2007)	2000	(No)	
(1984)	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	$\checkmark$
` ′	2002	✓	✓		2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓		2003		
	2004	✓	✓		2004		
	2005	✓	✓		2005		
	2006	✓	✓		2006		
	1996	<b>√</b>	✓		1996	<b>√</b>	✓
Hungary	1997	✓	✓	Japan	1997	✓	✓
(1986)	1998	✓ ·	√	(1991)	1998	✓ ·	✓
(1700)	1999	<b>√</b>	·	(1))1)	1999	✓ ·	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓ ·	✓
	2001	\(\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\color{100}}}}\)	✓		2001	✓ <b>/</b>	✓
	2002	<b>√</b>	<b>→</b>		2002	<b>√</b>	· ✓
	2002	<b>√</b>	<b>→</b>		2002	<b>√</b>	· ✓
	2003	<b>✓</b>	<b>√</b>		2003	<b>√</b>	<b>↓</b>
	2004	<b>∨</b> ✓	<b>V</b> ✓		2004	<b>√</b>	<b>↓</b>
	2006	<b>∨</b> ✓	<b>√</b>		2005	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>
		<b>✓</b>	<b>V</b> ✓	<del> </del>		<b>→</b>	<u> </u>
Ireland	1996 1997	,	•	Lataila	1996 1997	The state of the s	•
		(TP) ✓	( <b>√</b> )	Latvia		No	,
(1986)	1998	•	<b>√</b>	(1997)	1998	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>
	1999	(TP)	<b>(</b> ✓)		1999	<b>✓</b>	<b>√</b>
	2000	<b>√</b>	✓		2000	<b>✓</b>	<b>√</b>
	2001	No			2001	<b>✓</b>	<b>√</b>
	2002	<b>✓</b>	✓		2002	<b>✓</b>	<b>√</b>
	2003	<b>✓</b>	✓.		2003	<b>V</b>	✓
	2004	<b>✓</b>	✓		2004	<b>✓</b>	✓
	2005	<b>✓</b>	✓		2005	<b>✓</b>	✓
	2006	✓	✓		2006	✓	✓
	1996	<b>✓</b>	✓		1996		
Israel	1997	✓	✓	Mexico	1997		
(1988)	1998	✓	✓	(2000)	1998		
	1999	✓	✓		1999		
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	$\checkmark$
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	$\checkmark$
	2003	✓	✓		2003	No	
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	$\checkmark$
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	$\checkmark$
	2006	✓	✓		2006	No	

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

<sup>1997, 2003, 2004, 2005,</sup> 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
,	1996	No		ĺ	1996	✓	✓
Netherlands	1997	✓	$\checkmark$	Poland	1997	✓	$\checkmark$
(1985)	1998	✓	$\checkmark$	(1992)	1998	✓	$\checkmark$
	1999	(TP)	(✔)		1999	✓	$\checkmark$
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	<b>✓</b>	✓		2001	✓	$\checkmark$
	2002	✓	✓.		2002	✓	$\checkmark$
	2003	No*	✓		2003	✓	$\checkmark$
	2004	✓	<b>√</b>		2004	✓	$\checkmark$
	2005	(TP)	No		2005	No	
	2006	✓	$\checkmark$		2006	✓	✓
	1996	✓	✓		1996	No	
New	1997	✓	✓	Portugal	1997	✓	✓
Zealand	1998	✓	✓	(1995)	1998	✓	✓
(1990)	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	$\checkmark$
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	$\checkmark$
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	$\checkmark$
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓		2006	✓	$\checkmark$
	1996	<b>√</b>	✓		1996	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>
Norway	1997	✓	✓	Russia	1997	✓	✓
(1988)	1998	✓	✓	(1990)	1998	✓	✓
( 1 1 1 )	1999	✓	✓	( 11 1)	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	$\checkmark$
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	$\checkmark$
	2006	✓	✓		2006	✓	$\checkmark$
	1996	<b>√</b>	✓		1996	No	
Philippines	1997	✓	✓	Slovak	1997	No	
(1989)	1998	✓	✓	Republic	1998	✓	$\checkmark$
` ′	1999	✓	✓	(1996, re-	1999	✓	$\checkmark$
	2000	✓	✓	instated)	2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓	ĺ	2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	$\checkmark$
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	<b>✓</b>
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	$\checkmark$
	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.

<sup>\*</sup> 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
,	1996	✓	✓	,	1996	✓	✓
Slovenia	1997	✓	$\checkmark$	Sweden	1997	✓	$\checkmark$
(1992)	1998	✓	$\checkmark$	(1992)	1998	✓	$\checkmark$
	1999	✓	$\checkmark$		1999	✓	$\checkmark$
	2000	✓	$\checkmark$		2000	✓	$\checkmark$
	2001	✓	$\checkmark$		2001	No	
	2002	✓	$\checkmark$		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	$\checkmark$		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	$\checkmark$		2004	✓	$\checkmark$
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	$\checkmark$		2006	✓	✓
	1996				1996		
South Africa	1997			Switzerland	1997	✓	✓
(2001, re-	1998			(1999)	1998	✓	No
instated)	1999			, ,	1999	(TP)	(✓)
,	2000				2000		$\checkmark$
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	No			2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	$\checkmark$		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	$\checkmark$		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	$\checkmark$		2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	$\checkmark$		2006	✓	$\checkmark$
South Korea	1996				1996		
(2003)	1997			Taiwan	1997		
( )	1998			(2001)	1998		
	1999			( /	1999		
	2000				2000		
	2001				2001		
	2002				2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	<b>✓</b>		2003	✓	✓ ✓ ✓
	2004	✓			2004	✓	
	2005	✓	$\checkmark$		2005	✓	$\checkmark$
	2006	✓	$\checkmark$		2006	✓	$\checkmark$
	1996	✓	✓	Uruguay	1996		
Spain	1997	✓	$\checkmark$	(2003)	1997		
(1993)	1998	✓	$\checkmark$		1998		
	1999	✓	✓		1999		
	2000	✓	$\checkmark$		2000		
	2001	✓	$\checkmark$		2001		
	2002	✓	$\checkmark$		2002		
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	$\checkmark$
	2004	✓	$\checkmark$		2004	✓	$\checkmark$
	2005	✓	$\checkmark$		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
	1996	<b>✓</b>	✓
USA	1997	✓	✓
(1984)	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	$\checkmark$
	2000	✓	$\checkmark$
	2001	✓	$\checkmark$
	2002	✓	$\checkmark$
	2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓

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

50441111114 (211)

# Language(s) and translation

	AUS	CDN	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN
Language(s) of the fielded module											
Language 1 (L1)	English	English	German	Spanish	Czech	German	Spanish	Danish	Spanish	French	Finnish
Language 2 (L2)		French	French								Swedish
Language 3 (L3)			Italian								
Was the questionnaire translated?											
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 <sup>CH</sup>								L2 <sup>FIN</sup>
No, not translated	X	L1									

CH Double translation.
FIN Translated by a translation unit inside Statistics Finland.

	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P
Language(s) of the fielded module											
Language 1 (L1)	English	Hungarian	Croatian	Hebrew	English	Japanese	Latvian	Norwegian	Dutch	English	Portuguese
Language 2 (L2)				Arabic			Russian				
Language 3 (L3)				Russian							
Was the questionnaire translated?											
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	

	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
Language(s) of the fielded module											
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
Was the questionnaire translated?											
Yes, translated:											
- by member(s) of research team	X	X	X	L1			X	X			
- by translation bureau											
- by specially trained translator(s)	X			DD	X	X			L2	X	L1-L5
- other				L2-5 <sup>RP</sup>							
No, not translated									L1		

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

	AUS	CDN	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN
Language(s) of the fielded module											
Language 1 (L1)	English	English	German	Spanish	Czech	German	Spanish	Danish	Spanish	French	Finnish
Language 2 (L2)		French	French								Swedish
Language 3 (L3)			Italian								
Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?											
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									

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.

	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P
Language(s) of the fielded module											
Language 1 (L1)	English	Hungarian	Croatian	Hebrew	English	Japanese	Latvian	Norwegian	Dutch	English	Portuguese
Language 2 (L2)				Arabic			Russian				
Language 3 (L3)				Russian							
Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?											
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	

\_

An English bilingual checked the translation.

	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
Language(s) of the fielded module											
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
Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?											
Yes:											
- group discussion	X	X	X	L1 <sup>RP</sup>		X	X	X	L2	X	
- expert checked it	X				X			X	L2		L1-L5
- back translation											
- other				L1-L5 <sup>RP</sup>							
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.

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

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

	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
Language(s) of the fielded module											
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
Was the questionnaire pre-tested?											
Yes	X	X		L1				X	L2	X	L1
No			X	L2-L5	X	X	X				L2-L5
Not applicable									L1		
Were there any questions which caused problems when translating?											
Yes						X					
No	X	X	X	L1-L5	X		X	X	L2	X	L1-L5
Not applicable									L1		

# **Survey context**

	AUS	CDN	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL
How was the ISSP module fielded?																
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
How was the ISSP module fielded?																	
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	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	Е	F	FIN	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL
Were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order?																
Yes	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No					$X^{CZ}$		X	$X^{DK}$								
Were all the core ISSP items included?																
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
Were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order?																	
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No																	
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
No, not all included:																	
- from module																	
- background items							X									X	

# Sampling

	AUS	CDN	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL
The sample was designed to be representative of																
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
Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in																
<u>private</u> accommodation only		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
private & institutional accommodation	X							X								
Lower age cut-off																
18	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
17																
16										37	- V					
15										X	X					

	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
The sample was designed to be representative of																	
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	
Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in																	
<u>private</u> accommodation only		X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
private & institutional accommodation	X		X		X												
Lower age cut-off																	
18		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X		
17									X			X				X	
16	X										X						X
15																	

	AUS	CDN	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL
Was there an upper age cut-off?																
Yes																
Age											74					
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Did you use any variables for stratification?																
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X
No								X		X						
How many stages does your sampling design have?																
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	

	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
Was there an upper age cut-off?																	
Yes																	
Age		74	79									79					
No	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Did you use any variables for stratification?																	
Yes	X	X			X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
No			X	X				X				X					
How many stages does your sampling design have?																	
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		

	AUS	CDN	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL
Does your sampling frame consist of																
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				$X^{CL}$												
What selection method was used to identify a respondent?																
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.

	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
Does your sampling frame consist of																	
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																	
What selection method was used to identify a respondent?																	
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			

	AUS	CDN	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL
Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?																
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
Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?																	
Yes											$X^{1,2}$						
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X

Substitution of refusals.
 Substitution of non-contacts.
 Substitution of sample points.

## **Data collection**

	AUS	CDN	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL
Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?																
Face-to-face			X	X	X	$X^{b}$	X		X			$X^{b}$	X	X	X	X
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)						X <sup>s</sup>						X <sup>s</sup>				
Self-completion by mail	X	X						X		X	X					
Telephone																
Length of fieldwork																
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
Year of fieldwork																
2005																X
2006		X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X
2007	X		X						X						X	
2008								X								

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> background variables <sup>s</sup> substantive variables

## **Data collection (continued)**

	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?																	
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																	
Length of fieldwork																	
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		
Year of fieldwork																	
2005																	
2006	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
2007		X				X					X						
2008							X										

	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	E	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL
Were postal or telephone components used?											
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
Were incentives offered?											
Yes:											
- to respondent	X						X				
- to interviewer					X		X				
No		X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X
Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?											
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.

	J	LV	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
Were postal or telephone components used?													
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
Were incentives offered?													
Yes:													
- to respondent	X				X			X		X	X		
- to interviewer					X				X				
No		X	X	X		X	X					X	X
Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?													
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
No											X		

	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	E	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL
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
Call on different days in week	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
None of these											
Were a minimum number of calls required?											
Yes:											
Minimum number of required calls	5	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
No											
Were any interviews supervised?											
Yes:											
Approximate proportion (%)		7			55		2				
No	X		X	X		X		X	X	X	X

	J	LV	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
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
Call on different days in week	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
None of these													
Were a minimum number of calls required?  Yes: Minimum number of required	3	2	4	3	5	4	3	3	5	3	10	3	3
calls	3	2	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	10	3	3
No													
Were any interviews supervised?													
Yes:													
Approximate proportion (%)					6		10			1	10	25	10
No	X	X	X	X		X		X	X				

	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	E	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL
Were any interviews back-checked?											
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
Were any interviews back-checked?													
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
Were any contacts made by telephone or interviewer?									
Yes:									
- reminders by telephone							X		X
- other			$X^{DK}$						
No	X	X		X	X	X		X	
What was sent out in the first mailing?									
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							$X^{NL}$		
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	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
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	
Incentive						X			
Other material	X								
No third mailing			X	X					
What was sent out in the fourth (or last) mailing?									
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 $^{\ast}$

	AUS	CDN	СН	CL	CZ	$\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{D}}$	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL
Response figures based on reported figures																
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 <sup>DK</sup>	2517	1917	1189	1072	1010	1200	1038	1001
- partially completed (n)	2	35						6	4	93		5				

<sup>\*</sup> 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
Response figures based on reported figures																	
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

<sup>\*</sup> for calculation of response figures, see appendix.

### Data

	AUS	CDN	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL
Were any measures of coding reliability employed?																
Yes	X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X
No		X	X					X				X				
Was the keying of the data verified?																
Yes:																
Approximate proportion (%)				100	100		100		100		2	100	10	100	15	
No	X	X	X			X		X		X						X
Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?																
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
Were any measures of coding reliability employed?																	
Yes		X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X
No	X			X	X						X		X				
Was the keying of the data verified?																	
Yes:																	
Approximate proportion (%)	100		25			100		100		100		10		100		40	100
No		X		X	X		X		X		X		X		X		
Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?																	
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	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL
Data checks/edits on:																
- 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
Were data errors corrected?																
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																
Were the data weighted or post- stratified?																
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
Data checks/edits on:																	
- 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
Were data errors corrected?																	
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																	
Were the data weighted or post- stratified?																	
Yes				X		X	X			X	X			X	X	X	X
No	X	X	X		X			X	X			X	X				

### **Documentation**

	AUS	CDN	СН	CL	CZ	D	DO	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	Н	HR	IL	IRL
Is a national methods report available for your study?																
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
Is a national methods report available for your study?																	
Yes			X					X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
No	X	X		X	X	X	X		X								X

# Appendix

F	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 <sup>th</sup> 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.

F	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 Leisture 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 goverance, 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 Leisture 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.									

I	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 requited 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> <li>Addresses which could not be traced at all/ selected respondents who could not be traced</li> <li>Addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Addresses which could not be traced</li> <li>Addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings</li> <li>Details of address wrong (street numbers, post codes, etc.)</li> <li>Addresses with no letter boxes</li> <li>Selected respondent unknown at address</li> <li>Selected respondent moved, no forwarding address</li> <li>Selected respondent deceased</li> </ul>
Eligible (n)	Issued sample minus Ineligible	Issued sample minus Ineligible
Refusal (n)	<ul> <li>Personal refusal at selected address</li> <li>Proxy refusal (on behalf of selected respondent)</li> <li>Other refusal at selected address</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Refusal by selected respondent</li> <li>Refusal by another person</li> <li>Implicit refusals (empty envelopes, empty questionnaires returned)</li> </ul>
Non-contact (n)	<ul><li>No contact at selected address</li><li>No contact with selected person</li></ul>	No contact
Other unproductive (n)	<ul> <li>Selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate</li> <li>Selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey</li> <li>Selected respondent away during survey period</li> <li>Other type of unproductive reaction</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate</li> <li>Selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey</li> <li>Selected respondent away during survey period</li> <li>Other type of unproductive reaction</li> </ul>
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 nam	e of your institute a	and your cour	ntry:		
	Institute:			Country:		
1b.	Please enter the nam about the study:	e of the principal in	vestigator ar	nd your conta	act person for que	stions
	Principal Investigator:			Contact Person:		
2a.	What kind of institute	fielded the module	?			
		An	institute princ	cipally doing	market research	
		An ins	titute principa	ally doing ac	ademic research	
		An institute o	doing both ma	arket and aca	ademic research	
			(	Other (please	e write in details)	
2b.	Which institute carried	d out the fielding?				
	Our ISSP member institute itself		OR	Institute name:		
3a.	Was the questionnaire	e fielded				
					only in English	→ Question 39
			in Eı	nglish plus o	ther language(s)	
				0	nly in translation	→ Question 3b
3b.	Please enter the lang	uage(s) the module	e was fielded	in.		
	Please write in: Lang	<sub>l</sub> uage 1 to Languaς	ge 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 transfer otherwise continue with question 39)	nslations/languages,
a written translation (a questionnaire/application)	→Question 12
an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot)	—————————————————————————————————————
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

4. How was translation 2 checked?	
Group discussion	
Expert checked it	
Back translation	
Other (please write in details)	
Please write in:	
5. Was the translation 2 questionnaire pre-tested?	
Yes	
No	
So. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 2? Please tick all that apply.  No problems →Questions Instructions Whole questions Other (please write in details)  Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:	uestion 18
7. What did you do about any problems in translation 2?  Please enter details:	

otherwise continue with question 39)	ansiations/languages		
outerwise serialities with question 60)			
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			

	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.	Misstall Land Land and American Control of the cont	
-	What did you do about any problems in translation 3?	
ŕ	Please enter details:	
Į		
25 N	Was the questionnaire for language 4 …? <mark>(answer only if you have four or more tra</mark>	nslations/languages otherwise
	continue with question 39)	nsiations/languages, otherwise
	a written translation (a guestianneira/application)	→Question 26
	a written translation (a questionnaire/application)	
	an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot)	——Question 32
26. V	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  Answer scales  Instructions  Whole questions	→Question 32
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 tran	siations/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)	
OA Mas translation 5 also also dO	
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	
110	

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	า 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:	

). Were postal or telephone components used at any point (e.g., advance contacts)?
Yes - postal→Question 41
Yes - telephone ——→Question 41
No
. Please give details of the postal and/or telephone components.
Please enter details:
2. Were incentives offered?
Yes, to respondent
Yes, to interviewer
No, neither to respondent nor to interviewer
3. How was the ISSP module fielded in your country?
As an <u>individual</u> survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey)
As part of a <u>larger</u> survey →Question 44
1. Please provide information about the other stud(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name)
Please enter:
5. What was the approximate position of the Role of Government module in the larger questionnaire?
Start of questionnaire
Middle of questionnaire
End of questionnaire

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 <u>core</u> 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?  Adults living in private and in institutional accommodation  (e.g., residential homes for the elderly, asylum accommodation)?   → Question 52
	If private and institutional, please enter details in box below.
	Please enter in:
52.	Third, what was the <u>lower</u> age cut-off for your sample?
	WRITE IN:
53.	Was there any <u>upper</u> 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 de and upda		hone directory and its coverage
60. Please de	scribe your sampling method and your sampled units for the first stage?	
Please w	rrite in:	
	scribe your sampling method and your sampled units for the second stagular two or more stages, otherwise continue with question 64)	ge?
Please w	rite 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 <u>not</u> answer if your sampling frame consists of named individuals – which are t target persons. Then continue with question 66)	he
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	

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:  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 away during survey period	
For example: is there differential coverage of particular groups, either because of sample design or response differences?  Please write in:  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	
For example: is there differential coverage of particular groups, either because of sample design or response differences?  Please write in:  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	
For example: is there differential coverage of particular groups, either because of sample design or response differences?  Please write in:  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	
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	
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	
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	
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	
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 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	
- 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 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	$\neg$
Please write in:	1

	Here we ask for information about interviewer procedures.						
a.	Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?  Yes						
	No		]				
	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						
	Noither of the above		]				
	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	conc	duct	∍d)?			
	Yes - please write in approximate proportion			ج (	%		
	No						
			1				
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						
			1				
73.	. Was keying of the data verified?						
	Yes - please write in approximate level of verification				%		
	No		]				
	140	1	1				

constructed on the basis of other variables collected)?	
Ye	s
N	o
No derived variable	
No delived variable	3
75. Were data checked/edited to ensure that filter instructions were followed correctly?	
Ye	s
N	o
76. Were data checked/edited for logic or consistency?	
Ye	s
N	0
77. Were data checked/edited to ensure they fell within permitted ranges?	
Ye	s
N	
•	<u> </u>
If you answered YES for <u>any</u> question from Q72 to Q77, continue w If you answered NO for <u>all</u> questions Q72 to Q77, continue with	
If you answered YES for <u>any</u> question from Q72 to Q77, continue w If you answered NO for <u>all</u> questions Q72 to Q77, continue with  78. Were errors corrected? Please tick all that apply.	
If you answered NO for all questions Q72 to Q77, continue with 78. Were errors corrected?  Please tick all that apply.	Question 79.
If you answered NO for <u>all</u> questions Q72 to Q77, continue with 78. Were errors corrected? Please tick all that apply.  Yes - individual	Question 79.
If you answered NO for <u>all</u> questions Q72 to Q77, continue with 78. Were errors corrected? Please tick all that apply.  Yes - individual!  Yes - automatical!	y y
If you answered NO for <u>all</u> questions Q72 to Q77, continue with 78. Were errors corrected? Please tick all that apply.  Yes - individual	y y
If you answered NO for <u>all</u> questions Q72 to Q77, continue with 78. Were errors corrected? Please tick all that apply.  Yes - individual!  Yes - automatical!	y y
78. Were errors corrected? Please tick all that apply.  Yes - individual!  Yes - automatical!  No - not corrected	y y d
If you answered NO for all questions Q72 to Q77, continue with a 78. Were errors corrected? Please tick all that apply.  Yes - individually Yes - automatically No - not corrected.	y
If you answered NO for all questions Q72 to Q77, continue with a 78. Were errors corrected? Please tick all that apply.  Yes - individually Yes - automatically No - not corrected.  79. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?	y
78. Were errors corrected? Please tick all that apply.  Yes - individual!  Yes - automatical!  No - not corrected  79. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?  Yes - automatical!  No - not corrected  Yes - automatical!  No - not corrected or post-stratified?	y
78. Were errors corrected? Please tick all that apply.  Yes - individual  Yes - automatical  No - not correcte  79. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?  Yes - weighted or post-stratified?	y
78. Were errors corrected? Please tick all that apply.  Yes - individual!  Yes - automatical!  No - not corrected  79. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?  Yes - automatical!  No - not corrected  Yes - automatical!  No - not corrected or post-stratified?	y
78. Were errors corrected? Please tick all that apply.  Yes - individual!  Yes - automatical!  No - not corrected  79. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?  Yes - automatical!  No - not corrected  Yes - automatical!  No - not corrected or post-stratified?	y

o r. is a fiational 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

ıa.	riease effici 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 Contact Investigator: 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 OR Institute institute itself name:	
3a.	Was the questionnaire fielded	
	only in English	4
	in English plus other language(s)	b
	only in translation	b
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:	

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 w	ith 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 of the contin	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)	
47 West translation 0 at a 10	
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	
(answer only if you have four or more translations,	
A member o	r members of the research team
	A translation bureau
One or n	nore 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 wi	th 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:	
00 W/Let // Let also de la terra conflicio de la fina dela fina de la fina de	
33. What did you do about any problems in translation 5?	
Please enter details:	
	i

34. Here we ask questions on your mail survey.
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 las
1
2
3
4
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)

	question	
	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 (answer only if you have three or more mailings, otherwise continue wit	n questic	n 34e)
	YES	NO
Questionnaire		
Data protection information		
Explanatory letter		
Incentive		
Incentive		
Incentive		
Other material (Please write in details)  4. Mailing (or last, if more than four mailings) (answer only if you have three or more than some content of the c	re mailin	gs, oth
Incentive Other material (Please write in details)		
Other material (Please write in details)  4. Mailing (or last, if more than four mailings) (answer only if you have three or mowith question 34e):	re mailin	ngs, oth
Other material (Please write in details)  4. Mailing (or last, if more than four mailings) (answer only if you have three or mowith question 34e):  Questionnaire		
Other material (Please write in details)  4. Mailing (or last, if more than four mailings) (answer only if you have three or mowith question 34e):  Questionnaire  Data protection information	YES	
Other material (Please write in details)  4. Mailing (or last, if more than four mailings) (answer only if you have three or mowith question 34e):  Questionnaire  Data protection information  Explanatory letter	YES	
Other material (Please write in details)  4. Mailing (or last, if more than four mailings) (answer only if you have three or mowith question 34e):  Questionnaire  Data protection information	YES	

35.	How was the ISSP module fielded in your country?
	As an <u>individual</u> survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey)
	As part of a <u>larger</u> survey
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:

e. When did the fielding period finish officially?

40. Were all the <u>core</u> 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) <u>missing</u> →Question 41
41. 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. 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?
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:
44. Third, what was the <u>lower</u> age cut-off for your sample?
WRITE IN:
45. Was there any <u>upper</u> 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 →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)	

	Please write in:	]
	Please write in.	
		•
52.	Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the first stage?	
	Please write in:	
	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:	
	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:	
	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:	

50.	What selection method was used to identify a respondent?	a altitutations	la coletala ana disa
	Please tick all that apply. (do <u>not</u> answer if your sampling frame consists of named i target persons. Then continue with question 58)	ndividua	is – which are the
	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 que	estion 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
	_		
50	Please provide details of the substitution or replacement procedures used.		
59.	Please write in:		
60.	All in all, what are the known limitations (biases) of your <u>net</u> sample? For example: is there differential coverage of particular groups, either because of sample design or response differences?		
	Please write in:		
		1	

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 <u>starting</u> or <u>issued</u> 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 <u>any</u> question from Q62 to Q67, continue with Questions Q62 to Q67, continue with Q10 to Q	
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

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	