

ISSP Study Monitoring 1996-1998

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

Lisbon, May 8, 2000- May 10, 2000

**Janet Harkness, Bettina Langfeldt and Evi Scholz
(ZUMA)**

Contents

Overview report of ISSP study monitoring 1996-1998

Study monitoring report on the 1998 ISSP module

Overview Report

ISSP Study Monitoring 1996-1998

Janet Harkness

(ZUMA)

Introduction

This report is, in effect, a brief overview of findings from three surveys conducted by ZUMA for the ISSP to monitor implementations of three modules, plus three short individual reports on the monitoring findings for each module.

The surveys were conducted as part of the general quality monitoring procedures first agreed upon at the 1996 general assembly of the ISSP and extended at subsequent general assemblies. At the 1999 general assembly, satisfactory completion of the study monitoring report for a given module became a prerequisite for archiving ISSP data sets with the ISSP Archive. The monitoring surveys collect information on the design, process and outcome phases of individual implementations of ISSP modules. The reports here cover the modules for the years 1996 ('role of government'), 1997 ('work orientations'), and 1998 ('religion'). A chart of which members delivered data sets to the Archive and which returned completed monitoring questionnaires to ZUMA for these modules is appended to this overview.

One aim in conducting these monitoring studies is to establish quality monitoring on a firm and systematic basis in the ISSP. A second is to expand and improve the documentation available for researchers working with ISSP data. As with the 1995 monitoring study (Park and Jowell, 1997), the monitoring reports will be added as supplements to the Archive codebooks. They will thus be available, for example, from the Archive web site.

Quality monitoring and the need to develop and implement standard procedures of best practice are integral parts of an ongoing discussion within the survey research profession. The American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR), to mention only one organisation, has published a set of widely accepted 'standards of best practice' on its web site (www.aapor.org). Here, as in key publications on survey research quality, quality monitoring figures prominently.

In cross-national terms, quality and quality monitoring are concerned not only with quality in terms of national implementations, but also in terms of the comparability of studies across countries (Jowell, 1998; Harkness, 1999). For the ISSP, the surveys also monitor the extent to which individual members adhere to ISSP implementation requirements. For users of ISSP data, the information provided through internal ISSP monitoring enables them to make more informed decisions about the comparability of given components across countries. Information of this kind is all too often lacking for international projects, even for such well-known survey projects as the EUROBAROMETER and the World Values studies. In completing these questionnaires and making them publicly available, the ISSP becomes the first cross-national survey programme to target transparency on comparability.

The monitoring questionnaires

The monitoring surveys and the reports presented here follow closely the work undertaken by the National Centre for Social Research (formerly SCPR) in monitoring the 1995 module on 'national identity' (Park and Jowell, 1997). With only minor changes, the questionnaires used for the 1996, 1997, and 1998 modules replicate the questions developed by the National Centre to monitor the 1995 module. A copy of each is appended to the respective annual report.

An expanded, computer-assisted self-interview (CASI) questionnaire developed at ZUMA was completed by the seven ISSP members who participated in the ISSP modes experiment (Kalgraff *et al.*, 2000). Mode-specific and speedier questionnaires based on this CASI questionnaire are in the pipeline for 2000. A beta-version of a web-based questionnaire also developed at ZUMA, which is tailored for reporting on ISSP mail surveys, will be presented at the ISSP general assembly in Lisbon in May, 2000.

General remarks

This overview focuses on general developments over the three modules reviewed; the findings chart in the three individual report provides details of each country's answers to the questions in the questionnaire. Lists of responses to a small selection of open format questions follow the findings charts. These illustrate the range and character of explanations members give, for example, of how they assess translations, why they omit questions, or what, if any, quota procedures they employ.

Response to the questionnaire was sluggish. In part, this may be because members were asked to provide detailed information about a survey or surveys already two and perhaps three years distant. In the absence of national study documentation reports – the study description sheet required by the Archive seems to be the only technical documentation many members have of their ISSP studies – this was doubtless a difficult, perhaps tedious, undertaking. One or two countries indicated, indeed, that they could not see the sense in providing so 'much' information more than once.

However, since satisfactory completion of ISSP monitoring reports is now a prerequisite to archiving data with the Archive, completion in future will presumably become automatic. Long-term, the questionnaire can be distributed together with the Archive set-up for a module. Moreover, the next study about which members have to provide information is more recent (1999 'social inequality'). In addition, many members are by now familiar with the kind of

detail required. Thus the burden on members, as well as those collecting the information, will presumably also be reduced.

Over what became a considerable period of time, we did our best to collect and verify information from members on their implementations of the ISSP modules ‘role of government’ (1996), ‘work orientations’ (1997) and ‘religion’ (1998). We may, of course, have inadvertently misunderstood or misrepresented information we were given or found ourselves. Members are invited to contact us about any corrections they wish to make before the reports are included in the codebooks.

We should not expect great differences between findings for the 1995 study and those for the 1996 study, or indeed, the 1997 study. The monitoring report for 1995, which accelerated quality monitoring and some changes in how ISSP surveys are conducted, was first available at the 1997 general assembly. By that time, however, many members had already arranged procedures for the 1997 study.

The 1995 report (Park and Jowell, 1997) drew attention to a range of differences across studies conducted in the ISSP in the three main areas of *design*, *process*, and *outcomes*. At successive general meetings since the Park and Jowell report (1997) the general assembly has asked ZUMA to take on a number of controlling and monitoring functions. In keeping with these, the aim in conducting the monitoring studies is not simply to document difference but to identify areas in which comparability can and should be improved. In addition, the reports help researchers identify areas in which differences undermine comparability across countries (Jowell, 1998; Kuechler, 1998; Svallfors, 1998; Harkness, 1999).

As the 1995 report indicated, certain differences are critical for comparability, while others are much less important. Methodological differences which undermine comparability in important areas include differences in sampling procedures, in particular, non-probability procedures; differences in the population sampled; the use of substitution procedures for refusals and non-contacts; large differences in outcomes and in the ways in which outcomes are reported (e.g., response rates); as well as questionnaire-based differences such as question coverage, questionnaire design and translation issues. Since members sometimes follow certain procedures more by necessity than by choice, it remains to be seen how changes can be effected in areas identified as crucial for comparability.

Summary of the findings

The questionnaires (see pages 4-6 of the Findings Chart)

Translation and assessment: In 1996, the wording of the question on translation assessment was changed. Instead of asking whether members had used back translation, as in the monitoring questionnaire for the 1995 study (Park and Jowell, 1997), we asked whether members had assessed the quality of translations made. In addition, an expanded questionnaire completed by the modes experiment group (Kalgraff Skjåk, *et al*, 2000) collected details of the assessment made. With the exception of two countries, members translating the 1996 module also assessed the quality of their translation(s). The majority reported no problems in translating the questionnaire. In 1997 two countries began assessing their translations, while three other members who had assessed in 1996 did not assess the translations made for either the 1997 module or the 1998 module.

By 1998, the number reporting problems had increased. These include comments from a country which does not translate *per se* – a pointer to formulation problems in source questionnaires, at least for some forms of English – and comments from a country which used another member's version, despite reservations.

The ISSP requires member countries to make their own translations for good reasons. It is not acceptable simply to use a translation produced by another country for that country's particular context and language use. Quebec French, for example, is sufficiently different from the French of France to warrant differences in translation. At the same time, countries may benefit from comparing their versions – once finished – with those of other countries. Moreover, nothing speaks against choosing to adopt another country's version in a given language if it is better than one's own. We should point out, too, that members who have already fielded items being replicated sometimes have sub-optimal translations. They keep these in order to replicate, since only translation mistakes should be corrected from module to module. Tinkering with (translated) wording to improve versions is, on the other hand, not allowed, even if the borderline between sub-optimal and 'wrong' is sometimes fuzzy. New members working in the same language should not take over sub-optimal translations for their modules.

Pre-testing of questionnaires: It is possible that the wording of the monitoring question about pre-testing encourages under-reporting of pre-testing activities not using the mode of administration finally employed. Members conducting mail surveys, for example, tend not to pre-test by mail. At all events, 9 members pre-tested the 1996 module, 13 did not; eight

members pre-tested the 1997 module and 16 did not, and nine members pre-tested the 1998 module, while 14 did not.

In sum, over the period and modules reviewed, translation is not considered to be much of a problem, even if there is an increase in problems noted, and less than half the ISSP members pre-test, irrespective of whether they use an English or a translated questionnaire.

The findings on translation presented at the 1999 general assembly in Madrid (Harkness, 1999) suggest that translation is, in some respects, always a problem. The general guidelines on translation agreed upon at the 1999 general meeting also stress the usefulness of advance translation. These, in turn, make some form of pre-testing necessary. The answers which members provided to the open question on what translation problems they had also indicate that translation problems are often only recognised after the source questionnaire is completed. Advance translation, while the module is still being developed, would help here (Harkness and Schoua-Glusberg, 1998).

Questionnaire coverage: Over the three modules, with two exceptions, members reported that the substantive questions had all been asked in the required order. Per year one or two countries omitted content questions. Omissions are either made by mistake or after having received permission from the assembly to omit a question as required in the ISSP Working Principles.

The picture for background variables is less uniform. A fair number of members omit background variables in each of the modules under review. In some instances, numerous background variables have been omitted, as the table from the report on background variables in the 1996 module (Langfeldt, 2000) illustrates. At the 1999 meeting it became clear that a variety of factors have led members to omit background variables. There has, for example, been some uncertainty about how binding or compulsory 'compulsory' variables are, about which, indeed, are compulsory, as well as about what constitutes acceptable versions of different background variables. Thus while many countries collect information about the household cycle, there is considerable diversity in which information is collected. Countries may also have compelling reasons for omitting one or the other background variable. The answers to an open question in the monitoring questionnaire on why items were omitted indicate that the cost of fielding a relatively large number of background variables and the questionnaire space required for this have also resulted in omissions.

In 1998, two countries who had previously omitted variables reported complete coverage.

Sampling (see pages 7-8 of the three Findings Charts)

The general meeting in 1999 discussed a number of deviations from full probability samples and differences across the populations sampled by members pointed out in Park and Jowell (1997). The information provided by members for the three modules 1996-1998 again document these differences.

Universe sampled -- Age cut-offs: While the majority of members report a lower age cut-off of 18, several have a cut-off at 16 for the 1996 module. Two countries raised their cut-off to 18 by the 1998 module, another dropped the cut-off from 18 in 1996 module to 16 in 1997 and 1998. In 1996, four countries reported an upper age cut-off. By 1998, one country had dropped the upper age cut-off and two other had raised theirs. A fifth, new member reported an upper age cut-off in 1998.

Quota procedures: The use of quota procedures by some members was first noted in Park and Jowell (1997) and discussed at the 1997, 1998 and 1999 meetings. Apart from the addition of a new member, the countries reporting quota procedures have been using them regularly. In most cases, quota procedures are used in the selection of individuals within households. For the 1996 module, five members report using quota controls. For 1997, five members, and for the 1998 module, six members report using quota procedures, including a new ISSP member. Several countries have changed the procedures they use to select individuals at households, moving from the birthday method and, in one case, quota controls, to using a Kish grid.

Substitution: Nine of twenty-two members report using substitution procedures in 1996, nine of twenty-four in 1997 (the same members with one exception). In 1998, 11 of 24 members report using substitution, one member stops and another begins.

Fieldwork (see pages 9-10 of the three Findings Charts)

The ISSP was originally conceived of as a self-completion questionnaire to be fielded annually. The idea was that it could be fielded economically in 'piggy-back' fashion along with another survey already carrying background variables required for the ISSP survey. Nine members fielded the 1996 module as independent studies, while thirteen members fielded the module as part of a larger survey. In 1997 and 1998, nine (but in part different) members fielded the 1997 and 1998 modules as a separate survey and fifteen members fielded these modules together with another study. Three countries fielded the 1997 and 1998 modules together in different splits.

Mode of administration: Of the twenty-two countries reporting for 1996, thirteen fielded face-to-face, as in 1995, and nine used self-completion methods. The self-completion studies included four mail surveys (one with a telephone component) and five with other interviewer involvement (drop-off, interviewer attending, etc.). Most countries use the same mode each year; one changed back and forth (from 1994 to 1998) between self-completion with interviewer attending to postal completion and back again. For the 1998 module, fourteen countries conducted face-to-face interviews, 5 conducted mail surveys, and 5 used other self-completion methods. One postal survey uses a telephone component as the final reminder. Although computer-assisted collection procedures were not asked about in the monitoring questionnaires, answers member provided show that by 1998 several countries are using computer-assisted collection procedures.

Fielding time frames: As indicated in the 1995 monitoring study, the duration of fieldwork varies considerably across countries. It differs much less within countries over modules, although by 1998 there is some tendency for longer fieldwork times.

Year of fielding: Most, but not all, members fielded modules in the designated year. Three members fielded their modules together with larger biennial studies. This "delays" every second module (in the odd calendar years) by a year. The number of members fielding modules in different years is presented below.

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Module 1996	1	16	4	1	
Module 1997			19	4	1
Module 1998				19	5

Response enhancement and supervision measures: Country-specific factors related to survey infrastructures, individual surveys, and modes of administration result in differences across countries in the controlling measures employed. In general, over the three modules monitored, members report a small increase in interview(er) supervision, calling back at different times and on different days, and in their use of different kinds of checks on procedures. However, members also seem to have understood the questions on supervision differently and changes in answers may be related more to this than to changes in procedures actually used.

Response rates (see page 11-13 of the three Findings Charts)

Park and Jowell (1997) describe the difficulties encountered in trying to calculate response rates for the 1995 module as “a situation that needs urgent attention”. Three reports and years later, the situation has changed little.

In part, this is because quota procedures used to select respondents and replacement procedures used for non-contacts and refusals do not allow response rates to be calculated. In one instance, but for more than a single year, the fielding institute did not provide the information necessary to calculate various outcomes. In other instances, members failed to return a monitoring questionnaire. Study description sheets we were able to locate were also insufficient. We note, here, that the study description sheets which members are also required to complete for the Archive contain quite different degrees of detail across member countries. Some countries provide no or almost no information. In one or two cases, the study description sheets suggest that response rates can be calculated, but the answers the members provide in the monitoring questionnaires indicate that this is not the case.

Range of response rates: Many factors contribute to why response rates differ across studies and across countries. In the cross-national context these include considerations of very different kinds, some easily influenced, others not. As best as we can calculate, response rates range between 13%-95% for the 1996 module, between 11%-94% for the 1997 module, and between 10%-95% for the 1998 module (the mean response rates are about 57%, 56% and, 61% respectively). While high response rates are not a fail-safe indicator of survey quality and unusually high response rates are often greeted with scepticism about the nature of reporting in many circles, unusually low response rates and a very wide range of response rates must be seen as a cause for concern in comparative projects.

Data (see pages 14-15 of the three Findings Charts)

There is little change in procedures over the findings for the 1995 module. Over the three modules reviewed, 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.

As reported for the 1995 module, roughly one half applied subsequent weights or post-stratification for each module, to correct for errors of selection or response bias.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996-1998
(based on Archive and ZUMA documentation, April, 2000)

Country	Module	Archived	Study Report
Australia	1996	✓	No
	1997*	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Austria	1996	No	-
	1997	No	-
	1998	✓	✓
Bangladesh	1996	-	-
	1997	✓	No
	1998	No	-
Bulgaria	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Canada	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	No	-
Chile	1996	-	-
	1997	-	-
	1998	✓	✓
Cyprus	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	No
Czech Republic	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Denmark	1996	-	-
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
France	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Germany	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Great Britain	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Hungary	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Ireland	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No	-
	1998	✓	No
Israel	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No	-
	1998	✓	✓
Italy	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓

Country	Module	Archived	Study Report
Japan	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Latvia	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No	-
	1998	✓	✓
Netherlands	1996	No	-
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
New Zealand	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Norway	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Philippines	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Poland	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	No	-
Portugal	1996	-	-
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Russia	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Slovakian Republic	1996	-	-
	1997	-	-
	1998	✓	✓
Slovenia	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Spain	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Sweden	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
Switzerland	1996	(✓)	-
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	No
USA	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓

* Data for Australia were not available for inclusion in the tables which follow.

References

- Harkness, J. (1999) In pursuit of quality: issues for cross-national survey research. In: *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 2, 1999, 125-140.
- Harkness, J.A. and Schoua-Glusberg, A. (1998) Questionnaires in Translation. In Harkness, J.A. (ed.) *Cross-Cultural Survey Equivalence. ZUMA-Nachrichten Spezial No. 3* (Mannheim: Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen), 87-128.
- Jowell, R. (1998) How comparative is comparative research? *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42(2), 168-177.
- Kalgraff Skjåk, K., Harkness, J. and Smith, T.W. (2000) 'Response Effects by Mode and Culture. A Mode Experiment in Seven Countries'. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Association of Public Opinion Research, Portland, Oregon, May, 2000.
- Küchler, M. (1998) The Survey Method: An indispensable tool for social science research everywhere? *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42(2), 178-200.
- 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)
- Svallfors, S. (1996) National Differences in National Identities. An introduction to the International Social Survey Programme. *New Community*, 22, 127-34.

The International Social Survey Programme

Study Monitoring Report 1998

**Janet Harkness, Bettina Langfeldt and Evi Scholz
(ZUMA)**

Introduction

This report is based on the study monitoring survey conducted by ZUMA for the ISSP in 1998/1999 on the 1998 Religion module. Findings presented here were presented and discussed at the 1999 general assembly of the ISSP in Madrid, Spain.

Twenty-seven member countries archived the 1998 Religion module and all were asked to complete the monitoring questionnaire. After many reminders, with three exceptions, all members returned the questionnaire. The questionnaire use to monitor the 1998 study is appended. Apart from minor changes, the questions asked those asked in the 1995 monitoring study (Park and Jowell, 1997). Details of the individual answers members gave to the questions in the questionnaire are presented in the summary chart which follows here.

As indicated in the overview, we have done our best here to summarise the answers we received and to check the information with members. Members were also given the opportunity to make corrections before the report was added as a supplement to the Archive codebook for the 1998 study and becomes available on the Archive web site.

Summary of the findings

The questionnaire (see pages 4-6 of the Findings Chart)

In the questionnaire for the 1998 and subsequent modules, members were asked whether they had assessed their translations. Of the twenty-two countries that translated the questionnaire, only three did not assess the translation. Several countries fielded in English plus one other language. One member fielded in five languages including English, another in two other languages. Ten members reported translation problems.

Question Coverage (see page 6 of the Findings Chart)

In 1998, eleven of twenty-four countries did not include all the core items. Japan and Portugal omitted one or more substantive questions (Japan had permission to do so). The other omissions were all background variables.

Sampling (see pages 7-8 of the Findings Chart)

The sampling procedures reported for the 1998 module differ little from those reported for 1995. Six countries reported using quota controls, eleven reported using substitution. Three countries had a lower age-cut of 16 years of age, none of under 16 years of age. The other members all had a lower age cut-off of 18 years of age. Three countries reported an upper age-cut off, all different, all over 70 years of age.

Fieldwork (see pages 9-10 of the Findings Chart)

With one exception, countries tend to keep to the same mode of administration over the years. Several combined modes, usually as a result of fielding the module together with another study and asking all the background variables for both studies together. One country fielding a mail survey used a telephone component in the final reminder. Some interviews were thus also conducted by telephone. Most members fielded the module in 1998, but eight fielded the 1998 module in 1999.

As indicated in the overview, most countries reported basically the same kind and number of fielding checks and controls as in 1995. However, the questions asked in the monitoring questionnaire are better suited for surveys with an interviewer component than for mail surveys and the kind of reminders and checks used for these. The questions asked on how contact attempts are made did not allow some members to report procedures they use. In addition, several members queried how the questions on supervision were to be understood.

Response rates (see pages 11-13 of the Findings Chart)

As reported in the 1995 monitoring study, response rates are difficult to calculate for reasons mentioned in the Park and Jowell report (1997) and expanded in the overview of the 1996-1998 monitoring studies. Quota procedures, substitution and, in some cases, a lack of sufficient detail are the three main reasons. It also becomes clear that members differ in their definitions of outcome codes - what constitutes eligible, ineligible, etc.

Data (see pages 14-15 of the Findings Chart)

As indicated in the overview report, the findings reported on coding reliability and weighting change little over the period 1995 to 1998. 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.

Roughly one half applied subsequent weights or post-stratification for each module, to correct for errors of selection or response bias.

**Monitoring Findings Chart
1998**

The questionnaire

	A	AUS	BG	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	USA
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>																								
Yes, translated:	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- by specialist	X			X		X														X				
- by research team	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X		X	X		X		X	X
- other	X					X									X				X					
No, not translated										X							X							
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed?</i>																								
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
No											X							X						X
Not applicable										X							X							
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>																								
Yes	X		X	X		X		X			X							X	X					X
No					X		X		X			X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X
Not applicable										X							X							

The questionnaire (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	J	LV	NL	NZ	N	RP	P	RUS	S	SK	SLO	USA
<i>Did any concepts cause translation problems?</i>																								
Yes	X	X		X		X		X	X				X	X				X	X				X	
No			X		X		X	X			X	X			X		X			X	X	X		X
Not applicable										X						X								
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>																								
Individual survey	X				X		X	X	X		X		X								X	X		
Larger survey:		X	X	X		X				X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
- with ISSP at start		X	X									X		X		X	X							
- with ISSP in middle				X		X				X									X	X				
- with ISSP at end															X			X					X	X
- not answered																								
<i>Were the ISSP questions asked in the correct order?</i>																								
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No													X	X										

The questionnaire (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	USA
<i>Were all the core ISSP items included?</i>																								
Yes, all included		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X						X	X	X	
No, not all included:	X									X			X			X	X	X	X	X				X
- from module													X					X						
- background items	X									X			X			X	X	X	X	X				X

Sampling

	A	AUS	BG	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	USA
<i>Were there any quota controls used at any stage in the survey?</i>																								
Yes							X					X				X			X	X		X		
No	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X			X		X	X
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage in the survey?</i>																								
Yes				X	X			X				X		X		X		X	X	X		X	X	
No	X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X		X		X		X				X			X
<i>Were stratification factors used during sampling?</i>																								
Yes			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X
No	X	X							X						X	X					X			
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>																								
18	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X
16												X				X				X				
Under 16																								

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	USA
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>																								
Yes														X	X						X			
Age														85	79						78			
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
<i>What was the issued sampled unit?</i>																								
Address			X				X			X	X			X		X				X		X		X
Household	X				X	X			X		X													
Named individual		X											X		X		X	X			X		X	
Other				X				X											X					
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>																								
Kish grid	X		X	X	X	X		X		X	X								X			X		X
Quota												X							X	X				
Birthday method							X		X					X		X								
Other							X									X								
Not answered																								
Not applicable		X											X		X		X	X			X		X	

Fieldwork

	A	AUS	BG	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	USA
<i>Fieldwork method (ISSP module)</i>																								
Face-to-face	X		X	X	X		X	X			X	X		X				X	X	X		X	X	
Self-completion (via Interviewer)						X				X			X			X								X
Self-completion (postal)		X							X						X		X				X			
Telephone																					X			
<i>Fieldwork method (ISSP background variables)</i>																								
Face-to-face	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X		X		X	X	X		X	X	X
Self-completion (via Interviewer)												X												
Self-completion (postal)		X							X						X		X				X			
Telephone																					X			
<i>What rules governed interviewer attempts?</i>																								
Call at different time of day			X		X	X		X		X	X		X	X		X			X	X	X			X
Call on different days in week	X		X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X						X	X	X	X		X
Neither of above							X																X	
Not answered																		X						
Not applicable		X							X						X		X							

Fieldwork (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	USA
<i>Were a minimum number of calls required?</i>																								
Yes	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No												X	X											
Not answered																								
Not applicable		X							X						X		X							
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>																								
Yes			X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X						X	X	X				X
No	X						X						X	X		X					X	X	X	
Not answered																								
Not applicable		X							X						X		X							
<i>Were any interviews back-checked?</i>																								
Yes	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X		X		X	X	X		X	X	X
No				X									X								X			
Not answered																								
Not applicable		X							X						X		X							

Response rates

	A	AUS	BG	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	USA
<i>Were reminder letters/calls used?</i>																								
Yes		X								X					X	(X)	X				X			
No									X				X											
Not applicable	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X		X				X	X	X		X	X	X
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>																								
2 weeks or less								X			X		X	X										
Over 2 wks, < 1 month				X			X					X							X	X		X	X	
1 month, < 2 months	X				X																X			
2 months, < 3 months		X				X									X		X	X						
3 months or more			X						X	X						X								X
<i>Date of fieldwork</i>																								
1997																								
1998				X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
1999	X	X	X		X		X		X			X				X								
Not answered																								

Response rates (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I
<i>Reported response figures (where calculable)</i>												
Issued sample (n)	1728		1200	1505	3120	3216	1872	2600	11000	1988	1941	1500
Ineligible (n)	77		29	7	33	28	unknown	7	150	242	222	0
Elegible (n)	1651		1171	1498	3087	3188	1872	2593	10850	1746	1719	1500
- % refusal	17		1		11	18	18	2		31	23	
- % non-contact	18		3		6	12	22	2		3	0	
- % other unproductive	5		2		44	7		0.3		7	19	
- % completed cases	61		94		40	63	60	96	11	59	58	
- completed cases (n)	1002		1102	1503	1223	2006	1114	2488	1150	1022	1000	1009
<i>Reasons why response figures not calculable:</i>												
- no data supplied												
- quota sampling												X
- substitution				X								X

Response rates (continued)

	J*	LV	N	NL	NZ	P*	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	USA
<i>Response figures (where calculable)</i>												
Issued sample (n)	1800	2439	2500	13020	1800	1920		3963	2000	1350	3118	4622
Ineligible (n)	26	62	0	0	0	95		105	7	0	225	731
Elegible (n)	1774	2377	2500	13020	1800	1835		3858	1993	1350	2893	3891
- % refusal	8	17	6	32	7	4		25	9		15	19
- % non-contact	3	31	31	14	12	0		11	31		7	2
- % other unproductive	8	2	1	39	25	15		20	0		8	6
- % completed cases	77	50	61	15	56	65		44	60		70	73
- completed cases (n)	1368	1200	1532	1926	998	1201		1698	1189	1284	2024	2832
<i>Reasons why response figures not calculable:</i>												
- no data supplied												
- quota sampling							X			X		
- substitution							X			X		

* cases do not total 100%.

Data

	A	AUS	BG	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	USA
<i>Were any measures of coding reliability employed?</i>																								
Yes					X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X
No				X					X								X						X	
Not answered	X		X															X						
<i>Were reliability checks made on derived variables?</i>																								
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X		X
No																		X	X				X	
Not answered																				X				
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>																								
- filters	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	(X)	X
- logic or consistency	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X
- ranges	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Data (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	J	LV	N	NL	NZ	P	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	USA
<i>Were data errors corrected?</i>																								
Yes:	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- individually				X	X	X		X	X	X				X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	
- automatically	X						X				X	X						X						
- both		X	X										X								X			X
No																								
<i>Were the data weighted or post-stratified?</i>																								
Yes	X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X						X	X	X				
No		X	X					X					X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X

Answers to open questions on translation (close to *verbatim*)

Q 2b: How was the quality of the translated questionnaire assessed?

- Austria:** Used the German ZUMA version, with only a few modifications for country- specific terms. (Note: Austria's comments on translation problems reflects problems encountered in working with the ZUMA version which ZUMA also warned the co-ordinator about.)
- Bulgaria:** Specialist translators and discussions in research team
- Chile:** By two members of the research team
- Czech Rep.:** By two independent sociologists
- Denmark:** By another member of the research team
- France:** By research team
- Germany*:** Committee discussions, headed by trained survey translator.
- Italy:** By comparing two independent translations
- Japan:** English person who is married to a Japanese and has been in Japan for a long time
- Latvia:** The questionnaire was translated in Latvian and Russian. All versions were assessed by one of the members of the research team.
- Netherlands:** By fieldwork organisation
- Norway*:** We discussed the translation in a group, after having made the translation on our own.
- Philippines:** The 1998 ISSP work orientations module was translated into 5 major Philippine languages. The Tagalog version, which became the definitive version, was first translated (from English) by a senior field staff member of a private market research agency which does all fieldwork activities of SWS. Said senior field staff member is a non-SWS staff whose main assignment is to supervise field operations (spot-checking / back-checking / field editing). This Tagalog version was commented on by Linda Guerrero, plus 2 other SWS staff members. L. Guerrero decided on the final version. The 4 other translations which used the Tagalog version as basis, and sometimes the English version, were made by other non-SWS senior field staff members. These were no longer reviewed by SWS.
- Russia:** By an English-speaking researcher.
- Slovakia:** By members of the research team
- Slovenia:** By research group
- Spain:** No comment
- Sweden*:** Two independent translations by research team members are discussed and compared in a group of researchers. Translations are checked against the German and Norwegian translations (Note 1: Sweden, Germany and Norway translate from the source questionnaire but then use the other Germanic languages for comparison).

Russia: By an English-speaking researcher.

* Sweden, Germany and Norway translate from the source questionnaire and then compare their versions with those of the other Germanic languages.

Q2f: Which questions or concepts caused particular problems? (close to *verbatim*)

- Austria:** Question on morality (4-6, 8, 10)
English "wrong" => German "schlimm", "schlimm" is not a very common word in Austrian German.
Q 38c: "Faith-healers have God-given healing powers"
the German: "..... übernatürliche" => translation is not equivalent.
- Chile:** Q 3: 'Not wrong at all'
Q 7b: "All in all" "suffers"
Q 13a: "Religious leader"
Q 14a: "Overall"
Q 17: In the scale, alternatives 1 and 2, and 4 and 5 were not much different.
Q 24a, 25,26, 27: "denomination"
Q 35: This question was very difficult to understand for the respondents.
ISSP characteristics of national population form
- France:** Order of religious items
- Germany:** Q 3, Q 15, Q 16, Q 35a.
Translations in the 1991 module are also a problem, but we left them.
- Japan:** Q 21: Japanese main religions, Shinto and Buddhism, don't have texts like the Christian Bible.
- Latvia:** Personal God.
V 73: "Good luck charms do bring good luck" was translated as "Good luck charms do not bring luck"
- Philippines:** Re: Q on "do you believe in..life after death, heaven, hell, religious miracles". In the 1991 module we translated this literally, and I felt from the results that the translation meant they were ascribing to/ believing as sacred, for example, hell. So in the 1998 translation I used a Tagalog translation which in English literally means "Do you believe that there is..."
- Portugal:** Q 18: "Personal God": The problem was (and still is) how to distinguish between God, a God and a personal God.
Q 23: The meaning of the sentence.

Answers to open questions on omissions (close to *verbatim*)

Q7: Details of why questions were omitted

Austria:	Spouse ISCO88: not relevant for the particular module topic (religion)
Great Britain:	Subjective social class: doesn't work in a British context with this degree of subtlety.
Japan:	Q 21: Japanese main religions, Shinto and Buddhism, don't have Bibles like Christian Bible.
Netherlands:	Background variables are asked in our principal face-to-face survey, number of questions is limited.
New Zealand:	Mistake
Philippines:	Source of data cannot be the respondent, there would be new costs in getting the data as the source in the community would be the village captain.
Portugal:	Q 23: we couldn't find a way to translate it. Ethnic: we substituted ethnic group by nationality because it does not make sense to "divide" the population into ethnic groups.
Russia:	Not enough room in questionnaire - interview is too long. Living as married included in category -"married" in a variable "marital status".
USA:	No comment

Answers to open questions about quota procedures (close to *verbatim*)

Q 20: In what way were quota controls used?

Denmark:	If there was a person in the household between the age of 13 (18 for ISSP) and 29 years, the interviewer was attempted with this person. Otherwise by birthday criteria. For households with 4 or more inhabitants, two interviews were collected if possible.
Italy:	Sex and age
Netherlands:	Sex control
Philippines:	50% males, 50% females, by alternating between male and female respondents
Russia:	Each interviewer received quota's task by sex-by-age and sex-by-education quotas'. "
Slovakia:	Sex and age

***INTERNATIONAL
SOCIAL
SURVEY
PROGRAMME***

SCPR Methodological questionnaire^{©SCPR}

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE
Religion 1998 ISSP MODULE AS YOUR REFERENCE.

PLEASE WRITE IN THE NAME OF YOUR COUNTRY:

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

Section 1: the questionnaire

1. Was the ISSP questionnaire translated or adapted in any way from the original "British English" version?

Yes → **ANSWER Q.2**

No → **GO TO Q.3**

IF QUESTIONNAIRE TRANSLATED/ADAPTED

- 2a. Who carried out the translation of the questionnaire?

A specialist translator

A member or members of the research team

Other (PLEASE WRITE DETAILS BELOW)

- b. Was the quality of the translation assessed?

Yes → **ANSWER c.**

No → **GO TO d.**

- c. How was the quality of the translation assessed?

PLEASE WRITE IN:

- d. Was the translated questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes

No

- e. Were there any questions or concepts that caused particular problems when being translated into your language?

Yes → **ANSWER f.**

No → **GO TO Q.3**

IF 'YES'

- f. Which questions or concepts caused particular problems?

PLEASE WRITE IN:

- g. What did you do about them?

PLEASE WRITE IN:

EVERYONE PLEASE ANSWER

3. Which of the following best described how the ISSP module was fielded in your country?

As an individual survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey) → **GO TO Q.5**

As part of a larger survey → **ANSWER Q.4**

IF ISSP WAS PART OF A LARGER SURVEY

4. What was the approximate position of the Religion module in the larger questionnaire?

Start of questionnaire

Middle of questionnaire

End of questionnaire

EVERYONE PLEASE ANSWER

5. Were the questions in the Religion module all asked in the prescribed order?

Yes

No

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

No - some question(s) from Religion module not included → **ANSWER Q.7**

No - some background ISSP question(s) not included → **ANSWER Q.7**

Yes – all Religion questions and background questions included **SECTION 2**

IF ANY CORE ISSP QUESTIONS WERE NOT INCLUDED

7. Please write in details of the items and the reasons why they were not included.

ISSP question number or description of question:

Reason(s) not included:

Section 2: Sampling

8. Was your sample designed to be representative of the entire adult population of your country?

Yes → **GO TO Q.10**

No → **ANSWER Q.9**

IF NOT DESIGNED TO BE REPRESENTATIVE

9. What groups were excluded from, or under-represented in, your sample design?

EVERYONE PLEASE ANSWER

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

WRITE IN :

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

Yes - please write in cut-off

No cut-off

12. What were the different stages in your sampling procedure?
PLEASE WRITE IN:

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

None

Some

All

14. Overall, did every member of the population you were sampling have a known, non-zero, probability of selection?

Yes, known - and equal - probability → **GO TO Q.16**

Yes, known - and not equal - probability → **ANSWER Q.15**

No, not known probability → **ANSWER Q.15**

IF PROBABILITY EITHER NOT EQUAL OR NOT KNOWN

15. In what way was probability of selection not equal or not known?
PLEASE WRITE IN:

EVERYONE PLEASE ANSWER

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

No clusters

WRITE IN:

IF 'YES'

22. In what way was substitution permitted?
PLEASE WRITE IN:

EVERYONE PLEASE ANSWER

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

Yes → **ANSWER Q.24**
No → **GO TO Q.25**

IF STRATIFICATION FACTORS USED

24. What stratification factors were used, and at what stage(s) of selection?
PLEASE WRITE IN:

EVERYONE PLEASE ANSWER

25. All in all, what are the known limitations of your achieved sample?

For example: is there differential coverage of particular groups,
either because of sample design or response differences?

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

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

IF 'OTHER' CATEGORY USED

27. Please give details of what you have included in the 'other' category above.

Section 3: Fieldwork

28. How were the ISSP questions fielded?

	Religion module	Background variables
Face-to-face	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Self-completion (with some interviewer involvement in delivering or collecting)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Self-completion (postal)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephone survey	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

29a. The next group of questions are about interviewers.
If no interviewers were used at any point in the ISSP survey, **please go to Q30.**

IF INTERVIEWERS USED

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

Yes

No

c. Which, if any, of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address/household?

PLEASE TICK THOSE THAT APPLY

Calls must be made at different times of day

Calls must be made on different days of week

Neither of the above

d. Were interviewers required to make a certain number of calls before they stopped approaching an address or household?

Minimum number of calls required - please write in number

No minimum call requirement

e. Were any interviews supervised?

Yes - please write in approximate proportion %

No

f. Were any interviews back-checked?

Yes - please write in approximate proportion %

No

EVERYONE PLEASE ANSWER

30. Were postal or self-completion methods used at any point during fieldwork?

Yes → **ANSWER Q.31**
No → **GO TO Q.32**

IF POSTAL OR SELF-COMPLETION METHODS

31. Were reminder letters sent, or reminder calls made, during fieldwork?

Yes - write in maximum number
No

EVERYONE PLEASE ANSWER

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

D D M M Y Y
Start date
End date

Section 4: Data

33. Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes
No

34. Were the data from the questionnaire keyed subsequent to the interview (that is, non-CAPI surveys)?

Yes → **ANSWER Q.35**
No → **GO TO Q.36**

IF DATA KEYED

35. Was keying verified?

Yes - please write in approximate level of verification %
No

EVERYONE PLEASE ANSWER

36. Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

40. Have you answered 'yes' at any or all of questions 37 to 39 above?

Yes

→ **ANSWER Q.41**

No

→ **GO TO Q.42**

IF DATA CHECKED/EDITED

41. Were errors corrected individually or automatically (through, for example, a 'forced' edit)?

Yes - individual correction

Yes - automatic correction

No - not corrected

EVERYONE PLEASE ANSWER

42. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes

→ **ANSWER Q.43**

No

→ **FINISH**

IF DATA WEIGHTED

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

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

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