

# **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 1997 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](http://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 1997*

**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 1997 Work Orientations module. Findings presented here were presented and discussed at the 1999 general assembly of the ISSP in Madrid, Spain.

At the time of monitoring, twenty-five member countries had archived the 1997 Work Orientations module and all were asked to complete the monitoring questionnaire. After many reminders, with one exception, all members returned the questionnaire. The questionnaire use to monitor the 1997 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 1997 study.

## **Summary of the findings**

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

In the questionnaire for the 1997 and subsequent modules, members were asked whether they had assessed their translations. Of the twenty-four countries that translated the questionnaire, four did not assess the translation. Three of these had reported that they did assess their translations in 1996. Several countries fielded in English plus one other language. One member fielded in five languages including English, another in two other languages. Most members reported that translation was not a real problem.

### **Question Coverage (see page 6 of the Findings Chart)**

In 1997, eleven countries did not ask all the required core questions. In all but one case, omissions were background variables, not substantive questions.

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

The sampling procedures reported for the 1997 module differ little from those reported for 1995. Four countries reported using quota controls, nine reported using substitution. Three countries had a lower age-cut of 16 years of age, two of under 16 years of age. The other members all had a lower age cut-off of 18 years of age. Four 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 1997, but six fielded in 1998 and one fielded the 1997 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. In two cases, members who had not supervised interviews in 1996 report supervision in 1997. In one case, a member who reported supervising interviews in 1996 did not supervise in 1997.

**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  
1997**

## The questionnaire

	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	IL	J	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>																								
<b>Yes, translated:</b>	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			
- by research team	X			X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X		X		X	X	X		X	X	X
- other		X	X			X									X					X				
<b>No, not translated</b>										X							X							
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed?</i>																								
<b>Yes</b>	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>No</b>		X									X							X						X
<b>Not applicable</b>										X							X							
<i>Was the translated questionnaire pre-tested?</i>																								
<b>Yes</b>	X		X	X		X					X							X		X				X
<b>No</b>		X			X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X	X	
<b>Not applicable</b>										X							X							

## The questionnaire (continued)

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

## The questionnaire (continued)

	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	IL	J	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
<i>Were all the core ISSP items included?</i>																								
<b>Yes, all included</b>	X	X		X			X	X	X		X	X	X		X				X			X	X	
<b>No, not all included:</b>			X		X	X				X				X		X	X	X		X	X			X
- from module						X																		
- background items			X		X	X				X				X		X	X	X		X	X			X

## Sampling

	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	IL	J	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
<i>Were there any quota controls used at any stage in the survey?</i>																								
<b>Yes</b>							X					X				X				X	X			
<b>No</b>	X	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>																								
<b>Yes</b>				X	X			X			X	X	X							X	X		X	
<b>No</b>	X	X	X			X	X		X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X
<i>Were stratification factors used during sampling?</i>																								
<b>Yes</b>	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X		X	X		X	X
<b>No</b>			X						X						X	X			X			X		
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>																								
<b>18</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X
<b>16</b>														X		X					X			
<b>Under 16</b>																								

## Sampling (continued)

	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	IL	J	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>																								
<b>Yes</b>			X												X							X		
<b>Age</b>			70												79							76		
<b>No</b>	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>																								
<b>Address</b>	X						X			X		X				X					X			X
<b>Household</b>			X	X	X				X										X					
<b>Named individual</b>						X					X			X	X		X	X				X	X	
<b>Other</b>		X						X					X							X				
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>																								
<b>Kish grid</b>	X			X				X		X			X						X	X				X
<b>Quota</b>												X				X				X	X			
<b>Birthday method</b>		X			X		X		X							X								
<b>Other</b>			X																					
<b>Not answered</b>																								
<b>Not applicable</b>						X					X			X	X		X	X				X	X	

## Fieldwork

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

## Fieldwork (continued)

	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	IL	J	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
<i>Were a minimum number of calls required?</i>																								
<b>Yes</b>	X		X		X		X	X		X	X					X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>No</b>		X		X								X	X	X										
<b>Not answered</b>																								
<b>Not applicable</b>						X			X						X		X							
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>																								
<b>Yes</b>			X	X				X		X	X	X						X	X	X	X			X
<b>No</b>	X	X			X		X						X	X		X						X	X	
<b>Not answered</b>																								
<b>Not applicable</b>						X			X						X		X							
<i>Were any interviews back-checked?</i>																								
<b>Yes</b>	X			X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X		X	X
<b>No</b>		X	X											X								X		
<b>Not answered</b>																								
<b>Not applicable</b>						X			X						X		X							

## Response rates

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

## Response rates (continued)

	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK*	E	F	GB	H	I**
<i>Reported response figures (where calculable)</i>												
<b>Issued sample (n)</b>	1100	2000	6700	1360	1990	3711	1614		10000	2490	2074	1500
<b>Ineligible (n)</b>	33		769	0	95	189	0		98	318	247	
<b>Eligible (n)</b>	1067		5931	1360	1895	3522	1614		9902	2172	1827	
<b>- % refusal</b>	2		21	11	18	50	16			28	10	
<b>- % non-contact</b>	2			0	19		20			4	0	
<b>- % other unproductive</b>	1		26	14	5		0			5	8	
<b>- % completed cases</b>	95		51	75	57	50	64		10	62	82	
<b>Completed cases (n)</b>	1012	958	3028	1002	1080	1746	1034	1211	1032	1347	1500	1034
<b>Cases in ISSP data set</b>	1004	949	2518	1002	1080	1746	1034	1211	1011	1087	1496	1017
<i>Reasons why response figures not calculable:</i>												
<b>- no data supplied</b>												
<b>- quota sampling</b>												X
<b>- substitution</b>								X				X

\*Denmark provided a concrete number for realised cases. The other figures are based on Denmark's answer to Q27 and percent figures given there.

\*\*Eurisko had 1500 starting addresses and contacted 2357 individuals / households.

## Response rates (continued)

	IL*	J	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
<i>Reported response figures (where calculable)</i>												
<b>Issued sample (n)</b>		1800	3500	7676	1890	2000	3200		3477	1999	3137	4622
<b>Ineligible (n)</b>		21	0	0	0	86	66		114	17	279	731
<b>Eligible (n)</b>		1779	3500	7676	1890	1914	3134		3363	1982	2858	3891
<b>- % refusal</b>		8	2	26	5	4	11		28	10	16	19
<b>- % non-contact</b>		9	33	24	8	1	6		3	26	7	2
<b>- % other unproductive</b>		14	2	22	24	9	6		18	0	7	6
<b>- % completed cases</b>		69	63	28	63	86	77		51	64	70	73
<b>Completed cases (n)</b>	1042	1226	2199	2179	1198	1637	2402	1200	1698	1276	2001	2832
<b>Cases in ISSP data set</b>	1037	1226	2199	2267	1198	1637	1200	1200	1698	1353	1005	1228
<i>Reasons why response figures not calculable:</i>												
<b>- no data supplied</b>												
<b>- quota sampling</b>								X				
<b>- substitution</b>								X				

\*No information available from the fielding institute. Figures are for Israelis, not the Arab population also surveyed.

## Data

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

	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	GB	H	I	IL	J	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SLO	USA
<i>Were data errors corrected?</i>																								
<b>Yes:</b>	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	
- automatically							X				X							X						
- both	X		X			X		X				X		X					X			X		X
<b>No</b>																								
<i>Were the data weighted or post-stratified?</i>																								
<b>Yes</b>	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X							X	X	X	X		
<b>No</b>				X	X	X							X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X

**Switzerland:** Comparison of the German, French and Italian translations with each other and with the English version by members of the research team in co-operation with ZUMA (Germany).

(Note: Switzerland came to ZUMA with their own finished appraisal of versions in languages they wanted to use. ZUMA went through these with them and also explained why replications had sometimes left weak translations unchanged in one or the other country, etc.)

\* 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*)**

**Germany:** Old problems were left as translated. Problems to translate Q 22, 23 and 24 into compact German items.

**Japan:** Q18: Japanese permanent employees aren't generally aware of that there are contracts they make with their company. When Japanese people enter companies, they and their companies exchange some papers, but every paper isn't 'a written contract' by name.

**Poland:** "Business" in Q 8c.

**Portugal:** Response scales: "very" and "much" have the same meaning in Portuguese.

**Switzerland:** Translation of "job", "paid job".

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

### Q7: Details of why questions were omitted

- Czech Rep.:** Because of the relative homogeneity of the population of the Czech Republic (Census 1991: Czech nationality = 94,8 %)
- Germany:** Left out by mistake during layout changes.
- Great Britain:** Social class: doesn't work in a British context with this degree of subtlety.
- Japan:** No comment
- Netherlands:** SPISCO88 and SPWRKST and CLASS R: not useful in opinion survey; questionnaire too long anyway
- 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:** (Comment in Portuguese)
- Russia:** Not enough room in questionnaire - interview is too long. Living as married included in category - "married" in a variable "marital status"
- Switzerland:** Mistake
- 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, an interview was attempted with this person. Otherwise the birthday criteria was used. In households with four or more inhabitants two interviews were collected if possible.
- Italy:** Sex, age
- Netherlands:** Sex control questionnaires are divided 50-50 in questionnaires for men and women.
- 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.

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

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

<b>Bulgaria:</b>	Professional
<b>Cyprus:</b>	No comment
<b>Czech Rep.:</b>	Team of sociologists
<b>Denmark:</b>	Another member of the team
<b>Germany*:</b>	Committee discussion group headed by trained survey translator.
<b>Hungary:</b>	Not assessed
<b>Israel:</b>	Two separate translators and researcher team discussed the differences
<b>Italy:</b>	Comparison of two independent translations
<b>Japan:</b>	English person married to a Japanese who has lived in Japan for a long time
<b>Netherlands:</b>	By consulting colleagues/ fieldwork organisation
<b>Norway*:</b>	In group of staff members, different translation suggestions were considered.
<b>Philippines:</b>	The 1997 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.
<b>Poland:</b>	Research team
<b>Russia:</b>	Revision by an English-speaking researcher
<b>Slovenia.</b>	Research group
<b>Spain:</b>	Member of the research team and an outside translator working jointly
<b>Sweden*:</b>	Two independent translations by research members are discussed and compared in a group of researchers. Translations are checked against the German and Norwegian translations Sweden, Germany and Norway

translate from the source questionnaire but then use the other Germanic languages for comparison.

***INTERNATIONAL  
SOCIAL  
SURVEY  
PROGRAMME***

***SCPR Methodological questionnaire***<sup>©SCPR</sup>

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE  
**Work Orientations 1997** 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](mailto: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 Work Orientations module in the larger questionnaire?

Start of questionnaire

Middle of questionnaire

End of questionnaire

**EVERYONE PLEASE ANSWER**

5. Were the questions in the Work Orientations 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 Work Orientations module not included  → **ANSWER Q.7**

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

Yes – all Work Orientations 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?

	<b>Work Orientations module</b>	<b>Background variables</b>
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**