

International Social Survey Programme

Study Monitoring 2009

**Report to the ISSP General Assembly
on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP
by the Methodology Committee**

July 2011

Phil Gendall
Massey University
Private Bag 11-222
Palmerston North 4442
New Zealand

p.gendall@massey.ac.nz

International Social Survey Programme

Contents

Introduction	3
Monitoring Findings Chart.....	4
Appendix: Information about other studies the ISSP was fielded with	38
Calculation of Response Figures Based on Reported Figures	41

Introduction

The aim of ISSP monitoring and reporting is twofold: to record for internal ISSP purposes how ISSP studies were conducted in each country and how implementations met or failed to meet ISSP requirements as defined by the ISSP Working Principles. These aims are related to the pursuit of basic good or best practices in ISSP studies but also to comparability of data across ISSP datasets.

For users of ISSP data, the Study Monitoring Reports bring together information of relevance for analysis not otherwise available in such a compact form. The documentation provided on major aspects of each member's fielding and outcomes goes a considerable way towards guiding researchers on which differences between ISSP countries they might ignore and which they should consider.

This report is based on the study monitoring survey conducted by Methodology Committee of the ISSP for the 2009 Social Inequality module. Thirty-one member countries completed the monitoring questionnaire for this module. Details of the individual answers members provided are presented in the summary charts which follow. The information we received was checked with members, who were given the opportunity to make corrections. The report is available on the ISSP Archive web site.

Monitoring Findings Chart

2009

for

Argentina (AR)

Australia (AUS)

Bulgaria (BG)

Switzerland (CH)

Chile (CL)

China (CN)

Czech Republic (CZ)

Germany (D)

Denmark (DEN)

Estonia (E)

Spain (ESP)

France (F)

Flanders (FL)

Great Britain (GB)

Hungary (H)

Israel (IL)

Japan (J)

Latvia (LV)

Norway (N)

New Zealand (NZ)

Philippines (PH)

Poland (P)

Portugal (PO)

South Korea (ROK)

Sweden (S)

Slovak Republic (SK)

Slovenia (SLO)

Taiwan (TW)

Ukraine (UKR)

United States of America (USA)

South Africa (ZA)

Language(s) and translation

	AR	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	F	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																
Language 1 (L1)	Spanish	English	Bulgarian	German	Spanish	Mandarin Chinese	Czech	German	Danish	Estonian	Spanish	French	Dutch	English	Hungarian	Hebrew
Language 2 (L2)				French						Russian						Arabic
Language 3 (L3)				Italian												Russian
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>																
Yes, translated:																
- by member(s) of research team	X		X		X	X	X		X	L1,L2	X	X	X		X	L1
- by translation bureau													X			
- by specially trained translator(s)				L1-L3				X								L2, L3
- other																
No, not translated		X												X		

Translation (continued)

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PH	PO	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>															
Language 1 (L1)	Japanese	Latvian	Norwegian	English	Polish	Filipino	Portuguese	Korean	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	Ukrainian	English	English
Language 2 (L2)		Russian				Cebuano				Hungarian			Russian	Spanish	Afrikaans
Language 3 (L3)						Ilocano/ Iluko									Zulu
Language 4 (L4)						Ilonggo/ Hiligaynon									Tsonga
Language 5 (L5)						Maguindanaon									Tswana
Language 6 (L6)						Bicolano									Xhosa
Language 7 (L7)						Waray									
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>															
Yes, translated:															
- by member(s) of research team	X	L1, L2	X		X	L1-L7		X	X	L1	X	X	L1, L2		
- by translation bureau															
- by specially trained translator(s)	X				X		X			L2			L1, L2	L2	L2-L6
- other															
No, not translated				X										L1	L1

Translation (continued)

	AR	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	F	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																
Language 1 (L1)	Spanish	English	Bulgarian	German	Spanish	Mandarin Chinese	Czech	German	Danish	Estonian	Spanish	French	Dutch	English	Hungarian	Hebrew
Language 2 (L2)				French						Russian						Arabic
Language 3 (L3)				Italian												Russian
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>																
Yes:																
- group discussion			X		X	X	X	X	X	L1		X			X	L1
- expert checked it			X	L1-L3	X			X			X		X			L3
- back translation																
- other	X ^{AR}									L2 ^E			X ^{FL}			
No														X		
Not applicable		X														

^{AR} The researchers exchanged comments with people linked to ISSP in Spain, Mexico and Chile.

^E The translation of the questionnaire into the Russian was compared with the translation into Russian made by the team of Russia in 2009. Questions of current Inequality Module that were the same as in 1999 were also compared with the Russian version of the Latvian survey instrument of 1999.

^{FL} The ISSP module 2009 was independently translated by the institute in Flanders (Belgium) and the Netherlands. Both translations were compared to each other and in a discussion with H. Ganzeboom, H. Schröder and A. Carton, the differences were resolved and final decisions were taken although respecting "local" differences in use of language.

Translation (continued)

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PH	PO	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>															
Language 1 (L1)	Japanese	Latvian	Norwegian	English	Polish	Filipino	Portuguese	Korean	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	Ukrainian	English	English
Language 2 (L2)		Russian				Cebuano				Hungarian			Russian	Spanish	Afrikaans
Language 3 (L3)						Ilocano/ Iluko									Zulu
Language 4 (L4)						Ilonggo/ Hiligaynon									Tsonga
Language 5 (L5)						Maguindanaon									Tswana
Language 6 (L6)						Bicolano									Xhosa
Language 7 (L7)						Waray									
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>															
Yes:															
- group		L1, L2	X		X	L1-L7	X	X	X	L1	X	X	L1	L2	
- expert checked	X				X					L2		X	L1, L2	L2	L2-L6
- back translation															
- other						L1-L7 ^{PH1}									
Not applicable				X										L1	L1

^{PH} Cognitive testing with Field Anchors. Pre-tested on 12 randomly selected adults of different ages, sex and classes and then an assessment discussion with those who pre-tested the module.

Translation (continued)

	AR	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	F	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																
Language 1 (L1)	Spanish	English	Bulgarian	German	Spanish	Mandarin Chinese	Czech	German	Danish	Estonian	Spanish	French	Dutch	English	Hungarian	Hebrew
Language 2 (L2)				French						Russian						Arabic
Language 3 (L3)				Italian												Russian
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>																
Yes	X			L1-L3	X	X		X	X				X		X	
No			X				X			L1,L2	X	X				L1-L3
Not applicable		X												X		
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>																
Yes							X	X ^D		L1,L2						
No	X		X	L1-L3	X	X			X		X	X	X		X	L1-L3
Not applicable		X												X		

^D Q1i: "race": the German equivalent of "race" (Rasse) cannot be used in German surveys. Q23a,b: job examples to clarify the meaning of the answer categories have to be taken from German context.

Translation (continued)

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PH	PO	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>															
Language 1 (L1)	Japanese	Latvian	Norwegian	English	Polish	Filipino	Portuguese	Korean	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	Ukrainian	English	English
Language 2 (L2)		Russian				Cebuano				Hungarian			Russian	Spanish	Afrikaans
Language 3 (L3)						Ilocano/ Iluko									Zulu
Language 4 (L4)						Ilonggo/ Hiligaynon									Tsonga
Language 5 (L5)						Maguindanaon									Tswana
Language 6 (L6)		L1, L2	X			Bicolano									Xhosa
Language 7 (L7)						Waray									
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>															
Yes			X ^N				X	X				X			
No	X	L1, L2			X	L1-L7			X	L1, L2	X		L1, L2	L2	L2-L6
Not applicable				X										L1	L1
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>															
Yes												X ^{TW}	L1 ^{UKR}		
No					X	L1-L7	X	X	X	L1, L2	X		L2	L2	L2-L6
Not applicable				X										L1	L1

^N In Q16a it was impossible to form mutually excluding categories in Norwegian

^{TW} The respondent's immediate family members may own their home or apartment but not live in it. We use the TSCS definition of 'your immediate family' instead of using ISSP definition and give the following instruction: ISSP definition: [[TN: 'your immediate family' in Q21ab refers to spouse [husband/wife], children or other members of the nuclear family]], TSCS definition: 'your immediate family' in Q21ab refers to spouse [husband/wife] or partner. Respondents only estimate the value of the home or apartment they live in and exclude the home or apartment they own but don't live in

^{UKR} Answer scales.

Survey context

	AR	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	F	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>																
Individual survey												X				X
Larger survey:																
- with ISSP at start		X					X			X						
- with ISSP in middle	X		X	X	X	X		X			X			X	X	
- with ISSP at end									X				X			

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PH	PO	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>															
Individual survey	X		X						X						
Larger survey:															
- with ISSP at start				X						X		X			
- with ISSP in middle					X		X	X			X		X	X	
- with ISSP at end		X				X									X

Question coverage and order

	AR	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	F	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order?</i>																
Yes	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No						X ^{CN}										
<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
No, not all included:																
- from module																
- background items	X ^{AR}				X ^{CL}											

^{CN} Some questions were omitted as they were asked in other modules.

^{AR} Q21a and Q21b: The 2009 survey was fielded at the same time than the 2010 survey, with different questionnaires, but almost the same background questions. Unfortunately, a big mistake was that these two questions were asked for the 2010 survey, instead of the 2009.

^{CL} Questions 21a and 21b from background variables were omitted. These questions presented problems detected during the re-test. They were a difficult task for respondents, generating confusion and a very large number of NA.

Question coverage and order (continued)

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PH	PO	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>Were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order?</i>															
Yes	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No					X ^{P1}										
<i>Were all the core ISSP items included?</i>															
Yes, all included		X						X	X		X	X	X	X	X
No, not all included:															
- from module	X ^J		X ^N	X ^{NZ1}		X ^{PH}	X ^{PO}								
- background items					X ^{P2}					X ^{SK}					

^{P1} Some of the ISSP questions are an integral part of the PGSS, and were left there.

^J Q9b was omitted, as for many Japanese it is difficult to understand the difference between 'the working class' and 'the middle class'.

^N Q16a was omitted, as it was impossible to translate into mutually exclusive categories.

^{NZ1} Occupation questions 15b, 16c, and 18b not included. Optional questions 24a, b and c and 25a, b and c not included.

^{PH} Q18a, Q18b, Q20, Q21a, and Q21b were inadvertently missed.

^{PO} Q12e was inadvertently excluded.

^{P2} The ETHNIC variable was omitted as Polish society is very homogenous and asking about the ethnicity is likely to offend respondents.

^{SK} As the 2009 module was fielded together with the 2010 module, the background variables specification valid from 2010 onwards was used. As this specification does not include TYPORG variables for partner / spouse the construction of SPWRKTYP variable was not possible.

Sampling

	AR	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	F	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>																
...only adult citizens of country		X			X	X	X		X							X
...adults of any nationality	X		X	X				X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
<i>Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in...</i>																
...<u>private accommodation only</u>	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X
...<u>private & institutional accommodation</u>		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
17																
16																
15																

Sampling (continued)

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PH	PO	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>															
...only adult citizens of country	X					X		X	X	X		X			
...adults of any nationality		X	X	X	X		X				X		X	X	X
<i>Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in...</i>															
...private accommodation only	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
...private & institutional accommodation			X	X											
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>															
19			X												
18		X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
17									X						
16	X														
15															X

Sampling (continued)

	AR	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	F	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>																
Yes																
Age																
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Did you use any variables for stratification?</i>																
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X
No									X	X		X				
<i>How many stages does your sampling design have?</i>																
One stage		X														
Two stages								X	X			X	X			
Three stages	X		X	X	X		X			X				X	X	
Four or more stages						X					X					X

Sampling (continued)

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PH	PO	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	UKR	ZA
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>															
Yes															
Age		74	80						79						
No	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Did you use any variables for stratification?</i>															
Yes	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
No			X					X	X						
<i>How many stages does your sampling design have?</i>															
One stage			X						X						
Two stages	X			X						X	X				
Three stages		X			X		X	X				X			X
Four or more stages						X							X		

Sampling (continued)

	AR	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	F	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Does your sampling frame consist of...</i>																
Addresses			X						X	X		X		X		X
Households				X			X								X	
Named individuals (target persons)		X						X					X			
Named individuals (not the target persons)																
Areas	X					X				X	X					
Something else					X ^{CL}											
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>																
Kish grid				X	X	X	X				X			X	X	X
Birthday method	X		X						X	X		X				
Quota																
Other																
Not applicable		X						X					X			

^{CL} Use of census data; for urban areas: list of population by province, borough, district, zone and block; for rural areas: list of population by province, borough, district, locality and entity.

Sampling (continued)

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PH	PO	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>Does your sampling frame consist of...</i>															
Addresses							X						X	X	
Households		X						X					X		X
Named individuals (target persons)	X		X	X	X				X		X	X			
Named individuals (not the target persons)															
Areas						X				X			X		
Something else															
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>															
Kish grid						X								X	X
Birthday method		X					X	X		X					
Quota															
Other													X		
Not applicable	X		X	X	X				X		X	X			

Sampling (continued)

	AR	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	F	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>																
Yes					X ^{CL}			X ^D								
No	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PH	PO	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>															
Yes										X ^{SK}			X ^{UKR}		
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X

^{CL} Substitution of non contacts, refusals and sampling points.

^D Sample points in non-cooperating municipalities replaced with equivalent points prior to fieldwork.

^{SK} Substitution if respondent could not participate or did not want to, or if the interviewer was unable to establish contact with a selected household after four visits.

^{UKR} Substitution of PSUs (usually some villages) when there are serious transport problems.

Data collection

	AR	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	F	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?</i>																
Face-to-face	X ^{AR}		X	X	X	X	X	X ^b		X	X		X ^b	X	X	X
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)								X ^s	X				X ^s	X ^{GB}		
Self-completion by mail		X										X				
Telephone																
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>																
2 weeks or less																
Over 2 weeks < 1 month					X						X				X	
1 month < 2 mths			X							X						
2 months < 3 mths						X	X									
3 mths or more		X		X				X	X			X	X	X		X
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>																
2009			X ^{BG}	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X ^{IL}
2010		X ^{AUS}							X ^{DEN}	X						

^{AR} Note: Respondents were offered a blank questionnaire, in order to read questions at the same time the interviewer was reading them.

^b background variables

^s substantive variables

^{BG} 15.12.08 to 26.01.09

^{DEN} 14.09.09 to 11.01.10

^{IL} 15.09.09 to 15.02.10

^{GB} Background questions from CAPI, ISSP module on self-completion questionnaire.

^{AUS} 26.11.2009 to 28.02.2010

Data collection (continued)

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PH	PO	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?</i>															
Face-to-face		X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)	X														
Self-completion by mail			X ^{N1}	X					X						
Telephone															
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>															
2 weeks or less	X					X							X		
Over 2 weeks < 1 month		X													
1 month < 2 mths					X					X					X
2 months < 3 mths			X					X	X		X	X			
3 mths or more				X			X							X	
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>															
2009	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
2010			X ^{N2}		X									X	

^{N1} Respondents offered option of completing questionnaire on-line.

^{N2} 16.10.2009 to 07.05.2010

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

	AR	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	FL	GB	H
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>													
Yes - postal components:													
- advance letter			X				X				X	X	
- reminder & thank you letters								X			X	X	
Yes - telephone components			X					X			X		
No	X ^{AR}	X		X	X	X			X	X			X
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>													
Yes:													
- to respondent			X		X		X					X	
- to interviewer					X	X							X
No	X	X		X				X	X	X	X		
<i>Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?</i>													
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
No								X					

^{AR} Note: If no one answered when interviewers rang, or if the selected respondent was not at home, a letter with a description of the aims of the project was left.

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

	IL	J	LV	P	PH	PO	ROK	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>													
Yes - postal components:													
- advance letter		X		X		X			X	X		X	
- reminder & thank you letters													
Yes - telephone components					X	X	X			X		X	
No	X		X					X			X		X
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>													
Yes:													
- to respondent		X				X	X			X		X	
- to interviewer		X		X			X	X	X		X		
No	X		X		X								X
<i>Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?</i>													
Yes	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X
No						X						X	

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

	AR	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	FL	GB	H
<i>Which of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address or household?</i>													
Call at different time of day			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Call on different days in week	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
None of these													
<i>Were a minimum number of calls required?</i>													
Yes:													
Minimum number of required calls	2	3	5	3	3	3	4	6	4	3	5	6	3
No													
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>													
Yes:													
Approximate proportion (%)				20	25	7						10	
No	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X		X

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

	IL	J	LV	P	PH	PO	ROK	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>Which of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address or household?</i>													
Call at different time of day	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Call on different days in week	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
None of these													
<i>Were a minimum number of calls required?</i>													
Yes:													
Minimum number of required calls	4	3	2	3	3	4	5	4	5	3	3		3
No												X ^{USA}	
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>													
Yes:													
Approximate proportion (%)					20	10	7			1		5	10
No	X	X	X	X				X	X		X		

^{USA} GSS makes many attempts to contact HUs, often more than 10, but there is no set minimum

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

	AR	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	FL	GB	H
<i>Were any interviews back-checked?</i>													
Yes:													
Approximate proportion (%)	20	10	20	60	20	40	100	10	10	25	60	10	10
No													

	IL	J	LV	P	PH	PO	ROK	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>Were any interviews back-checked?</i>													
Yes:													
Approximate proportion (%)	30	25	10	7	20	22	100	5	60	44	10	10	10
No													

Data collection: mail

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

^N Information letter with URL, Username and Password to the web questionnaire.

Data collection: mail (continued)

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

^{AUS} Reminder sent only to non-respondents

Information on response and outcome figures ⁺

	AR	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D ^p	DEN	E	ESP	F	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																
Issued sample (n)	4681	5002	2079	2640	1687	5250	2000	3169/1430	2700	4063	3600	10000	2383	2260	2287	1709
Ineligible (n)	810	327	421	151	4	143	14	360/125		147		562	107	199		84
Eligible (n)	3871	4675	1658	2489	1683	5107	1986	2809/1305	2700	3916	3600	9438	2276	2061	2287	1625
- refusal (n)	994	823	256	768	127	1571	521	1485/717	209	976	1196	6517	745	710	827	373
- non-contact (n)	1729	2297	178	204	50	382	75	196/71	914	1692	1052	104	109	118	102	174
- other unproductive (n)	15	30	224	283	1	127	185	163/72	59	203			307	102	348	32
- completed cases (n)	1133	1525	1000	1229	1505	3010	1205	956/439	1511	1005	1215	2817	1115	1130	1010	1046
- partially completed (n)				5		17		9/6	7	40	57			1		
Response Rate (%)	29.3	32.6	60.3	49.4	89.2	58.9	60.7	34.0/33.6	56.0	25.7	33.8	29.8	49.0	54.8	44.2	64.4

⁺ for calculation of response figures, see appendix, p. 42.

^D Western federal states followed by eastern federal states.

Information on response and outcome figures (continued)⁺

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PH	PO	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>															
Issued sample (n)	1800	2109	3500	2520	2800	2863	2770	2500	2000	1925	1800	4488	3987	2023	3500
Ineligible (n)	80	196	208	83	381		613	4	28	125	83	178	658	63	6
Eligible (n)	1720	1913	3292	2437	2419	2863	2157	2496	1972	1800	1717	4310	3329	1960	3494
- refusal (n)	207	479	20	88	410	949	823	351	168	536	358	635	346	233	142
- non-contact (n)	37	338	1783	1091	361		297	510	603	78	199	1374	806	105	45
- other unproductive(n)	180	27	25	53	385	623	37	36	64	27	95	275	165	41	2
- completed cases (n)	1296	1069	1456	935	1263	1200	1000	1599	1137	1159	1065	2026	2012	1581	3270
- partially completed (n)			8			91					4				35
Response Rate (%)	75.3	55.9	44.2	38.4	45.1	41.9	46.4	64.0	57.7	60.2	62.0	47.0	60.4	80.7	93.4

⁺ for calculation of response figures, see appendix, p. 42.

Data

	AR	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	F	FL	GB	H	IL
<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
No				X ^{CH}												
<i>Was the keying of the data verified?</i>																
Yes:																
Approximate proportion (%)	20	25	100		100	100			80	10			100	100	10	100
No				X ^{CH}			X	X			X	X				
<i>Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?</i>																
Yes		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
No									X							
No derived variables	X															X

^{CH} CAPI fielding means these questions do not apply.

Data (continued)

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PH	PO	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>Were any measures of coding reliability employed?</i>															
Yes		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No	X			X											
<i>Was the keying of the data verified?</i>															
Yes:															
Approximate proportion (%)	100		10			100	100	100	10			20			100
No		X		X	X					X	X		X	X ^{USA}	
<i>Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?</i>															
Yes	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X
No		X									X				
No derived variables										X					

^{USA} Not possible with CAPI

Data (continued)

	AR	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	F	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>																
- filters	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- logic or consistency	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
- ranges	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
<i>Were data errors corrected?</i>																
Yes:																
- individually	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
- automatically			X				X			X	X			X	X	
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

Data (continued)

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PH	PO	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>															
- filters	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- logic or consistency	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
- ranges	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Were data errors corrected?</i>															
Yes:															
- individually	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- automatically	X		X	X			X		X	X	X				X
No															
<i>Were the data weighted or post-stratified?</i>															
Yes					X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X
No	X	X	X	X				X	X		X				

Documentation

	AR	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CN	CZ	D	DEN	E	ESP	F	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Is a national methods report available for your study?</i>																
Yes		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
No	X						X							X		X

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PH	PO	ROK	S	SK	SLO	TW	UKR	USA	ZA
<i>Is a national methods report available for your study?</i>															
Yes			X			X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
No	X	X		X	X		X				X				X

Appendix

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
1	Argentina	The ISSP 2009 module was fielded with a survey on health services utilization and expenditures.
2	Australia	The ISSP 2009 module was fielded with the Australian Survey of Social Attitudes, General Attitudes
3	Bulgaria	The ISSP 2009 module was fielded together with the ISSP 2007 module Leisure Time and Sports, and a few more questions about sport, poverty, social exclusion, social stratification and national identity.
4	Chile	The ISSP 2009 module was carried out together with questions relating to Chilean political, economic and social attitudes.
5	China	The ISSP 2009 module was fielded with the Chinese General Social Survey (CGSS)
6	Czech Republic	Additional Czech specific questions on social inequality were attached at the end of the module.
7	Denmark	The ISSP module was fielded with a smaller addition. This addition was part of a project regarding social inequality. The title of the project is: <i>Social capital and underclass phenomena – understanding the link between inequality, ethnic divides and social trust</i> . The responsible scientist is Christian Albrekt Larsen, Centre for Comparative Welfare Studies, Denmark
8	Estonia	Study “Equality and inequality in Estonia”. In addition to ISSP module, in the study was included also a module related to educational inequality and social justice in Estonia. This part contained questions about the role of education in Estonian society and public perceptions and expectations to education. Furthermore, in addition to the ISSP questions on social inequality, there were a number of additional questions about inequality and social justice in Estonia.
9	Germany	ISSP 2009 was fielded with ALLBUS 2010 (30 years of ALLBUS: selection of best replications). See ALLBUS 2010 methods report.
10	Great Britain	ISSP 2009 was fielded as part of the British Social Attitudes Survey, 2009.

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
11	Flanders	The ISSP 2009 module was fielded together with the annual survey “Social-cultural changes in Flanders Belgium”. Apart from the classical background variables of respondent and partner, the face-to-face questionnaire contained following themes: module on contact with and the perception of Brussels, scale on individualism, social trust, membership different organisations, volunteer work, module on giving material and financial support; health condition, module with additional questions on social inequality, social network, use of internet and other media, module on politics with political efficacy scale, party preference, trust in government, contact with government; leisure time; well-being, expectations for the future.
12	Hungary	The ISSP Social Inequality 2009 questionnaire was asked as a part of the regular Omnibus survey of TARKI, November 2009.
13	Israel	The ISSP 2009 module was conducted together with the ISSP 2008 Religion module.
14	Latvia	The ISSP 2009 Social Inequality module was fielded along with the ISSP 2008 Religion module.
15	New Zealand	Some additional questions about euthanasia and abortion in different circumstances were added to the questionnaire between the ISSP questions and the demographic questions.
16	Philippines	The ISSP 2009 module was fielded with questions on Civil Society Index, Membership in Organizations, Electoral Preferences, Election Automation, Awareness and Trust Rating of Countries and Personalities, Philippines Movies, and Drug Prices.
17	Poland	The ISSP was fielded with the Polish General Social Survey (PGSS) 2010.
18	Portugal	The ISSP 2009 Social Inequality module was fielded along with the ISSP 2008 Religion module.
19	Slovenia	The ISSP 2009 Social Inequality module was fielded with the ISSP 2008 Religion module and a General National Social Survey with an accent on perception of social and economic conditions, values, political attitudes, and some behavioural variables (e.g., social and political participation).
20	Slovak Republic	The ISSP modules 2009 and 2010 were fielded together. The modules appeared in the questionnaire in the following order: ISSP 2009 and ISSP 2010 questions. Some country specific questions were added.
21	South Africa	Survey was fielded as part of the South African Social Attitude Survey (SASAS) which consisted of two questionnaires. The ISSP module was fielded in Questionnaire 1. Other topics in the questionnaire were: Democracy and governance, national identity and pride, intergroup relations, education, moral issues, public participation, personal well-being.

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
22	South Korea	Three topical modules - the '2009 ISSP 'Social Inequality IV' and the 2009 Special Topical module 'Equity and Inequality in Korea' and the 2009 Special Topical module 'Mental Health and Suicide in Korea' - were fielded as part of the 2009 KGSS (Korean General Social Survey).
23	Spain	The ISSP 2009 module was run as part of the monthly national survey run by ASEP since 1986 on Public Opinion of Spaniards.
24	Switzerland	The ISSP 2009 Social Inequality module was fielded together with the ISSP 2008 Religion module and another module in the MOSAiCH 2009 survey.
25	Taiwan	The ISSP 2009 module was fielded with Taiwan Social Change Survey 2009 (Q1: Social Inequality). Other survey topics include "family and neighbourhood effects" and "inequality in health".
26	Ukraine	Questions on politics (voting preferences), corruption, organization of Ukrainian nationalists, happiness and real estate acquirement preferences were also asked.
27	USA	The ISSP 2009 module was fielded as part of the biennial General Social Survey.

Calculation of Response Figures Based on Reported Figures

Report Category	Face-to-Face Questionnaire Category	Mail Questionnaire Category
Issued sample (n)	Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)	Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)
Ineligible (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addresses which could not be traced at all/ selected respondents who could not be traced - Addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addresses which could not be traced - Addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings - Details of address wrong (street numbers, post codes, etc.) - Addresses with no letter boxes - Selected respondent unknown at address - Selected respondent moved, no forwarding address - Selected respondent deceased
Eligible (n)	Issued sample minus Ineligible	Issued sample minus Ineligible
Refusal (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Personal refusal at selected address - Proxy refusal (on behalf of selected respondent) - Other refusal at selected address 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Refusal by selected respondent - Refusal by another person - Implicit refusals (empty envelopes, empty questionnaires returned)
Non-contact (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No contact at selected address - No contact with selected person 	No contact
Other unproductive (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate - Selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey - Selected respondent away during survey period - Other type of unproductive reaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate - Selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey - Selected respondent away during survey period - Other type of unproductive reaction
Completed cases (n)	Full productive interview	Completed returned questionnaires (net sample size)
Partially completed (n)	Partial productive interview	Partially completed returned questionnaires

