

International Social Survey Programme

ISSP 2016 - Role of Government V

Study Monitoring Report

Lausanne, September 2018

Dominique Joye & Marlène Sapin (ed.)

Swiss Center of Expertise in the Social Sciences - FORS
University of Lausanne
Bâtiment Géopolis
CH-1015 Lausanne
Switzerland

issp@fors.unil.ch

Contents

Introduction	<u>3</u>
Monitoring Findings Chart	<u>4</u>
Appendix I: Information about other studies the ISSP was fielded with	<u>23</u>
Appendix II: Description of the stratification variables used	<u>24</u>
Appendix III: Description of the sampling frame	<u>25</u>
Calculation of Response Figures Based on Reported Figures	<u>26</u>

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 2016 Role of Government module. Thirty-five 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

For

Australia (AU)	New Zealand (NZ)
Belgium (BE)	Norway (NO)
Chile (CL)	Philippines (PH)
Croatia (HR)	Russia (RU)
Czech Republic (CZ)	Slovakia (SK)
Denmark (DK)	Slovenia (SI)
Finland (FI)	South Africa (ZA)
France (FR)	South Korea (KR)
Georgia (GE)	Spain (ES)
Germany (DE)	Suriname (SR)
Great Britain (GB)	Sweden (SE)
Hungary (HU)	Switzerland (CH)
Iceland (IS)	Taiwan (TW)
India (IN)	Thailand (TH)
Israel (IL)	Turkey (TR)
Japan (JP)	United States (US)
Latvia (LV)	Venezuela (VE)
Lithuania (LT)	

Language(s) and translation

	AU	BE	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR	GE	DE	GB	HU	IS	IN	IL	JP	LV
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	English	Dutch	Spanish	Croatian	Czech	Danish	Finnish	French	Georgian	German	English	Hungarian	Icelandic	Hindi	Hebrew ^{IL}	Japanese	Latvian
Language 2 (L2)		French					Swedish		Russian				English	Marathi	Arabic		Russian
Language 3 (L3)		English ^{BE_1}												Gujarati	Russian		
Language 4 (L4)														Bengali			
Language 5 (L5)														Oriya			
Language 6 (L6)														Telugu			
Language 7 (L7)														Tamil			
Language 8 (L8)														Malayalam			
Language 9 (L9)														Kannada			
Language 10 (L10)														Assamese			
Language 11 (L11)														Punjabi			
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>																	
Yes, translated:																	
- by member(s) of research team		L1-L2	X	X	X	X	L1-L2	X	L1-L2			X	L1		L1	X	L1-L2
- by translation bureau		L1-L2					L1-L2			X				L1-L11	L2-L3	X	
- by specially trained translator(s)																	
- other											X						
No, not translated	X	L3															
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>																	
Yes:																	
- group discussion			X	X	X	X	L1-L2	X	L1-L2	X			L1		L1	X	L1-L2
- expert checked it		L1-L2 ^{BE_2}					L1-L2			X		X			L3	X	
- back translation				X					L1-L2					L1-L11			
- other		L1-L2															
No															L2		
Not applicable	X	L3									X						
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested</i>																	
Yes		L1-L2	X		X				L1-L2	X			L1	X	L1		
No				X		X	L1-L2	X				X				X	L1-L2
Not applicable	X	L3									X						
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>																	
Yes																	
No		L1-L2	X	X	X	X	L1-L2	X	L1-L2	X		X	L1	X	L1	X	L1-L2
Not applicable	X	L3									X						

^{BE_1} Available language in web module; paper questionnaire upon request

^{BE_2} Dutch: First phase: expert check within institute Flanders (Belgium). Second phase: - The ISSP module 2016 was independently translated by the institute in Flanders (Belgium) and the Netherlands. Both translations were compared to each, differences were cleared out and final decisions were taken although respecting "local" differences in use of language. French: First phase: expert check within institute Wallonia (Belgium). Second phase: The ISSP module 2016 was independently translated by the institute in Wallonia (Belgium) and France. Both translations were compared to each other, differences were cleared out and final decisions were taken although respecting "local" differences in use of language.

^{IL} The most common language of interview was Hebrew, therefore the following questions will refer to Hebrew.

Language(s) and translation (continued)

	LT	NZ	NO	PH	RU	SK	SI	ZA	KR	ES	SR	SE	CH	TW	TH	TR	US ^{US}	VE
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																		
Language 1 (L1)	Lithuanian	English	Norwegian	Filipino	Russian	Slovak	Slovenian	English	Korean	Spanish	Dutch ^{SR_1}	Swedish	German ^{CH_1}	Chinese	Thai	Turkish	English	Spanish
Language 2 (L2)				Bicol				Afrikaans					French					
Language 3 (L3)				Cebuano				Zulu					Italian					
Language 4 (L4)				Hiligaynon				Tsonga										
Language 5 (L5)				Iluko				Tswana										
Language 6 (L6)				Maranao				Xhosa										
Language 7 (L7)								Venda										
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>																		
Yes, translated:																		
- by member(s) of research team	X		X	L1-L6	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	L1-L3	X	X	X		
- by translation bureau																		
- by specially trained translator(s)								L2-L7					L1-L3				L2	X
- other											X ^{SR_2}							
No, not translated		X						L1									L1	
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>																		
Yes:																		
- group discussion	X		X	L1-L6		X	X		X	X ^{ES}	X ^{SR_3}	X	L1-L3	X		X	L2	X
- expert checked it					X			L2-L7					L1-L3	X		X	L2	
- back translation															X			
- other													L1-L3 ^{CH_2}					
No								L1										
Not applicable		X															L1	
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested</i>																		
Yes				L1-L6					X				L1-L3	X	X	X		X
No	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X					L2	
Not applicable		X															L1	
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>																		
Yes			X ^{NO}															
No	X			L1-L6	X	X	X	L2-L7	X	X	X	X	L1-L3	X	X	X	L2	X
Not applicable		X						L1									L1	

^{NO} Words or concepts: Category 3 in Q 8a,b,c

^{ES} Only the new questions

^{SR_1} Occasionally questions were translated in native or foreign languages by the interviewer.

^{SR_2} Members of the ISSP in NL and BE

^{SR_3} Two independent translations and compared them in groups discussions

^{CH_1} The German questionnaire mostly is translated on the fly to Swiss-German by the interviewer, a non-written but widely used dialect in oral situations.

^{CH_2} Translation by two professional translators, then comparison between the two versions in a group discussion and adjudication of best translation by a reviewer of the team. The three language versions are then compared and some adjustments made.

^{US} The target sample is those speaking English or Spanish. Those not speaking these languages are ineligible.

Survey Context

	AU	BE	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR	GE	DE	GB	HU	IS	IN	IL	JP	LV
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>																	
Individual survey		X				X	X	X	X							X	
Larger survey																	
- with ISSP at start	X			X	X							X	X	X			
- with ISSP in middle			X														X
- with ISSP at end										X	X						

Question Coverage and Order

	AU	BE	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR	GE	DE	GB	HU	IS	IN	IL	JP	LV
<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	X	
No																	
<i>Were all the core ISSP items included?</i>																	
Yes, all included	X	X ^{BE}	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X
No, not all included:																	
- from module						X ^{DK}							X ^{IS}				
- background items											X ^{GB}						

^{BE} Problem of question format for some cases on Q9a and Q9b

^{DK} There is no BIRTH variable. We are unable to provide information about the respondent's birth year or precise age due to a change in the procedures of the Danish Data Protection Agency.

^{GB} Various background variable questions are missing. BSA has been running since 1983 and therefore question consistency is of paramount importance, in order to be able to reliably compare data across years. The way background questions are asked on BSA sometimes differs to the ISSP standard. We are working to standardise BSA questions or produce derived variables, wherever possible.

^{IS} v17 Q6e "Government should spend money: military and defence". Iceland does not have an army. Therefore the question was not fielded.

Survey Context (Continued)

	LT	NZ	NO	PH	RU	SK	SI	ZA	KR	ES	SR	SE	CH	TW	TH	TR	US	VE
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>																		
Individual survey		X	X									X						
Larger survey																		
- with ISSP at start	X			X				X						X	X			X
- with ISSP in middle					X		X		X				X			X	X	
- with ISSP at end						X				X	X							

Question Coverage and Order (Continued)

	LT	NZ	NO	PH	RU	SK	SI	ZA	KR	ES	SR	SE	CH	TW	TH	TR	US	VE
<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	X
Yes, apart from omissions		X																
No														X ^{TW_1}				
<i>Were all the core ISSP items included?</i>																		
Yes, all included	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X			X	X		X
No, not all included:																		
- from module																		
- background items		X ^{NZ}						X ^{ZA}			X ^{SR}		X ^{CH}	X ^{TW_2}			X ^{US}	

^{NZ} Missing questions: PARTLIV, SPWRKHRS, SPWRKSUP, TOPBOT, HHTODD, F_BORN, M_BORN and SUBCASE. Opted not to ask these questions.

^{ZA} Unfortunately FBorn and Mborn was omitted. Reason why missing: Unfortunate accidental omission.

^{SR} Missing question: URBRURAL. Reason why missing: We thought it was a good idea to omit it. It is irrelevant in the Surinamese context.

^{CH} CH_ETHN1/CH_ETHN2 WAS NOT ASKED. The concept of ethnic group is not significant in Switzerland. The Swiss society is founded on cultural and linguistic diversity. There is no official classification of ethnicity, and it is neither a debate nor a social reality in Switzerland.

^{TW_1} The order was changed in order to incorporate the question items from the TSCS module.

^{TW_2} 1. Variable PARTY_LR was not included in the questionnaire (This kind of party affiliation (left-right) does not fit for Taiwan's political situation.) 2. Some of cases are missing for variables Union, mainstat, spmainstat (The skip instruction in the questionnaire is not arranged properly).

^{US} Missing questions: TYPORG1, NSUP. Reason why missing: GSS questions are insufficient to answer NSUP, and TYPORG1 is part of a non-core module that was not asked in 2016.

Sampling

	AU	BE	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR	GE	DE	GB	HU	IS	IN	IL	JP	LV
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>																	
...only adult citizens of country	X		X	X		X			X					X	X		
...adults of any nationality		X			X		X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X
<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 ^{AU}					X							X			X ^{JP}	
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>																	
21																	
18	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
17																	
16																X	
15							X										
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>																	
Yes							X		X								X
Age							74		94								74
No	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	

^{AU} Sample was selected from the Australian electoral roll, and thus includes those who are institutional accommodation who are on the roll.

^{JP} Residential homes for the elderly and official residence are included.

Sampling (Continued)

	LT	NZ	NO	PH	RU	SK	SI	ZA	KR	ES	SR	SE	CH	TW	TH	TR	US	VE
<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				X	X
<i>Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in...</i>																		
...private accommodation only	X			X	X	X ^{SK}	X	X	X ^{KR}	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
...private & institutional accommodation		X ^{NZ}	X															
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>																		
21											X							
18	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
17																		
16								X										
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>																		
Yes			X								X	X						X
Age			79								74	79						74
No	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	

^{NZ} Includes residential rest homes

^{SK} In private accommodation respondents in households with a kitchen were approached.

^{KR} Approximately 98.8% of the adult population in South Korea live in private accommodations (Population and Housing Survey in Korea, 2010). Excluded from the survey are those residing in institutional arrangements, such as dorms, military quarters, work camps, nursing homes, long-term care facilities, and the like.

Sampling

	AU	BE	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR	GE	DE	GB	HU	IS	IN	IL	JP	LV
<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					X				
Other																	
<i>How many stages does your sampling design have?</i>																	
One stage	X	X				X	X						X				
Two stages								X		X		X				X	
Three stages			X	X													X
Four or more stages					X				X		X			X	X		
<i>Does your sampling frame consist of... **</i>																	
Addresses					X				X		X	X			X		
Households				X				X	X								X
Named individuals (target persons)	X	X				X	X		X	X			X	X		X	
Named individuals (not the target persons)																	
Areas			X														
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>																	
Kish grid			X								X	X			X		
Birthday method				X	X			X	X								
Quota																	
Other																	
Not applicable	X	X				X	X			X			X	X		X	X ^{LV}
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>																	
Yes					X ^{CZ}					X ^{DE}							
No	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X

* The variables used for stratification are described in APPENDIX II (on page 24)

** Supplementary information on the sampling frames can be found in APPENDIX III (on page 25)

^{CZ} Addresses without any private dwellings were excluded from the sample during the second stage of the sampling process. Any kind of substitution of non-response units was not permitted at any stage of the selection process.

^{DE} Before fieldwork started in 2016, 6 municipalities out of the selected 148 did not cooperate and did not deliver information. Thus these sample points had to be replaced by others with the same structural characteristics (same administrative district, same BIK region, and same type of community) prior to the fieldwork. Substitution of any individual case was not allowed during the fieldwork.

^{LV} Selection of the respondent by „the youngest male rule“

Sampling (Continued)

	LT	NZ	NO	PH	RU	SK	SI	ZA	KR	ES	SR	SE	CH	TW	TH	TR	US	VE
<i>Did you use any variables for stratification?</i>																		
Yes*	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X
No			X						X			X			X			
Other																		
<i>How many stages does your sampling design have?</i>																		
One stage			X									X	X					
Two stages		X		X		X	X			X								
Three stages								X	X		X			X		X		X
Four or more stages	X				X										X		X	
<i>Does your sampling frame consist of...*</i>																		
Addresses	X				X					X	X				X	X	X	
Households								X	X								X	
Named individuals (target persons)		X	X				X			X		X	X	X	X			
Named individuals (not the target persons)																		
Areas				X		X												X
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>																		
Kish grid				X				X								X	X	X
Birthday method	X				X	X			X									
Quota																		
Other											X ^{SR_1}							
Not applicable		X	X				X			X		X	X	X	X			
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>																		
Yes				X ^{PH}	X ^{RU}						X ^{SR_2}							
No	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X

* The variables used for stratification are described in APPENDIX II (on page 24)

** Supplementary information on the sampling frames can be found in APPENDIX III (on page 25)

^{PH} Substitute or replacement barangays (PSUs in NCR and SSUs in non-NCR) were selected during the sampling. Up to three replacement/substitute barangays were sampled for each city/municipality level (SSU in non-NCR). Substitution or replacement is done prior to the fieldwork, and is only allowed in the following conditions: 1) barangay is high security risk (presence of armed conflict); 2) barangay is too remote; 3) barangay can only be reached by special transportation, i.e., helicopter. No substitution or replacement of barangay was made for the 2016 survey module.

^{RU} Replacement is permitted at the first stage of the selection PSU within the same stratum in exceptional cases.

^{SR_1} First birthday after a random month

^{SR_2} Only if the address was empty or did not exist, the interviewer could go to the house next door.

Data Collection

	AU	BE	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR	GE	DE	GB	HU	IS	IN	IL	JP	LV
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?</i>																	
Face-to-face			X	X	X				X			X		X	X		X
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)																X	
Self-completion by mail	X							X									
Mixed mode		X ^{BE}				X ^{DK}	X ^{FI}			X ^{DE}	X ^{GB}		X ^{IS}				
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>																	
2 weeks or less												X				X	
Over 2 weeks < 1 month			X														X
1 month < 2 mths				X	X	X			X					X			
2 months < 3 mths																	
3 mths or more	X	X					X	X		X	X		X		X		
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>																	
2015					X										X		
2016	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
2017	X	X		X									X				
2018		X												X			

^{BE} web/postal self-completion

^{DK} Initially letters were sent to the respondents, then follow up phone call for the non-respond respondents, which were followed up by email request.

^{FI} Returned questionnaires 1186: mail 517, online 669

^{DE} ISSP substantive questions asked CASI; some ISSP BV are taken from ALLBUS and asked face-to-face, some ISSP BV are part of the ISSP interview.

^{GB} The ISSP was fielded as part of the 2016 British Social Attitudes (BSA) survey. The BSA is formed of a Computer-assisted face-to-face interview by an interviewer and a self-completion questionnaire, introduced to the participant at the end of the face to face interview. The ISSP substantive questions were fielded on the self-completion part of the survey. Background questions were fielded on the face-to-face part of the survey.

^{IS} Mail and websurvey. Respondents were initially asked to answer via email and were sent a printed copy of the questionnaire if they failed to respond online.

Data Collection (Continued)

	LT	NZ	NO	PH	RU	SK	SI	ZA	KR	ES	SR	SE	CH	TW	TH	TR	US	VE
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?</i>																		
Face-to-face	X			X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)																		
Self-completion by mail												X						
Mixed mode		X ^{NZ}	X ^{NO}						X ^{KR}									
Other											X ^{SR}							
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>																		
2 weeks or less				X	X													
Over 2 weeks < 1 month																		X
1 month < 2 mths	X		X			X									X			
2 months < 3 mths										X		X				X		
3 mths or more		X					X	X	X		X		X	X			X	
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>																		
2015							X											
2016	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X			X	X
2017								X					X		X	X		
2018											X							

^{NZ} Respondents had the option of using their survey code (provided on an information letter) to fill out the survey online. This was identical to the postal survey.

^{NO} part mail, part online

^{KR} Part self-completion, part face-to-face

^{SR} Mainly face-to-face interviews and partly leave-behind (drop off)

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

	CL	HR	CZ	GE	DE	GB	HU	IL	IN	JP	LV	LT	PH	RU	SK	SI	ZA	KR	ES	SR	CH	TW	TH	TR	US	VE
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>																										
Yes - postal components:			X ^{CZ}																							
- advance letter					X ^{DE}	X ^{GB}				X ^{JP}						X ^{SI}			X ^{ES}		X ^{CH}	X ^{TW}			X ^{US}	
- reminder & thank you letters																					X					
Yes - telephone components													X ^{PH}			X			X		X ^{SR}		X			X
No	X	X		X			X	X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X					X	X		X
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>																										
Yes:																										
- to respondent			X		X	X				X	X			X				X				X	X	X		X
- to interviewer	X		X	X			X			X					X			X								
No		X						X	X			X	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	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
No									X								X								X	

^{CZ} Advance contact letters provided brief information about the survey and the future visit of the interviewer.

^{DE} Respondents were informed about survey in advance letter.

^{GB} Advance letters were sent to selected addresses about one week before the start of fieldwork, informing them that an interviewer would be calling at their address.

^{JP} Introductory postcards are sent to every respondent a week before the fielding.

^{PH} For interview validation. Interviews were either validated in person by the supervisors or backchecked through a phone call from the supervisors.

^{SI} FSUs are named individuals. Letters were sent to inform them on the survey background and relevance. Experience shows that the letter facilitates interviewer contact. - Interviewers called some respondents to make the appointments.

^{ES} An advance letter was sent to all individuals included in the sample, describing the survey. It also contained a toll-free number to provide information about the survey for those interested.

^{SR} Double checking of questionnaires. For clarification and data check by the investigator.

^{CH} POSTAL: All sample units received an advance letter with an information flyer. A second letter was used to announce the eventual refusal conversion or a re-contact by telephone. TELEPHONE: If no contact could be established after 5 face-to-face contact attempts, all sample units with fixed-line telephone number were contacted by telephone to fix an appointment for the face-to-face interview.

^{TW} We sent postal cards to all sampled individuals for advanced contacts. About 30% of all respondents were contacted by phone for clarifying certain items in the questionnaires by research assistants of the project.

^{US} All households were sent an initial letter. Some households received interim mailings to explain the survey or make contact. Some households received phone calls to make contact, gain cooperation, schedule an interview, or, in a few cases, conduct an interview.

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

	CL	HR	CZ	GE	DE	GB	HU	IL	IN	JP	LV	LT	PH	RU	SK	SI	ZA	KR	ES	SR	CH	TW	TH	TR	US	VE
<i>Which of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address or household?</i>																										
Call at different times of day	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Call on different days in week	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
None of these									X						X											
<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	X	X	X	X		X	X
Minimum number of required calls	5	5	4	3	4	6	3	4	3	3	2		3	1	4	5	3	10	4	7	5	3		3		3
No												X											X		X	
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>																										
Yes:	X		X			X			X				X				X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X
Approximate proportion (%)	29		1			5			10				20				20	10		1		1	10	15	5	30
No		X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X			X		X					
<i>Were any interviews back checked?</i>																										
Yes:	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X ^{LV}	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^{ES}	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Approximate proportion (%)	62	20	33	10	100	10	20	30		40	13	10	20	15	10	50	20	100	8	10	20	31	100	35	10	30
No									X																	

^{LV} Interviews were carried out on Tablet PC with built-in GPS signal that allowed controlling the coordinates of carried out interviews. This was an additional way of supervising the work of interviewers and quality of survey in general.

^{ES} 100% back-checked through verification (by phone) when sex or age written in questionnaire by interviewer did not match the information provided in the sample by the National Statistics Institute, and there were also some interviews that were randomly selected to be back-checked.

Data Collection: Mail

	AU	BE	DK	FI	FR	IS	NZ	NO	SE
<i>Were any contacts made by telephone or interviewer?</i>									
Yes:									
- precontacts by telephone					X ^{FR}				
- reminders by telephone			X		X	X ^{IS,1}			
- other									
No	X	X		X			X	X	
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>									
Yes		X	X	X ^{FI}		X ^{IS,2}	X	X	
No	X				X				X

^{FI} Incentives: two gift vouchers (300 euro each) was raffled among all respondents. That was told to all respondents in all advance letters.

^{FR} Double telephone campaign (one outreach before sending the questionnaire, and one reminder before the last mailing). A reminder letter (with the questionnaire) is sent to all households which have not returned the questionnaire (up to 3 reminders).

^{IS,1} Telephone calls were made to those that hadn't answered the questionnaire and they reminded of the survey and encouraged to answer. Email addresses were collected and added to the online survey. Respondents who provided email addresses received reminders regarding the survey if they failed to complete the survey.

^{IS,2} The letter included information stating that five participants would be drawn to receive gift cards.

Data Collection: Mail

	AU	BE	DK	FI	FR	IS	NZ	NO	SE
<i>What was sent out in the first mailing?</i>									
Questionnaire	X		X		X		X		
Data protection information	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Explanatory letter	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Incentive			X			X	X		
Other material						X ^{IS_1}			
<i>What was sent out in the second mailing?</i>									
Thank you and reminder combined						X		X	
Reminder sent only to non-respondents	X	X	X	X	X		X		
Questionnaire			X	X	X				X
Data protection information		X	X	X	X	X			X
Explanatory letter		X	X	X	X	X			
Incentive			X			X	X		
Other material						X ^{IS_1}			
No second mailing									
<i>What was sent out in the third mailing?</i>									
Questionnaire	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Data protection information	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Explanatory letter	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Incentive						X	X		
Other material						X ^{IS_2}	X ^{NZ}		
No third mailing			X						
<i>What was sent out in the fourth (or last) mailing?</i>									
Questionnaire	X			X	X			X	X
Data protection information	X			X	X			X	X
Explanatory letter	X	X		X	X			X	
Reminder only to non-respondents									
Incentive		X							
Other material									
No fourth mailing			X			X	X		

^{IS_1} Username and password to complete the survey online

^{IS_2} Mailing 3 was a telephone reminder to collect email addresses

^{NZ} Ballpoint pen

Information on Response and Outcome Figures *

	AU	BE	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR	GE	DE	GB	HU	IS	IN	IL ^{IL}	JP	LV
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																	
Issued sample (n)	5000	7500	1872	3631	2431	2500	2500	6000	1942	5346	4697	2570	3000	8269	1414	2400	6846
Ineligible (n)	329	83	0	112	0	0	10	766	18	336	451	316	150	577	25	26	925
Eligible (n)	4671	7417	1872	3519	2431	2500	2490	5234	1924	5010	4246	2254	2850	7692	1389	2374	5921
- refusal (n)	3404	60	289	1689	797	344	9	0	108	2360	2089	932	406	2034	215	329	1308
- non-contact (n)	0	5227	155	797	187	445	1291	3616	194	519	305	212	1085	3460	132	151	3392
- other unproductive (n)	0	178	12	7	47	573	4	117	135	442	289	110	37	690	17	283	219
Interviews(n)	1267	1952	1416	1026	1400	1138	1186	1501	1487	1689	1563	1000	1322	1508	1025	1611	1002
Response Rate (%)	27.1	26.3	75.6	29.2	57.6	45.5	47.6	28.7	77.3	33.7	36.8	44.4	46.4	19.6	73.8	67.9	16.9

*For calculation of response figures, see appendix IV, p. 26

^{IL} These figures pertain to interviews in Jewish and Mixed (Jewish-Arab) communities. In the case of additional 223 interviews conducted in small Arab communities sampling lists are less systematic and we cannot calculate response rates.

Information on Response and Outcome Figures *

	LT	NZ	NO	PH	RU	SK	SI	ZA	KR	ES	SR	SE	CH	TW	TH	TR	US	VE
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																		
Issued sample (n)	4230	4075	4400	3138	6818	1904	1800	3500	2241	3000	1904	2997	2603	4070	2400	3440	3357	1200
Ineligible (n)	36	0	383	0	132	0	126	27	19	117	25	61	15	148	150	334	891	106
Eligible (n)	4194	4075	4017	3138	6686	1904	1674	3473	2222	2883	1879	2936	2588	3922	2250	3106	2267	1094
- refusal (n)	1055	342	43	239	2554	479	437	362	576	450	308	17	998	1055	306	1115	733	11
- non-contact (n)	2087	2353	2597	505	2444	275	114	37	251	388	219	1745	151	570	350	336	48	36
- other unproductive (n)	46	30	117	1194	112	0	99	11	344	211	79	34	373	331	119	120	96	2
Interviews(n)	1006	1350	1260	1200	1576	1150	1024	3063	1051	1834	1273	1140	1066	1966	1475	1535	1390	1045
Response Rate (%)	24.0	33.1	31.4	38.2	23.6	60.4	61.2	88.2	47.3	63.6	67.7	38.8	41.2	50.1	65.6	49.4	61.3	95.5

*For calculation of response figures, see appendix IV, p. 26

Data

	AU	BE	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR	GE	DE	GB	HU	IS	IN	IL	JP	LV	LT	NZ	NO	PH	RU	SK	SI	ZA	KR	ES	SR	SE	CH	TW	TH	TR	US	VE
Were any measures of coding reliability employed?																																			
Yes			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No	X	X				X						X	X		X				X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X							
Was the keying of the data verified?																																			
Yes:		X	X	X	X		X		X		X			X	X	X				X	X			X	X	X					NAP	X	X	X	X
Approximate proportion (%)		50	100	30	25		1		15		100			10	100	100				5	100			100	100	100					4	100	20		50
No	X					X		X		X		X	X				X	X	X			X	X					X						X	
Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?																																			
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No									X						X		X						X		X										
No derived variables															X		X						X		X			X							X
Data checks/edits on:																																			
- filters	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- logic or consistency	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- ranges	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
None																																			
Were data errors corrected?																																			
Yes:																																			
- individually	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- automatically	X						X					X				X	X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X					
No																																			
Were the data weighted or post-stratified?																																			
Yes	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X			X		X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X			X	X
No				X						X			X		X	X		X		X				X					X	X		X	X		
Other																																			

Documentation

	AU	BE	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR	GE	DE	GB	HU	IS	IN	IL	JP	LV	LT	NZ	NO	PH	RU	SK	SI	ZA	KR	ES	SR	SE	CH	TW	TH	TR	US	VE
Is a national methods report available for your study?																																			
Yes		X	X			X				X	X			X				X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
No	X			X	X		X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X			X					X										

Appendix I

Information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).

Australia (AU)	Part of the Australian Survey of Social Attitudes 2016. Other topic areas: Overseas aid and government; IVF Technology and Sex Selection; Religion and society; Prime Ministers; Aboriginality; Government websites; Digital disruption; Youth and government; Ageing; Insurance; Personal background (ISSP and other background variables); Optional feedback.
Chile (CL)	The module was carried out along with questions about Chilean political, economic and social attitudes.
Croatia (HR)	The 2016 and 2017 ISSP modules were fielded together.
Czech Republic (CZ)	ISSP module was part of the bigger academic survey. It contained additional questions focusing on political attitudes like political legitimacy, trust, efficacy, political education and security. However, ISSP module was the main part of the survey.
Germany (DE)	ALLBUS 2016 (Allgemeine Bevölkerungsumfrage der Sozialwissenschaften); main topic: family and gender roles; attitudes towards ethnic groups
Great Britain (GB)	The ISSP was fielded as part of the 2016 British Social Attitudes (BSA) survey. The BSA is formed of a Computer-assisted face-to-face interview by an interviewer and a self-completion questionnaire, introduced to the participant at the end of the face-to-face interview. The ISSP was fielded on the self-completion part of the survey. Other topics on the 2016 BSA survey included attitudes towards: public spending, social welfare, politics, health, housing, education, trades unions, official statistics, the European Union, transport, retirement, pensions, incomes and attitudes towards transgender people.
Hungary (HU)	TARKI Omnibus 2016/04
Iceland (IS)	Questions regarding changes to Icelandic society (1 grid with 10 questions) were added. The questions were written by professors Sigrún Ólafsdóttir and Jón Gunnar Bernburg
Israel (IL)	The ISSP 2016 module was conducted together with the ISSP 2015 module 'Work orientation'.
Latvia (LV)	Two ISSP studies: Work Orientation IV and Role of Government.
Lithuania (LT)	"Role of Government". Parts of the survey: ISSP module "Role of Government" and "Social Welfare".
Philippines (PH)	The ISSP 2015 survey module was fielded along with the ISSP 2016 survey module. In addition, other survey modules were included: Hope and Optimism, Trust in Selected Countries, opinions on Philippine foreign relations and the West Philippine Sea.
Russia (RU)	Omnibus survey
Slovakia (SK)	ISSP Role of Government was fielded together with Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES) survey, Module 4. Some country specific questions were added.
Slovenia (SI)	The ISSP 2016 module was fielded together with: General national social survey (life satisfaction, trust, social and political orientations, political participation, social wellbeing, etc.); Another ISSP module (2015, Work Orientations); National module on attitudes about security
South Africa (ZA)	Other topics in the survey were: Attitudes to work and unemployment, ESS welfare attitudes; Views on poverty, homelessness and informal settlements; foreign policy and South Africa's global role, current affairs in South Africa, Smoking and Tobacco behaviour, Batho Pele and voting questions.
South Korea (KR)	Three topical modules: -the 2016 ISSP 'Role of Government' and - the 2016 EASS 'Family in East Asia' and -the 2016 special topical module were fielded as part of the 2016 KGSS (Korean General Social Survey).
Spain (ES)	The 2016 and 2015 ISSP modules were fielded together (in that order: first ISSP2016 and then 2015).
Suriname (SR)	Opinions on Social Issues in Suriname (ISSP 2016)
Switzerland (CH)	The ISSP 2016 was part of MOSAiCH 2017, which included both ISSP 2016 (Role of Government V) and 2017 (Social Network III) and a national module on political attitudes towards Switzerland and its institutions.
Taiwan (TW)	Taiwan Social Change Survey: 2016, Questionnaire II Citizen and Role of Government
Thailand (TH)	ISSP 2017: Social Networks III
Turkey (TR)	We had a number of additional questions at the beginning and at the end of the ISSP module
United States (US)	General Social Survey 2016
Venezuela (VE)	HOPE/OPTIMISM 2016

Appendix II

Description of the stratification variables used:

Australia (AU)	The sample was stratified by electorate
Chile (CL)	The country was stratified according to the percentage of population living in every region and then each region was stratified according to the percentage of population living in rural and urban within a region. This process was part of the first stage of the sample design.
Croatia (HR)	Stratified random multi-staged sample: level of settlements, level of household, level of individual. Two-way stratification: by 6 regions (defined as the traditional groups of counties) and 4 settlement sizes (defined by the number of residents). The size of each stratum is based on the proportion of the number of 18+ residents within the stratum in the total 18+ population.
Czech Republic (CZ)	NUTS2 and type of municipality
Finland (FI)	Implicit geographic stratification (systematic random sampling) variables: residence code, gender, 10 year age groups
Georgia (GE)	Type of settlement - urban and rural areas according to their size (small, medium and large).
Germany (DE)	Microstratification of municipalities; stratified according to federal states (Bundesländer) and smaller regional administrative districts (Regierungsbezirke); communities according to BIK regions and municipalities.
Great Britain (GB)	Region, Population density, % owner occupiers
Hungary (HU)	Region and type of settlement
India (IN)	Multiple levels of stratification used starting with Parliamentary Area> Assembly Segment>Polling Booth>Respondent. The final respondent selected randomly from the ECI rolls as explained in our detailed methodology note submitted to ISSP technical committee.
Israel (IL)	Socioeconomic characteristics of statistical area, geographic region of statistical area.
Japan (JP)	Region, size of community, and ratio of employed population in tertiary industry
Latvia (LV)	Age (18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74), gender (male, female), nationality (latvians, other nationality), region (Rīga, Pierīga, Vidzeme, Kurzeme, Zemgale, Latgale) and settlement type (Riga, cities and towns, rural areas). Cities, bigger towns and rural areas were used as separate stratum each.
Lithuania (LT)	Administrative unit. Settlement size.
New Zealand (NZ)	Age, Gender, Māori-descent, Auckland residence (whether or not the respondent lived in the Auckland region) Nine Strata: 1. Maori men 18-45; 2. Maori women 18-45; 3. Non-Maori men 18-30; 4. Non-Maori women Auckland 18-30; 5. Non-Maori women non-Auckland 31-45; 6. Non-Maori Auckland 31-45; 7. Non-Maori Non-Auckland 31-45; 8. Non-Maori 46+
Philippines (PH)	The Philippines is geographically divided into three (3) main island groups: Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao; the National Capital Region (NCR) is located in Luzon. Based on this geographical division, the Philippines is stratified into the four study areas: NCR, Balance of Luzon (areas in Luzon outside of NCR), Visayas and Mindanao. Each of the four study areas had a sample size of 300 adult respondents, for a total of 1,200 statistically representative adults aged 18 and above.
Russia (RU)	1) types of settlements; 2) urban/rural; 3) number of residents
Slovakia (SK)	200 primary sampling units were chosen from the register of municipalities of Slovakia with a probability matching taking into account the county population (8 counties = NUTS III) and community size (inhabitants of Slovakia over 18 years of age).
Slovenia (SI)	CEA (Cluster Enumeration Areas) as PSU on the first stage of sampling are stratified according to 12 statistical regions * 6 types of settlement
South Africa (ZA)	Province, geotype, race,
Spain (ES)	Municipalities were classified by: (1) 17 Spanish Regions (Comunidades Autónomas (CCAA) and (2) Size of Habitat (municipalities)
Suriname (SR)	13 geographical (sub-)districts
Switzerland (CH)	The gross sample has been retrieved by the SFSO, using a random procedure inside each of the 7 regions of Switzerland (NUTS 2). The regional stratification is proportional
Taiwan (TW)	The following variables are used to stratify the population frame into six levels of regions:(1) the proportion of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Forestry and Fishing employment as the total employment, (2) the proportion of industrial employment as the total employment, (3) the proportion of supervisors or professionals employment as the total employment, (4) the proportion of population between age15 and 64, (5) the proportion of population age 65 or older, (6) the proportion of population with bachelor's degree or higher levels of education, (7) population density , (8) population growth for the past 5 years
Turkey (TR)	Urban rural divide is used
United States (US)	Stratification is used in two ways. First, the sample frame is stratified by region, rural/urban, and certain demographics. This assures the representativeness of the sample points. Second, the weight includes a non-response component that adjusts for geography.
Venezuela (VE)	Implicit stratification by socio-economic level within states

Appendix III

Description of the sampling frame (e.g., population register, electoral roll, telephone directory and its coverage and updating).

1	Australia (AU)	Australian Electoral Roll
2	Belgium (BE)	Statistics Flanders is authorized to use the National Register. The register contains information about gender, age, nationality, name, address of target person, name of partner and household composition. Gender and age are used to check whether the correct person answered the questions.
3	Chile (CL)	The sampling frame is the population by region, province, municipality, district, locality and blocks (entities) in urban (rural) areas. This listing was prepared using the most reliable digital information at hand to date, i.e. the 2002 Census data.
4	Croatia (HR)	List of settlements derived from Census 2011. Stratified random multi-staged sample: level of settlements, level of households, level of individual.
5	Czech Republic (CZ)	RUIAN (Territorial Identification Register of Buildings and Addresses), updated to March 2016. It's a database which covers all streets and buildings within the streets in the localities of the Czech Republic. Locations with less than 200 inhabitants are excluded (only 1,7 % of inhabitants of the CR). We used data (about population 18+) from a 2011 census (Sčítání lidu, domů a bytů 2011) for sampling of PSU's (Primary Sampling Units).
6	Denmark (DK)	Population register
7	Finland (FI)	Population register variables
8	France (FR)	Mailing list provided by a private operator (this list is regularly updated and it has a wider coverage than the national census, which we are not allowed to use in France unless we ask for a special administrative authorization).
9	Georgia (GE)	The frame of areas - General Population Census from 2014 by National Department for Statistics (GeoStat).
10	Germany (DE)	Local population registers of inhabitants of communities. Updated continuously.
11	Great Britain (GB)	The sampling frame is the Postcode Address File (PAF), a list of addresses (or postal delivery points) compiled by the Post Office.
12	Hungary (HU)	We use random walking. The underlying idea of this method is that fieldworkers do not receive names and addresses, but a starting point and a route in all sample localities and a standardised procedure to select the individuals to be asked in the selected household.
13	Iceland (IS)	Population register (The National Registry)
14	India (IN)	Electoral roll of Election Commission of India. Geographic Coverage is 100%. Demographic coverage is 100%. Updated every year by ECI.
15	Israel (IL)	Population Registry mapped on to statistical areas.
16	Japan (JP)	Sampling frame: Basic Resident Register; Coverage: Residents of Japan; Updating: Once a month-once a year (varies depending on cities/wards/towns/villages).
17	Latvia (LV)	Register of Addresses (Households) obtained from the State Land Services.
18	Lithuania (LT)	Address register. The register is renewed two times a month.
19	New Zealand (NZ)	2015 electoral roll
20	Norway (NO)	The Central Register of Persons
21	Philippines (PH)	The sampling frame was designed using population data based on the 2010 Census of Population and Housing (2010 CPH) conducted by the National Statistics Office (NSO) [now under the Philippine Statistics Authority]. The target population for the survey is the non-institutionalized adult population aged 18 years old and above currently residing in the Philippines. No exclusions were done.
22	Russia (RU)	Electoral districts
23	Slovakia (SK)	Random route procedure was used.
24	Slovenia (SI)	Central Register of Population (a list of names and addresses being constantly updated by public administration) is used as a sampling frame.
25	South Africa (ZA)	Small Area Layer Framework
26	South Korea (KR)	Residential Household Registers created by our Center's own group of independent samplers
27	Spain (ES)	Most recent official data from the POPULATION REGISTER (January 2013). Sample was provided by the National Statistics Institute (www.ine.es)
28	Suriname (SR)	Complete list of addresses from the General Bureau of Statistics. For the Interior, this is replaced by family names.
29	Sweden (SE)	National population register
30	Switzerland (CH)	Individual based register sample of the Swiss Federal Statistical Office (SFSO), containing all residents of Switzerland. This complete population register is updated every three months.
31	Taiwan (TW)	Population register
32	Thailand (TH)	Population register, Electoral roll
33	Turkey (TR)	Population register of household addresses obtained from the Statistical Institute of Turkey (SIT).
34	United States (US)	The GSS is an area, probability sample that selects PSUs which are metro areas or non-metro counties, segments within those PSUs, households/addresses within those segments, and a randomly selected adults within the households. The areas (PSUs and segments) are selected based on US Census figures. The addresses are selected from a national list of residential addresses from the post office augmented by our own listings in mostly rural areas.
35	Venezuela (VE)	List of census blocks within census segments, which are groupings of approximately 200 dwellings for the whole country based on 2011 national census. The list of dwellings within the census blocks was emended just before the study.

Appendix IV: 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
Partially completed (n)	Partial productive interview	Partially completed returned questionnaires