Norway
ISSP 2018 – Religion IV
Technical Report

ISSP Technical Report

ISSP module

M1. This report describes the realisation of the ISSP module Religion IV in Norway

M2. The study was organised by

Gry Karlsen and Knut Kalgraff Skjåk

from the institute Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD)

M3. The fieldwork was conducted by Respons Analyse AS

M4. The survey was fielded from 22.02.2019 to 30.05.2019
(Please use the format dd.mm.yyyy)

Translation and adaptation

T1. The questionnaire was fielded with a written version in

Language	At least 2 independent translations	The following competencies were present in the team (check all that apply)
1. Norwegian	◉ Yes ○ No	☐ Language specialist ☒ Survey specialist ☐ Other
2.	○ Yes ○ No	☐ Language specialist ☐ Survey specialist ☐ Other
3.	○ Yes ○ No	☐ Language specialist ☐ Survey specialist ☐ Other
4.	○ Yes ○ No	☐ Language specialist ☐ Survey specialist ☐ Other
5.	○ Yes ○ No	☐ Language specialist ☐ Survey specialist ☐ Other
6.	○ Yes ○ No	☐ Language specialist ☐ Survey specialist ☐ Other
7.	○ Yes ○ No	☐ Language specialist ☐ Survey specialist ☐ Other
8.	○ Yes ○ No	☐ Language specialist ☐ Survey specialist ☐ Other

Language	At least 2 independent translations	The following competencies were present in the team (check all that apply)
9.	◯ Yes ◯ No	☐ Language specialist ☐ Survey specialist ☐ Other
10.	◯ Yes ◯ No	☐ Language specialist ☐ Survey specialist ☐ Other
11.	◯ Yes ◯ No	☐ Language specialist ☐ Survey specialist ☐ Other
12.	◯ Yes ◯ No	☐ Language specialist ☐ Survey specialist ☐ Other
13.	◯ Yes ◯ No	☐ Language specialist ☐ Survey specialist ☐ Other
14.	◯ Yes ◯ No	☐ Language specialist ☐ Survey specialist ☐ Other

T2. And the questionnaire was fielded in the following languages without a written version

Does not apply

T3. The following questions, sections, words or concepts caused problems when translating in the following languages

Question: Q33b "people belonging to different religions cannot get along with each other when living close together"
Concepts: Q. 33B - “Living close together” refers to having a neighbor or living in the same small community.

We found this concept a bit difficult to translate, and would have appreciated a more thorough guideline. We ended up translating it into: "people belonging to different religions can not get along

T4. The translation problems were addressed with the following solutions

Group discussions

T5. The translated questionnaire was tested (please answer for the first language mentioned in T1.1)

☐ With a quantitative pretest on 0 individuals

☐ With a cognitive test on 0 individuals

Data collection

D1. The ISSP module was

- ◯ An individual survey compraising only the ISSP module
- ◉ Part of a larger survey

D1a. In the case of being fielded as part of a larger survey, the ISSP module was at the

- ◉ Start of the questionnaire
- ◯ Middle of the questionnaire
- ◯ End of the questionnaire
- ◯ Does not apply

D1b. The main characteristics of the other studies the ISSP was fielded with were

10 items on religion from Norwegian researchers (one of the items was the optional item 8a)

D2. Were all the questions of the ISSP module included or were questions modified or omitted:

- ◉ All required questions of the module were included
- ◯ Some questions of the module were missing
- ◯ Some questions of the module were modified
- ◯ Some questions of the module were modified and some were missing

The main reasons for omitting or modifying questions were as follows:

D3. Apart from omissions, the substantive questions in the module were

- ◉ All asked in the prescribed order
- ◯ Not asked in the prescribed order

D3a. In case of changes which was the order of questions and the reasons for changing the order

D4. Were all background variables included or were some missing or not compliant with the guidelines:

- (●) All required background questions were included and coded according to the guidelines
- ( ) Some background questions were missing
- ( ) Some background questions were not compliant with the guidelines
- ( ) Both: some background variables were missing and others were not compliant with the guidelines

The main reasons for omitting background variables or not compliant coding with the guidelines are:

D5. The data collection mode was:
(Please check all that apply but for the ISSP module only if part of a larger survey)

- [ ] Face-to-face, PAPI
- [ ] Face-to-face, CAPI
- [x] Self administered, Paper
- [ ] Self administered, Computer assisted CASI (without Internet)
- [x] Self administered, CAWI (Computer on Internet)
- [ ] Web questionnaire, all devices except CAWI only
- [ ] Telephone interview

D5a. In case of PAPI or CAPI:

- ( ) No visuals (showcards)
- ( ) Visuals (showcards)
- (●) Does not apply

D6. What was the sequence of communications and contacts with the respondents, letters, personal contacts, emails, etc.? In which order?

1. 22.02.2019: information letter, including access information for web questionnaire, paper questionnaire and reply envelope
2. 01.03.2019: thank you letter and reminder combined
3. 20.03.2019: information letter, including access information for web questionnaire, paper questionnaire and reply envelope
4. 10.04.2019: information letter, including access information for web questionnaire, paper

D6a. If interviewers were involved in the process, they were paid:

- ○ Only according to the realised cases
- ○ Partly according to the realised cases
- ○ Salary based on time spent or monthly salary
- ◉ No interviewers were involved

D6b. And interviewers had to follow these rules (check all that apply):

- ☐ Calls/visits must be made at different times of the day
- ☐ Calls/visits must be made at different days of the week
- ☐ Calls/visits must be made during several weeks

D6c. The interviewers were asked to make at least [0] calls/visits before they stopped approaching an address or household.

D7. In total, if the mode was not face-to-face, the maximum number of letters or mails sent to respondents was [4]

D8. In the case of mail or web survey, in addition to mails, the respondents were contacted as follows:

- ☐ Precontacts by telephone
- ☐ Precontacts by personal visit
- ☐ Reminders by telephone
- ☐ Reminders by personal visit
- ☒ Other type of contacts

The respondents were informed in the first survey letter that they could choose to respond by web survey, and the access information for the web questionnaire was sent out in all mailings (refer to D6)

D9. Incentives were

- ○ Not offered to respondents
- ◉ Offered to respondents

D9a. If incentives were offered, they were (check all that apply):

- ☐ Given in advance, unconditionally prepaid incentives
- ☐ Given conditionally by the interviewer, at point of interview, promised before
- ☐ Given conditionally by the interviewer, at point of interview, not promised before
- ☒ Sent/given after the survey, conditionally postpaid incentives
- ☐ Other

D9b. If incentives were offered, they were (check all that apply):

- ☐ Cash
- ☐ Voucher
- ☐ Gift
- ☒ Lottery
- ☐ Other

D9c. The average value of incentives per respondent was [1500] [NOK]

D10. The fieldwork was monitored using contact forms, documenting each contact, or contact attempt, for each person in the sample

- ◯ On paper
- ◯ In electronic format
- ◯ A combination of paper and electronic forms
- ◉ No contact forms were used

D11. Approximatively 0 % of the interviews were back-checked.

D12. Please comment on any difficulty in the implementation or data collection

Coding and verifying

C1. The following checks were done (check all that apply):

- ☒ Any measure of coding reliability
- ☒ Data checked or edited for logic or consistency
- ☒ Control of data in the permitted range
- ☒ Control of duplicates
- ☒ Control of near-duplicates
- ☒ Check of coding of filtered variables
- ☐ Others

C1a. If others, which checks were done

C2. Which corrections were done?

- 9 duplicates on caseid were removed (2 sent in two complete paper questiona

Sampling

S1. The sample was designed to be representative of

- ◯ Only adult citizens of the country
- ◉ Adults of any nationality residing in the country

S2. The sample was designed to be representative of

- ◯ Only adults living in private households
- ◉ Adults living in private and institutional households (e.g. homes for the elderly, etc.)

S3. The lower age cut-off was [18] and the upper age cut-off was [79]
(999 meaning no upper age cut-off).

S4. The sample design excluded by design the following groups

S5. One or more stratification variables

- ◉ Were not used when drawing a smaple
- ◯ Were used when drawing a sample

S5a. The stratification variable(s) was/were built in the following way:

S6. The sampling frame was built on

- ☐ Addresses
- ☐ Households
- ☒ Named individuals: the target person
- ☐ Named individuals: not the target person
- ☐ Areas
- ☐ Other

S6a. If “other” or “named individuals not the target person”, please specify

S7. The sample was based on the following source

Population register

S8. The following method was used to identify a respondent

- (●) None, it was a named individual sample
- ( ) Kish Grid
- ( ) Last or next birthday
- ( ) Other

S8a. If "other", please specify

S9. The sampling design had 1 stage(s)

S10. At the different stages, the sampling method and the sampled units were:

S10a. at stage 1:

A nationwide, simple random sample of persons aged 18-79 years

S10b. at stage 2 (if any):

S10c. at stage 3 (if any):

S10d. at stage 4 and more (if any):

Weighting

W1. Was weight variable(s) included for the data?

- ( ) Yes
- (●) No, not needed according to the design
- ( ) No, needed by design but not computed

If No please skip the section and proceed to response rate section

W2. The weight(s) were calculated by

- ( ) The data collection agency
- ( ) The ISSP member organization
- ( ) Other

If other, please explain

W3. Is the weight personal-level, household-level, or something else?

- ◯ Person
- ◯ Household
- ◯ Other

If other, please explain

W4. What type of weight was applied?

Single type weights

- ◯ Design weight
- ◯ Post-stratification weight
- ◯ Non-response weight

Combined, summary weights

- ◯ Design+post-stratification
- ◯ Design+non-response
- ◯ Post-stratification+non-response
- ◯ Design+post-stratification+non-response

- ◯ Other

If other, please describe

Design weights are adjustments that must be made to produce a representative sample of the target population because of features of the sample design. Examples include, adjustments for the number of eligible respondents in a household when one random member is selected as the target respondent, the oversampling of regions or social groups, and the sub-sampling of initial non-respondents for further follow-up.

Post-stratification weights are usually adjustments based on differences between the distributions of selected demographics on the survey and a reference standard such as a census, large-scale, high-quality demographic survey, and/or administrative records that are judged to have more accurate and representative coverage of the target population.

Non-response weights are adjustments for non-response based on case-level information about the attributes of all sampled cases. Examples are - using geocoded data for address-based samples to correct for any bias due to differential non-response by community type and/or region and using case-level data from variables in a population register sample to correct for differential non-response.

W5. If post-stratification weights were used, they were based on the following variables:

Response rate

Main AAPOR Category	Detailed AAPOR category	
5. Issued sample	Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)	4400
4. Not eligible	4.3, 4.5 Not a residence	
	4.6 Vacant residence	
	4.7 No eligible respondent	
	4.8, 4.9 Other non eligible Specify: 1 - underaged 8 - moved abroad	9
3. Unknown eligibility	3. Unknown eligibility, non-interview	2958
2. Eligible, no interview	2.10 (except 2.12) Refusal (household and individual)	126
	2.12 Break-off	38
	2.2 Non contact	
	2.3 Respondent unable to participate, other in AAPOR	5
	Other types of unproductive reaction Specify: 5- other (unkown) 6 - spouse i.e. answered instead of repsondent	12
1. Interviews	Valid interview	1252

When new sample units are added during the field period via a new dwelling units list or other standard updating procedure, these additional issued units are added to the starting number of units to make up the total gross sample size.

Please check that the number 5 (issued sample) is effectively the sum of the categories 4, 3, 2 and 1. Note: The number refers to the AAPOR table, edition 2016 (http://www.aapor.org/AAPOR_Main/media/publications/Standard-Definitions20169theditionfinal.pdf)

As AAPOR use in some cases 3 digits, 2.3 is a general code grouping together the lower levels.