

Lithuania
ISSP 2018 – Religion IV
Technical Report

ISSP Technical Report

ISSP module

M1. This report describes the realisation of the ISSP module in

M2. The study was organised by

from the institute

M3. The fieldwork was conducted by

M4. The survey was fielded from

to

(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. <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Language specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Survey specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Other
2. <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Language specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Survey specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Other
3. <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Language specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Survey specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Other
4. <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Language specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Survey specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Other
5. <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Language specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Survey specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Other
6. <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Language specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Survey specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Other
7. <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Language specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Survey specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Other
8. <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Language specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Survey specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Other

Language	At least 2 independent translations	The following competencies were present in the team (check all that apply)
9. <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Language specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Survey specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Other
10. <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Language specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Survey specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Other
11. <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Language specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Survey specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Other
12. <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Language specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Survey specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Other
13. <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Language specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Survey specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Other
14. <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Language specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Survey specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Other

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

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

T4. The translation problems were addressed with the following solutions

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

- ☐ With a quantitative pretest on individuals
☐ With a cognitive test on individuals

Data collection

D1. The ISSP module was

- ☐ An individual survey comprising 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

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
- ☐ Self administered, Paper
- ☐ Self administered, Computer assisted CASI (without Internet)
- ☐ 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?

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 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

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

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

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. Approximately % 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?

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 and the upper age cut-off was
(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 sample
- ☐ 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

--

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

 stage(s)

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

S10a. at stage 1:

--

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)	<input type="text"/>
4. Not eligible	4.3, 4.5 Not a residence	<input type="text"/>
	4.6 Vacant residence	<input type="text"/>
	4.7 No eligible respondent	<input type="text"/>
	4.8, 4.9 Other non eligible Specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
3. Unknown eligibility	3. Unknown eligibility, non-interview	<input type="text"/>
2. Eligible, no interview	2.10 (except 2.12) Refusal (household and individual)	<input type="text"/>
	2.12 Break-off	<input type="text"/>
	2.2 Non contact	<input type="text"/>
	2.3 Respondent unable to participate, other in AAPOR	<input type="text"/>
	Other types of unproductive reaction Specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
1. Interviews	Valid interview	<input type="text"/>

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.