

Netherlands
ISSP 2006 – Role of Government IV
Study Description

ISSP Study Description Form – Netherlands (NL)

Last revised: April 15 2008

INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SURVEY PROGRAMME NETHERLANDS – 2006 fieldwork

MODULE 2005: Work Orientations
MODULE 2006: Role of Government

STUDY DESCRIPTION

Study title: “ISSP 2005+2006: Opvatting over Werk. Rol van de Overheid.”

Fieldwork dates: March–December 2006

PI: Harry B.G. Ganzeboom
Saskia Opdam (fieldwork manager)

Sample type: (Step 1:) Simple random address sample, (Step 2:) random date selection of household member (*)

Response: 40.3% (*)

Fieldwork agency: Free University Amsterdam

Fieldwork Methods: Postal survey

Sample size: 1918

Language: Dutch

Weights: post-stratification (*)

(*) See further below.

The data will appear in the ISSP publicly released data as two independent data-files. The user should be aware that the social background variables are identical between these modules. However the units do not overlap.

The user should also be aware that the complete data file (described in this documentation), including all the collected information on demography and social background, as well as the standardized ISSP variables has been archived at DANS [Data Archiving and Networked Services] in The Hague, the successor to the Steinmetz Archive. The appropriate bibliographic reference to this file will be:

Ganzeboom, Harry B.G. [principal investigator] & Saskia Opdam, “ISSP 2005 + 2006: Opvattingen over werk. Rol van de Overheid.” [machine-readable data file]. The Hague: DANS. To be archived.

Introduction

The modules 2005 (“Work Orientations”) and 2006 (“Role of Government”) of the International Social Survey Programme were conducted in 2006 in the Netherlands as a stand-alone postal survey at the Free University Amsterdam [VUA] (Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social Research Methodology) by Harry B.G. Ganzeboom [principal investigator] and Saskia Opdam [fieldwork manager]. As of 2005, VUA has taken over the national ISSP membership for the Netherlands, formerly held by the Social and Cultural Planning Office [SCP] in The Hague, with Jos Becker as principal investigator. Funding for the 2005-2006 data collection was supplied by the SCP and the VUA.

The data-collection followed very much the same methodology as for the ISSP2003&2004 (see below). Important changes in the procedure have been:

- While the data for the two modules were collected with exactly the same procedure, the questionnaires of the two modules were separated (split ballot). The two questionnaires share the same social background questions (start with Z), but cover different topics. The WOR variables start with C, the ROG variables with D.
- We attempted twice to improve the response by offering incentives.
- The fieldwork took a long time because we were unhappy with the initial response rate and put two extra reminders in place.

Otherwise, the data collection process can be summarized as follows:

- Translation of the ISSP questionnaire documents was conducted by ourselves. The translation for the items in the Work Orientations module was copied from the earlier version. This was not possible for the Role of Government that has not been held before in the Netherlands. However, we consulted with the Social and Cultural Planning Office (Maurice Gesthuizen, Paul Dekker) about specific issues in translation.
- The standard ISSP questions were complemented with a large number of demographic variables, many of them on education and the occupational career. In both surveys a number of questions on the education/occupation link were added on behalf of Maarten Wolbers (VUA). In the WOR questionnaires a set of items attitudes on illegal immigrants was added formulated by Kees van de Veer (VUA).
- A simple random sample was drawn from the complete list of addresses in the Netherlands, maintained by Cendris, a subsidiary of the national postal service. For about 79% of the addresses there is an associated family name and about 61% have a phone number (matched with the national phone register). The sampling frame is known to be very accurate and complete.
- All respondents were approached using (A) advance letter, (B) first questionnaire, (C) first postcard reminder, (D) second reminder by letter, (E) second questionnaire. Then, non-respondents with a known phone number received a phone-call (G). Non-respondents without a known phone number or who were not

reached by the phone reminder, received (H) a third questionnaire and (I) a reminder by postcard.

- All the questionnaires received were screened on completeness and double responses. All the alphanumerical information was transferred to a coding file.
- The remaining (numerical) information was keypunched (single punching) by a professional agency (InDat).
- The alphanumerical information for country of origin and occupations was coded using standard international classifications.
- The keypunched data were checked and labeled and merged with the coded alphanumerical information.
- A post-stratification weight was developed using (A) national benchmarks, (B) information from the sampling frame, (C) information from the household roster.

Response

Table 1 details the various steps taken to (re)approach the respondents and its results in terms of received questionnaires.

Throughout the fieldwork, respondents could call (in fact: call an answering machine) to ask further information, refuse participation or make comments. Once respondents had expressed non-willingness to participate, either by phone or (e-)mail, they were not contacted again. General information on the ISSP project and the data-collection was also provided on a website, that was referred to on the questionnaire and all the information sent to the respondent.

After the first campaign (in June 2006) we were unhappy with the response and decided to re-contact after the summer all non-respondents that had not been contacted in the phone reminder before the Summer. We also implemented a new incentive system for this last round.

Table 1: Mailings and response pattern						
Week	Event Date	Action	Sent out	Response End week	Refused	Out of frame
9	03/02	Sample received	5000			
11	03/16	Advance letter	5000		2.2%	34.9%
12	03/20	First Questionnaire		16.2%	14.4%	66.3%
13	03/24	Postcard reminder		52.1%	22.5%	71.1%
14	04/05	Reminder letter		62.5%	29.9%	74.7%
15				70.2%	32.1%	75.9%
16	04/20	Second questionnaire		72.7%	36.1%	79.5%
17		Phone reminder		83.4%	75.1%	
18		Phone reminder		88.0%	81.9%	
19		Phone reminder		91.3%	84.3%	
31				94.4%	92.3%	81.9%

44	11/02	Third questionnaire				
45				95.0%	92.8%	
46				96.8%	96.5%	91.6%
47				98.9%	98.6%	96.4%
48				100.0%	100.0%	1000%
49						
				1918	717	188

Sample

The sample was drawn from the national addresses list of Cendris, a subsidiary of TPG, the Dutch national postal agency. The specifications called for a systematic random sample of N=5000. For over 85%, the addresses are associated with a family name – the remaining 15% were addressed as “To main occupant [hoofdbewoner]”. The addresses are matched with the national phone register, which resulted in 70% of addresses being associated with a phone number.

Sampling within households was conducted by random date selection. The addresses were stratified in 12 random date groups and the addressed was invited to have the questionnaire completed by the household member whose birthday was closest to the date specified.

Table 2: Response and non-response						
	Together 2005&2006		Work Orientations 2005		Role of Government 2006	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Initial sample	5000		2500		2500	
Undeliverable	188		108		80	
Net sample	4812	100.0%	2392	100.0%	2420	100.0%
Valid response	1918	39.9%	925	38.7%	993	41.0%
Explicit refusal	596	12.3%	317	13.3%	279	11.5%
No response	2287	46.5%	1144	47.8%	1143	49.3%

RESPONSE ENHANCEMENTS EXPERIMENTS WITH INCENTIVES

We have experimented twice with response enhancing incentives. In the initial sample, a randomized group experiment was held using a conditional incentive of euro 2. The treatment consisted of a promise that the research project would pay 2 euro to a named charity. The respondents in the experimental group could choose one of 20 charities. A reference to this was made in the introductory letter. In the control group, no such reference was made and respondents could not make a donation.

We found no effect of the treatment on the observed response. We paid a total of 1600 euro's to the charities.

The second experiment was held after the restart of the fieldwork, among the group of non-respondents without phone numbers (N=1523). The unconditional incentive was a set of six stamps (total value euro 1.95), send along with the third questionnaire. A reference to the stamps was made in the introductory letter. Again a randomized group experiment was held, with the control group receiving no stamps.

Again, there is no significant effect of the incentive, but this result may be due to the low statistical power: this was a smaller group and the response was very low to begin with. Nominally, the response in the incentive group was 1.3 times higher than in the control groups.

The total cost of this incentive was about euro 1700.

POST-STRATIFICATION WEIGHTS

There are four pieces of information that can inform us about selectivity that occurs because of non-response, and can be used to post-stratify the data.

Sample-frame information

- Location of the sampled address. It is to be expected that response in urban areas, and in particular in the four major cities (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague, Utrecht) is lower than elsewhere.
- Name: for about 11% of the sample there was no access to a name of the inhabitants. This has decreased the response.
- Phone: for about 32% of the sample there was no access to a phone number. Apart from obstructing the opportunity to use the third (phone) reminders, it is to be expected that not being listed in the phone-register is a strong correlate of willingness to participate.
- Foreign family name: Family names in the Netherlands can with considerable accuracy be classified as foreign and non-foreign. In particular Moroccan and Turkish names are easy to recognize, this is much harder for Surinamese and Antillean names.

In 11 cases, the respondents had removed their identification number from the mailed back questionnaire, although they supplied useable information. These questionnaires cannot be connected to the sample frame information and thus cannot be post-stratified in this respect (and these respondents kept receiving reminders to the very end...)

Ecological information (neighbourhood characteristics)

- Neighbourhood characteristics (connected to the detailed postal code in the sample frame) can be expected to predict response patterns

This information has not been used for post-stratification. Its usefulness is left for future investigation.

Household box information

Selectivity may also occur within responding households. Each respondent was asked to complete a household box, which gives access to information of all household members with respect to:

- Sex

- Age
- Position in household
- Main activity
- Highest completed / current education.

In addition, we have information on:

- Total number of persons in household eligible for the sample (i.e. all household members of 16 and older).

Using this information, a synthetic population can be formed that consists of all household members in the designated age bracket (16-75+). The actual sample should be representative of this synthetic population. All this information was used to develop the post-stratification weight.

National benchmark information

Finally, sample distributions can be compared to known distributions in the national population or other (presumably more representative) surveys. However, in order to make a valid comparison, one has to make sure that the variables in question are identically measured. We believe this can be done with sufficient precision with respect to:

- Formal marital status
- Age
- Sex
- Participation in last national election

Note that we do not believe that highest/current education or main activity can be compared to national benchmark information, because responses to these questions are too sensitive to question formats.

The weight was developed using iterative proportional fitting with a precision of $\pm 1\%$ of the margins of the benchmark distributions.

Table 4: Benchmark distributions, unweighted sample data and weights			
URBANIZATION*	Benchmark	Weight	
• Rural (A1-A5)	14.1	1.008	
• Towns (B1-B5)	36.3	0.945	
• Small cities (C1-C4)	25.8	1.003	
• Four large cities (C5)	23.6	1.138	
NAME*	Benchmark	Weight	
• No name	14.2	.954	
• With name	85.1	1.253	
FOREIGN NAME*	Benchmark	Weight	
• Dutch name	95.8	.985	
• Foreign name	4.2	1.241	
PHONE*	Benchmark	Weight	
• No phone listed	32.9	.911	
• Phone listed	67.1	1.182	

SEX**	Benchmark	Weight	
• Male	49.6	0.970	
• Female	50.3	1.1031	
AGE **	Benchmark	Weight	
• 16-24	12.2	1.562	
• 25-34	14.8	1.161	
• 35-44	20.1	1.041	
• 45-54	19.2	.975	
• 55-64	17.9	.911	
• 65-74	10.3	.851	
• 75-hi	5.6	.728	
EDUCATION**	Benchmark	Weight	
• LO	6.4	1.103	
• LBO	17.8	1.112	
• MAVO	13.4	1.005	
• HAVO	5.9	0.988	
• VWO	4.4	1.051	
• MBO	18.6	1.045	
• HBO	22.8	0.888	
• WO	10.7	0.922	
MAIN ACTIVITY**	Benchmark	Weight	
• Full-time work	39.2	1.033	
• Part-time work	19.9	.991	
• Unemployed	2.5	.979	
• Student	9.3	1.580	
• Retired	15.7	.786	
• Homemaker	9.7	1.224	
• Disabled	2.9	.968	
• Other	0.8	.972	
MARITAL STATUS***	Benchmark	Weight	
• Married	57.0	1.071	
• Widower	7.1	.676	
• Divorced	9.1	.752	
• Never married	26.8	.976	
LAST NATIONAL ELECTION***	Benchmark	Weight	
• Did not vote	20	.818	
• Did vote	80	1.639	
Sources: * Sampling frame, ** Household box, *** Population statistics			

In summary, it can be said that one group was severely underrepresented in our effective sample: young adults, in particular in as far as they live in their parents' households. Among these, the younger children (16 year olds) are particularly

underrepresented. However, the highest marginal weight (2.1) is generated for non-voters. Non-voting has been found to be a strong correlate of non-response in surveys, as is the presence of name and phone number in the address register. Note on the other hand, that the sample is fairly representative with respect to education and main activity. An unexpected finding is that the four large cities are only moderately underrepresented and that some under-representation occurs in rural areas.