

# International Social Survey Programme ISSP 2019 - Social Inequality V

Study Monitoring Report

Lausanne, December 2022

Marlène Sapin, Dominique Joye, Karin Nisple, Maud Reveilhac, & Stephanie Steinmetz (eds.)

Swiss Center of Expertise in the Social Sciences - FORS

University of Lausanne

Bâtiment Géopolis

CH-1015 Lausanne

Switzerland

[issp@fors.unil.ch](mailto:issp@fors.unil.ch)

# Contents

1	Introduction . . . . .	2
2	Monitoring Findings Chart . . . . .	3
3	Survey Context . . . . .	4
4	Information on Response and Outcome Figures . . . . .	5
5	Translation and Pretests . . . . .	6
6	Question Coverage and Order . . . . .	8
7	Sampling 1 . . . . .	10
8	Sampling 2 . . . . .	11
9	Weighting . . . . .	13
10	Appendix I: Main reasons for omitting or modifying variables of the ISSP module . . .	15
11	Appendix II: Main reasons for omitting or modifying background variables . . . . .	16
12	Appendix III: Sampling strategies . . . . .	17

# 1 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 Report brings 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.

Since the ISSP 2018 module, the Study Monitoring Report is presented in a new, condensed format as each country's "Technical Report" is now also published along with the documentation. This report is based on the study monitoring survey conducted by the ISSP Methodology Committee for the 2019 Social Inequality module. Twenty-nine 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 website. More detailed information on each country can be found in the respective country reports, also available on the GESIS website.

This is a summary based on the main indicators. The interested reader will find a detailed report for each country on the GESIS web pages. We encourage users to consider the specificities of fieldwork in different countries, even if the work of the methodological committee ensures that the data are as comparative as possible in the context of a worldwide survey.

## 2 Monitoring Findings Chart

**For:**

Australia (AU)	Lithuania (LT)
Austria (AT)	Norway (NO)
Bulgaria (BG)	New Zealand (NZ)
Chile (CL)	Philippines (PH)
Croatia (HR)	Russia (RU)
Czech Republic (CZ)	Slovenia (SI)
Denmark (DK)	South Africa (ZA)
Finland (FI)	Suriname (SR)
France (FR)	Sweden (SE)
Germany (DE)	Switzerland (CH)
Great Britain (GB)	Taiwan (TW)
Iceland (IS)	Thailand (TH)
Israel (IL)	United States (US)
Italia (IT)	Venezuela (VE)
Japan (JP)	

### 3 Survey Context

	Beginning	End of field	Part of a larger survey	F2F-PAPI	F2F-CAPI	PAPER	CASI	CAWI	WEB	CATI
Australia (AU)	16.05.2019	29.04.2020	X			X				
Austria (AT)	23.04.2021	16.08.2021	X		X					X
Bulgaria (BG)	03.05.2021	30.05.2021	X	X						
Chile (CL)	26.04.2019	03.06.2019	X		X					
Croatia (HR)	11.05.2019	18.06.2019	X		X					
Czech Republic (CZ)	25.04.2019	14.07.2019		X	X					
Denmark (DK)	08.10.2019	02.12.2019							X	X
Finland (FI)	13.09.2019	31.12.2019				X			X	
France (FR)	18.03.2021	23.04.2021	X					X		
Germany (DE)	30.07.2020	30.09.2020				X				
Great Britain (GB)	06.07.2019	27.10.2019	X			X				
Iceland (IS)	13.07.2020	03.02.2021	X		X			X		X
Israel (IL)	27.01.2021	10.05.2021						X	X	
Italia (IT)	07.10.2019	18.12.2019			X					
Japan (JP)	16.11.2019	24.11.2019				X				
Lithuania (LT)	01.12.2020	21.12.2020		X						
Norway (NO)	28.02.2020	10.06.2020	X			X			X	
New Zealand (NZ)	28.01.2020	03.10.2020				X		X		
Philippines (PH)	27.04.2019	11.05.2019	X	X						
Russia (RU)	25.01.2019	31.01.2019	X	X	X					
Slovenia (SI)	01.10.2019	24.01.2020	X		X					
South Africa (ZA)	20.11.2018	10.04.2019	X		X					
Suriname (SR)	01.11.2019	22.04.2020	X	X		X				
Sweden (SE)	04.11.2019	07.01.2020				X			X	
Switzerland (CH)	04.02.2019	31.07.2019	X			X		X		
Taiwan (TW)	30.06.2019	25.02.2020	X		X					
Thailand (TH)	02.06.2019	30.07.2019		X						
United States (US)	01.12.2020	03.05.2021	X						X	X
Venezuela (VE)	20.04.2022	09.05.2022	X	X						

*Note:* F2F-PAPI: Face-to-face, paper and pencil personal interviews; F2F-CAPI: Face-to-face, computer assisted personal interviews; Paper: Self administered, paper and pencil personal interviews; CASI: Self administered, computer assisted self interviews (without internet); CAWI: Self administered, computer assisted web interview (on internet); Web: Web questionnaire, all devices except CAWI only; CATI: Computer assisted telephone interviews (only allowed as supplementary interviews).

## 4 Information on Response and Outcome Figures

	AU	AT	BG	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR	DE	GB	IS	IL	IT	JP	LT	NO
Issued sample (n)	5000	4600	1700	1956	2181	3800	3090	2500	2253	3888	5304	3148	3183	3000	2400	2382	4400
Ineligible (n)	283	0	39	5	74	344	0	7	0	14	454	64	0	0	0	100	0
Eligible (n)	4717	4600	1661	1951	2107	3456	3090	2493	2253	3874	4850	3084	3183	3000	2400	2282	4400
-refusal (n)	0	980	208	259	696	703	715	7	17	248	2350	1083	1982	415	436	998	0
-non-contact (n)	3628	2359	293	280	382	756	1236	1493	579	2289	415	501	0	1236	319	185	3077
-other unproductive (n)	21	0	9	38	29	73	101	27	59	12	361	273	0	134	172	49	0
Interviews (n)	1068	1261	1151	1374	1000	1924	1038	966	1598	1325	1724	1227	1201	1215	1473	1050	1323
Response Rate (%)	22.6	27.4	69.3	70.4	47.5	55.7	33.6	38.7	70.9	34.2	35.5	39.8	37.7	40.5	61.4	46.0	30.1

*Table continues below.*

	NZ	PH	RU	SI	ZA	SR	SE	CH	TW	TH	US	VE
Issued sample (n)	5400	12726	7371	2310	3531	2050	5000	7840	4054	2400	11511	1200
Ineligible (n)	196	1944	236	142	33	378	172	14	187	109	967	12
Eligible (n)	5204	10782	7135	2168	3498	1672	4828	7826	3867	2291	10544	1188
-refusal (n)	369	1004	2296	653	384	98	27	442	812	160	0	9
-non-contact (n)	3573	5323	3059	193	103	14	3157	3960	1009	506	8146	45
-other unproductive (n)	52	205	183	158	284	559	8	382	120	92	546	15
Interviews (n)	1210	4250	1597	1164	2727	1001	1636	3042	1926	1533	1852	1119
Response Rate (%)	23.3	39.4	22.4	53.7	78.0	59.9	33.9	38.9	49.8	66.9	17.6	94.2

For response rate calculation, see :

[http://www.aapor.org/AAPOR\\_Main/media/publications/Standard-Definitions20169theditionfinal.pdf](http://www.aapor.org/AAPOR_Main/media/publications/Standard-Definitions20169theditionfinal.pdf)

5 Translation and Pretests

	AU	AT	BG	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR
Language 1	English	German	Bulgarian	Spanish	Croatian	Czech	Danish	Finnish	French
Language 2								Swedish	
Language 3									
Language 4									
Language 5									
Language 6									
Language 7									
Language 8									
Language 9									
Language 10									
Language 11									
Language 12									
Language 13									
Quantitative Pretest	X		X	X	X				
Cognitive Pretest			X						

Table continues below.

	DE	GB	IS	IL	IT	JP	LT	NO	NZ
Language 1	German	English	Icelandic	Hebrew	Italian	Japanese	Lithuanian	Norwegian	English
Language 2			English	Arabic					
Language 3									
Language 4									
Language 5									
Language 6									
Language 7									
Language 8									
Language 9									
Language 10									
Language 11									
Language 12									
Language 13									
Quantitative Pretest	X				X				
Cognitive Pretest			X			X			

Table continues below.

	PH	RU	SI	ZA	SR	SE	CH	TW	TH
Language 1	Filipino	Russian	Slovenian	English	Dutch	Swedish	German	Chinese	Thai
Language 2	Iluko			Afrikaans			French		
Language 3	Hiligaynon			isiXhosa			Italian		
Language 4	Cebuano			Tswana					
Language 5	Bicol			Xitsonga					
Language 6	Waray			TshiVenda					
Language 7	Maranao			Zulu					
Language 8	Tausug								
Language 9	Chavacano								
Language 10	Masbateno								
Language 11	Sorsoganon								
Language 12	Maguindanaon								
Language 13	Maranao								
Quantitative Pretest	X		X	X				X	X
Cognitive Pretest		X	X					X	

*Table continues below.*

	US	VE
Language 1	English	Spanish
Language 2	Spanish	
Language 3		
Language 4		
Language 5		
Language 6		
Language 7		
Language 8		
Language 9		
Language 10		
Language 11		
Language 12		
Language 13		
Quantitative Pretest		X
Cognitive Pretest		



6 Question Coverage and Order

	AU	AT	BG	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR	DE	GB	IS	IL	IT	JP	LT	NO
Were all the questions of the ISSP module included or were questions modified or omitted																	
All included	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X			X	X			X
Some missing							X		X		X	X			X		
Some modified																	
Some modified and other missing																	
Apart from omissions, were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order																	
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No																	
Were all background variables (BV) included or were some missing or not compliant with the guidelines																	
All BV included	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X
Some BV missing		X															
Some BV non compliant										X		X					
Some BV missing other non compliant											X						

Table continues below.  
Note: The main reasons for omitting or modifying the variables of the ISSP module and the background variables are respectively documented in Appendix I and Appendix II.

[illegible]

7 Sampling 1

	AU	AT	BG	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR	DE	GB	IS	IL	IT	JP	LT	NO	NZ
The sample was designed to be representative of																		
Only adult citizens of country	X			X			X						X	X				
Adults of any nationality		X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X
The sample was designed to be representative of adults living in																		
Private accomodation only	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X		X		
Private and institutional accomodation							X			X		X			X		X	X
There was a lower and/or upper age cut off																		
Lower age cut off	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	15	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
Upper age cut off							79	74									79	
Table continues below.																		

	PH	RU	SI	ZA	SR	SE	CH	TW	TH	US	VE
The sample was designed to be representative of											
Only adult citizens of country	X					X		X	X		
Adults of any nationality		X	X	X	X		X			X	X
The sample was designed to be representative of adults living in											
Private accomodation only	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Private and institutional accomodation											
There was a lower and/or upper age cut off											
Lower age cut off	18	18	18	16	21	18	18	18	18	18	18
Upper age cut off				105	74	79					

## 8 Sampling 2

	AU	AT	BG	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR	DE	GB	IS	IL	IT	JP	LT	NO	NZ
Did you use variables for stratification?																		
Yes	X		X				X						X				X	
No		X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X
What selection method was used to identify a respondent?																		
No selection needed	X	X						X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X
Kish grid				X							X							
Last or next birthday			X		X	X										X		
Other							X		X									
How many stages does your sampling frame have?																		
N of stages	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	3	2	3	1	1
Your sampling frame is built on																		
Adresses						X					X							
Households			X		X				X									
Target person	X	X					X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X
Not the target person																		
Areas				X												X		
Other									X									

*Table continues below.*

*Note:* More information on the sampling strategy in each country are presented in Appendix III.

[illegible]

## 9 Weighting

	AU	AT	BG	CL	HR	CZ	DK	FI	FR	DE	GB	IS	IL	IT	JP	LT	NO	NZ
Did you include any weight variables for the data?																		
Yes	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X		X
Not needed according to the design			X		X							X		X	X		X	
Needed by design but not computed																		
Is the weight personal-level, household-level, or something else?																		
Person	X			X		X	X	X	X		X		X			X		X
Household																		
Other		X								X								
What type of weight was applied?																		
Design weight		X				X				x								
Post-stratification weight	X	X		X		X	X	X	X				X			X		X
Non-response weight	X			X														
Post-stratification weights based on:																		
Post-stratification described	X	X		X		X		X	X		X		X			X		X
Post-stratification sex	X	X		X		X		X	X		X		X			X		
Post-stratification age	X	X		X		X		X	X		X					X		X
Post-stratification urban/rural				X				X										X
Post-stratification region						X		X			X							X
Combined, summary weights:																		
Design + Post-stratification		X				X												
Design + non-response																		
Post-stratification + non-response	X			X														
Design + Post-stratification + non-response																		

*Table continues below.*

	PH	RU	SI	ZA	SR	SE	CH	TW	TH	US	VE
Did you include any weight variables for the data?											
Yes	X	X		X	X			X		X	X
Not needed according to the design			X			X	X		X		
Needed by design but not computed											
Is the weight personal-level, household-level, or something else?											
Person	X	X		X				X		X	
Household											X
Other					X						
What type of weight was applied?											
Design weight								X			X
Post-stratification weight	X	X		X	X			X		X	
Non-response weight				X						X	
Post-stratification weights based on:											
Post-stratification described	X	X		X	X			X		X	
Post-stratification sex		X		X	X			X		X	
Post-stratification age	X	X		X	X			X			
Post-stratification urban/rural								X			
Post-stratification region	X									X	
Combined, summary weights:											
Design + Post-stratification								X			
Design + non-response											
Post-stratification + non-response											
Design + Post-stratification + non-response				X						X	

## 10 Appendix I: Main reasons for omitting or modifying variables of the ISSP module

Country	Description
Denmark (DK)	We have omitted the optional variables from v62 and onwards
France (FR)	All optional questions (from Q24 and onwards) were omitted due to questionnaire length.
Great Britain (GB)	<p>All optional questions were omitted due to questionnaire length. v59 and v60 questions were omitted due to questionnaire length. Some questions were adapted with country-specific concepts as per the ISSP instructions. The following background variables were adapted to ISSP requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EMPREL Employment relationship</li> <li>• SPWORK Spouse, partner: currently, formerly or never in paid work</li> <li>• SPEMPREL Spouse, partner: employment relationship</li> <li>• SPWRKSUP Spouse, partner: supervise other employees</li> <li>• SPISCO08 Spouse, partner: occupation ISCO/ ILO 2008</li> <li>• SPMAINST Spouse, partner: main status</li> </ul>
Iceland (IS)	All required questions of the module were included in face-to-face interviews and web surveys. However, questions Q15a and Q15b (with diagrams showing different types of societies) were omitted in the telephone survey because respondents could not be shown the visuals necessary to comprehend the questions.
Japan (JP)	V37(Q12b Conflicts between the working class and the middle class) was omitted from the Japanese questionnaire, since there is no clear definition of a certain “class” in Japan.
Lithuania (LT)	Optional ISSP Social Inequality V questions were omitted, because we had a very long questionnaire part concerning Covid-19 issues.
Slovenia (SI)	When preparing the questionnaire for CAPI, the question about the subjective class Q22 (V61), otherwise included in the national set of demographic variables, was accidentally “lost” somewhere.
South Africa (ZA)	v67 to v70, SPDEGREE, VOTE_LE, NAT_PRTY, PARTY_LR. Unfortunate accidental omission.



## 11 Appendix II: Main reasons for omitting or modifying background variables

Country	Description
Austria (AT)	TYPORG1 was not asked, because many respondents in Austria are not familiar with the concepts of “profit”- “non profit organization”.
Germany (DE)	MAINSTAT and SPMAINST: category 8 “In compulsory military service or community service” was not asked because since 2011 there is no compulsory military service in Germany.
Great Britain (GB)	Please see 2019 bv gb for details. Omitted background variables: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PARTLIV - Living in steady partnership</li> <li>• SPWRKHRS - Spouse, partner: hours worked weekly</li> <li>• GB_PRTY - Did respondent vote in last general election?</li> <li>• PARTY_LR - Country specific party voted for in last general election</li> <li>• VOTE_LE - Did respondent vote in last general election</li> <li>• nat_ETHN2 - Country-specific: ethnic group 2</li> <li>• F_BORN Father’s country of birth</li> <li>• M_BORN Mother’s country of birth</li> </ul>
Iceland (IS)	Question SPENPREL was not coded according to the guidelines because by mistake the answer categories used were according to the 2018 module and not updated according to the 2019 module. Therefore the two categories 3. (Self-employed with 1-9 employees) and 4. (Self-employed with 10 employees or more) were replaced by one category (Self-employed with employees), coded as 6 in the data.
New Zealand (NZ)	We updated our asking of partner’s employment status to differentiate between self-employed with and without employees, but did not realise that that was changed in the international standard to differentiate between 1-9 and 10 or more employees as well.
South Africa (ZA)	These questions were unfortunately omitted in the survey questionnaire: SPDEGREE, VOTE_LE, NAT_PRTY, PARTY_LR
Suriname (SR)	URBRURAL Although the question was part of the questionnaire, it was misunderstood by many interviewers as: referring to a place when living abroad.
Switzerland (CH)	Background variable 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.
Taiwan (TW)	Variable PARTY_LR was not included in the questionnaire because this kind of party affiliation (left-right) does not fit for Taiwan’s political situation. Variable PARTLIV has been derived from the answers to MARITAL because we did not ask this question separately.
United States (US)	TYPEORG1 was not asked on the GSS this year.

## 12 Appendix III: Sampling strategies

Country	Description
Australia (AU)	<p>Source: Australian Electoral Roll</p> <p>Stage 1: Systematic random sample of the electoral roll</p> <p>Stage 2: -</p> <p>Stage 3: -</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: -</p>
Austria (AT)	<p>Source: Address register of persons living in private households provided by the Austrian Mail Company (Österreichische Post)</p> <p>Stage 1: random selection of NUTS-III regions, stratified by size of municipality</p> <p>Stage 2: random selection of sample points</p> <p>Stage 3: random selection of individuals in private households</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: the number of selected addresses was stratified by bundesland (federal state) and size of municipality</p>
Bulgaria (BG)	<p>Source: Three-stage random-route sampling: 1 stage: Cluster sample from of the last actual list of electoral sections (as of 12.02.2021) and randomly selected starting points (addresses);</p> <p>Stage 1: Cluster sample from the last actual list of electoral sections (as of 12.02.2021) - systematic random selection.</p> <p>Stage 2: Household selection based on the standard random walk procedure, strictly following predefined walking prescriptions (designed by sampling experts) by the purposefully trained/briefed interviewers starting from those addresses.</p> <p>Stage 3: Selection of respondents within the selected HH using the last birthday criteria.</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: -</p>
Chile (CL)	<p>Source: 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 2017 Census data.</p> <p>Stage 1: The first stage of the sampling process sets the number of completed interviews per cluster at 6, where a cluster is defined as a block or entity. The application of 6 interviews per cluster to the total number of interviews targeted in the sample (1,956) yields 326 primary sampling units (PSU) to be identified at this stage. The PSUs are proportionally distributed throughout the regions of the country, taking into account the ratio of each region's population to national population. Within each region, a purely random selection process is followed, such that each individual has a well-defined probability of being selected as the reference point for a PSU. The process is carried out by a computerized, random, proportionate-to-population process to select blocks (entities) in the urban (rural) areas. A computer program selects PSUs for the sample, and then they are located on a census map.</p> <p>Stage 2: The second stage is selecting households within PSUs. Selection rules for households are provided to interviewers so they can select them randomly within each block (entity) drawn during the first stage. After taking a census of each selected block and entity, a random walk or systematic sampling procedure is followed, whereby every nth household is included in the sample until a total of 6 households are identified.</p> <p>Stage 3: In the third stage, the interviewer selects an adult, within each household, using a random number table to identify the person to be interviewed.</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: 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 areas. This process was part of the first stage of the sample design.</p>
Croatia (HR)	<p>Source: For the purpose of designing the structure of the planned sample, data from the Croatian Central bureau of Statistics (parameters of the last census from 2011) were used. Based on the data for each region, sampling starting points were selected.</p>

Stage 1: Selection of primary sampling units (settlements) was conducted by the “probability proportionate to size” method. Each settlement had a probability of being in the sample proportionate to its population size. The selection of settlements was based on a random sampling procedure. All settlements in a stratum were alphabetically ordered and their respective populations were cumulated. Assignment of random numbers from cumulative population of all settlement was conducted. Those settlements under which randomly assigned numbers fell into were chosen. Within each primary sampling unit, the “random starting points method” was used to select starting points. There were 125 starting points in total. On average allocation of 8 respondents was assigned to each starting point.

Stage 2: Selection of households within the starting points was conducted by the “random walk method”. Interviewers were instructed to follow a specified route from the starting point, conducting an interview at every 6th dwelling/housing unit (systematic sampling). Non-contacts were re-visited 3 times before being declared as non-response.

Stage 3: Selection of the respondent within a household was conducted by random selection by last birthday key.

Stage 4: -

Stratification: Within each location/city/region, the probabilistic sampling design sought to ensure the representativeness of the sample by key socio-demographic variables (gender and age structure of respondents) according to regional parameters.

---

Czech Republic (CZ)	Source: Registry of Territorial Identification, Addresses and Real Estate (RUIAN), version spring 2018, in combination with the variables from Census 2011 database (eg. number of inhabitants 18+). RUIAN is the database of streets and buildings within the streets. The number of dwellings and approximate number of inhabitants is also included.
------------------------	---

Stage 1: Systematic probability sampling of sampling points, which are the “basic settlement units” (territorial unit forming a part of a community with distinct territorial and technical settlement conditions or a cluster of residential or recreational character).

Stage 2: Simple random selection of households.

Stage 3: Selection of the respondent based on the “last birthday” method.

Stage 4: -

Stratification: NUTS2 Type of municipality

---

Denmark (DK)	Source: The Danish Civil Registration System (CPR) used as sampling frame, and the sampling method was simple random sampling
--------------	---

Stage 1: -

Stage 2: -

Stage 3: -

Stage 4: -

Stratification: -

---

Finland (FI)	Source: The sample was drawn from the Statistis Finland census database which is based on the census data originating from the Finnish Census bureau. The Statistics Finland database is updated five times a year and was updated just prior when the sample was drawn.
--------------	--

Stage 1: Implicit stratification by variables stated above.

Stage 2: -

Stage 3: -

Stage 4: -

Stratification: Implicit stratification was conducted by age and municipality

---

France (FR)	Source: The samples were constructed by the French national statistical office (INSEE). The first and second ones were based respectively on the 2011 and 2014 population census. The third sample was randomly drawn from the Fidéli database (January 2020), which contains demographic information on individuals, household structure and household incomes.
-------------	--

Stage 1: A random sampling of 241 points was selected according to a random process based on an exhaustive list of municipalities, stratified by region and type of settlement (urban/rural), - In 2016, 300 geographic points were randomly selected by region and household composition. The same points were used in 2020 sample.

	<p>Stage 2: Refreshment sample (2020): individuals aged 18 and over (on the 1st January 2020), randomly selected in the sampling points. A total of 8000 persons with name and address. - Extended sample (2016): random sampling of 10000 households in the sampling points.</p> <p>Stage 3: Refreshment sample (2020): not concerned. - Extended sample (2016): a random selection of individuals aged between 18 and 79 in the household was done through a face-to-face interview using the Kish grid method.</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: The sample frame was stratified by : - geographical areas (NUTS-1 region)</p>
Germany (DE)	<p>Source: Local population registers of inhabitants of communities. Updated continuously.</p> <p>Stage 1: Random sample for Eastern and Western Germany drawn separately. Random selection of 162 communities/sample points. Western Germany: 103 communities with 111 sample points.</p> <p>Stage 2: Random sample of persons officially registered (Einwohnermelderegister-Stichprobe) with 24 personal addresses per sample point.</p> <p>Stage 3: -</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: Microstratification of municipalities; stratified according to federal states (bundesländer) and smaller regional administrative districts (Regierungsbezirke); communities according to BIK regions and municipalities.</p>
Great Britain (GB)	<p>Source: Postcode Address File (PAF)</p> <p>Stage 1: Stratified sampling: postcode sectors were selected systematically from a list of all postal sectors in Britain. Before selection, any</p> <p>Stage 2: Random sampling: 26 addresses were selected in each of the 306 sectors producing a total issued sample of 7,956 addresses. In each sector,</p> <p>Stage 3: Random sampling: dwelling unit (DU) and/or person selection was carried out by interviewers using a KISH grid where there were two or more DUs and/or individuals living at a selected DU.</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: Post code sectors were stratified on the basis of: 36 sub-regions; population density, (population in private households/area of the postal sector in hectares), with variable banding used in order to create three equal-sized strata per sub-region; and ranking by percentage of homes that were owner-occupied.</p>
Iceland (IS)	<p>Source: The sample was drawn from the national register, which supplies individuals with registered addresses.</p> <p>Stage 1: The urban stratum was sampled directly using simple random sampling and the non-urban stratum was divided into primary sampling unit using the first two digits of the postal codes and sampling units were selected using systematic sampling with a random start.</p> <p>Stage 2: From each primary sampling unit 66 individuals were selected using systematic sampling with the population ordered by 3-digit postal code, gender and age.</p> <p>Stage 3: -</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: Two-strata, two-stage sampling was used. The strata were built based on 3-digit postal codes. Roughly into urban (extended capital area and the extended-regional-capital-north (ERCN)) and non-urban.</p>
Israel (IL)	<p>Source: -</p> <p>Stage 1: A random sample drawn from a full probability internet panel</p> <p>Stage 2: -</p> <p>Stage 3: -</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: -</p>
Italia (IT)	<p>Source: Three-stage random cluster sample, based on the electoral national register.</p> <p>Stage 1: The population was sorted into strata according to: a. four standard macro-areas, as specified by the National Institute of Statistics (North-West, North-East, Centre, South and Islands);</p> <p>Stage 2: Within each municipality, electoral districts were extracted according to the following rule: in large cities, 4 districts; in province capitals, 2 districts; in all other municipalities, 1 district.</p>

Stage 3: Individuals were randomly selected within each electoral district (from separate lists for women and men).

Stage 4: -

Stratification: First stage: The population was sorted into strata according to: a. four standard macro-areas, as specified by the National Institute of Statistics (North-West, North-East, Centre, South and Islands); b. size of municipality of residence; c. the municipality being a province capital or not. The six major Italian cities (Rome, Milan, Naples, Turin, Palermo, Genova) were included by default among the primary sampling units, being considered as selfrepresentative. Within each stratum, municipalities were extracted according to the size of the resident population, reaching a total of 136 primary sampling units (i.e. electoral districts). Second stage: Within each municipality, electoral districts were extracted according to the following rule: in large cities, 4 districts; in province capitals, 2 districts; in all other municipalities, 1 district. Therefore, the total number of sample units was given by:  $(6*4)+(20*2)+(72*1)=136$  Third stage: Individuals were randomly selected within each electoral district (from separate lists for women and men).

Japan (JP)	<p>Source: basic Resident Register</p> <p>Stage 1: All over Japan is divided into 13 blocks, and depending on the ratio of each block population, survey spots are assigned. The total spots become 200.</p> <p>Stage 2: For 200 survey spots, 12 sample individuals are selected at regular intervals from the basic Resident Register.</p> <p>Stage 3: -</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: Region, size of community, and ratio of employed population in tertiary industry</p>
Lithuania (LT)	<p>Source: National Department of statistics, population statistics.</p> <p>Stage 1: First stage: The territory of the Republic of Lithuania is divided into 10 administrative units (counties) based on Nomenclature of Territorial Units as used in the official EU statistics. Each county is represented in the sample proportionally to its population size. 1. Alytaus 5.13%</p> <p>Stage 2: The total number of interviews in each survey region (county) was allocated to 5 strata in proportion to the population of each stratum. The stratum is defined on the basis of a settlement size. The following strata are identified in each survey region (county): 1. Up to 2,000</p> <p>Stage 3: Number of PSU's (PSU -clusters) allocated by the size of settlement depending on the share of Lithuanian population living in a certain type of settlement (based on the latest statistics). PSU's were selected randomly from each stratum (county and settlement size combination cell) list. In total 109. Interviewers used random route procedure. In each household eligible respondents for the survey was selected by using last birthday rule.</p> <p>Stage 4: Does not apply</p> <p>Stratification: Counties, settlement size</p>
New Zealand (NZ)	<p>Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls</p> <p>Stage 1: Stratified sampling as described above, 5,400 units total</p> <p>Stage 2: -</p> <p>Stage 3: -</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: The sample was stratified by gender, age group, and ethnicity. Electoral rolls give: title, and gender was imputed where no title. (Male/Female); start-date and enddate, and age is somewhere between those. (18-30, 31-45, 46-60, 61-75, 76+); Maaori Descent; Geographical meshblock, which we matched with the most recent census geographical meshblock data (2013) to identify high Pacific meshblocks, with a cutoff of at least 15% in the population, and high Asian meshblocks, with a cutoff of at least 25% in the population. (Maaori, Pacific, Asian, Other).</p>
Norway (NO)	<p>Source: Population register</p> <p>Stage 1: A nationwide, simple random sample of persons aged 18-79 years</p> <p>Stage 2: -</p> <p>Stage 3: -</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: -</p>

Philippines (PH)	<p>Source: The sampling frame was designed using population data based on the 2015 Census of Population and Housing (2010 CPH) conducted by the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA).</p> <p>Stage 1: Primary Sampling Units. For NCR, the Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) are the barangays. For the rest of the Philippines, the PSUs are the provinces.</p> <p>Stage 2: Secondary Sampling Units. For the rest of the Philippines, the Secondary Sampling Units (SSUs) are the cities/municipalities.</p> <p>Stage 3: Tertiary Sampling Units. For the rest of the Philippines, the Tertiary Sampling Units are the barangays.</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: The Philippines is divided into seventeen (17) regions. REGION I (Ilocos Region), REGION II (Cagayan Valley), REGION III (Central Luzon), REGION IV-A (CALABARZON), REGION IV-B (MIMAROPA), REGION V (Bicol Region), REGION VI (Western Visayas), REGION VII (Central Visayas), REGION VIII (Eastern Visayas), REGION IX (Zamboanga Peninsula), REGION X (Northern Mindanao), REGION XI (Davao Region), REGION XII (Soccsksargen), NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION (NCR), CORDILLERA ADMINISTRATIVE REGION (CAR), AUTONOMOUS REGION IN MUSLIM MINDANAO (ARMM), and REGION XIII (CARAGA). Each of the 17 regions had a sample size of 250 adult respondents, for a total of 4,250 statistically representative adults aged 18 and above.</p>
Russia (RU)	<p>Source: from census or the best available estimates from government surveys or other high-quality data-sources:</p> <p>Stage 1: The nationwide sample (N=1597) was divided among: a) 8 large geographical macro regions (Federal Okrugs) proportionate to the size of the local population aged 18+ of each macro region b) 5 types of urban settlements and rural districts in each of 8 macro regions proportionate to the size of the local population aged 18+ of each type:</p> <p>Stage 2: Selection of secondary sampling units (SSUs). On the second stage the secondary sampling units (SSUs) are selected from the lists of electoral districts (blocks, streets) in urban settlements and villages in rural districts.</p> <p>Stage 3: Selection of households. On the third stage the households were selected by the route method within selected electoral districts and sampled rural localities.</p> <p>Stage 4: Selection of respondents. On the fourth stage within a household a respondent was selected among eligible household members by the nearest birthday to the date of interviewing. If nobody at home or a member of a household selected as a respondent refused to participate in the survey, or if a household or a respondent was not achieved for a visit, the interviewer was required to follow the next address from the route list. Substitutions of addresses were not allowed.</p> <p>Stratification: 1) types of settlements 2) urban/rural</p>
Slovenia (SI)	<p>Source: Central Register of Population (a list of names and addresses being constantly updated by public administration) is used as a sampling frame. List of CEAs (approximately 11000) (PSUs) is constructed by National Statistical Office for sampling purposes.</p> <p>Stage 1: 210 PSU - selection was made by probability proportional to size of CEA (Clusters of Enumeration Areas)</p> <p>Stage 2: systematic random selection inside CEA (PSU) brings fixed numbers of persons with name and address - 11 individuals were select within each PSU.</p> <p>Stage 3: -</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: CEA (Cluster Enumeration Areas) as PSU on the first stage of sampling are stratified according to 12 statistical regions * 6 types of settlement. Of the 72 theoretical strata, 25 are empty, so in practice there are 47 implicit strata.</p>
South Africa (ZA)	<p>Source: The EA (census enumerator area) is used as PSU (primary sampling unit) and the number of households (HHs) in the SAL as the MOS (measure of size). SAL's are drawn within the explicit strata pps and a fixed number of households drawn per drawn SAL. Within each drawn HH one person 16 years or older is drawn at random using Kish's grid.</p>

Stage 1: Rescaling not explicitly but only implicitly. I assume that this question relates to whether sample sizes are rescaled with the view to do cross-tabulating analyses using STATA. Sub-class analyses are done by using SAS surveymeans, using the “domain” facility. Disproportionately large samples were selected from areas known to be inhabited by the two smallest components of the population, namely (i) areas with dominantly Indian populations and (ii) the Northern Cape

Stage 2: -

Stage 3: -

Stage 4: -

Stratification: Explicit stratification variables: Province, population group and geography type (viz. urban formal, urban informal, tribal and rural formal, including commercial farms).

Suriname (SR)	<p>Source: Describe the sources used for sampling as the type of register or the specific procedure used The sample was obtained from AbS (the General Bureau of Statistics Suriname).</p> <p>Stage 1: Strata: all 13 (sub-)districts urban/rural were represented.</p> <p>Stage 2: Clusters: 94 PSU's were randomly selected within the sub-districts (proportional to size).</p> <p>Stage 3: For each PSU 20 addresses in urban areas and 30 in rural areas via systematic random sampling within PSU. In the interior: subdistricts with no proper address system, names of head of households substituted the addresses</p> <p>Stage 4: Random sampling of respondent within household, using birthday method</p> <p>Stratification: 1. Strata: all 13 (sub-)districts urban/rural were represented proportional-to-size. 2. Clusters: 94 PSU's were randomly selected within the sub-districts (proportional to size). 3. for each PSU 20 addresses in urban areas and 30 in rural areas via systematic random sampling within PSU. In the interior: sub-districts with no proper address system, names of head of households substituted the addresses.</p>
Sweden (SE)	<p>Source: National register database on the Swedish population.</p> <p>Stage 1: full probability sample of the adult population in Sweden (18-79 years)</p> <p>Stage 2: -</p> <p>Stage 3: -</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: -</p>
Switzerland (CH)	<p>Source: 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.</p> <p>Stage 1: The gross sample has been retrieved by the SFSO, using a random procedure inside each of the 7 NUTS2 regions. The regional stratification is proportional. Individuals are the sample units.</p> <p>Stage 2: -</p> <p>Stage 3: -</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: 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.</p>
Taiwan (TW)	<p>Source: Household Register</p> <p>Stage 1: The number of target respondents is decided for each of the six strata of regions proportionate to the size of their populations.</p> <p>Stage 2: The number of townships is decided for each level of regions and is randomly selected from each level. Villages or “li”s (administrative unit under township) then are randomly selected from each chosen townships</p> <p>Stage 3: The number of respondents is decided for each village or li. Individuals ages 18 or over are randomly selected from household registers in each village or li (administrative unit under township).</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p>

Stratification: 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 ages 15 and 64, (5) the proportion of population aged 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

Thailand (TH)	<p>Source: Describe the sources used for sampling as the type of register or the specific procedure used</p> <p>Stage 1: A list of district per region was randomly selected, the number was determined in proportion to the population of the region.</p> <p>Stage 2: This stage consisted in randomly selecting a number of sub-district in each district in proportion to the population in the selected district per region.</p> <p>Stage 3: The third stage determined the number of people to be surveyed according to the number of selected sub-district per region.</p> <p>Stage 4: The name individuals were selected from the selected sub-district, using the systematic sampling.</p> <p>Stratification: -</p>
United States (US)	<p>Source: US Postal Service Address List</p> <p>Stage 1: First-stage units on the National Sampling Frame are called National Frame Areas (NFAs), each of which is composed of a USPS Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) of one or more</p> <p>Stage 2: The second-stage selection yielded a sample of segments that are census tracts in urban areas (where post office address lists are usually available) and a sample of segments that are block</p> <p>Stage 3: Households within block groups or census tracts</p> <p>Stage 4: Individuals within households</p> <p>Stratification: 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.</p>
Venezuela (VE)	<p>Source: List of census blocks within segments which are groups of approximately 200 dwellings for the whole country based on 2011 household and population national census. The list of dwellings within the census blocks was emended just before the study.</p> <p>Stage 1: Systematic selection of census blocks (units for the first stage) with probabilities proportional to the number of households within each stratum.</p> <p>Stage 2: Systematic selection of dwellings (units for the second stage) with equal probability within each census blocks.</p> <p>Stage 3: random selection of a person within the dwelling using the Kish method</p> <p>Stage 4: -</p> <p>Stratification: Explicit geographic stratification by political and administrative regions called states. Implicit stratification by socio-economic level within states.</p>