ISSP Technical Report

ISSP module

M1. This report describes the realisation of the IS	SP module	in
M2. The study was organised by		
Wiz. 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.	O Yes O No	Language specialist Survey specialist Other
2.	O Yes O No	Language specialist Survey specialist Other
3.	O Yes O No	Language specialist Survey specialist Other
4.	O Yes O No	Language specialist Survey specialist Other
5.	O Yes O No	Language specialist Survey specialist Other
6.	O Yes O No	Language specialist Survey specialist Other
7.	O Yes O No	Language specialist Survey specialist Other
8.	O Yes O 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.	O Yes O No	Language specialist Survey specialist Other	
10.	O Yes O No	Language specialist Survey specialist Other	
11.	O Yes O No	Language specialist Survey specialist Other	
12.	O Yes O No	Language specialist Survey specialist Other	
13.	O Yes O No	Language specialist Survey specialist Other	
14.	O Yes O No	Language specialist Survey specialist Other	
T3. The following questions, sectollowing languages	tions, words or concepts caused p	roblems when translating in the	
T4. The translation problems wer	re addressed with the following so	olutions	
	was tested (please answer for the individuals	first language mentioned in T1.1)	
	individuals		

Data collection

D1. The ISSP module was
An individual survey compraising only the ISSP modulePart 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 questionnaireMiddle of the questionnaireEnd of the questionnaireDoes 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 orderNot 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: · O No visuals (showcards) O Visuals (showcards) O 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 O Not offered to respondents O 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
O In electronic format
A combination of paper and electronic forms
O No contact forms were used
D11. Approximatively % 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):
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?
GET THICK COTTECTIONS WETE CONC.

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 householdsAdults 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).
S5. One or more stratification variables
S5. One or more stratification variables O Were not used when drawing a smaple O 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
C Last or next birthday
Other
S8a. If "other", please specify
SO The counting desired and section (a)
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? O Yes
No, not needed according to the design
O No, needed by design but not computed
If No please skip the section and proceed to response rate section
W2 TI : 1(4) 11 11
W2. The weight(s) were calculated by O The data collection agency
The ISSP member organization
Other

If other, please explain
W3. Is the weight personal-level, household-level, or something else?
O Person
O Household
Other Other
If other, please explain
W4. What type of weight was applied?
Single type weights
O Design weight
O Post-stratification weight
O Non-response weight
Combined, summary weights
O Design+post-stratification
O Design+non-response
O Post-stratification+non-response
O 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 w	veights were used, they were based on the following varia	bles:
Response rate		
Main AAPOR Category	Detailed AAPOR category	
5. Issued sample	Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)	
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:	
3. Unknown eligibility	3. Unknown eligibility, non-interview	
2. Eligible, no interview	2.10 (except 2.12) Refusal (household and individual)	
	2.12 Break-off	
	2.2 Non contact	
	2.3 Respondent unable to participate, other in AAPOR	
	Other types of unproductive reaction	
	Specify:	
1. Interviews	Valid interview	

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.