

**Eleventh International Workshop on  
Comparative Survey Design and Implementation (CSDI 2013)**

**Session Abstracts**

**Session 1 - Survey Process Quality**

**1. Quality assurance and quality control in 3M surveys**

*Gelaye Worku and Lars Lyberg, Stockholm University, Sweden*

Quality assurance (QA) and quality control (QC) are clearly neglected areas in many 3M surveys. In this paper we define quality assurance and quality control and its role in the survey life cycle. We define what is special about 3M surveys and describe the efforts made in a number of more or less ongoing surveys. There are examples of surveys that put in considerable effort in maintaining high quality, while others show very little ambition. Based on the steps of the survey lifecycle we summarize what is being done. What is in place and what is not in place? What can be praised and what can be criticized? We end with a modest suggestion regarding the implementation of a basic QA/QC framework.

**2. Measuring comparative error**

*Brad Edwards, Westat and Tom W. Smith, NORC at the University of Chicago, USA*

“Total survey error (TSE) ... refers to all sources of bias (systematic error) and variance (random error) that may affect the validity (accuracy) of survey data.” (Lavrakas 2008) However, most of the TSE literature is based on cross-sectional, mono-cultural surveys. Recently, some have proposed other error sources as part of TSE: conditioning effects in longitudinal surveys (effects that arise from the dimension of time), and comparative error in cross-cultural or multinational surveys (Smith 2011). The literature on comparative survey methods offers many examples of errors that arise from comparing cultural groups or countries, but this community of scholars has not engaged closely with the TSE literature. This paper develops the concept of comparative error, elaborates on its relationship to other TSE sources, and discusses some ways to measure it.

**3. Upgrading tender specifications for the European Company Survey (ECS): Integrating advanced translation and cognitive interviewing into the questionnaire design process.**

*Greet Vermeylen, Eurofound, European Union*

The European Company Survey (ECS) is a representative Europe-wide business survey. The aim is to map workplace practices and social dialogue at workplace level in the European Union, with a view to inform policy makers at national and European level about these issues. Currently, fieldwork is taking place of the 3<sup>rd</sup> wave of the survey (3<sup>rd</sup> ECS).

The unit of enquiry is the establishment, local branches of companies. The target sample is 30000 establishments in 32 countries (27 EU Member States and Croatia, Former Yugoslav

Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Montenegro and Turkey, ranging from 300 to 1650 per country). It is a CATI survey and consists of two interviews per establishment: an interview of 25 min with a human resources manager, followed by a 15 minute interview with an official employee representative on the other hand (where possible).

The topic of the survey has changed for every wave: the first survey (2004/5) dealt with working time and work life balance, the second one (2009) with flexibility practices and social dialogue and the third one (2013), is dealing with work organization, workplace innovation, employee participation and social dialogue.

The questionnaire of the survey is drafted by Eurofound in close cooperation with what is called 'tripartite stakeholders' of Eurofound's Governing Board, in order to ensure integration of concerns of the current social debate, and a group of experts from different member states, involved in national surveys dealing with these matters.

One of the main challenges of any cross-national survey is to have a questionnaire, which is not only politically relevant, but which captures the concepts in a comparable way in a multinational setting. One of the new elements in the current wave of the survey is an advance translation of the draft source questionnaire in two target languages. This helped to finalize the questionnaire to be pre-tested and were used to formulate translators' guidelines. Furthermore, a pretest took place in three countries and consisted of both cognitive and structured interviews. These fed into the finalization of the questionnaire, which was subsequently translated in all languages. Furthermore, key concepts which might be locally specific were translated separately by experts from all the countries and provided to the translators.

The paper will give overview of the different steps of this process.

## **Session 2 - Metadata**

### **4. Best and actual practices: Documenting data collection on the ISSP**

*Lauren Doerr, NORC, USA*

Much literature has discussed the importance of documenting the data collection lifecycle and paradata, particularly in cross-national studies. However, information around the "nuts and bolts" of international field efforts is sparse and/or difficult to locate, and tends to be organized by country or local organization. This presentation will discuss existing precedents for documentation of both best practices and actual practices in multi-national data collection. Then, it will describe an evolving proposal to collect or synchronize documentation of the realities of the data collection process across the various fielding organizations that participate in the ISSP. It will then open the floor to discussion.

### **5. Quality assessment of ISSP background variables**

*Evi Scholz and Regina Jutz, GESIS, Germany*

The presentation provides first insights into the quality of revised ISSP background variables. The quality assessment is the last step in the revision process of the ISSP background variables (ISSP BV) starting in 2009. The process involved a review and discussion of the construction of background variables of each ISSP member country and resulted in modifications and some additions to the background variables. With the ISSP 2010 we have now the chance to evaluate the modified background variables with the most recent published data. For 30 countries we did a quality assessment in technical terms investigating coverage and non-response of ISSP BV, both with respect to variables in general and with respect to single categories.

### **Session 3 - Surveying Hard to Survey Populations (H2S)**

#### **6. Five dimensions that impact surveying disaster affected populations**

*Beth-Ellen Pennell, University of Michigan, USA, Yashwant Deshmukh, C-Voter, India  
Jennifer Kelley, University of Michigan, USA, James Wagner, University of Michigan, USA  
and Patty Maher, University of Michigan, USA*

This paper discusses the methodological challenges and issues that face researchers studying displaced populations due to natural or man-made disasters. It covers studies in such diverse contexts as the Gulf Coast of the United States, Haiti, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Ukraine, and Japan. Worldwide, natural disasters have increased over 200 percent in the past decade, affecting over two billion people (Centre of Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters; Guha-Sapir, Vos, Below & Ponserre, 2011). In 2010 alone, natural disasters affected more than 200 million people and cost more than \$100 billion USD worldwide (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, in partnership with Norwegian Refugee Council; Yonetani, 2011). The rise in natural disasters highlights the ever increasing demand to understand the physical, mental, social and economic needs of these populations. Studies that target these populations face extreme and challenging conditions. Standard survey approaches and methodologies may well not be feasible or appropriate in these contexts.

This paper reviews the relevant methodological and substantive literature on studying internally displaced populations as well as draws upon the experiences of the authors and their collaborators in the implementation of research in areas of natural and man-made disasters (e.g., Chernobyl and Japan's 'dual disaster'). Further, this paper discusses innovative approaches in study design and field operations to address such issues as sampling, questionnaire development, field operations, and ethical issues, as well as other context-specific study design and implementation details. The presentation will focus on the five unique dimensions of disasters, (i.e. Type, Severity, Location, Phase and Goal) and how they impact the survey life cycle, with particular attention to questionnaire development, field operations, and ethical considerations.

#### **7. Surveying cultural and linguistic minorities**

*Janet Harkness, Matthew Strange, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Kristen Cibelli, University of Michigan, Peter Mohler, University of Mannheim, Beth-Ellen Pennell, University of Michigan, USA*

Cultural and linguistic minorities can be hard-to-reach (H2R) either as the target population of interest or as a subpopulation of a general population survey. The challenges associated with studying these minorities are important to understand in order to assess and address the survey error that can be introduced when designing and implementing studies that include these groups.

But what are cultural minorities? How do they differ from linguistic minorities? What makes them sometimes H2R and how can we improve data quality on them? What insights does the literature provide and what is lacking? Do procedures commonly advocated to survey these populations mirror best practice recommendations? If not, how can practical improvements be achieved? What tools help document and improve research quality? Prepared as a chapter in the forthcoming book *Hard-to-Reach Survey Populations*, this paper aims to answer these questions. It draws on a systematic review of literature of methodological challenges in surveying H2R populations, including our own work appraising procedures used in design, translation, adaptation, and implementation for cultural and linguistic minorities.

We begin with a description of what constitutes cultural and linguistic minorities. We discuss the potential challenges faced by researchers interested in surveying cultural and linguistic minorities and approaches taken to address these challenges in the areas of sampling and coverage, questionnaire development, adaptation and translation, pretesting, and data collection. We also outline additional approaches to studying these hard-to-reach populations including qualitative, mixed-methods, and community-based research methods and how these can complement survey methods. The concluding section addresses needed improvements in the documentation and development of research methods to expand solutions and increase the quality of hard-to-reach cultural and linguistic minority research.

#### **8. Conducting surveys in areas of armed conflict**

*Zeina Mneimneh, Bill Axinn, Dirgha Ghimire, Kristen Cibelli, University of Michigan, USA and M. Al-Kaisy, Ibn Seena Teaching Hospital*

This presentation aims to guide researchers interested in conducting surveys during armed conflict by pointing them to survey design and implementation challenges encountered in such contexts and discussing possible approaches to address those challenges. Prepared as a chapter in the forthcoming book *Hard-to-Reach Survey Populations*, we first identify a number of dimensions that characterize most armed conflict settings. We then discuss how these dimensions pose methodological challenges at different stages of the survey lifecycle and potential solutions to address the challenges and improve survey data quality in armed conflict settings.

Armed conflict presents substantial challenges for survey research. However, we find that possible solutions can be drawn from an overarching set of four principles: 1) flexibility at

different phases of the study, 2) a mixed method approach that could maximize that flexibility and minimize possible bias, 3) unconventional approaches in interviewer's recruitment and training, and 4) tailoring data collection approaches. In this presentation we focus on the application of these principles specifically to questionnaire development and pretesting, interviewer hiring and training, and data collection. Finally we address the ethical considerations that arise when conducting surveys during armed conflict and conclude with some future directions.

#### **Session 4 – Language & Translation**

##### **9. Learning effects in answering surveys in a non-native language**

*Oliver Lipps, Brian Kleiner, and Eliane Ferrez, FORS, Switzerland*

This paper is a follow-up of a previous one (Kleiner, Lipps, and Ferrez 2012), of which a preliminary version was presented at the CSDI workshop in Washington in 2011. In that work, we analyzed the data quality collected from sampled individuals who were not native speakers of the survey language, but who decided to participate all the same. That survey respondents may not be fully proficient in the language of survey administration may be due to the fact that the questionnaire is not available in the respondents' native language or that they accept the language of the first contact (most often the language spoken in the respondent's region). The latter may be a pragmatic solution if the respondent does not want to be re-contacted by another interviewer at a possibly less convenient time. In addition, some respondents may prefer to speak the language of the area they are living in and may welcome being interviewed in that language.

##### **10. Translation into shared languages in comparative surveys - The example of the translation into Russian in ESS, ISSP and WVS**

*Anna Andreenkova, CESSI, Russian Federation*

The issue of the translation on shared languages is one of very important for comparability surveys in many regional or world-wide comparative projects. We will explore the methods of translations into shared languages and the consequences of different approaches to the translation on the example of Russian language.

Russian language is used in many countries participating in such important comparative projects as ESS, ISSP, World Value survey, Eurobarometer etc. - in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, three Baltic countries and Israel. Sometimes the comparative studies are conducted in 15 countries which were formerly united into Soviet Union. The proportion of interviews administered in all these countries in Russian varies from 3% in Georgia to about 50% in Ukraine, 96% in Belarus and 100% in Russia. In some of these countries the choice of Russian language is mostly defined by Russian ethnicity and Russian is the mother-tongue and most-often used language for respondents. But in some countries Russian is the only language of communication between different ethnic groups (for example, Armenians and Azeri) and is chosen during personal interviews by respondents of non-Russian ethnicity

whose main language is not Russian (as a small minority they prefer Russian as mean of communication to the main language of the country like Tatars in Ukraine or Ukrainians in Middle Asian or Baltic countries). Sometimes respondents in some countries choose to be interviewed in Russian to express their political protests or other political, social views and preferences. So, respondents in different countries choose Russian as a language for personal interview because of different motives and belong to different groups by their ethnicity, fluency in Russian and peculiarities of Russian language. All these should be taken into account when translating the source questionnaire into Russian in comparative surveys. Moreover in some countries main country language belongs to the same language group as Russian – for example, Ukrainian or Belarus which make the translation process and the comparison and the validation of translations between two main languages easier. But in some countries main language is very different linguistic group than Russian (all Transcaucasian languages, languages of Baltic countries or of Middle Asian countries). Then the task of the translation of international source questionnaire is even more difficult – one needs to take care not only about equivalence between source questionnaire and Russian questionnaire but also between questionnaires in all local languages including Russian.

The purpose of the current study is assessing the degree of similarity of questionnaires in Russia in different large-scale international surveys as ESS, ISSP and WVS, evaluate the number of dissimilarities between translations and figure out the sources of these dissimilarities and possible consequences of them for data comparison on analysis stage. All differences in translations are classified into different types – grammatical and punctuation differences and words order, differences due to the usage of synonymous, differences in response scales, differences in substantial words in the question, usage of additional words, etc. The following step will be the attempt to differentiate the differences in translation into differences in usage of Russian language in different social, cultural and political environment, the differences due to the differences in interpretation of question and answer categories by translation and researchers and differences attributed to the style and specific usage of language of particular translator. As a conclusion we will try to show the specific problems and issues translating the questionnaire into Russian in general and with comparative purpose in particular.

#### **11. Quantitative evaluation of questionnaire translation with bilingual speakers**

*Sunghee Lee, Julia Lee, and Jennifer Kelley, University of Michigan, ISR-SRC, USA*

This study attempts to evaluate the measurement equivalence in translated questionnaires quantitatively by using data from the National Latino and Asian American Study (NLAAS). The NLAAS conducted an experiment with Latino respondents who reported equal proficiency in English and Spanish (bilingual Spanish-English speaking Latinos) by randomly assigning the interview language between English and Spanish. Other than interview language, by design these two groups should be comparable in measures. Any difference between the interview language groups among the bilingual Latinos can be attributed to the differences in the measurement properties due to translation. We adjust for any potential differences between language groups with respect to age, gender, education and

nativity. This is done by standardizing the distributions of these four variables to match those of the English group. We focus on the translation of vague quantifier response scales commonly used in survey research. The translation of these response scales is not simple as they combine both negation and quantification and as the available lexical and structural options for the scales differ across languages, and there is very little empirical research on this area. One may argue that bilingual respondents may bring in different cultural norms depending on the interview language making the differences in estimates are caused by cultural rather than linguistic differences, this study does not attempt to examine linguistic equivalence apart from cultural influences. Instead, we regard the differences in estimates indicating measurement non-comparability between the questionnaires due to translation regardless of whether caused by linguistic or cultural influences.

## **Session 5 – Questionnaire Development & Testing**

### **12. Probing in different scenarios – a typology**

*Dorothee Behr, GESIS, Germany*

The presentation aims at offering a typology of probing. Typical scenarios where probing can be implemented (cognitive interviewing, debriefing, random probes, web probing) will be looked at in terms of respective goals, actors involved, probing techniques, case numbers, to name but a few dimensions. The typology shall encourage discussion on best practice for item evaluation and on appropriate combinations of different probing scenarios. The focus will be placed on cross-national implementation.

### **13. The challenges in cross-national cognitive interviewing**

*Beth-Ellen Pennell, Zeina Mneimneh, Kristen Cibelli, and Jennifer Kelley, University of Michigan, USA*

Adapting cognitive interviewing techniques to multiple cultural contexts adds additional layers of complexity. This presentation discusses the challenges involved in conducting cognitive interviews in an international context. We discuss the following topics:

- Cognitive interviewer recruitment – What is the ideal background and experience?
- Training - How should the necessary knowledge and skills be transferred? What length of time is required? What materials are necessary? Can training be done remotely? How can readiness be assessed?
- Monitoring and supervision – What is the best way to monitor cognitive interviewing? Should interviews be recorded? What if recording is culturally or technically not feasible? How can language barriers be overcome?

We draw on examples from our experience applying cognitive interviewing techniques in other countries, most recently in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA), but will also outline a design for an upcoming cross-national study, hoping to initiate a dialogue with colleagues to

gain insights or suggestions on the successful application of cognitive interviewing methods in collaboration with survey research colleagues in other countries.

## **Session 6 – ACASI in Cross-Cultural Settings**

### **14. Introduction of ACASI voices in translation (Audio Computer Assisted Survey Interview)**

*Brad Edwards, Jeff Phillips and Ed Dolbow, Westat, USA*

Traditional ACASI instruments employ recorded “voice talents” to read the questions. This approach offers good voice quality but is time-consuming and costly. These challenges increase with instrument length and complexity. Text-to-speech (TTS) technology, similar to that used by e-book readers, is an alternative to human recordings that could greatly reduce ACASI implementation costs. Westat is evaluating TTS as part of the field test of a large-scale longitudinal study. We will discuss the TTS implementation process, the lessons learned from the field test, and the advantages of TTS vs. recorded voice approaches.

### **15. ACASI implementation across languages and cultures: Spanish ACASI on the National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG). Arabic ACASI on the World Mental Health (WMH) study in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Chinese ACASI on the China Mental Health Study (CMHS).**

*Nicole Kirgis, Yu-chieh (Jay) Lin, and Zeina Mneimneh, University of Michigan, ISR-SRC, USA*

Audio Computer-Assisted Self Interviewing (ACASI) has been used on U.S. surveys since the mid 1990’s as a methodological tool for the administration of sensitive or stigmatizing questions in order to improve reporting on such measures. For example, studies such as the National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG) use ACASI to collect specific information on sexual behaviors and abortion. By removing the interviewer as the administrator of the questions, respondents are afforded a private environment in which to provide accurate responses, thereby reducing social desirability bias and thus increasing reporting of sensitive behaviors. It is also believed that ACASI, in comparison to other self-administered modes such as Computer-Assisted Self Interviewing, reduces use barriers related to low literacy.

Little is known about the use of ACASI across different cultures and languages, specifically in the developing world. This session will explore practical issues in the implementation of ACASI based on data collection experiences across several surveys implemented in three countries of varying levels of economic development, social structure, and technology penetration across different segments of the population: Spanish ACASI on the NSFG, Arabic ACASI on the World Mental Health (WMH) study in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and Chinese ACASI on the China Mental Health Study (CMHS).

Specifically, the presentation will cover aspects of project implementation, including questionnaire content of ACASI, translation issues, text-to-speech use, and other design considerations. In addition, field experiences across the three studies will be presented,

including an evaluation of non-response rates, break-offs, and mode switching and how respondent and interviewer characteristics may influence these production measures.

## **Session 7 – Translation Assessment**

### **16. On the different uses and users of the term adaptation**

*Dorothee Behr, GESIS, Germany*

Transferring a questionnaire from one language and culture into another language and culture calls for translation and/or adaptation of the questionnaire. Whether translation or adaptation is required or referred to depends on various factors, among which: (1) the goal of the research (e.g., comparative), (2) the original design of the source questionnaire and, thus, its transferability to other languages and cultures (e.g., source questionnaire was designed with only one culture in mind), (3) the (linguistic) unit referred to (e.g., word vs. sentence), (4) the discipline – including its terminology – to which a researcher belongs (e.g., psychology, translation studies), or (5) personal views on what adaptation and translation involve. Firmly embracing Janet Harkness' work on adaptation (e.g., 2010), this presentation will look into the different uses and users of the term *adaptation*, in contrast to the term *translation*. This study shall encourage, in the long term, the use of a consistent terminology. A consistent understanding of what translation and adaptation involve is essential given the widespread use of cross-national research data, the different analysis techniques that can go with translation/adaptation, and the impact that different understandings of translation/adaptation have on the actual "translation" process. In the short or medium term, the aim is to raise a greater awareness of how the term *adaptation*, in contrast to *translation*, is used by different researchers. Also, a greater debate shall be encouraged on what kind of changes in translation are possible, or even required, to produce an equivalent questionnaire in comparative research.

### **17. Translation verification in the European Social Survey: A reliable means of assessing translation quality**

*Sally Widop, City University & ESS, GB, Brita Dorer, GESIS, Germany, and Rory Fitzgerald, City University & ESS, United Kingdom*

Throughout all stages of the cross-national survey life cycle there are threats to measurement equivalence. Errors can occur during the drafting, pre-testing or translation stages of questionnaire design as well as during administration of the questionnaire itself.

In order to address potential inaccuracies in its questionnaire translations, and to enhance the quality of the translations used the European Social Survey (ESS) included an additional 'verification' stage in rounds 5 and 6. cApStAn, an external company specialised in linguistic quality control of survey instruments, was appointed to verify a selection of items taken from the translated questionnaires in each participating country. This process involved

verifiers from outside the original translation teams checking the translations for linguistic accuracy and equivalence to the source questionnaire.

This paper will briefly compare the different strategies used to implement the verification process during ESS rounds 5 and 6. The types of translation problems identified by the verifiers in each round will be discussed and implications for both ESS national teams and for source questionnaire designers in general will be considered. Finally, we will evaluate to what extent verification has contributed to improving translation quality across the ESS and whether it should systematically be integrated into the well-established TRAPD methodology in order to have a homogeneous translation quality assessment across all ESS language versions.

#### **18. The online translation tool 'LMU' adapted to the needs of the European Social Survey (ESS)**

*Brita Dorer, GESIS, Germany and Maurice Martens, CenterData, the Netherlands*

The Language Management Utility (LMU), developed by CentERdata, has been in use in different multilingual surveys, amongst others, the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE). It is a web application that focuses on managing the translation process of multilingual CAPI and CAWI questionnaires.

LMU:

- is highly configurable; therefore it can be perfectly integrated into translation processes in the questionnaire development cycle;
- provides multiple interfaces for various roles in the translation process; tools for translation managers to overview the process;
- supports longitudinal studies; it manages and stores questions and their translations across waves;
- stores all intermediate steps, every change is stored and kept to allow roll back and analysis on the complete translation process;
- generates several reports and exports; in excel or word format;
- is Unicode compatible; fully supports all languages, including non-Latin characters, right-to-left languages;
- provides easy interface to Blaise programmes;
- imports Blaise questionnaires; textual changes will be identified automatically and flagged for translation reducing manual labour enormously;
- exports MultiLingual Blaise questionnaires online; translated versions of imported questionnaires can be generated directly from the web application.

The European Social Survey (ESS) is a major cross-cultural survey fielded biannually in 25+ countries since 2002. The English source questionnaire is translated into 30+ language versions applying, with methodological rigour, the TRAPD procedure. The translation

activities are carried out in the participating countries, and so far no translation tool or other type of centralised electronic platform has been used.

However, the wish to introduce such a translation tool has been increasingly expressed in order to work from one more homogeneous platform across the entire project. As the LMU has proven its usefulness in the SHARE project, it has been decided to adapt this tool to fit the ESS purposes. The first time of this tool going live for the ESS is scheduled to be the 7<sup>th</sup> round, that is, in 2014.

The paper will look into how the LMU can cope with the specific ESS requirements and be integrated into the ESS workflow: the new translation tool must not only be able to deal with all TRAPD steps, including two independent translations, review, adjudication, pretesting and documentation stages; the ESS has been using two additional features in order to enhance the quality of its translations, i.e. translation verification by cApStAn, an external service provider, and a coding scheme called SQP (Survey Quality Predictor), overseen by researchers at the Universitat Pompeu Fabra in Barcelona; in order to cover the full ESS translation turnaround, these two new steps need to be considered by the tool too. Examples of ESS-specific requirements to be solved include (a) defining the different roles in the LMU, e.g. to translators, reviewers, National Coordinators or for the ESS translation team; or (b) how to link this platform to the different fieldwork modes used in the ESS countries as these use both CAPI and PAPI. Another innovative idea would be to link the LMU with a Translation Memory function, a feature that is somewhat the heart of commercial translation tools in the broader translation business; and this would be an asset for survey translation tools too.

This paper will present work in progress, as the development of the joint 'ESS LMU' is underway, and a prototype is scheduled to be tested in autumn 2013.

## **Session 8 – Respondent Behavior; Translation**

### **19. Investigating cultural variability in nonverbal behaviors associated with responding to survey questions**

*Timothy Johnson, University of Illinois at Chicago, SRC, USA*

Nonverbal communication has been referred to as the “hidden dimension” of culture. Although more so in high-context cultures, all social groups employ some forms of nonverbal communication. Cross-cultural variability in expectations regarding the appropriateness of eye contact, expressions of emotion, various degrees of interpersonal distance, and sensory involvement during initial encounters may be expected to lead to higher rates of communication difficulties. Little research to date has attempted to systematically investigate potential variability in the nonverbal behaviors associated with survey interviews. In this presentation, we explore patterns of general nonverbal behaviors across four diverse race/ethnic groups during face-to-face interviews that were video-recorded in Chicago, and compare these with findings from more traditional nonverbal behavior coding research.

**20. Evaluation of response behavior on open-ended questions: Who took the burden to answer on the meaning of left and right?**

*Cornelia Züll and Evi Scholz, GESIS, Germany*

The left-right dimension plays an important role in all sorts of political science studies and analyses are mostly based on the left-right self-placement. In some studies that are interested in deeper understanding, this self-identification is probed by open-ended questions about the meaning of left and right. Due to a considerable non-response in these open-ended questions in the German General Social Survey 2008, quality assessment is recommended before substantive analyses on Germans' ideological ideas start. This paper investigates what affects response behavior to the open-ended questions on the meaning of left and right. Our findings indicate that not only substantial variables matter in response behavior but also some methodological issues.

**21. Backtranslation vs. committee approach: An experiment comparing how they perform**

*Alisú Schoua-Glusberg, Research Support Services, USA*

Twenty years ago, the only commonly used method for assessing questionnaire translations was backtranslation, a translation performed by a single translator, followed by a step in which a second translator translates back into English. The original and backtranslated English versions are compared, supposedly allowing the monolingual researcher to assess the quality of the translation. If both versions differ in meaning, any discrepancy is investigated. This process is expected to uncover problems in the original translation.

Janet Harkness began looking for alternative translation assessment approaches over fifteen years ago. She clearly identified the problems in using backtranslation exclusively, as it pretends to evaluate the translated instrument without actually looking at it.

Backtranslation, she observed, uncovers some problems in the original translation, some problems in the second or backtranslation, yet fails to uncover some problems in both steps. Harkness' developed the TRAPD (translation-review-adjudication-pretesting-documentation) model as an alternative method.

This presentation will describe an experiment underway to compare a translation obtained by backtranslation with one done by Committee Approach, a team approach that includes the steps in TRAPD and has gained acceptance in the industry since the mid 1990s, yet no experiments are published showing how it compares with backtranslation.

For the experiment, a survey scale of 20 items is being translated into Polish via Committee Approach. A comparison of a backtranslation version and the committee version will be performed to determine 1) how each process best identifies translation problems and 2) how each fares in producing a translation that native speakers in a focus group find most idiomatic.

## **Session 9 – Measurement**

### **22. The International Standard Classification of Education 2011 and its application in the European Social Survey**

*Silke Schneider, GESIS, Germany and Hilde Orten, NSD, Norway*

This paper introduces the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) 2011 as a tool for measuring educational attainment in comparative research. ISCED is commonly used in official and also increasingly so in academic surveys (e.g. the European Social Survey or since recently also the International Social Survey Programme). ISCED covers almost all countries in the world and is centrally maintained and documented by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, together with OECD and Eurostat. ISCED has been reviewed over the last few years, with the new version adopted by the UNESCO General Conference in November 2011. This paper first describes ISCED 2011 and the most important changes as compared to the older version, ISCED 1997. Then the paper deals with its adaptation and implementation to cross-national social surveys, using as example round 5 of the European Social Survey. Finally, the ESS round 5 education data will be evaluated a) in terms of their comparison with previous ESS rounds, b) official data, and c) construct validity. Remaining open issues and problems of the classification as well as future challenges will be discussed.

### **23. Measuring relationship status in Contemporary Europe: Problems and solutions**

*Sally Widdop, City University & ESS, United Kingdom and Hilde Orten, NSD, Norway*

In recent years there has been increasing diversification in the types of relationships that are legally recognised in Europe. Some countries have opened up marriage to same-sex couples (e.g. Norway & the Netherlands); others have introduced registered partnerships for same or opposite-sex couples (e.g. Germany & the UK). At the same time, unmarried cohabitation (and legal recognition of this) has also become more prevalent in many countries. In contrast, there remain areas of Europe where no such developments have taken place. Marriage continues to be defined exclusively as a union between two people of the opposite sex and marriages or partnerships for couples of the same sex are not legally recognised (e.g. Bulgaria & Russia) and unmarried cohabitation is far less common (e.g. Croatia & Greece).

This paper has three purposes. Firstly it describes the substantial efforts made on the European Social Survey to reduce measurement error and capture these new forms of relationship status, namely through the introduction and implementation of new question blocks in round 3 (2006) and again in round 5 (2010). Secondly, it offers an overview of how countries differ in the types of partnerships that are emerging and those that are legally recognised. Finally, it reports on the results of a review of the round 5 country-specific instruments and a consultation process with National Coordinators that was conducted prior to round 6.

### **24. Mortality prediction using self-rated health and mortality expectation**

*Sunghee Lee, Mingnan Liu and Norbert Schwarz, University of Michigan, USA*

Self-rated health (SRH) and mortality expectation are the two most frequently used factors for predicting mortality. Even though these two factors have appeared widely in the literature, it is not clear whether they are equivalent or one of them is preferable to the other. Also, it is unclear whether such predictions hold the same across different race/ethnic groups and between different interview languages. In order to achieve a reliable comparison between groups, it is crucial to make the measurement properties of SRH and mortality expectation comparable across different interview languages. In this study, we will explore this topic using the Health and Retirement Study (HRS) data from 1992 to 2010. HRS is a longitudinal survey collecting a series of health and finance related data along with mortality data in follow-up interviews. This allows us to use respondents' SRH and mortality expectation reports in predicting known mortality status. In particular, this study examines three research questions. First, we will examine the relationship between SRH and mortality expectation. Second, we will examine the mortality prediction power of SRH and that of mortality expectation separately and compare them. Third, we will compare the relationships and predictions in the first two questions across four separate population subgroups: English-speaking non-Hispanic Whites, English-speaking non-Hispanic non-Whites, English-speaking Hispanics, and Spanish-speaking Hispanics. In all analyses, the socio-demographic characteristics and objective health conditions will be controlled. The differential prediction powers across different conditions are a sign of potential measurement errors from lacking comparability.

## **Session 10 - Comparative Analysis**

### **25. Analysis of comparative surveys: What has changed?**

*Peter Granda, University of Michigan, ICPSR, USA and Meinhard Moschner, GESIS, Germany*

Even though comparative international surveys occupy a central position in the history of social science research, they mirror all the changes observed in data collection, sharing, and analysis seen over the last half century or more. Questionnaires are more complicated and often depend on complex computer-assisted programming; interviewers require increased levels of training; new metadata standards encourage more complete documentation as public-use files are created for secondary analysts; and analysts have access to much more powerful software and newer analytic techniques to produce their research outputs. All of this in a world where costs skyrocket and response rates plummet.

There are now many traditional comparative surveys, such as the Eurobarometers, ISSP studies, and World Values Surveys, with long histories and impressive numbers of publications from their use. There are also newer surveys, like ESS and SHARE, which attract considerable attention from the research community because of their methodological advances and attention to detail on all aspects of the survey life cycle.

This session solicits papers from research analysts which probe into the relationship between these surveys and also compare results from different survey programs. Possible questions that this session seeks to investigate:

- Has the research use of the older comparative surveys changed over the years?
- Has the appearance of the newer surveys changed the ways that researchers use these older surveys?
- What effect have newer design, sampling, and data collection methodological approaches had on such issues as questionnaire development, field operations, and analytic techniques for all comparative survey programs?
- Do the older surveys continue to provide data that newer researchers want to use?
- Have the increasing number of comparative surveys produced more accurate and reliable measures of their populations?
- Do we have too much comparative data or not enough?

## **26. Comparative multi-level analysis beyond GDP and employment rates**

*Daniel Fredriksson and Sebastian Sirén, SOFI, Sweden*

The Social Citizenship Indicator Program (SCIP) at SOFI is a unique database focused on institutional structures of five major social insurance programs. It provides detailed information on citizens' rights and duties based on legislation related to old age, illness, unemployment, work accidents, and family change. The database covers macro data from 18 countries with information pertaining to 1930, 1933, 1939, 1947, 1950, and thereafter every fifth year up to 2000. SCIP was initiated by Walter Korpi in the early 1980's to establish a theoretically relevant and empirically reliable set of institutional data for comparative welfare state research with a focus on political and other factors of relevance for development of social citizenship rights. It provides alternatives and complements data from the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). SCIP contains detailed information on citizens' rights and duties based on legislation related to five major programs, that is, old age pensions, benefits in the cases of sickness, unemployment and work accidents, as well as family support. SCIP includes 18 countries with uninterrupted political democracy during the postwar period, that is, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, UK and USA. Information refers to fourteen time points: 1930, 1933, 1939, 1947, 1950, and thereafter every fifth year up to 1995. The paper will provide an overview of SCIP as well discuss specific examples of comparative research successfully using both macro and micro data from survey such as the ESS or ISSP.

## 27. Comparative surveys – Fit for analysis?

*Peter Ph. Mohler, Mannheim University & COMPASS, Germany*

The title of this paper is admittedly somewhat exaggerating, but in what sense? What does it mean for a published comparative survey to be fit for analysis. The fitness for use quality concept always takes a user perspective. Thus the title could be read as "are published comparative surveys fit for analysis in a user perspective?". The answer is yes, but there are major pitfalls. Some of them are due to users not willing to read documentation, others are hidden at obscure places in documents, and some are just not mentioned at all. Examples are: Value Surveys using non-probability sampling as well as probability sampling without clearly stating that non-probability sampling disables comparability; items in the methods addendum to the ESS face to face surveys can be asked in several modes (face-to-face, self-completion etc.) within one country and across countries with interesting effects on their analysis; and, despite greatest efforts of survey publishers, users tend to ignore design weighting requirements. After a short general introduction, examples will be given for all three types of non-fitness for use.

### **Session 11 – Response Scales & Context Effects**

## 28. How people perceive ordinal response scales in self-reported health questions: A comparison between U.S. and China

*Mengyao Hu, University of Michigan, ISR-SRC, USA*

The unbalanced bipolar ordinal response scales for self-reported health questions (excellent, very good, good, fair or poor) are commonly used in U.S. surveys. With an increasing demand for cross-cultural studies, these scales are translated into many other languages, sometimes without understanding the impact it will have on data quality and/or comparability across cultures. Research into the comparability of self-rated health questions across cultures has been limited to experimental studies with only one version of translation used. Moreover, few of them have examined whether the changing of scale structures (such as from unbalanced bipolar to unipolar) would influence the within-culture response distributions and affect the comparability of cross-cultural studies.

This study attempts to comprehensively evaluate the comparability of self-rated health questions with ordinal response scales between U.S. and China. The China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS) – which contains two self-rated health questions translated differently and with different scale distributions – and the U.S. Health and Retirement Study (HRS) will be used for this study. Factor analysis will be conducted to measure various dimensions of health, and the same health indexes will be created for both culture groups. A series of cumulative logistic regression models will then be run to examine the potential different response patterns across culture and across different scale-designs by controlling the same set of health indexes and potential confounders. This study will allow methodologists to better understand whether different translations of response scales for self-rated health questions combining with differently designed scale structures could lead to measurement error in cross-cultural studies.

## 29. Interaction between question context effects and linguistic backgrounds

*Sunghee Lee, Norbert Schwarz and Leanne Streja University of Michigan, ISR-SRC, USA*

Despite lacking theories, question context effects are one of the most frequently examined measurement errors. Based on social cognition and communication theories and the notion of high vs. low context culture, we hypothesized 1) interactions among textual, cultural, and external question contexts. We chose the self-rated health (SRH) question, a popular survey item believed to be immune to context effects, and further hypothesized 2) larger context effects for Spanish speakers (and Hispanics) than English speakers (and non-Hispanics). We conducted two sets of experiments in a multilingual survey. A subset of respondents was randomly assigned to different textual contexts of SRH by varying its order in a questionnaire. The results supported the hypotheses. English-speaking respondents' reports on SRH were consistent across all textual contexts, but simple changes in the textual contexts produced dramatically different reports by Spanish-speaking respondents. Specifically, Spanish speakers reported substantially better health when SRH was asked after specific health condition questions than before any health-related questions. Because language is a proxy for culture, this demonstrated an interaction between textual and cultural contexts. Furthermore, among Spanish speakers, the textual context effects were larger for females and older respondents and differed by comorbidity status, illustrating an interaction among three types of contexts. Implications are twofold. First, context effect patterns observed in one culture do not necessarily apply to another culture. Second, even within the same culture, context effects vary by respondents' characteristics. Hence, context effects studied with a homogeneous group should not be assumed to hold in cross-cultural studies.

## Session 12 – Nonresponse

### 30. Nonresponse survey usability: Experiences in Switzerland

*Michèle Ernst Stähli, Caroline Vandenplas, Dominique Joye, and Alexandre Pollien, FORS, Switzerland*

With declining response rates in most countries across the world and a growing agreement amongst survey methodologists that high response rates are not a guarantee for low non-response bias risk, the need for nonresponse bias analyses of surveys is becoming more and more important. The difficulty of performing such analyses is the lack of available information about nonrespondents. Often strong assumptions have to be made to estimate nonresponse bias; e.g. nonrespondents are close to hard-to-reach and hard-to-convince respondents or bias/non-bias on socio-demographical variables predict bias on key variables. One possible way to collect data about nonrespondents is to conduct nonresponse follow-up surveys. In Switzerland, such surveys have been realized as a follow-up to 4 international surveys: European Social Survey 2006 and 2010, European Values Study 2008 and MOSAiCH 2011 ('Measurement and Observation of Social Attitudes in Switzerland' comprising the Swiss version of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP)). These surveys took however place in another time frame than the corresponding

main survey (2 to 6 months later) and had a very different design (self-administered questionnaire/CAPI, around 15 questions/ one hour face-to-face interview). Therefore, when comparing results from the nonresponse follow-up with the main survey outcomes to assess the nonresponse bias, one should be careful to separate the non-response bias from difference due to time, question positioning, mode or other possible effects. We analyse the possibility to disentangle the real difference between respondent and non-respondent from the different effect due to the change in design at the hand of a control group of respondents to both surveys (200 to 300 individuals). We also discuss the possibility to generalize our findings to other surveys and in other countries.

### **31. Nonresponse targets in a cross-national survey**

*Ineke Stoop, SCP, the Netherlands*

In recent years there has been increasing attention in the nonresponse community to the importance of overall response rates (what is acceptable and how important are they) and alternative approaches for reducing nonresponse bias (e.g., responsive design, adaptive design). Whilst there is a strong case for remaining reluctant about a move away from high response rates there are good reasons to study alternative targets.

The European Social Survey (ESS) sets a target response rate of 70%. Whereas prescribing a high target response rate has a number of advantages, it also poses a number of problems. To start with the pros: it is a goal easy to communicate and easy to check; the higher the response rates, the lower theoretical maximum nonresponse bias; aiming for a high response rate could be an incentive to try hard. But there are also disadvantages. Firstly, in some ESS countries a response rate of 60% or even 50% is the maximum that seems to be achievable. Secondly, it is neither clear whether higher response rates result in lower nonresponse bias, nor whether countries with the same response rates show the same nonresponse bias. Thirdly, response rates can be enhanced by focusing efforts on the easiest groups, or by indefinitely extending fieldwork, both possibly suboptimal strategies. And finally, it turns out that there are differences across countries in sampling design, fieldwork implementation and call record keeping that can magnify or obscure nonresponse effects.

The presentations will give some background on ESS nonresponse strategies and efforts to maximize response rates, minimize nonresponse bias and improve cross-national comparability.

### **32. Using the CNEST error source typology with triangulated cross-national pretest data**

*Rory Fitzgerald, City University & ESS, United Kingdom*

This paper evaluates a Cross National Error Source Typology that was developed as a tool for making cross-national questionnaire design more effective. Cross-national questionnaire design has a number of potential error sources that are either not present or are less common in single nation studies. Tools that help to identify these error sources better inform the survey researcher when improving a source questionnaire that serves as the

basis for translation. This article outlines the theoretical and practical development of the typology and evaluates an attempt to apply it to cross-national cognitive interviewing findings from the European Social Survey.

### **Session 13 – Social Science Infrastructure**

- 33. Organized by FORS, Lausanne: Short presentation on ESS (R. Fitzgerald)
- 34. Organized by FORS, Lausanne: Short presentation on EVS (FORS)
- 35. FORS publication on infrastructures (I. Renschler)

### **Session 14 – Measurement Error**

- 36. Measurement error, data quality and the software SQP  
Diana Zavala, Universitat Pompeu Fabra and Willem Saris, ESADE, Spain

- 37. **Correction for measurement error in multilevel analysis using SQP**  
*Bruno Arpino, Universitat Pompeu Fabra*

Despite the extensive literature on multilevel modelling and its wide application in the social sciences, few works have considered the problem of measurement error when applying multilevel models. In standard single-level settings, the consequences of measurement errors on parameter and standard error estimates are well-known. In multilevel models, measurement errors can provoke biases of parameter estimators at different levels. Moreover, variance components and Variance Partition Coefficients can be also affected. As a consequence, the substantive conclusions that we draw based on these badly estimated models might be wrong.

In this paper, we propose a simple approach to correction for measurement error based on questions quality predictions offered by the software SQP. SQP contains a data base of about 4000 survey questions of which the quality was estimated on the basis of MultiTrait MultiMethod (MTMM) experiments, the vast majority of which were conducted within the European Social Survey (ESS). Quality of questions not included in the experiments can be obtained through the software based on a meta-analysis of all the experiments by introducing questions characteristics. We will show how to use these quality predictions to correct for measurement errors in standard software. We argue that this approach is an improvement compared to previous works where corrections were based on sensitivity analyses or a-priori assumptions on error variances, not empirically justified on the basis of previous evidence.

We will demonstrate the approach using data from the ESS but it can have a more general application.

- 38. **Evaluation of the measurement model for political trust in the ESS (SPQ)**  
*Diana Zavala, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Spain*

Cross cultural survey research requires that the measures used to compare groups of countries or populations are indeed comparable. This paper evaluates if the questions used to measure the concepts for political trust in the ESS are equivalent or invariant i.e. they are interpreted in the same way by all respondents regardless of their cultural context or national origin. Configural, metric and scalar invariance is tested using Multi-group structural equation modelling (MG-SEM). The paper also examined the quality of the composite scores for invariant groups.

Typically invariance testing is done across countries, but in the ESS if at the least 5% of the target population speaks a minority language, language versions are translated. Therefore, it was worth to test if invariance holds cross culturally [groups defined by language]. Results show that political trust consists of two latent concepts: trust in institutions and trust in authorities.

Results show that trust in authorities is invariant for all the groups. Although, this is not the case for trust in institutions, in some cases one language within a country is invariant while the other is not.

**Eleventh International Workshop on  
Comparative Survey Design and Implementation (CSDI 2013)**

**Participants' Bio-Sketches**

**Anna Andreenkova**

Anna Andreenkova - is vice director and senior researcher of one of the oldest survey research company in post-Soviet countries - CESSI (Institute for comparative social research) which is located in Moscow (Russia) but has branches in Kazakhstan, Ukraine and conducts surveys in other countries of former Soviet Union. She is National Coordinator of ESS (European Social Survey) in Russia. Her main field of interests is the methodology of comparative surveys in post-Soviet countries, translation issues and methods of adaptation of survey instruments to different cultural environment, measurement of political attitudes and values in comparative perspective.

After her graduation from the Department of Sociology, Moscow State University, Anna Andreenkova was a Guest Fellow in Nuffield College, Oxford (UK) working on her doctoral thesis on political cleavages in new democracies. She got her PhD in Political Science from Russian Academy of Sciences in 1997. Dr. Andreenkova was involved in many large-scale comparative and single-country research projects including "Youth and the future" in all countries of the former Soviet Union with University of Maryland (USA), longitudinal study "Living Conditions and Life Satisfaction in Russia" (RUSSET) in cooperation with University of Amsterdam (Netherlands), "Ethnicity, Nationalism and Citizenship in former Soviet Union" with Nuffield College, Oxford (UK), "Party Formation in Russia and Ukraine" with the University of Iowa (USA), "Human values trends in post Soviet Russia" with Helsinki University in Finland and many others.

**Bruno Arpino**

Bruno Arpino is Assistant Professor at the Department of Political and Social Sciences, Universitat Pompeu Fabra. Previously, he has been working as post-doc research fellow at Bocconi University in Milan (Italy). He obtained a PhD in Applied Statistics from the University of Florence (Italy) in 2008 with a thesis titled "Causal inference for observational studies extended to a multilevel setting. The impact of fertility on poverty in Vietnam". The thesis was awarded by the Italian Statistical Society the price as the best thesis in Applied Statistics 2007/2008. His main research interests are in the areas of causal inference and multilevel models and their application in the socio-demographic field. He currently coordinates the activities related to the project "European Social Survey - Data for a Changing Europe (DACE)" for which the Research and Expertise Center on Survey Methodology (RECSM) of the Universitat Pompeu Fabra is responsible.

**Dorothee Behr**

Dorothee Behr is a researcher at GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Germany. She was a member of the Central Coordinating Team of the European Social Survey (ESS) and of the International Consortium of the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC). This work included involvement in comparative questionnaire design, drafting of translation guidelines and providing translation support to countries. Currently, she is involved in item development for PISA 2015 and in a research project that applies cognitive interviewing techniques to cross-national web surveys with the overall aim to assess item comparability in cross-national research.

Ms. Behr holds a diploma in translation studies from the University of Heidelberg. She received her doctorate in translation studies from the University of Mainz in 2009. In her dissertation, she studied the team translation approach in questionnaire translation. Her research interests include survey translation, cultural aspects in comparative survey research, web survey design, and cross-cultural probing.

**Kristen Cibelli**

Kristen Cibelli received her Bachelor of Arts degree in International Relations from Tufts University in Medford, Massachusetts. Following her B.A. degree, she worked in the area of international human rights. She assisted advocates in the collection, management and analysis of data about human rights abuses in countries including Liberia, Sierra Leone, Nigeria and Thailand (for Burma). She returned to graduate school earning her Masters of Science degree from the Joint Program in Survey Methodology from the University of Maryland at College Park. Kristen is currently a second year PhD student at the Michigan Program in Survey Methodology and serves as a Graduate Student Research Assistant at the Institute for Social Research's Survey Research Operations. Her research interests include cross-cultural survey research, interviewer respondent interaction, and the application of survey methods in challenging contexts such as post conflict or post disaster and in low development countries.

**Lauren Doerr**

Lauren Doerr is a Senior Survey Director at NORC at the University of Chicago, where she is currently the Project Director for the General Social Survey (GSS). She has served in a variety of roles in nearly all stages of the survey process in nearly ten years at NORC, and has been intimately involved with data collection on the ground for numerous international surveys. Lauren has also played a central role in developing and implementing training, interpretation and translation procedures for multilingual surveys at NORC, and serves as a point person for multilingual methodology issues. She holds a B.A. in Comparative Literature and Anthropology from Haverford College, and a M.A. in Social Psychology from the University of Chicago.

**Brita Dorer**

Brita Dorer is a researcher at GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, specialized in the field of questionnaire translation. She is currently heading the translation team of the European Social Survey. Her scientific interests are the evaluation and quality enhancement of questionnaire translation and adaptation, translatability of source questionnaires / advance translations, intercultural aspects of questionnaire translation. She is currently preparing a PhD

on advance translations carried out in order to improve translatability of survey questionnaires. She holds a degree in English, French and Italian translation studies from Johannes-Gutenberg-University Mainz, FTSK Germersheim, where she also worked as a freelance lecturer for English-to-German and French-to-German translation. She has been involved in translating survey questionnaires into German, such as ESS, ISSP, PIAAC and SHARE.

### **Brad Edwards**

Brad Edwards is a Vice President and Deputy Area Director at Westat in Rockville, Maryland just outside Washington, DC. He works on household and establishment surveys in long-term care, health care costs, and tobacco use, has management responsibility for the area that houses the PISA and PIAAC studies, and he's co-chairing a 2015 International conference on total survey error. He co-edited the 2010 monograph *Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional, and Multicultural Contexts* (Janet Harkness, lead editor), and is currently co-editing another book, *Hard-to-Survey Populations* (Roger Tourangeau, lead editor) following the Hard-to-Reach conference he co-chaired in New Orleans last year.

### **Michèle Ernst Stähli**

Michèle Ernst Stähli is currently in charge of the group "International Surveys" at FORS (organizing namely the ESS, ISSP, SHARE and EVS) and the Swiss Coordinator for the ESS. She is perfectly fluent in all national languages (F,D,I) and in English, a major advantage in supervising surveys in this multilingual country. Her career combines over 15 years of substantial academic research (PhD in sociology of work) and teaching of methodology for social sciences, and several years of experience as project manager of scientific surveys at a field agency in Switzerland. Her current methodological research focuses on the quality of different sample frames, the effect of incentives, non-response bias and mixing modes.

### **Rory Fitzgerald**

Rory Fitzgerald has been a member of the ESS Core Scientific Team (CST) since 2004 and became ESS Director in 2012. He plays a leading role in the design, management, and overall coordination of the ESS, and directs the CST. His key expertise is in cross-national survey methodology, with a focus on questionnaire design, pre-testing, and non-response. He also played a key role in developing the application for ESS to become a European Research Infrastructure Consortium (ERIC).

### **Daniel Fredriksson**

Daniel Fredriksson is a Research assistant at SOFI, the Swedish Institute for Social Research at Stockholm University. Daniel works daily with the SCIP/SPIN database performing coding and analysis on the four major social insurance programs included in SCIP (old age pensions, benefits in the cases of sickness, unemployment and work accidents) and the subsequent extension that is the Social Policy Indicator Database (SPIN) which will include also information and data on services such as childcare and elderly-care.

### **Peter Granda**

Peter Granda is Assistant Director for Collection Development at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) located at the University of Michigan and also is the Director of the Health and Medical Care Archive (HMCA), the official data archive of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. He has interests in the creation and use of comparative and harmonized data collections and also acts as Director of Data Processing for the National Survey of Family Growth and as Co-Principal Investigator of the Integrated Fertility Survey Series. Along with colleagues at GESIS in Cologne, he established a partnership to process and distribute the Eurobarometer surveys for secondary analyses.

He has a long association with the cultures of South Asia where he spent several years of study in the southern part of the Indian subcontinent and holds a Ph.D. in History from the University of Michigan.

### **Mengyao (Maggie) Hu**

Mengyao Hu is in her second year of study within the master program in Survey Methodology at the University of Michigan. In addition to her studies, she works as a research assistant within Survey Research Operations in the Survey Research Center. Her current research focuses on measurement errors in cross-cultural surveys. Since 2011 she worked as a quantitative analyst for Survey of Healthy Aging in Neighborhoods of Diversity across the Lifespan which was conducted in Baltimore. Ms. Hu recently completed an internship with Measurement Science Group (Center of Innovation) at the Nielsen Company, where she worked as a project manager for mobile survey research.

### **Timothy P. Johnson**

Timothy P. Johnson is Director of the Survey Laboratory at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). He is also Professor of Public Administration and Research Professor of Public Health at UIC, where he is responsible for teaching courses in survey methodology and data analysis. His personal research has focused on cultural and other sources of measurement and nonresponse errors in surveys, and the social epidemiology of health behaviors. Johnson earned his Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Kentucky in 1988. He currently also serves as Vice Chair for UIC's Social and Behavioral Institutional Review Board, as Deputy Director for Evaluation & Tracking of UIC's Center for Clinical Translational Sciences, and as President of the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research and current Associate Standards Chair for AAPOR, the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

### **Jennifer Kelley**

Jennifer Kelley is a Research Area Specialist at the Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. She splits her time between the International Unit and Survey Research Operations in the Program Design and Management Group. Jennifer is involved with several large surveys, including the World Mental Health Survey in Saudi Arabia and the National Survey of Family Growth. Jennifer received her Master's degree in Survey Methodology from the University of Michigan. Her operational interests include surveys conducted in international settings, particularly those in developing or transitional countries, and populations affected by disaster. Jennifer's methodological research interests are measurement issues in cross-cultural surveys and interviewer and respondent behavior.

**Nicole Kirgis**

Nicole Kirgis is a Survey Director in the Survey Research Operations unit of the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center, where she is currently directing the National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG). In addition, she provides consultation and training on data collection operations to international researchers. Her international work includes providing training and consultation to the Institute for Social and Environmental Research in Chitwan, Nepal, providing consultation to the Institute of Social Science Survey at Peking University for the Chinese Family Panel Studies and China Mental Health Study, and training on the Health and Retirement Study (HRS) in Japan. She was on the initial development teams for the World Mental Health Survey and the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE). She holds a BA in Social Relations from Michigan State University and is a master's student in the Program in Survey Methodology at the University of Michigan.

**Lennard Kuijten**

Since January 2012, Lennard works at CentERdata as a scientific programmer. He studied cognitive psychology and medicine at Maastricht University. He also holds a bachelor's degree in artificial intelligence from the University of Amsterdam. After his graduation at TNO on the use of online communication and ambient intelligence in support of transmural care, Lennard worked two years at Philips on applied research in the field of healthcare IT architecture. Prior to joining CentERdata, he worked for an organization that develops online CRM software and online knowledge environments for educational institutes. His work focused on e-learning environments, online benchmarking, user interface design and online surveys. In various other projects, Lennard worked extensively with large amounts of data, data analysis and online communities.

**Sunghee Lee**

Sunghee Lee is Assistant Research Scientist at the Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. Her research interest includes measurement and sampling issues for data collection with rare populations, including racial, ethnic, and linguistic minorities. Currently, she is examining inferences with respondent-driven sampling data and cultural influences on survey measurements among the US Latino population.

**Oliver Lipps**

Oliver Lipps, PhD, is head of the methodological research program at FORS - the Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences, Lausanne - and member of the Swiss Household Panel (SHP) team. In addition, he is lecturer in survey methodology and survey research at the Institute of Sociology at the University of Basel (Switzerland). He has been working on methodological issues in panel data since 1995. He has published a number of articles on data quality issues in cross-sectional and longitudinal designs, using data from, e.g., the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE), the Swiss Labor Force Survey (LFS), the European Social Survey (ESS), and the Swiss Household Panel (SHP).

**Lars Lyberg**

Lars Lyberg, Ph.D., is former Head of the Research and Development Department at Statistics Sweden and currently Professor Emeritus at the Department of Statistics, Stockholm University. He is the founder of the Journal of Official Statistics (JOS) and served as Chief Editor for 25 years. He is chief editor of Survey Measurement and Process Quality (Wiley, 1997) and co-editor of Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional, and Multicultural Contexts (Wiley, 2010), Telephone Survey Methodology (Wiley, 1988) and Measurement Errors in Surveys (Wiley, 1991). He is co-author of Introduction to Survey Quality (Wiley, 2003). He chaired the Leadership Group on Quality of the European Statistical System and chaired the Organizing Committee of the first European Conference on Quality in Official Statistics, Q2001. He is former president of IASS and former chair of the ASA Survey Methods Section. He is a fellow of the American Statistical Association and the Royal Statistical Society. He received the 2012 Waksberg Award.

### **Maurice Martens**

Since 2004, Maurice has worked with CentERdata as a scientific software developer. He studied Applied Mathematics and Knowledge Engineering. He has a Master's degree in Business Mathematics. Before joining CentERdata he was involved in developing mobile games. Maurice has extensive experience with various programming languages and environments. He focuses on web-based systems. Maurice is involved in several CentERdata projects, developing customized solutions for online web questionnaires to supporting large international studies and projects (SHARE, Understanding Society, Dasish). He is responsible for the design and development of the LMU; an online environment for managing translations for large multilingual studies in multiple modes. The LMU is currently being upgraded to also support the ESS translation process.

### **Peter Ph Mohler**

Peter is owner and Chief Consultant of Comparative Survey Services (COMPAS) and honorary professor at Mannheim University. He is the former director of ZUMA, Mannheim, where he was also head of the European Centre for Comparative Surveys (ECCS), PI of the German General Social Survey (ALLBUS) and of the German part of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP). He was ISSP Secretary 1991-1997 and a founding senior member of the ESS Central Scientific Team till 2008. He has served on the German Data Forum (RATSWD), the board of the Leibniz Gemeinschaft and as speaker of the Methods Committee of the German Sociological Association. His major research interests are comparative survey methodology, knowledge management, and computer-assisted text analysis. He is co-editor of Cross-Cultural Survey Methods (John Wiley, 2003) and Surveys in Multinational, Multiregional and Contexts (John Wiley, 2010). Together with colleagues of the ESS Central Coordinating Team, he received the European Descartes Prize in 2005. He read sociology at Frankfurt and Giessen where he received his Doctorate. From Frankfurt he received the *venia legendi* for Sociology.

### **Beth-Ellen Pennell**

Beth-Ellen Pennell is the Director of International Operations at the Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. Ms. Pennell has more than 30 years of experience in survey research operations and methods including the design and conduct of large-scale comparative surveys. She has been with ISR since 1989 and was Director of Survey

Operations for 10 years. Ms. Pennell also serves as the Director of the Data Collection Coordination Center for the World Mental Health Survey Initiative, a joint project of the World Health Organization, Harvard University and the University of Michigan. In this position, Ms. Pennell coordinates the technical support and oversees the implementation of the data collection activities for these general population epidemiological studies in more than 30 countries. She has presented, published and taught on survey research techniques and cross-cultural research. She is one of the editors for *Surveys in Multinational, Multiregional and Contexts* (John Wiley, 2010) and one of the lead editors for the *Cross-cultural Survey Guidelines* <http://ccsg.isr.umich.edu>, a comprehensive guide to the conduct of cross-national and cross-cultural survey research. Ms. Pennell received her Master's Degree in Applied Social Research at the University of Michigan in 1997.

### **Isabelle Renschler**

Isabelle Renschler is a political scientist by training with a PhD from the Swiss Federal Institute on Technologies in Lausanne (EPFL). She is a senior researcher at FORS and has been working on methodological issues related to cross-cultural surveys and language issues, and is coordinating institutional networking.

### **Silke Schneider**

Silke Schneider is head of the knowledge transfer department and researcher at GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences. Her area of specialisation is the measurement of educational attainment in cross-national surveys. After studying Sociology, Psychology and Philosophy at the University of Cologne, she completed her doctorate on this topic at Nuffield College, Oxford. Subsequently, she consulted the European Social Survey (ESS) on how to improve the measurement of education in the ESS. This involved an international consultation process with all ESS countries and close documentation by NSD, Norway. At GESIS, Silke Schneider coordinates the GESIS Research Methods Training programme, e.g. the GESIS Summer School in Survey Methodology.

### **Evi Scholz**

Evi Scholz is a researcher at GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Germany. She works for the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP), where she is responsible for the German survey and serves as member of the ISSP methodology committee and convener of the ISSP methods work group on demography. This work includes drafting ISSP source questionnaires, evaluating and improving the quality of the ISSP background variables and implementing the German ISSP surveys.

Evi Scholz graduated in political science, modern, social and economic history at the University of Mannheim. She received her doctorate in the social sciences from the University of Gießen. She is mainly interested in cross-national survey design and in the measurement of background variables.

### **Alisú Schoua-Glusberg**

Alisú Schoua-Glusberg is a cultural/linguistic anthropologist (Ph.D., Northwestern U. 1985) and has worked in survey research since 1984. As a survey researcher she has used qualitative techniques for improving questionnaire design, including focus groups, cognitive interviews and ethnographic interviews, specializing in the use of these techniques with Hispanics in the US. She has pioneered new approaches to instrument translation, a topic on which she has written and presented widely. She has been responsible for design and implementation of data collection strategies and procedures in technically and technologically sophisticated longitudinal and cross-sectional surveys, at NORC, Harvard University, Metro Chicago Information Center and IMPAQ International. She consults internationally on survey data quality and impact evaluations, and has worked in projects in Turkey, Mexico, the Georgian Republic, and currently in Senegal and Burkina Faso. She is Principal at Research Support Services Inc., which she founded in 1996.

### **Sebastian Sirén**

Sebastian Sirén is a Research assistant at SOFI, the Swedish Institute for Social Research at Stockholm University. Sebastian works daily with the SCIP/SPIN database performing coding and analysis on the four major social insurance programs included in SCIP (old age pensions, benefits in the cases of sickness, unemployment and work accidents) and the subsequent extension that is the Social Policy Indicator Database (SPIN) which will include also information and data on services such as childcare and elderly-care.

### **Tom Smith**

Tom W. Smith is an internationally recognized expert in survey research specializing in the study of societal change and survey methodology. He is Director of the Center for the Study of Politics and Society at the National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago. Since 1980 he has been a principal investigator of the National Data Program for the Social Sciences and director of its General Social Survey (GSS). He is also co-founder and former Secretary General (1997-2003) of the International Social Survey Program (ISSP). The ISSP is the largest cross-national collaboration in the social sciences.

Smith has taught at Purdue University, Northwestern University, the University of Chicago, Tel Aviv University, and the University of Cologne.

He was awarded the 1994 Worcester Prize by the World Association for Public Opinion Research (WAPOR) for the best article on public opinion, the 2000 and 2003 Innovators Awards of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR), the 2002 AAPOR Award for Exceptionally Distinguished Achievement, the Eastern Sociological Society Award for Distinguished Contributions to Sociology in 2003, the Best Publication by an International Scholar, American Sociological Association Section on Global and Transnational Sociology, 2010 and the Warren E. Miller Award for Meritorious Service to the Social Sciences, ICPSR/University of Michigan, 2011. He is currently Past President of the World Association for Public Opinion Research.

### **Ineke Stoop**

Ineke Stoop is a senior researcher at The Netherlands Institute for Social Research/SCP. She is a member of the Core Scientific Team of the European Social Survey. Her key expertise is in cross-

national survey methodology with a focus on nonresponse. She is a member of the European Statistical Advisory Committee (ESAC) and Scientific Secretary of the International Association of Survey Statisticians (IASS).

### **Greet Vermeylen**

Greet Vermeylen is a research manager in Eurofound (the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions) in Dublin since 2003. She is currently working on two European-wide surveys, the European Working Conditions Survey and on the European Company Survey (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/surveys/index.htm>). Previous to working in Eurofound, she was working in DG Employment and Social Affairs the European Commission and for a taskforce during the Belgian Presidency of the European Union dealing with social protection issues. She studied at the KULeuven, LUISS (Rome), ULB (Brussels), and at the European University Institute (Florence).

### **Sally Widdop**

Sally Widdop has been working for the Centre for Comparative Social Surveys at City University for seven years – first as a Research Assistant and as a Research Fellow (since 2010). She is heavily involved in the design, management and coordination of the European Social Survey (ESS) and is a member of the ESS Core Scientific Team. She is also involved in a wide range of activities related to the ESS including questionnaire design, pre-testing, fieldwork monitoring and has recently collaborated with SHARE colleagues on an EC FP7 project to develop enhanced fieldwork monitoring tools.

### **Gelaye Worku**

Hailemichael Gelaye, is a student at the master programme in survey methodology and official statistics at Stockholm University, Faculty of Social Science, department of statistics. She has a bachelor of science in statistics from Addis Ababa University. She is a member of the Ethiopian Statistical Association. She also worked as a data supervisor for Johns Hopkins University - Technical Support for the Ethiopian HIV/AIDS ART Initiative, in a program called Advanced Clinical Monitoring. She is currently working on her master thesis on quality assurance and quality control in multinational and multicultural surveys.

### **Diana Zavala**

Diana Zavala is a survey methodologist, currently representing RECSM-UPF at the Core Scientific Team (CST) and at the Translation Expert Task Group of the European Social Survey (ESS). She has participated in the design and evaluation of the questionnaire of the ESS Round 6 and in the preparatory works of the ESS Round 5. Her current research line is on quality of survey data, analyzing the effects of minority languages in the reliability and validity of cross-cultural survey data. At RECSM she has also collaborated with Catalan survey agencies consulting in survey methodology. In her previous experience, she coordinated the electoral surveys of a national newspaper for the 2006's Mexican presidential election. She collaborated as public opinion consultant at Mexican Senate. Diana has been consultant for World Health Organization (WHO)

Barcelona Office on several projects in Turkey and Spain. Her research interests are survey methodology, MTMM experiments, structural equation modelling and questionnaire design. She is also interested in religious pluralism, identity politics and political radicalism.

**Cornelia Züll**

Cornelia Züll is a researcher at GESIS (Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences) in the department “Survey Design and Methodology”. She works in the field of computer assisted text and content analysis. She supports academic survey researchers in computer-assisted text analysis, in the use of text analysis software and other data analysis methods. Her research focuses mostly on computer-assisted text analysis methods and application.