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1. Project summary

The European Social Survey (ESS) is a time series with three main aims:

1. To chart and explain shifts over time in Europe’s social, political and moral climate in relation to its changing population patterns and institutions

2. To improve methods of European social measurement in comparative studies, particularly attitudinal studies

3. To develop a series of European social indicators, including attitudinal indicators, that measure changes over time in the quality of life in different European nations

Three biennial rounds of the ESS have already been funded within FP5 and FP6, all co-funded by the European Science Foundation and some 25 national academic funding bodies throughout Europe. It is an academically-driven, uniquely rigorous comparative time series, helping to document and interpret hitherto inadequately-charted aspects of the European condition. Its wide-ranging questionnaire covers people’s value orientations, their political and cultural perspectives, and the underlying social structure of their societies. A separate data collection exercise monitors major events during fieldwork as a backdrop to an understanding of attitude change. The ESS has already established itself as a robust multi-national, multi-funded programme of large-scale substantive and methodological research – an exemplar of the European Research Area at work. It is also developing a world-wide reputation for both its rigour and utility. In the first 18 months of its first public data release, nearly 5,000 people across Europe and beyond had registered to use it. Seven books and countless articles based on its data are in preparation. A US clone has been funded by their American NSF. We are also negotiating an independent contract within Call 2 for ‘infrastructure’ support for the ESS - to sustain and improve its networks, accessibility, and methodology - but this specific targeted research project is solely for support of the 4th biennial Round of this influential and much-used European time series.
2. Project objective(s)

Why a European Social Survey?

Now beginning its third Round, the European Social Survey (ESS) is an important example of the European Research Area successfully at work. This specific targeted research project aims to continue the ESS into its fourth Round. It is in fact one of only two social science projects among the 23 projects which the Commission’s European Strategy Forum for Research Infrastructures (ESFRI) has included on its “List of Opportunities” to the Commissioner of projects corresponding “to major needs of the European scientific community in the coming years”, the development of which “is necessary to maintain Europe’s position at the cutting-edge of world research” (European Commission, 2005).

The ESS is unique or unusual in a number of respects. First, it was initiated not by a single group of scholars, but by the European Science Foundation in response to the joint resolve of its member organisations across Europe. Thus, in the mid-1990s the ESF set up an Expert Group which concluded after a year’s deliberations that a new European-wide time series to measure changes in underlying social attitudes across Europe had become an imperative. They then set up two further working groups to look at the practicalities of undertaking such a project, and a Blueprint eventually emerged (European Science Foundation, 1999; 2000). Only then did the ESF invite the first (and continuing) Co-ordinator of the ESS to form a team and seek funding from the EC in support of its first Round. A successful application was made under FP5 Call 2 and – since then – two further successful applications have been made by the same team for Rounds 2 and 3 (under FP5 Call 3 and FP6 Call 1).

From the start, however, the EC has been only one of over 20 funding bodies which support the ESS. The EC has funded the design and coordination of the first three Rounds, while the bulk of the project’s overall costs – its fieldwork and national co-ordination – has been supported at each Round by the academic funding councils of its 25 participating nations. Meanwhile, the ESF has continued to fund certain scientific meetings. So the ESS’s ‘bottom-up’ origins have resulted in a remarkably wide degree of endorsement from the academic social science community throughout the EU.

One reason for such wide support for the ESS is that climate shifts in the public’s deep-seated social attitudes are as important a part of social reality as are shifts in their demographic characteristics, social conditions and behaviour patterns. They influence the direction of public policy and the propensity for social and economic change. They are the primary drivers of change in the moral and political climate. Yet they tend to be excluded from the social research agendas of governments which focus mainly on socio-economic behaviour and circumstances (Davis, Mohler & Smith, 1994; Davis & Jowell, 1989). They are also largely outside the scope of media opinion polls which focus mainly on short-term changes in the social and political weather.

The ESS has three primary objectives:

- **To produce rigorous trend data at both a national and a European level about continuity and change over time in people’s social values.** In the absence of rigorously-compiled multinational statistics on changing social attitudes, it becomes all too easy for governments and parliaments to impute such data, drawing selectively on inadequate and often unrepresentative sources. In an extraordinarily well-documented continent, European governance remains hampered by a lack of reliable trend data about how the citizens of its
different member and applicant countries compare and differ in their underlying attitudes, preferences, prejudices and fears. This objective will be operationalised by designing and conducting the survey and producing the resulting high quality multi-country dataset to time. It can be measured by ensuring that each of the appropriate workpackages delivers to time throughout the life of the project and ultimately by the availability of the dataset on the web to timetable.

- **To tackle longstanding deficiencies in cross-national attitude measurement.** Perversely, the very factors that make political and cultural differences interesting and important also make them difficult to measure in a comparative perspective (Harkness, Van de Vijver & Mohler, 2003; Jowell, 1998; Kuechler, 1998). Language barriers are difficult to surmount. Methodological practices are difficult to harmonise. Each country has a different historical background and unique social and institutional arrangements which may differentially influence the way their citizens interpret and answer certain questions. Comparative attitude studies in Europe have long been the poor relations of national studies as a result of these difficulties, confounding cross-national comparisons and compromising European governance. This problem has for too long been overlooked and now urgently needs to be addressed and resolved. This objective will be operationalised by ensuring that quality enhancement continues from round to round on the ESS. In addition, all ESS protocols and methodological reports are made publicly available to ensure a cascading effect in relation to the methodological standards set by the ESS and the wider European research community.

- **To bring social indicators into consideration (alongside economic indicators) as a regular means of monitoring the quality of life across nations.** Official data designed to monitor the progress of nations have tended to be heavily dominated by economic indicators (GDP, RPI, unemployment levels, etc). This practice has, however, recently been revised with the EC’s adoption of regular measurements of social exclusion in EU countries (see Atkinson et al, 2002). The ESS is thus likely to become a valuable vehicle for data that contribute to the compilation of further social indicators – both behavioural and attitudinal. So, for instance, fear of crime could in future be monitored alongside actual crime statistics, and political trust could be monitored alongside figures on electoral turnout. There is, of course, always a complicated relationship between ‘objective’ and ‘subjective’ statistics of this nature, but it is indisputable that, in combination, they considerably enhance our understanding of societies. The recently applied for ESS i3 infrastructure proposal seeks funds to transform ESS data into a set of clear and commonly accepted social indicators. However such a process will only be possible if data are collected in each biennial round of the ESS so it is in this way that this objective can be measured. Measurement of success will therefore be the availability of Round 4 data at the end of the project. The pending infrastructure grant will enable this data to feed into an agreed set of indicators in the future. The ESS Round 4 questionnaire is likely to be influenced by the work of the infrastructure proposal if additional requirements for social indicator questions are identified.

Europe’s unique combination of diversity and integration makes it a natural laboratory for the development of rigorous methods of comparative measurement. In any case, European governance depends on evidence of the highest quality to understand and explain the complex interactions between Europe’s institutional structures and the behaviour and attitudes of its citizens. A key function of the European Social Survey is to raise methods of cross-national attitude research to a level of rigour comparable to best practice at a national level (Braun & Mohler, 1991; Park et al, 2002; van Praag & Uitterhoeve, 1999; Smith, 1982).
In relation to each of these goals the ESS Central Coordinating Team now has a clear track record of delivery. Data from Rounds 1 and 2 of the ESS have been made available on time and the ESS has been widely quarried and reported upon. The quality of the consortium and the management in making this happen as well as their ability to mobilise the resources available has clearly been demonstrated in ESS Rounds 1 and 2. In addition, the partners in the ESS consortium have clearly demonstrated that they have the resources and expertise available to produce high quality outputs to time.

**Demand for the ESS**

When applying to the Commission for the first round of the ESS, we had little idea of whether the support that had been expressed for it at a national level would translate itself into financial support. It had always been our intention that only central funding would be asked of the Commission and, to a much lesser extent, of the ESF, with the bulk of the overall costs to come from participating national academic funding agencies. We somewhat ambitiously anticipated in our initial application that some 15 of the ESF member organisations might agree to participate in the project and thus to meet their own national fieldwork and co-ordination costs. In response, the Commission generously agreed to fund the first Round.

In turn, an overwhelming 22 self-funding countries from virtually all corners of Europe (and beyond) decided to participate in Round 1 and – with one exception (Israel) again in Round 2. In fact five further countries joined in Round 2 (Estonia, Iceland, Slovakia, Ukraine and Turkey). The 27 participating countries to date, all of which we anticipate will also take part in Rounds 3 and 4 are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, 21 of the EU 25 countries are now involved in the project (with only Latvia, Lithuania, Cyprus and Malta currently missing). Also involved are Norway, Switzerland, Ukraine, Turkey (and Israel). This extraordinary degree of commitment to the ESS reflects a widespread recognition that the debilitating substantive and methodological gaps that the ESS seeks to address are indeed worth remedying. The ESS must above all resist becoming a glorified, European-wide opinion poll based on fragile scientific methods and sure-fire questions about topical issues. Its purpose instead is to be the authoritative source of data about long term value changes in a changing Europe. And to achieve that purpose it has to be both conceptually well-anchored and carried out with unprecedented rigour. Moreover, its data must be made immediately available to the academic and policy communities in Europe and beyond in an accessible and user-friendly format.

---

1 The funding decisions for ESS Round 3 are still being taken – in time for fieldwork in 2006.
2 As with all previous Rounds, national funding councils are not invited to commit themselves to participation in any Round until central funding from the EC has been finalised. However, at a recent meeting of the national funding councils, they decided to formulate a Memorandum of Understanding committing them to seek funds in advance for up to two Rounds at a time. The intention of this action is to ensure a degree of continuity and stability in what they regard as too important a time series to leave to ad hoc funding decisions.
All these aims have been achieved in Rounds 1 and 2 and improvements are under way for Rounds 3 and 4. As a premature model of the ‘European Research Area’, it depends on Commission funding for its co-ordination, on national funding for its fieldwork, and on the European Science Foundation for a network of meetings and academic advice. Recent cuts in funding from the ESF in this latter area will now be met through the infrastructure proposal submitted to the Commission. New nations, such as Croatia, Bulgaria, Malta and Russia are hoping to join the project in future rounds, and – as noted - the present participants are making arrangements to secure long-term support. As far as dissemination and potential exploitation of the findings are concerned, nearly 5,566 data users had already registered to use the data by June 2005, which are proving to be relevant to a wide range of social science disciplines – including political science, sociology, public administration, economics, social psychology, statistics, mass communications, modern social history and social anthropology. The dataset is also attracting the widespread attention of civil servants, politicians, think tanks and journalists.

Always planned as a time series, the ESS depends critically on the type of continuity provided by this Specific Targeted Research Project. As survey builds upon survey, it will provide a unique long-term account of change and development in the social fabric of modern Europe.

Progress to date

Until the first round of the ESS was well under way, we could not be sure that its ambitious methodological aims would actually be attainable in all participating countries. For instance, rigorous and consistent probability samples of this kind had not been attempted before in a Europe-wide attitude survey; nor had such meticulous question development or translation procedures; background socio-demographic data at this level, accompanied by ‘events’ data, were new departures; the response rate target of 70% – while long-regarded as highly desirable - were thought to be well above the reach of certain countries, such as the Netherlands and Greece. In all these respects, however, standards not previously achieved have not only been accomplished, but are now being sought in other surveys too, thus achieving one of the key aims of the ESS – the improvement of survey standards in general.

In a few countries, of course, such standards were already in place for important national surveys, but rarely for cross-national attitude surveys. Now, although by no means every participating country in the ESS is yet achieving all of the project’s ambitious goals, we are coming closer to our (unattainable) goal of uniform rigour. And many countries which have long suffered from poor response rates have shown marked improvements. For instance, renewed efforts and innovative methods in Switzerland lead to dramatic improvements in response rate from Round 1 (33.5%) to Round 2 (46.9%).

We have already referred to the unexpectedly large demand for the data, which became apparent as soon as the first Round dataset was first released (on time) in September 2003. This is now likely to accelerate following the launch of ESS Round 2 data on September 28th 2005. Three books on the data have already been published (in German, Hungarian and Polish), and four others are in preparation (in English, Spanish, Portuguese and Greek). Meanwhile, countless articles and dissertations based on ESS data are already under way and as they are made available they are listed on the ESS website and in the ESS data user bulletin. In several countries too, major conferences to launch the ESS data have taken place, and the mass media have highlighted many of the survey’s initial findings.

So far the only data available come from the first and second Rounds of the survey which will enable initial exploration of change and continuity. However, as soon as data from the third and
fourth Round data become available, it will enable even richer analysis of national and cross-national change, and in turn the survey is likely to grow even further in its interest and utility.

**Substantive contribution**

The core ESS questionnaire ranges over numerous topics which are designed to produce a unique record over time of underlying societal stasis and change.

The following broad topic areas are included in the core questionnaire:

- public trust in government, politicians and other major institutions
- political interest and participation
- socio-political orientations
- issues of governance and efficacy at the national and international level
- underlying moral, political and social values
- social inclusion and exclusion
- national, ethnic and religious allegiances
- well-being, health and security
- demographic composition - age, sex, marital status, etc
- education and occupational background
- financial circumstances
- household circumstances

In addition, each Round of the survey contains at least two substantial ‘rotating modules’, to be repeated at intervals. The subject matter of these modules, as well as the composition of the multinational specialist teams that help to determine their precise content, are selected following a Europe-wide competition. Round 1 of the ESS contained two such modules, each comprising around 60 questions. One was on public attitudes to immigration and asylum (and related subjects), and the other on issues to do with citizenship, involvement and democracy. In the second Round, three rotating modules were included – one of 60 questions and the other two of 30 questions each. The longer module was on the subject of family, work and well-being, and the two shorter ones were on the subjects of economic morality and health and care-seeking. In the third round the two modules selected are on the subject of well being and the life course. The data from the rotating modules already released have attracted immediate interest among users as they are less dependent than are the core modules on repeat readings.

Findings from the rotating modules may, moreover, be related in their analysis not only to one another, but also to the wide array of other substantive and background variables contained in the core questionnaire. Thus, in a book already in preparation on the immigration module, insights are being gained not only into the scale and nature of cross-national differences, but also into how precisely the findings relate to other attitudes and characteristics in those different societies.

A major launch conference of ESS Round 1 data took place at the invitation of the Commission at the end of 2003 in Brussels, at which the first analytical papers arising out of the ESS were presented by the project’s principal substantive and methodological architects. It was attended by around 200 people from all over Europe. The Commission has decided that a similar conference or a session at the European Social Model conference should accompany, or follow the release of the second Round data. These conferences, together with various national launch conferences – such
as in Norway, Poland, Portugal, Germany, the UK and Spain – have helped not only to disseminate ESS findings widely but also to obtain valuable feedback for the design of future Rounds.
### 3. List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partic. Role*</th>
<th>Partic. no.</th>
<th>Participant name</th>
<th>Participant short name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date enter project**</th>
<th>Date exit project**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>City University</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zentrum fuer Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen</td>
<td>ZUMA</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau</td>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ESADE</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Katholieke Universiteit Leuven</td>
<td>KUL</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Norwegian Social Science Data Services</td>
<td>NSD</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Ljubljana</td>
<td>UL</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CO = Coordinator  
CR = Contractor
4. Relevance to the objectives of the specific programme and/or thematic priority

State of the art

The ESS is by no means the first, nor will it be the last, survey of Europe-wide public attitudes. Three other reputable such surveys pre-date it and still play important roles. The Eurobarometers have been undertaken by the Commission since 1973 and have an enviable record. But they fulfil a quite different function from that of the ESS. In particular, their prime purpose is to serve the Commission’s public opinion research agenda. So, although invaluable as a European time series, the Eurobarometers were never designed or resourced to achieve either the coverage or the exacting standards of rigour that the ESS has set for itself – whether in respect of sampling, response rates, fieldwork quality or question reliability (Bréchon & Cautrès, 1998; Saris & Kaase, 1977). These factors ruled out the possibility of trying to adapt the Eurobarometers (even if they had been open to adaptation) for the intended purposes of the ESS.

The same is true of the other two Europe-wide surveys of trends in social attitudes. The European Values Survey, which has taken place only every ten years, is also carried out to different standards from those of the ESS and also has its own reserved agenda. While an excellent source of survey material on religious and moral issues, it could not plausibly have been adapted to meet the wider ESS agenda.

Meanwhile, the International Social Survey Programme is a loose voluntary federation of survey teams in 40 nations (covering six continents). Its methodological standards are inconsistent and it too has a reserved programme of work for the foreseeable future. It is not, and could not become, a European survey focusing on European priorities.

The only other serious cross-national surveys in Europe are market research studies with commercial agendas, and a range of Eurostat surveys devoted to behavioural and demographic measurements (see for instance Eurostat, 1999; Eurostat, 2000). Impressive as these Eurostat surveys clearly are, they could not incorporate extensive measures of people’s underlying attitudes, despite their obvious relevance to European governance and academic debate. As noted, public sector agencies (rightly) tend to steer clear of ‘sensitive’ subjects with political ramifications. So topics such as citizenship, propensity to vote, attitudes to crime and punishment, ‘family’ values, social mores, political trust, racial prejudice, national identity and so on are largely absent from official surveys everywhere. Yet they remain among the most important issues on the social agenda of most governments.

In short, if a reliable Europe-wide time series of changing attitudes was to be created, it had to be created afresh.

Improving comparative research

As noted, the ESS has quickly built up a significant head of steam in building a vehicle that will provide an accurate long-term account of social change in modern Europe and, in particular, of the ebb and flow of attitude and value shifts. It will investigate the extent to which differences in attitudes within member states are, on various measures, greater or smaller than differences between them. More importantly from the perspective of European governance, it will investigate the extent and pace at which these intra- and inter-country differences widen or narrow over time. These issues can be addressed successfully only via a rigorous time series such as the ESS.
We have argued in the sections above just how much we believe the ESS is contributing to its field – both substantially and methodologically. We are clearly not alone in this belief, as evidenced by the steady, continuous and increasing support the project has received not only from the Commission as well as the support it has received from the ESF, from some 27 disparate national academic funding bodies and most recently from ESFRI by way of its endorsement of the ESS as one of only two potential Europe-wide infrastructures in the social sciences. In addition the ESS Central Coordinating Team as well as others involved in establishing the ESS have been awarded the prestigious Descartes prize. This is the first year that a social science project has been awarded this prize.

From the Commission’s standpoint, the ESS has been fulfilling many of the explicit goals of Priority 7, such as the production of “comprehensive and reliable information and analysis of citizens' attitudes, preferences, civic values etc” (p9, FP6, Priority 7 Work Programme, Call 1), and the “promotion and support for comparative research, methodologies and data generation” (p18, FP6, Priority 7 Work Programme, Call 2). The ESS is in the centre of this research topic.

In addition, the relevance of the ESS to a European “knowledge based society” is apparent at a number of levels. It will add a new dimension to the array of authoritative statistics at both a national and multinational level. Well-founded data on the shifting structure and salience of public attitudes within and between countries are notably scarce more or less everywhere, and it is appropriate that the EU should lead the way in overcoming obstacles to their collection and analysis. With the development in Europe of social indicators to stand alongside well-established economic indicators (Atkinson et al, 2002), the ESS will now provide the all-important link between objective and subjective indicators of quality of life in a fast-changing Europe.

The ESS’s contribution to European statistics, policy and academic debate depends not only on continuity of funding at both a national and a European level, but also on the project’s ability to adapt to changing technologies and lifestyles. For instance, for reasons of consistency and comparability, the ESS collects its data face-to-face in all countries, even in countries where telephone interviewing is now the usual mode for surveys. But we must nonetheless be sensitive to the massive changes in the availability of the telephone and the internet throughout Europe, which is beginning to nullify one of the relative advantages of face-to-face interviewing against other modes – its universality. So we have already been investigating (and experimenting with) the possibility of a mixed mode approach to data collection, attempting first to overcome some of its well-documented disadvantages (Dillman, 2000). The modest budget for this experimentation has been supplemented by a substantial contribution from Gallup Europe – who face an identical set of dilemmas and are keen to attempt to resolve them collaboratively. This work will be continued via support from the Commission in the ESS’s recent infrastructure proposal if negotiations are successfully completed.

In all these ways, the ESS is actively tackling many of the inherent and longstanding difficulties that face cross-cultural surveys, many of which have hitherto been regarded as intractable.

Developing the European Research Area

The central purpose of the European Research Area (ERA) is to create a collaborative, knowledge-based culture in Europe, founded on world-class research methods and providing widespread access and penetrating analysis. The ESS not only conforms to those requirements but is, we believe, helping to extend the intellectual and methodological boundaries of the ERA. And with its already large array of funders, active participants and users across Europe and beyond, the ESS is already an example of the ERA successfully in action.
In terms of dissemination too, the ESS has broken fresh ground. Its data are made immediately and freely available to any internet user (and others) in a form that facilitates analysis – whether by sophisticated or relatively naïve users. While casual users may in minutes check findings or create simple two-way or three-way tables, all on-line, more sophisticated users have the choice of downloading the data for serious analysis of trends in respect of, say, political trust and its relationship to electoral turnout, or the extent to which social mores are converging or diverging across Europe, or the emergence of new (national or supranational) socio-political cleavages, and so on. Thus academics, policy analysts and interested lay people alike are all able to quarry the data in order to become more informed about Europe’s changing social condition. Meanwhile, we will have completed the development of a special web-based training programme in analysis methods called EduNet as a way of helping students throughout Europe and beyond to get more out of the data. EduNet was launched on September 28th 2005 along with ESS Round 2 data and part of the infrastructure proposal that we are negotiating with the Commission aims to extend this service with future rounds of ESS data collection.

Alongside the dataset itself is a substantial body of accompanying documentation. Indeed, every significant document and guideline that is produced during the course of each two-year cycle of the survey, together with a frank assessment of the problems encountered en route, is made available on the ESS web site and in a comprehensive technical report which accompanies the official release of each biennial dataset.
5. Potential Impact

The potential impact of the project is tied up with its objectives. Each Round of the survey of course provides the potential to identify and explain changes in attitudes amongst the citizens of Europe. And each Round also provides a further opportunity for methodological innovation as well as being a new platform for the cascading effects of the ESS’s aim to improve methods of European social measurement in comparative studies. In time the potential impact of attitudinal social indicators alongside other economic and behaviourally sourced items will provide policy makers and academics alike with a rich new source by which to assess societal progress.

5.1 Contributions to standards

In addition, see section 2 ‘progress to date’ regarding substantive contribution.

Standards of survey research in Europe are variable but their average standard falls well below average standards in, for instance, the US and Canada. There are, of course, pockets of excellence in Europe, but the gap between best and worst practice is a problem in EU-wide quantitative studies, which depend above all on consistently high standards. While Eurostat continues to do excellent work in harmonising definitions and certain concepts used in social measurement across Europe, the amount of inter-country variation in sampling practices, data collection methods and response rates remains a serious obstacle to rigorous comparative enquiry.

For instance, probability (random) sampling has long been the only acceptable method of enquiry in every important US or Canadian quantitative study, but is frequently absent from such studies in parts of Europe. Even though national statistical institutes, as well as Eurostat, invariably use probability methods, many cross-national academic surveys - in common with much commercial practice – resort to ‘quota’ sampling, which is regarded with deep suspicion by the best worldwide scholars and journals and which has proved to be profoundly inaccurate on occasions (see Jowell et al, 1993).

These differences in methodology are simply not among the sort of US-Europe variations that can be attributed to cultural differences. Probability methods are the rock on which statistical theory and practice is based, and while the commercial world has pioneered less scientific methods, they have done so because they are quicker and cheaper, not because they can compete for rigour. There are, however, formidable difficulties in employing probability sampling ‘on the ground’, particularly in cross-national surveys where the structure of sampling frames differs by country. And the ESS is probably the first Europe-wide attitude survey that decided to tackle this problem head-on. It has set up a standing panel of sampling experts with whom national teams must discuss their sampling proposals and, only after any necessary adjustments are the sample designs ‘signed off’. In several cases, these discussions have resulted in visits to the countries concerned. The upshot is that ESS samples are regarded as among the most rigorous of all national samples, matching those achieved by Eurostat in their major time series.

Sampling methods are, however, only one aspect of the ESS’s unusual rigour and state-of-the-art measures deployed in tandem to minimise selection and other biases:

• all residents of a country are included, regardless of citizenship, and no substitution is permitted
• a minimum ‘effective’ sample size of 1500 is stipulated in each country
• a target response rate of 70 per cent must be aimed for
• face-to-face interviewing is mandatory (pending the outcome of mode research)
• translation of the questionnaire must take place according to specified protocols, and into all
languages spoken by more than 5% of any nation’s population
• an innovative form of national ‘event’ recording is required so that data analysts may later take
context effects into account in the interpretation of findings
• response rate enhancement measures are required, such as:
  ▪ advance letters to potential respondents
  ▪ personal briefings of all interviewers
  ▪ minimum of four attempts to contact each potential respondent, including weekend and
evening calls
  ▪ no interviewer’s assignment should exceed a specified size (24), thus minimising
‘interviewer effects’
  ▪ a fieldwork period of between one and four months is specified to maximise the likelihood
of locating all potential respondents
  ▪ re-issuing of refusals and non-contacts where appropriate is standard practice
  ▪ the use of incentives is encouraged where appropriate

The impact of these and other ESS innovations on survey practice more generally is already
becoming evident. As noted, an American survey based on ESS protocols and questions has
already been funded by the US NSF, and a special request has been made by the NSF to the
Commission to enable US scientists to attend ESS events and conferences. The impact on
European survey methods is also considerable, with reassessments of norms already taking place in
countries such as the Netherlands and Switzerland where response rates in the ESS have been so
much higher than had been thought practical any more. Even so, many loopholes remain - some
arising from a failure to apply all measures optimally, others from nation-specific obstacles that will
take time to overcome. Round on round, there will be improvements as part of a strategy for raising
standards, and these will feed into national and international survey practice via the continuing
dissemination of what is now possible and practicable in quantitative comparative measurement.
One well used mechanism for spreading good practice is by the regular meetings of National Co-
ordinators at which innovations and experiments are presented and discussed. The ESS Central
Coordinating Team (CCT) is seeking funding to continue these NC meetings from the infrastructure
proposal it is currently negotiating with the Commission.

5.2 Contribution to policy developments and quality standards

It is far too early in the ESS’s life to attempt to evaluate its impact on policy. The first round aim of
the ESS was to produce reliable benchmark measures against which long-run changes in social
values may subsequently be chartered and monitored. Data from Round 2 have only just been
released and so the opportunity to monitor change has just been unleashed.

However, it is possible to foresee the likely implications of the ESS for European governance in
general rather than for specific policies.

The ESS has now demonstrated that it is possible to measure public attitudes successfully across
countries. Public attitudes are always important, even critical, to the formation of public policy,
enabling existing or future policies to be evaluated by the electorate. Further the rigorous collection
and analysis of public attitudes in an era of falling political participation and electoral turnout helps
to mitigate the democratic deficit. The ESS is becoming an essential tool for monitoring the health
of democracy in Europe.

Despite having completed just two rounds, the ESS has had a clear impact in terms of improving
Europe-wide methods of social measurement. The ESS has demonstrated levels of quality and
rigour in a Europe-wide comparative social survey that had hitherto been ruled out as unachievable. This will allow social attitudes to play a role in European governance.

In turn a range of variables already included in the ESS could make an invaluable contribution in expanding the existing socio-economic focus of European social indicators to include socio-political phenomena as well. Changes in such variables need to be monitored and understood. Overlooking or ignoring such changes would be negligent and perhaps dangerous. In any event, whether these variables become part of the official indicators or comprise an ‘unofficial’ list that can be evaluated by scholars and politicians, the ESS is finally available to fill this gap with reliable data.

How accurate are attitude data? And how will they be used? These sorts of questions are still occasionally asked about attitude surveys. Perhaps this is because they are sometimes confused with transitory media opinion polls, whose poor reputation for quality and a lack of consistency spills over onto the wider genre.

If a case still needed to be made for the utility of well-founded attitude research, it would start with the statement that democratic societies require well-grounded data about their characteristics, their behaviour patterns, and their underlying cultural and political values in order to become better analysts of their own condition. In the absence of such data they are forced to rely on impressionistic snippets of information derived from the occasional opinion poll, focus group and bar-room conversation. Reliable and accurate attitude data help to identify and explain public preferences and misgivings in relation to government priorities, leading on occasions to encouraging or inhibiting certain proposals or policies. Their particular utility lies in their ability to portray a representative picture of societal values as against the self-selected viewpoints of interest-based lobbies.

But no longer are attitude data exclusively at a national level sufficient. Successful European governance depends critically on the availability of comparable and authoritative data about the priorities and preferences, cultural norms and sensibilities, anxieties and well-being of people in different member and candidate countries. Academics, politicians, journalists, policy analysts and others interested in the detail of European issues need increasingly to rely on accessible facts and figures about conditions and circumstances in 25 disparate countries. These facts and figures are by no means confined to demographic and economic trends. As important are cultural, social and moral trends which the ESS, among other statistical time series, helps to provide.

But although the ESS was explicitly designed as a time series, it is not yet able to rely on any continuity of funding from Round to Round. As noted in the abstract, we are negotiating an independent contract for longer term ‘Infrastructure’ support for aspects of the ESS that a STREP budget cannot be stretched to cover. But the FP6 Infrastructure vehicle is in turn unable to support research and data collection of the sort that a STREP vehicle covers. So, until FP7 comes into play - when there is every prospect of resolving such problems - we have to resort to separate applications in order to cover different aspects of the ESS time series. Particularly, as noted, now that the ESS is on the Commissioner’s “List of Opportunities” for future social science infrastructure support in FP7, and likely to be the subject of a Memorandum of Understanding for future long term national support, we see this present Specific Targeted Research Project for Round 4 funding as a necessary bridge to a more coherent and rational process of support for our time series.

5.3 Risk assessment and related communication strategy

The only risk identified with this project in relation to society / citizens related to ethical issues regarding data collection. See Section 9 – ethical issues for further information on this.
6. Project management and exploitation/dissemination plans

6.1 Project management

The consortium

The overall co-ordination, direction and management of the project will be carried out by a Co-ordinator and PI with four colleagues - all based at City University, London (City) – Partner 1. This task is based within the Centre for Comparative Social Surveys at City, a new Research Centre especially set up during Round 2 to house the ESS and its associated activities. The Principal Applicant and Co-ordinator is Professor Roger Jowell, who originally set up the ESS while at the National Centre for Social Research, Britain’s largest independent research institute in the social sciences, which he co-founded and directed for 30 years, relinquishing that post specifically to work full-time on the ESS. The other four members of the co-ordinating team at City are two senior researcher fellows, one researcher, and one research and administrative assistant. They will bear the primary responsibility for setting the project up, sustaining its management structure, implementing and maintaining its methodological standards, and co-ordinating the work of the participating national teams. They will also be accountable for the project’s finances and deliverables. City will also facilitate the decision making structure of the project – the Central Coordinating Team meetings that will be held 8 times during the project.

ZUMA in Mannheim, Germany (Partner 2), is one of Europe’s best-known centres of excellence in survey methods and cross-cultural survey research. It is the German national consulting institute for academic survey research. Consulting on sampling issues, sub-contracting and translation are among the key scientific services provided by ZUMA for cross-cultural, cross-national projects. It will in this case take the lead role in deploying and controlling the work of the specialist group on sampling – with the task of ensuring consistent compliance with the required standards – and on translation – responsible for translation guidelines and general compliance with these. They will also have the role of ensuring contract adherence more generally, working with National Coordinators to ensure that fieldwork organisations fulfil their obligations and achieve their targets. This task will be closely co-ordinated with Partner 3 (SCP). The Director of ZUMA professor Peter Mohler coordinated ZUMA ESS contributions to Rounds one and two. Professor Janet Harkness has this role in round three.

Dr Ineke Stoop and her colleagues at the Social and Cultural Planning Office (SCP), the leading social research organisation in The Netherlands (Partner 3), will be responsible during the early period of the study for devising and ensuring the implementation of the rules of engagement for the selection of survey organisations and National Co-ordinators in each of the participating countries. They will also be responsible for the detailed specification of contextual and event data, some of which will be collected at a national and some at a European level.

Professor Willem Saris, a pioneer in survey methods, who was previously at the University of Amsterdam, has now founded a new research centre with colleagues - the Survey Research Centre at ESADE (SRC) in Barcelona, Spain (Partner 4). SRC will be responsible for two work packages, both concerned with the reliability and validity of questions. They will evaluate questions with respect to quality (conceptualisation, scalability, reliability and validity), design tests for quality assessment, estimate measurement error in response and propose correction factors. This work will generate reports on the properties of individual questions which will be of great value to future users of the data.
Professor Jaak Billiet and his colleagues at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (KUL) (Partner 5) are also at the leading edge of survey methodology internationally. They will take special responsibility for data quality assessment, assisted in this work by Partners 3 and 7. They will prepare the specification of items required to report on variances in item and overall response rates, interviewer effects both within and across countries, as well as response bias and variance. In addition prior to data release they will check for outliers in the data and investigate if these are genuine differences or measurement errors. They will also be responsible for the conduct of the quantitative pilot survey.

Bjørn Henrichsen and his colleagues at NSD in Bergen, one of Europe’s most highly-rated data archives (Partner 6), will act once again as the official archive of the project, employing the most modern available technology to assemble, check, merge, and harmonise more than twenty fully-documented national datasets and to make the data sets and meta data readily available to all.

Brina Malnar at the University of Ljubljana (UL) (Partner 7) is a new member of the Central Coordinating Team of the ESS. Partner 7 will be responsible for ensuring and monitoring adequate dissemination of ESS data and methods across Europe and beyond. The dissemination brief will not be confined to work done within the ESS ‘family’, but will extend to work and publications produced by users worldwide, widening the reach and influence of the project and its standards. UL will also assist Partner 5 in assessing data quality.

There are thus only two changes in the Central Co-ordinating Team that has been responsible for Rounds 1 – 3. As outlined above, the present six people and institutions will be joined by a seventh (Brina Malnar at the University of Ljubljana in Slovenia). She is a longstanding ESS National Co-ordinator who has been intimately involved in the project from its start. The second change involves only a transfer of institutions. Willem Saris, formerly of the University of Amsterdam, has founded a new research unit at ESADE which will now house his work.

The seven Partners will continue their successful collaboration, shaping the project as a whole and cooperating in their various roles and responsibilities. They will also be jointly responsible for stimulating and, in many cases, writing a series of accessible papers and reports on which future Rounds of the ESS, as well as other multinational studies, will be able to draw. Apart from the changes outlined above, the continuity of institutions and most of the staff associated with the ESS is assured.

**Overall co-ordination**

The organisational structure of the ESS has top-down and bottom-up elements. On the one hand, in order to achieve high and consistent standards among all countries and institutions with their different methodological practices, protocols and conventions, a partly top-down approach is essential. On the other hand, if the project is to contribute to academic and policy debates within Europe, it must be accessible and responsive to the people and organisations at the leading edge of these debates, necessitating a bottom-up approach. The current organisational structure of the ESS was set up at the start of the first round, and has proved to be a successful combination between these two approaches. The success of the time series depends on a continuation of this structure.

As from the start, the overall direction and co-ordination of the ESS will be carried out by Professor Roger Jowell, based at City University London, where he directs the Centre for Comparative Social Surveys and works alongside four colleagues. This team constitutes the engine room of the project, setting up, running and improving the systems, co-ordinating the other six Partners and the 25 National Co-ordinators to ensure consistency and comparability, and signing off the project’s design, functional and financial obligations.
The six co-applicants (Partners 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7) all report to and work with the Co-ordinator’s office to fulfil the numerous central management roles in the project. Each Partner has pre-specified and self-contained responsibilities, some of which continue throughout the project’s life, others for shorter periods. The seven institutions are also jointly responsible for overall quality control and quality assessment, producing a series of papers, reports and analyses on all aspects of the project for present and future users of the data and planners of future projects who may draw on our successes and avoid repeating our failures.

Advisory and specialist groups

The project will draw on expertise from a variety of specialist groups, all of which were set up during Round 1 and continued into Rounds 2 and 3.

Foremost among these is the Scientific Advisory Board, on which the funding agencies of all participating countries are represented by their own scientific appointment. The independent chair of this Board will continue to be Professor Max Kaase of the International University of Bremen, Germany. He has been intimately associated with the project since its inception - first as chair of the initial ESF Expert Panel which recommended the idea of a European Social Survey, then as Chair of the ESF Steering Committee which produced a Blueprint for it, and latterly as Chair of the Scientific Advisory Board for the first two rounds of the ESS proper. He is a past Vice President of the ESF and a distinguished comparative political scientist, and is currently President of the International Political Science Association (IPSA). The rest of the Scientific Advisory Board is made up of a formidable group of senior social scientists from all over Europe, who collectively provide the project with an impressive range of wisdom and experience.

A smaller specialist Methods Group guides the technical development of the project, helping to ensure that it continues to fulfil its role as a model of good methodological practice. The Group is Chaired by Professor Denise Lievesley, now chief executive at the Health and Social Care information centre, formerly chief statistician at UNESCO and a President of the UK Royal Statistical Society and Director of the International Statistical Institute (ISI). She is now also President-Elect of the ISI. The four other members of the Group are also eminent survey statisticians – one from the US and three from other European countries.

Two Question Module Design Teams will be appointed, as in previous rounds, following a Europe-wide Call for proposals from multinational teams of subject specialists. Their role will be to help conceptualise and design modules of questions for the rotating half of the Round 4 questionnaire. The choice is made by the Scientific Advisory Board in full session on the basis of the interest and relevance of the proposed topics to European academic debate or policy, and the credentials of competing teams. A very high overall standard of applications was achieved in response to the Rounds 2 and 3 Calls in particular.

The Sampling and the Translation Expert Panels are two further specialist groups at the heart of the project. They are working groups rather than advisory groups, dedicated to the rigorous implementation of the project specifications in their respective fields. In each case they are responsible for the final specification of the survey procedures and for all necessary guidance and support in putting them into practice in each country. The four-person Sampling Panel is chaired by Dr Sabine Häder, and the four-person Translation Taskforce by Professor Janet Harkness, both of ZUMA in Germany (Partner 2).
National teams

Within each of the participating countries, a National Co-ordinator (30% to 50% time) plus a survey organisation will be appointed by the national funding agency (in almost all cases via an open competitive process) to implement the work according to a central specification prepared by the Central Co-ordinating Team.

To achieve continuity and maximise returns on the investments they have already made, many national funding agencies will wish to re-appoint the same teams for Round 4. Thus for the most part the teams will be in a position to build on their working relationships with the Central Co-ordinating Team, Sampling Panel and Translation Panel and - based on their experience in Rounds 1 to 3 - work for still higher and more consistent quality in Round 4. By the same token, the national teams will be in a much stronger position than they were at the start to contribute critically to important aspects of the project.

Multinational meetings

A project of this ambition, scale and complexity needs to be cemented by a sense of collective purpose and ‘ownership’, incorporating strong reciprocal obligations. Otherwise, national interests will always tend to triumph over multinational ones. To accomplish such an atmosphere and sustain it over the life of the project and beyond, regular face-to-face contacts and discussions among the key participants at all levels is essential. Individual voices need to be heard and difficult decisions arrived at by consent. We would be unable to engage in team-building across Europe and in the imposition of common standards on countries and individuals with widely-differing starting points via remote networks and communication. The people involved need to know and trust one another if we are to sustain the considerable shared commitment that exists to the uncompromising standards of this project.

Budget provision in this STREP has been made for CCT meetings and for Questionnaire Design Team meetings only. As in previous Rounds, the ESF has generously agreed to fund the four meetings of the Scientific Advisory Board, held at more or less equal intervals during the life of the project. We have sought funding for National Coordinator and Methods Group meetings from our recent infrastructure proposal and they are excluded from this STREP.

The seven Partners, who now have a considerable track record of working successfully together, will communicate regularly by telephone, fax and email to ensure a continued clarity of purpose and roles. They will also meet face-to-face at regular intervals to solve problems and develop strategies. They will jointly and severally ensure that the project performs according to plan.

6.2 Plan for using and disseminating knowledge

Distribution of data is offered at no charge to the scientific community via several media and is, where possible, tailored to the preferences of individual users. For instance, potential data users have access to the data either directly from Partner 6, or via other CESSDA/IFDO archives. Provided they adhere to the same general conditions of access, other Archives are also free to develop and implement their own technologies for access and distribution.

The availability of both online download (via the internet using NESTAR technology) and offline distribution (via disks) gives maximum flexibility to users, who receive the data ready for analysis in all common statistical packages, together with a technical report, codebook and questionnaires for each Round in a universal document exchange format.
The CCT determines the content and structure of the meta data documents that accompany each dataset, which – as noted - are made available within six months of the deposit of national datasets to the Archive. Before then, trial datasets are made available in confidence to National Coordinators, Question Module Design Teams and the CCT to enable preliminary analyses to ‘prove’ the data (or otherwise) in advance of their widespread distribution.

The ESS Archive website contains full details of the data content, access arrangements, codebooks and other documentation. News about the project is also distributed to mail groups of users via the ESS data user bulletin. At present and continuing through this grant articles, books and papers based on the ESS – whether substantive or methodological – are documented on the ESS website.

Of course the scope of this description of work is primarily limited to the provision of data. However, as part of ESS Round 4 the CCT will work closely with national teams to encourage them to organise launch conferences and other events to promote ESS data. In addition details of publications using ESS data are posted on the ESS home website (www.europeansocialsurvey.org) as well as appearing in the ESS data users bulletin. A list of the publications currently listed on the website is included in Appendix A5.

6.3 Raising public participation and awareness

Apart from its important role as a rigorous source of data for academic analysis and debate, the ESS enjoys an almost unique position among social science research projects in being able to engage the awareness and interest of politicians, journalists, civil servants and the wider public. All democratic societies nowadays require accurate information about the attitudes and values of their electorates in order to become better analysts of their own condition. But European governance is especially dependent on such information as a way of understanding similarities and differences within and between a disparate range of member states. Journalists, civil servants and the informed public use such data to tap into long run shifts in public opinion and broad social trends.

By virtue both of its clear focus on social attitudes and its role as a rigorous and impartial academic project, the ESS has fast become the authoritative source of reliable data on climate shifts in European public attitudes. As the download figures among registered data users already show, the dataset is by no means of importance only to qualified social scientists. On the contrary, it is quarried by increasing numbers of journalists, those from government and lay people too and is quoted in a growing number of newspapers in many countries. Most unusually for a social science project, its excellence and utility have even been recognised by the natural science community via by being awarded the prestigious 2005 Descartes Prize.

The ESS already has a very high public profile, and its exposure and reputation continue to grow with each Round.
7. Workplan– for whole duration of the project

7.1 Introduction - general description and milestones

Below is a description of the workplan for the entire project. At each stage we highlight the objectives and milestones that need to be achieved.

Introduction

The work will be split into a number of work packages (12 in this Round), which knit together to form an integrated framework of design, co-ordination and dissemination.

The 12 work packages fall broadly into the categories - project design and consortium management on the one hand (Work Packages 1, 5, 6, 7), and RTD, innovation and dissemination on the other (Work Packages 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12). Both types of activities are fundamental to the success of the project and in many cases overlap and have a structuring effect on each other. In the description below we will highlight where different types of activity dominate.

General description and milestones

Participating countries

The continuing support for the ESS from countries who have already participated, together with the interest from newer entrants suggests that we should budget for 25 countries in Round 4. As in the case of Israel in Round 2, a few of the participating countries may miss a Round for special financial or other reasons, but judging by experience to date, they are likely to be replaced by new entrants. Moreover, the proposed Memorandum of Understanding will help longer term planning and therefore enhance the stability of participation from Round to Round. Even so, we cannot at this stage be certain of the precise number or identity of the nations that will participate in Round 4. What is certain, however, is that Commission funding is required for the project’s central co-ordination before even earmarked national contributions will be unlocked. Once again, we anticipate that national contributions in total for Round 4 will amount to around three times the Commission’s contribution. Ensuring participation from countries is performed by the City team as a consortium management activity (Workpackage 1) in collaboration with the European Science Foundation. The key milestone for this work is the start of ESS Round 4 fieldwork which will be September 2008.

The sample

The survey aims to be representative of all people in the residential population of each country aged 15 years and above (with no upper age limit), regardless of their nationality, citizenship or legal status. In any country where a minority language is spoken as a first language by 5% or more of the resident population, the questionnaire is translated into that language, and appropriate interviewers are deployed to administer the interviews.

Each national sample is selected by strict probability methods (random sampling) at every stage so that the relative selection probability of every sample member is known and non-zero. Quota sampling is not allowed at any stage. All interviews are conducted face-to-face in people’s homes and anyone who refuses, or with whom no contact is made, may not be substituted.
Once again, we have allowed in the budget for members of our specialist Sampling Panel to be able to visit a number of teams – in particular new participants or those who faced difficulties on earlier rounds - to ensure that the rigorous sampling specifications are followed. The minimum specified ‘effective’ sample size (having taken account of non-response and the design effects that arise from clustering) is 1500 in countries with more than 2 million persons. This generally amounts to a numerical sample size of around 2000 per country, and more in some cases. For nations with populations of less than 2 million, the minimum requirement is reduced to an ‘effective’ sample size of 800, with actual sample sizes of around 1100.

This is an RTD activity carried out under Workpackage 2. The key milestones include making available the sampling specifications for ESS Round 4 (October 2007) and the start of ESS fieldwork when sampling specifications should have been signed off by the Sampling Panel (September 2008).

Fieldwork and data preparation

As in the first three Rounds, the prescribed mode of data collection for Round 4 will be face-to-face interviewing (pending our experimental work on alternative modes). Among the detailed procedures for fieldwork and other aspects of the study that are described in the ‘Specification for Participating Countries’ (see www.europeansocialsurvey.org), issued to all participants, are the following details and information:

- full details of the sampling principles and methods to be applied (Kish, 1965)
- the target minimum response rate (70%) and the procedures needed to maximise it (Laurie, Smith & Scott, 1999; Loosveldt, Pickery & Billiet, 1999; Loosveldt, 1995; Pickery & Loosveldt, 1999)
- the outcome codes required for each address so that response rates and non-response can be consistently defined, documented and calculated
- the target maximum non-contact rate (3%) and the procedures for minimising it
- the detailed procedures for randomising selected individuals at each randomly selected address or household
- the permitted assignment size for interviewers (no more than 24 interviews per assignment, and no more than two assignments per interviewer)
- the procedures for identifying and following up ‘difficult-to-contact’ cases
- the requirement to translate questionnaires into minority languages (‘the 5% rule’) and the detailed protocols for doing so
- the requirement to conduct approved quality control back-checks (by telephone or in person) on 5% of respondents, 10% of refusals and 10% of non-contacts
- the ethical guidelines to be followed (Declaration of Ethics, International Statistical Institute - see Jowell, 1986)
- the deadlines to be met and the forms of data delivery

Each nation also has to keep records of:

- the date, time and outcome of each call at each address
- the characteristics of each (anonymous) interviewer - including gender, age and education
- reasons for non-response within various pre-specified categories
- data about non-respondents (including, where possible, their gender, age band and housing conditions)
- the representativeness of each national sample relative to known population distributions
- full details of item non-response
details of interviewer variance in response rates and response sets

To maximise potential response rates, the overall duration of fieldwork is required to be a minimum of 30 days and a maximum of 120 days from a pre-specified starting point.

The ‘official’ source questionnaire is accompanied by a data protocol specifying the standard codes and data formats to be adopted. The data protocol is developed by NSD as an RTD activity (Workpackage 10). The key milestone is June 2008 when the data protocol has to be sent to national teams. Almost all questions are pre-coded to standard formats, but each national team carries out a series of pre-specified range and logic checks either as part of their computer-assisted interviewing procedures or as a separate post-fieldwork exercise.

Overall contract adherence in each country is assured by perusing all internal contracts, keeping in regular touch with National Co-ordinators and requiring detailed forms to be filled in itemising progress under various specified headings. This latter task is performed as part of Workpackages 5, 6 and 2. It is an ongoing task with a key milestone of September 2008 and the start of ESS Round 4 fieldwork.

The questionnaire

The content of the questionnaire is overseen by the City team as part of Workpackage 2 (RTD activity). They consult with the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) and National Coordinators at relevant points during the development cycle.

a) Determining the content of the core

The questionnaire is divided into a core module (more or less fixed from Round to Round) and two rotating modules. A recent decision by the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) of the ESS has ‘freed up’ a limited amount of space for further core items by reducing the size of rotating modules from 60 to 50 items each from Round 3 onwards. This means that temporary or permanent additions to the core may be possible to allow for the changing salience of certain issues over time. But the process of selecting and crafting new core items will be the same as for the present core.

Thus, as before, a helpful starting point was to eliminate certain classes of question altogether from consideration – such as questions about the sorts of transient issues over which media opinion polls (rightly) enjoy a monopoly. The ESS has always been concerned only with longer term variations in culture and social structure within Europe over three broad domains:

People’s value orientations - their world views, including their religiosity, their socio-political values and their moral standpoints

We refer here to the deeply-rooted pre-dispositions that help to guide, justify or explain people’s opinions, attitudes and actions (Rokeach, 1973). These pre-dispositions tend to predict and help explain people’s opinions, attitudes and behaviour patterns, and suggest how they are likely to respond to social, political and economic changes. In this category too are the key socio-political cleavages that exist across cultures and nations within Europe (and beyond). While the content of the debate about particular issues tends to vary from country to country, underlying values (such as in relation to ‘equality’ or ‘liberty’, or people’s religious identification) tend to transcend nations and are more capable of being tapped by multinational studies such as the ESS (Schwartz, 1997).

Questions on the following aspects of people’s value orientations emerged as part of the core module:
- left-right orientations (egalitarianism and interventionism)
- libertarian-authoritarian orientations
- basic human and moral values
- trust in institutions and confidence in the economy
- interest in politics and voting turnout
- personal and system efficacy
- religious orientation, present and past

**People’s cultural/national orientations** - their sense of national and cultural attachment and their (possibly related) feelings towards outgroups of one sort or another

The ESS needs to monitor and explain whether and in what way the EU cuts across traditional ideas of nationhood, and the cross-pressures (if any) between old nationalisms and a new sense of ‘supranationalism’. Equally it needs to monitor the sorts of tensions we have witnessed recently within some democracies between an inclusive sense of citizenship and patriotism on the one hand and an exclusive sense of nationalism and ethnocentrism on the other (Dowds & Young, 1996).

So, questions on the following aspects of cultural and national orientation are part of the core:

- citizenship and civic engagement
- attitudes to the EU and other forms of multilevel governance
- attitudes to migration
- ethnocentrism and racism

**The underlying social structure of society** - people’s social positions, including their education, occupational group, degree of social exclusion, plus standard background characteristics such as age, household structure and gender.

The ESS needs to collect accurate individual-level data about the numerous factors that are linked to people’s social and economic position in society. People’s values and, in particular, changes in those values cannot be interpreted in the absence of detailed collateral socio-economic and socio-demographic background information. So the core must provide data to enable analysts to investigate and interpret the relationships between people’s socio-economic position and their socio-political (and moral) values.

So the following socio-economic and socio-demographic items form part of the core:

- respondent and household demographic characteristics
- education of respondent, children and partner
- family origin
- work status and unemployment experience
- occupation and socio-economic status of respondent and partner
- economic standing/income of household
- subjective health status of respondent
- social trust and networks
- objective and subjective indicators of poverty
- experience and fear of crime
- access to and use of mass media
For the initial core items, we commissioned a number of international academic specialists to prepare papers that considered the options within sub-categories of the above domains and then recommended the sub-topics (and in some cases even the proposed questions) that they believed should be essential components of the core. Their collective brief was to get beneath the surface and thus aid understanding of an intricate set of relationships. In an era of falling electoral turnouts and declining trust in government, for instance, solid evidence is required about changes in societal trends and, in particular, in public attitudes that affect governance at both a national and a supranational level. The expert papers that helped to define the core were of course made publicly available.

The key milestones for discussing amendments or additions to the core questionnaire will be a meeting of the Scientific Advisory Board prior to the pilot (date to be arranged). The ESS pilot would be the second key milestone (in January 2008) when proposed changes to the core would be tested. The final milestone would be June 2008 when the questionnaire has to be finalised before it is sent to national teams for translation.

The final part of the core module is a supplementary questionnaire – fielded either as a self-completion questionnaire or as part of the main face-to-face interview. It is reserved for two purposes. First, it is the vehicle for a well-established 21-item self-completion scale developed by the Israeli psychologist, Professor Shalom Schwartz (Schwartz, ibid) that is designed to classify respondents according to their basic value orientations.

Its second purpose is methodological, comprising mode experiments, wording experiments and other methodological tests designed to inform future rounds of the ESS or generally to advance the state of the art (Saris & Munnich, 1995). In Round 4 – as in previous rounds – the supplementary questionnaire will contain tests to establish the validity and reliability of the survey measures across all countries. The content of this second part of the questionnaire is determined under Workpackage 8. The key milestones would be the selection of items for the pilot (January 2008) and the selection of items for mainstage fieldwork (by June 2008).

b) Determining the rotating modules

Within the confines of a 30-minute core questionnaire, no topic can of course be tackled exhaustively. The rotating modules offer greater scope for this sort of in-depth coverage of particular topics.

As noted, we advertise Europe-wide at each round for proposals from potential multinational Question Module Design Teams. From the proposals received, the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) then selects two teams (three in Round 2) to help design modules on their specialist subjects. In Round 1, the two topics selected were:

- **Immigration and asylum**
  This subject has re-emerged in recent years as a key policy issue in many European nations. The module focused on ways in which public opinion on this issue is formed and how it relates to general attitudes towards minorities and other out-groups. It addressed public awareness and perceptions of the scale and impact of immigration, as well as public attitudes toward freeing up or restricting the flow of immigrants and asylum seekers.

- **Citizenship, involvement and democracy**
  This module was built on existing work and was designed to investigate the growing sense of political and social disengagement in many modern societies. It looked at the ramifications of community fragmentation and the decline in institutional trust. It sought to uncover the nature...
of social and political conditions most conducive to greater citizen involvement, and the benefits that such involvement may bring to the societies that possess it.

In Round 2, the SAB selected three rotating modules – the first comprising the usual 60 items, and the other two comprising 30 items each. They were:

- **Family, work and well-being**
  This module focused on the implications for personal well-being of changes in the nature of work, family and household structures, such as typical work patterns, up-skilling of jobs and the increase in numbers of both single-person and dual-earner households. Many people in work are torn between the quest for economic security on the one hand and more disposable time on the other. Exploring these conflicts in a comparative perspective will add to a general understanding both of the sources of satisfaction and strain and to the role of national welfare regimes in this process.

- **Attitudes to health and care-seeking**
  Health care is high on the policy agenda of most governments in Europe, partly to do with rising costs. Some European countries provide health care abundantly, to the point of medicalising society, while others provide for only basic necessities. The provision of services, along with a host of social and cultural factors, may have a strong influence on how people perceive their own health and how they seek care when ill. So this module provided data to enable the complex inter-relationships between the structure and culture of health and care-seeking in Europe to be mapped and better understood.

- **Economic morality: market society and citizenship**
  This module was designed to build on existing comparative work that investigates the normative and moral culture of markets and consumption under the pressure of globalisation, neo-liberal market policies and the transition to market economies. It examined, on the one hand, the extent to which consumers felt exploited by commercial enterprises and, on the other, how much they themselves tended to practice a number of illegal, 'unethical' or 'shady' practices in various spheres of consumption. The module tackled both commercial and government services in an attempt to discover if and how the relationships differed.

The Europe-wide competition for the Round 3 Question Module Design Teams is now complete, after a special meeting of the Scientific Advisory Board. The modules selected were:

- **Personal and Social Well-being: Creating indicators for a flourishing Europe**
  It has become customary to judge the quality of a society by the use of objective indicators, predominantly socio-economic ones. Yet in most developed nations in Europe and elsewhere, increases in income, health and education have not produced comparable increases in happiness or life satisfaction. To address this issue, this proposal seeks to evaluate the success of European countries at promoting the personal and social well-being of their citizens. Whilst much has been learnt from introducing subjective measures of global happiness or life satisfaction into survey research, significant recent progress in the development of high quality subjective measures of personal and social well-being is not being fully utilised, and should be systematically developed across Europe. We suggest that domain-specific measures, such as income, family and work satisfaction, require further understanding both in terms of their causes and effects. Most importantly, we argue that the next generation of advancement in the field requires us to look beyond 'hedonic' measures of well-being (feeling and evaluation) to 'eudaimonic' measures of capabilities and functionings since these are associated with sustainable rather than transient well-being. This module represents the first systematic attempt to create a set of policy-relevant national well-being accounts.
The Timing of Life: The organisation of the life course in Europe

The module aims at furthering our understanding of the views of European citizens on the organisation of the life course and of their strategies to influence and plan their own lives. Three main research topics concerning the organisation of the life course are to be studied in the set of proposed questions: 1) to what extent do citizens perceive the life course as a structured sequence of life stages, and which events mark the transition from one stage to the other? 2) do social norms concerning the life course exist, and if so, to what extent are these norms backed by sanctions?; 3) what are the expectations and capacities of citizens concerning life course planning? Based on life course theory, we expect that the three questions have heterogeneous answers between societies with different cultures and institutional settings, and that there is an important intra-societal variation too. Besides its primary scientific relevance, the proposed topics relate to recent public debates about the (re-)structuring of welfare states.

c) Stages of questionnaire development

Both core and rotating modules are designed according to strict timetables, during which they go through a range of processes designed to ensure that each question passes both a relevance test and a quality threshold, and also that it can plausibly be asked within all countries. The modules go through the following five stages of development. All stages are managed by Partner 1 as part of their RTD Workpackage (2). Other partners also advise and guide the process. Partner 2 provides advice and guidance on translation issues whilst Partners 4 and 5 advise on data quality and piloting issues.

Stage 1
The various concepts proposed for inclusion are scrutinised and then transformed into candidate questions or scales that seem to represent those concepts as precisely as possible. Since subsequent data users require source material that makes these links transparent, the whole process is documented in detail.

Stage 2
To achieve the appropriate quality standard, the proposed items are evaluated by reference to standard quality criteria such as reliability and validity (Scherpenzeel & Saris, 1997). Some of these evaluations are based on the proven properties of similar question in other surveys, while others are based on 'predictions' that take into account their respective properties. Attention is also given to other considerations such as comparability of items over time and place, expected item non-response, social desirability and other potential biases, and the avoidance of ambiguity and vagueness.

Stage 3
The third step is a large-scale pilot with a sample of around 400 conducted in the UK. As before, the pilot is likely to contain a number of split-run experiments on question-wording alternatives.

Stage 4
The pilot results are analysed in detail before deciding which items to adopt, amend or eliminate in the light of the evidence.
Stage 5
The final step is the production of a fully-fledged ‘source questionnaire’, ready for translation from English into the languages of all participating countries. The various question authors provide material for annotating the source questionnaire with guidance for translators on the intention behind certain questions, or their proposed measurement properties. This is especially useful where the English words have no direct equivalents in certain other languages. Each participating country then carries out a small-scale pre-test to iron out remaining translation difficulties - a process that may in turn lead to further minor adjustments to the source questionnaire.

The Translation Expert Panel oversees the whole process of translation, from the drafting of detailed guidelines through the production of templates that facilitate the actual process, to annotation of the questionnaire with the meaning of certain concepts and items. It also deals with most of the queries that arise from National Co-ordinators and their own panels of translators, reviewers and adjudicators. All in all, the translation process is meticulously handled according to best international practice to ensure that every language version of the questionnaire is optimally equivalent to every other. National Co-ordinators are also required to produce a paper trail outlining the provenance of the final version of the questionnaire in each language, so that analysts and scholars may study the nuances behind the choice of certain words or phrases in different languages. Countries with shared languages (such as Belgium and France, Belgium and The Netherlands, France and Switzerland, etc) use special procedures which involve independent translations at the first stage and subsequent comparisons in an attempt to be open to influence from other versions without losing important national variations in phraseology. The questionnaire translation is managed by Partner 2 as part of Workpackage 4.

As noted, every stage of the above process is documented in detail and the resulting report is distributed to all National Co-ordinators and made available on the web.

Contextual and event data
All survey responses can be affected by timing and context, but certain types of attitudinal data are particularly prone to such effects. So in order to help identify those national variations that owe more to exogenous factors than to underlying attitudinal differences, the ESS needs to provide context information alongside the substantive data. This simple but innovative departure from normal survey practice should greatly increase the analytic power of ESS datasets.

We are therefore compiling a guide to the best sources of routine country-specific background information which may aid an appreciation of subtle differences of context within participating countries. For instance, many statistics collected and published by Eurostat, OECD, WHO, the World Bank and others contain information in an appropriate form, country by country, on GDP, unemployment rates, population distributions, measures of inflation, birth rates, longevity statistics, and so on. But the overview we are preparing needs also to refer to other potentially relevant contextual information such as the nature of each country’s electoral system, the ‘colour’ of its incumbent government, its religious profile, and the size, composition and distribution of its minority groups. Partner 6 is thus compiling a guide on behalf of the CCT to a parsimonious list of sources for comparable background statistics for all (or nearly all) participating countries to accompany each release of the dataset.

But country-specific demographic and socio-economic macro statistics are only part of the story. Equally important are contextual socio-political factors in a particular country which may affect responses - such as the proximity of an election, recent industrial or political unrest, or even a natural disaster. Sometimes a major event may occur in the middle of fieldwork, giving rise to a natural experiment in which responses before and after the event can be compared.
Consider the immediate worldwide impact that the events of September 11 2001 had on people’s behaviour, let alone on their attitudes to certain issues. The same is true of the war in Iraq. European events such as the Madrid attack in March 2004, or the Beslan school massacre, might have created similar turbulence in attitudes. Bradburn (1969) analysed the social trauma of the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963 and the increase in social cohesion that it created. The 2004 tsunami in Asia may have had a similar effect, even in parts of Europe. But less sudden occurrences, such as the continuing discussion of the issue of Islamic headscarves, or the accession of former candidate countries to the EU, might all have similar short or longer term impacts on certain public attitudes. To help disentangle these sorts of sudden impacts from secular underlying attitude changes, we need to allow space for recording them in the dataset.

So we have been creating what might be referred to as a ‘media reported event data bank’ which briefly documents the major political, social and economic factors in each country just before or during fieldwork that are likely to have a substantial bearing on response patterns.

A similar but updated set of procedures will be used during ESS Round 3. Compiled largely by the National Co-ordinators in a format provided by the CCT, the data are subsequently added to the national datasets. This area of work is overseen by partner 3 in Workpackage 11. An important part of this Workpackage is ensuring that national teams complete this work accurately and to time.

**Quality adherence**

Some aspects of quality control are achieved by establishing and implementing certain procedures in advance. Examples are the use of face-to-face interviewing, probability sampling methods, and the outlawing of substitution of non-respondents.

Other aspects of quality control are achieved not only by laying down certain standards, but also by offering support in advance of and during the process, and by closely monitoring adherence. For instance, although the final choice of fieldwork organisation is made by each national funding agency, the selection is based on a detailed central specification containing minute details of what is required, by whom, in what form and by when.

Centrally-established specifications are also made available on sampling and translation issues, and on the adoption of certain standard classifications (such as ISCO). These sorts of procedures will be thoroughly reviewed prior to their implementation in ESS Round 4. This area of work is overseen by City (Workpackage 2) and ZUMA (Workpackage 6) but also involves other workpackages in specific areas as appropriate.

**Quality assessment and improvement**

A primary purpose of the ESS is to improve methods of European surveys in general and of cross-national attitude surveys in particular. Quality assessment is an important part of that process. Thus every round generates a report on the properties and quality of each national sampling frame. Similarly, we assess the relative difficulty of translating different classes of questions by scrutinising the documentation of the process of translation into each language. The detailed documentation of the questionnaire design process, including the work on the reliability and validity of questions is all archived too and should encourage the practice of question assessment.

A conscientious time series must of course welcome and aim to incorporate self-improvement at every Round. With that in mind we have a strict policy of transparency which involves
documenting our failures as well as our successes and trying to learn from our mistakes and omissions. This in turn allows others to avoid such pitfalls in the future.

Archiving and data delivery

a) Depositing national data

As in previous Rounds, all participating nations will undertake to submit their data to the Archive (Partner 6) by a certain date (February 1, 2009) and in one of several pre-specified formats that are readily convertible into popular statistical packages or into ASCII without losing information. The available formats are made known to all National Co-ordinators well in advance of the fieldwork period so that documents and procedures are prepared with the deposit stage in mind.

Once at the Archive, the datasets are assembled, checked, merged, documented and disseminated in a user-friendly format within 8 months of the final deposit. A key role of the Central Co-ordinating Team during the post-fieldwork phase is to avoid timetable slippage and ensure that all these ambitious plans are faithfully adhered to.

The Archive’s roles include the following tasks:

- produce a comprehensive ESS round 4 Data protocol
- produce data dictionaries
- produce data checking and cleaning programs
- evaluating and assessing the content, structure and format of datasets and documentation
- error checking, correction and validation, in consultation with the National Co-ordinators, the Central Co-ordinating team and - where appropriate - the Question Module Design Teams
- standardising or harmonising national variables
- merging all national data into an integrated multinational dataset
- documenting the datasets according to the ‘DDI meta data standard’ (see http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/DDI/)
- converting the datasets, meta data and accompanying technical report into the DDI standard
- generating portable and system files for all common statistical packages (SPSS, SAS, SYSTAT, etc), based on the generic DDI format
- incorporating central survey documents into a universal document exchange format, such as PDF
- giving appropriate support to all ESS data or meta data users

To ensure that the datasets and documentation are readily available, a meta database has been developed containing all textual elements (such as questionnaires, technical report, data definitions etc).

All of the following features must thus be in place for a time series such as the ESS:

- the use of lasting media for data storage
- doubling-up in backup systems
- a state-of-the-art storage environment
- storage of meta data in a generic format
- regular control and migration of data to more timely storage media
- regular migration of data files to appropriate formats
- regular adjustments of conversion software to developments in statistical package formats
b) Data delivery

In accordance with data protection regulations in various countries, only anonymised data are made available to users. And, as an extra precaution, we require each national team to check their own data before deposit with confidentiality strictly in mind.

Distribution of data is offered at no charge to the scientific community. Potential data users have access to the data either directly from Partner 6, or via other CESSDA/IFDO archives. Provided they adhere to the same general conditions of access, other Archives are also free to develop and implement their own technologies for access and distribution.

Users will receive the data ready for analysis in common statistical packages, together with a technical report, data protocol and other documents in a universal document exchange format.

c) Other forms of dissemination

The CCT determines the content and structure of the meta data documents that accompany each dataset, which – as noted - are made available within six months of the deposit of national datasets to the Archive. Before then, trial datasets are made available in confidence to National Coordinators, Question Module Design Teams and the CCT to enable preliminary analyses to ‘prove’ the data (or otherwise) in advance of their widespread distribution.

7.2 Work planning, timetable and risks

The overall duration of Round 4 of the ESS will be 27 months from the start date to the delivery and distribution of an immediately usable dataset dedicated to the social science and policy communities throughout the EU and beyond. This start date clearly needs to meet the requirements of the start of fieldwork in September 2008.

The chart overleaf shows the sequence and duration of the various stages. One of the Central Coordinating Team’s key roles is of course to ensure timetable adherence in all participating countries. We are aware that this is only very partially related to appropriate ‘policing’. It is achieved mainly by offering appropriate guidelines, support and help whenever it is needed.

The lines in the Chart highlight the key timing for each activity. Obviously, the activities within each of the Work Packages – from preparation to assessment and evaluation – cover longer periods than are shown in the table, often for the entire duration of the project. The duration of each individual Work Package is shown in a separate list subsequently.

Risks

Two main potential risks face this project, as with all time series.

The first is that some of the national funding agencies will find themselves unable to fund the fieldwork and national coodination for R4 in their country. To the extent that this happens, it may make the ESS less representative of the whole of Europe than it is fast becoming. This is unlikely but possible. It happened in Round 2 but only to one country (Israel), alone out of the 22 Round 1 countries and it appears that they will now return to the fold for future Rounds. In any event, the overall number of participating countries rose between Round 1 and Round 2.
The risk of this happening on a larger scale has already been minimised by a number of measures which are of growing importance. In the first place, the active engagement of the ESF in recruiting and retaining participation of their members continues and will still hold true for R4. Even more importantly, however, the national funding agencies have recently framed a Memorandum of Understanding which many of them have subscribed to (or are in the process of doing so). The Memorandum obliges its signatories to commit themselves to funding two ESS Rounds at a time from now on as a means of ensuring a degree of continuity and stability in what they regard as too important a time series to leave to ad hoc funding decisions.

Meanwhile, positive signs from potential new ESS countries including Bulgaria, Malta, Cyprus and Russia suggest that participation levels in the ESS may be more likely to grow than to shrink.

A second risk is that there will be insufficient applications from potential Questionnaire Design Teams for R4 (or that either of the two teams selected will fail to deliver). But this risk too is more hypothetical than real, since the competition for becoming a Questionnaire Design Team has been growing form Round to Round. The networks we have already established for advertising the biennial competition have increasingly born fruit, ensuring that the quality as well as the quantity of applicants is increasing.
7.2 Workplanning and timetable

**Workplanning** (June 2007 – September 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarter 1</td>
<td>Quarter 2</td>
<td>Quarter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Co-ordination</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Co-ordination" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Co-ordination" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Co-ordination" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Design and development</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Design and development" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Design and development" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Design and development" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sampling co-ordination</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Sampling co-ordination" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Sampling co-ordination" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Sampling co-ordination" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Translation and Equivalence of instruments</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Translation and Equivalence of instruments" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Translation and Equivalence of instruments" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Translation and Equivalence of instruments" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Fieldwork commissioning</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Fieldwork commissioning" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Fieldwork commissioning" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Fieldwork commissioning" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Contract monitoring</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Contract monitoring" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Contract monitoring" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Contract monitoring" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Piloting and quality assessment</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Piloting and quality assessment" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Piloting and quality assessment" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Piloting and quality assessment" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Design and analysis of pilots</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Design and analysis of pilots" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Design and analysis of pilots" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Design and analysis of pilots" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Question reliability and validity</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Question reliability and validity" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Question reliability and validity" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Question reliability and validity" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Data archiving and delivery</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Data archiving and delivery" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Data archiving and delivery" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Data archiving and delivery" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Collection of event data</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Collection of event data" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Collection of event data" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Collection of event data" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 ESS dissemination monitoring</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="ESS dissemination monitoring" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="ESS dissemination monitoring" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="ESS dissemination monitoring" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Timetable (June 2007 – September 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire appointments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire development</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample design and selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Coordinators and Field Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field quantitative pilots</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event data collection</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main fieldwork</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality assessment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data protocol and cleaning programmes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data coding/cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data deposit to Archive</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data checking/weighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data proving</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data release</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 Graphical presentation of work packages

- Europe-wide competition for question module design teams
- Appointment of question module design teams
- Questionnaire development
- Pilot
- Translation
- Collection of event data
- Documentation
- Archiving
- Fieldwork
- Appointment of National Co-ordinators and survey organisations
- Sample design
- Sample selection
- Quality assessment
- Data release
- START: CCT appointed
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7.4 Work package list /overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work-package No</th>
<th>Workpackage title</th>
<th>Lead contractor No</th>
<th>Person-months</th>
<th>Start month</th>
<th>End month</th>
<th>Deliverable No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Co-ordination and implementation of the multi-nation survey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Design, development, and process quality control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sampling co-ordination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Translation of instruments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fieldwork commissioning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Contract monitoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Piloting and quality control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Design and analysis of pilot studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Analysis of reliability and validity of mainstage questions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Data archiving and delivery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12, 13, 14, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Collection of event data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ESS dissemination monitoring</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7.5 Deliverables list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>De. no.</th>
<th>Deliverable name</th>
<th>WP no.</th>
<th>Lead participant</th>
<th>Estimated person-months</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Delivery date (project month)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Report on fieldwork contracts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Report on SQP analysis of initial questions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Report on pilot question reliability</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Report on sampling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Report on fieldwork parameters checklist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Report on questionnaire comparability in translation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ESS Final report</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Quality assessment report</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Report on contract adherence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Report on process quality</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Report on main stage question reliability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Data protocols and dictionaries</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Data checking and cleaning programmes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fully archived dataset</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Data delivery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>User support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Database of contextual and event data for 25 countries</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ESS Dissemination activities report</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 28.85
7.6 Work package descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workpackage number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Start date or starting event:</th>
<th>Month 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workpackage title</td>
<td>Co-ordination and implementation of the multi-nation survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant id</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-months per participant:</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objectives

Ensure delivery of the fourth round of a 25-nation European-wide social survey carried out to exacting standards and according to timetable.

Description of work

Leadership of project, responsible for all deliverables to timetable and for overall budget and contract. Assembling and co-ordinating 25 national project teams and two questionnaire design teams. Arranging and accounting for plenary sessions, board meetings and specialist meetings throughout project.

Deliverables

The fourth round of a pan-European social survey, plus numerous reports and publications on process, methods, findings and outcomes.

Milestones and expected result

High quality, 25-nation exemplar survey, advancing cross-national methodology and providing the fourth reading of much sought after substantive data for social science and policy communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workpackage number</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Start date or starting event:</th>
<th>Month 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workpackage title</td>
<td>Design, development, and process quality control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant id</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-months per participant</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objectives

Design and implement consistent survey methods, instruments and procedures in 25 nations and ensure compliance throughout.

### Description of work

Oversee the specified tasks allocated to all Partners on the one hand, and the national teams on the other. Assess equivalence of procedures and standards and remedy deviations, giving practical assistance where necessary.

### Deliverables

The fourth round of a multi-nation comparable dataset containing details of the similarities and contrasts in changing social values across Europe.

### Milestones and expected result

As above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workpackage number</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Start date or starting event:</th>
<th>Month 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workpackage title</td>
<td>Sampling co-ordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant id</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-months per participant:</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**

Design and implementation of workable and equivalent sampling strategies in all participating countries (with the aid of a panel of experts). Assessment and continued consultation with participating countries regarding the sampling strategy.

**Description of work**

Assessment of proposed country sampling designs and, as necessary, development or adjustment of sampling designs in co-operation with national teams. Computation of design weights and design effects.

**Deliverables**

Detailed sampling strategies, approval of 25 implementation plans, report to Co-ordinating Team.

**Milestones and expected result**

Successful execution of appropriate random samples of the residential population in a diverse group of nations.
**Objectives**

Designing and co-ordinating the translation protocols for questionnaires for multi-national, multi-cultural implementation, advising on implementation of guidelines for the translation of the source questionnaire. Reviewing and adapting where necessary the guidelines and assessment procedures, based on findings from previous rounds.

**Description of work**

Contributing annotations and advice during the construction of the source questionnaire. Providing guidance via an expert panel to national teams on translation and documentation procedures. Reviewing procedures based on findings from previous rounds.

**Deliverables**

Translation guidelines, assessment and quality guidelines, source questionnaire consultation, support of individual national translation efforts, Frequently Asked Questions online aid for translators, overall report.

**Milestones and expected result**

The production of well-founded, optimally comparable questionnaires in 25 countries.
### Workpackage number 5

**Start date or starting event:** Month 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workpackage title</th>
<th>Fieldwork commissioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant id</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-months per participant</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objectives

Improve specifications for fieldwork, oversee commissioning of fieldwork in all participating countries in accordance with consistent best practice guidelines and checklists.

### Description of work

Production of a pro forma for fieldwork specifications in participating countries; advice and support for funders and national co-ordinators in the selection process of survey organisations and in the contracting process. Consulting with Work Package 6 on contract adherence and the development of a new signed-off fieldwork checklist. Report to Co-ordinating team.

### Deliverables

- Fieldwork specifications Round 4.
- Signed-off checklists (prior to contracts).
- Contracts with survey organisations.

### Milestones and expected result

Selection of competent field institutes in participating countries; documentation and report on process. Improved contract adherence, by incorporating into the contract the main fieldwork parameters agreed upon between the CCT and NCs.

Selection of NCs and survey organisations.
Overview report on selection of NCs and survey organisations and of contracting procedures.
Workpackage number | 6 | Start date or starting event: | Month 2
--- | --- | --- | ---
Workpackage title | Contract monitoring | | |
Participant id | 2 | | |
Person-months per participant | 6.0 | | |

Objectives

Ensure adherence to contractual conditions of national fielding agencies.

Description of work

Revise (from experience of previous Round) and apply checklist to sign-off fieldwork in all participating countries (in cooperation with Workpackage 5 on fieldwork commissioning). Revise and apply protocols to monitor fieldwork implementation and contract adherence. Provide guidance and propose remedial action, where necessary.

Deliverables

Consistent survey procedures and standards, high response rates, adherence to delivery targets. Documentation of deviations from procedures and standards. Report to Co-ordinating team.

Milestones and expected result

As above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workpackage number</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Start date or starting event:</th>
<th>Month 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workpackage title</td>
<td>Piloting and quality control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant id</td>
<td>5 3 7</td>
<td>Person-months per participant:</td>
<td>13.5 2.6 2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**
Contract and oversee conduct of quantitative pilot study; assess quality of constructs in the pilot study; set up and implement evaluation procedures to assess and, where possible, improve data quality for main survey.

Obtain information on response process, differential response rates and possible bias as a consequence of non-response in the main stage survey. Checking of the response distribution for item non-response and outliers that may be caused by measurement error.

**Description of work**
Ensure the fielding of the quantitative pilot study conducted in 1 nation.
Analyse constructs and relationships between them via structural equation models.
Determine and apply a series of measures for evaluation of data quality in the main survey.
Evaluate improvement of data quality in comparison with previous Rounds of the survey.
Prepare reports for potential data users on country-specific and more widespread problems with the data and, where possible, methods of correction.
Design improved contact forms.
Analyse non-response in relation to different sampling characteristics and cross-national differences in fieldwork practice.

**Deliverables**
Series of reports via CCT on the quality of the data, including analysis of number, time and outcome of contacts, non-response levels nation by nation, and the effects of such variations on representativeness and bias.

**Milestones and expected result**
Improved understanding of the factors that affect data quality in surveys and ways of improving it with particular emphasis on unit and item non response.
Production of revised Contact forms
Contribution to reports on data quality with a particular emphasis on non-response.
Analysis of contact form data.
Objectives

Quality control of the questionnaire design process and the design of experiments to evaluate new items or scales. Contributions to the evaluation of both pilot and main questionnaires with particular emphasis on the reliability and validity of items and scales.

Description of work

Check content validity of measures. Use SQP for prediction of reliability and validity. Design split ballot MTMM experimental designs. Analyse and interpret results of the quantitative pilot survey to assess question reliability and validity and make recommendations on ways of mitigating problems in the final source questionnaire.

Deliverables

Reports and recommendations via Co-ordinator on recommended improvements to questionnaire based on SQP and other analyses.
Detailed statistical analyses of the properties of each new question at the pilot stage.

Milestones and expected result

Preventing and correcting unnecessary measurement errors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workpackage number</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start date or starting event:</td>
<td>Month 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workpackage title</td>
<td>Analysis of reliability and validity of mainstage questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant id</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-months per participant:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objectives

Design experiments to evaluate measures in all countries in the supplementary questionnaire. Analyse the main stage survey results to measure the validity and reliability of the measures within it in order to inform other analysts of ways of mitigating data problems.

### Description of work

Report to Co-ordinating team (and subsequently to all data users).

### Deliverables

Provisional reporting on the statistical analyses of MTMM experiments in different countries (based on a sub-set of the available datasets), of the properties of questions at the main stage fieldwork.

### Milestones and expected result

Tests for correction factors where applicable, to prevent unnecessary measurement errors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workpackage number</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start date or starting event:</td>
<td>Month 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workpackage title</td>
<td>Data archiving and delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant id</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-months per participant</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**

Checking, merging, documenting, archiving, and delivery of the fourth round dataset and documentation.

**Description of work**

Developing database design, robust systems for merging, harmonising and archiving, and delivery services.

**Deliverables**

1) Data protocol, data dictionaries and data checking and cleaning programs
2) Successful merging, harmonising, cleaning and documentation of each dataset.
3) Archiving all merged and accessible datasets with electronic codebooks and other documentation
4) Data delivery
5) User support

**Milestones and expected result**

State of the art archiving of the fourth round of data with user support.
**Workpackage number** | 11  
---|---
**Start date or starting event:** | Month 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workpackage title</th>
<th>Collection of event data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant id</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person-months per participant:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objectives

Assess, review and set guidelines for the collection of contextual and event data; collect contextual data from existing sources or refer to existing data bases, instruct and advise national co-ordinators in collecting additional contextual and event data.

### Description of work

Design of a set of procedures and guidelines for participating countries; advice and support for National Coordinators in their choice of media and selection of relevant events, and in collecting event and contextual data. Set up a web data base through which event data can be disseminated. Locate and reference existing databases of contextual data. Consult with Partner 6. Report to Co-ordinating team.

### Deliverables

- Guidelines to event reporting and collecting contextual information.
- Monitor event reporting during fieldwork.
- Construct web database of media-reported event data for participating countries.
- Produce overview of websites comprising statistical and systemic contextual data.
- Produce parsimonious set of context data for participating countries (with Partner 6)

### Milestones and expected result

As above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workpackage number</th>
<th>Start date or starting event:</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Month 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workpackage title</td>
<td>ESS dissemination monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant id</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-months per participant</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**

Work closely with ESS National Coordinators (NCs) in promoting the dissemination of ESS data from Rounds 1-4 of the ESS. Monitor publications and other events using ESS data that derive from the ESS in each participating nation as well as outside the ESS countries.

**Description of work**

Encourage NCs to organise launch conferences and other activities to promote the ESS. Monitor reports and other materials that use the ESS and share this information with the ESS data user community.

**Deliverables**

Report on ESS dissemination activities

**Milestones and expected result**

Increase number of ESS Round 4 launch and dissemination activities in participating ESS countries.

Achieve greater awareness of ESS outputs.
## 8. Project resources and budget overview

### 8.1 Efforts for the project

Project number (acronym): ESS4

#### Full duration of project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREP Activity type</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>ZUMA</th>
<th>SCP</th>
<th>SRC</th>
<th>KUL</th>
<th>NSD</th>
<th>UL</th>
<th>TOTAL PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research/innovation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2 Design, development and process quality control</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3 Sampling co-ordination</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4 Translation of instruments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7 Piloting and quality control</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP8 Design and analysis of pilot studies</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP9 Analysis of reliability &amp; validity of mainstage questions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP10 Data archiving and dissemination</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP11 Collection of event data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total research</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>134.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Consortium management activities |      |      |     |     |     |     |    |                |
| WP1 Co-ordination and implementation of a multi-national survey | 17.4 |      |     |     |     |     |    | 17.4           |
| WP5 Fieldwork commissioning | 0.9  |      |     |     |     |     |    | 0.9            |
| WP6 Contract monitoring | 6    |      |     |     |     |     |    | 6              |
| WP12 Dissemination Monitoring | 2.2  |      |     |     |     |     |    | 2.2            |
| **Total management** | **17.4** | **6** | **0.9** |     |     |     |    | **26.5**      |

**TOTAL per Participant** | 87 | 18 | 6.5 | 9.2 | 13.5 | 22.6 | 4.4 |

**TOTAL ACTIVITIES** | 87 | 18 | 6.5 | 9.2 | 13.5 | 22.6 | 4.4 | 161.2 |
8.2 Overall budget for the project (Forms A3.1 & A3.2 from CPFs)
8.3 Management level description of resources and budget.

The total budget agreed with the Commission is €1,489,942 spread over two years, from June 2007 to September 2009. The total amount to be spent on the project during the same period will be around €7.5m, the remainder contributed by national academic funding councils for fieldwork and related activities, and by the ESF for meetings of the project’s Scientific Advisory Board. Thus, the proportion of the project for which we are seeking funding is less than 25 per cent of its total costs.

The bulk of the resources are for staff costs. Even so, for a project of this quality, scale and complexity, we believe that the staffing we have proposed is very parsimonious – consisting in most cases of parts of people’s time rather than full-time support. Other large budget items such as travel and piloting have also been kept to the absolute minimum required to conduct the project to the standard we have set. In addition all participants require travel budgets to attend CCT meetings and in regards to other ESS duties eg sampling panel duties.

The fieldwork and National Coordinator costs that are once again to be met by national funding agencies vary considerably by country and – round on round - have been the subject of separate funding decisions in 27 disparate nations. Of the Round 1 countries, however, only Israel - which has been suffering a national budgetary crisis – has dropped out of Round 2. At the same time five further countries (Estonia, Iceland, Slovakia, Ukraine and Turkey) have joined the survey and are self-funding. Though variable internationally, the costs of the ESS – because of its high quality requirement - always tend to be high in comparison with other social surveys in each country, making these participation figures all the more gratifying. Moreover, the national funding agencies have now resolved to sign a Memorandum of Understanding which will enable longer-term national funding for the ESS.

We have never made any pretence that the ESS costs are low. We strongly believe, however, that the project is highly cost-effective and becoming more so. And, judging by their actions as well as words, this view seems to be shared by academic funding agencies across Europe.

The tables on the pages that follow show the resources required from the Commission to coordinate ESS Round 4. These estimates and the types of resources required are based upon the experience of carrying out ESS Rounds 1 and 2.

Overleaf we show in detail the major budget heads and the requested contribution from the EU. FCF contracts clearly provide a higher level of resources as demonstrated in the CPF forms.

All contractors using the additional cost model request the additional costs from the Commission shown below. However, it should be noted that in line with previous rounds of the survey many contractors provide more than the additional costs provided for by the Commission. For example, senior members of many of the teams attend management meetings and provide strategic support for the project.

---

4 We are asking for a contract running from June 2007 for 27 months. However, the first three months will overlap with brought forward Round 3 funding and will therefore not require financial support.
Ethical issues

In this section we address the issue raised by the commission that ‘surveys or interviews including personal data such as “data about health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction” are likely to give rise to ethical issues’.

- In which countries the data are collected.

As stated earlier in the description of work, it cannot be guaranteed which countries will participate in ESS Round 4 since countries fund ESS on a Round by Round basis. Commission funding is, however, a prerequisite for national funding. At the time of writing the best guide is those countries that took part in ESS Round 2.

These are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, 21 of the EU 25 countries are now involved in the project (with only Latvia, Lithuania, Cyprus and Malta currently missing). Also involved are Norway, Switzerland, Ukraine, Turkey (and Israel). Israel was unable to take part in Round 2 due to funding problems. We also know that for Round 3 Bulgaria is very likely to participate.

- Which national, EU and/or other international regulations will apply – and how the project will deal with these regulations.

The ESS subscribes to the Declaration on Ethics of the International Statistical Institute (ISI, http://www.cbs.nl/isi/ethics.htm), to which all national teams are asked to adhere. In addition we can confirm that ESS National Coordinators are responsible for ensuring that the project is conducted in line with any current national code obligations they may have and with national Data Protection laws. These requirements are included in the Specification for participating countries which all national teams must follow when participating in the ESS.

- If the data are anonymous or codified, and if not, who will have access to the data.

National teams and survey houses remove any personal identifies on the data before it is delivered to the archive. Up to the time that the data set is first released, access to programs and data files on the Archive web site are controlled by login using usernames and passwords. All National Coordinators and their teams had access to their own data files only, while the CCT
members had full access, thus making the Archive web site an on-line workbench for the project.
It is the responsibility of National Coordinators and survey houses in each country to ensure that
the data are suitably anonymised to comply both with their national laws and regulations and
with the ISI Declaration on Ethics. The integrated data that is available to the general public has
all personal identifiers removed or anonymised.

- What will happen to the data after the end of the project / How the data will be stored.

Once the data are released onto the public web site, access to the anonymised data became free
to all, subject only to a straightforward registration.
Appendix A - Consortium description

A.1 Participants and consortium

Participant 1: CITY, London, UK

The Centre for Comparative Social Surveys is housed within City University and is the co-ordinating institution of the ESS. Its programme of work is devoted to cross-cultural, cross-national research, both substantive and methodological. It was set up within the School of Social Sciences over two years ago specifically in order to house and co-ordinate the European Social Survey, and it enjoys strong support from both the School and the university administration. It has already established a strong methodological and substantive reputation as the primary academic centre in Britain concerned with cross-national quantitative measurement, and recently won an open competition for a grant from the UK Economic and Social Research Council for methodological work in this field. All staff members of the Centre are research appointments.

Curriculum Vitae of key participants:

Roger Jowell is a Research Professor at City University London and is the Founder Director of its Centre for Comparative Social Surveys. Prior to that he was the Director of the National Centre for Social Research, which he started in 1969 and helped build into Britain’s largest social research institute. He is an elected member of the International Statistical Institute, an Academician of the Academy for Social Sciences and was awarded a CBE in 2001 for services to social science. He is a recent vice-president of the UK’s Royal Statistical Society.

His main research output has been in the field of social and political attitude monitoring and survey methods. He founded and directed the British Social Attitudes survey from 1983 to 2001 and co-directed the British Election Studies from 1983 to 2000. He was the founding chair of the International Social Survey Programme from 1984 to 1989. More recently he has been the Co-ordinator of the European Social Survey since its inception in 2001, chairing its Central Co-ordinating Team, and - prior to that - the ESF’s Methodology Committee which crafted its design. His writing has focused primarily on social and political values, social change, voting behaviour and survey methods. His publications include a major textbook on survey research, 18 edited books on British Social Attitudes and four co-authored books on British electoral behaviour.

Rory Fitzgerald has been a Senior Research Fellow in the Centre for Comparative Social Surveys at City University since May 2004. He is closely involved in the design, management and coordination of the ESS and is a member of its Central Co-ordinating Team. Before that he was a Research Director at the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen), which he joined in 1999, having previously worked at Gallup specialising in political opinion polls. He is a graduate with a first class honours degree from Cardiff University and a masters in European politics from Swansea University. At NatCen he managed a number of large-scale social survey projects, most recently the Department for Work and Pensions ‘Family Resources Survey’ (FRS). He has carried out a number of large-scale computer-assisted face-to-face and telephone surveys, postal self completion surveys as well as conducting cognitive and exploratory research. He also analysed large and complex datasets.

Caroline Roberts has been a Senior Research Fellow at City University and a member of the Central Co-ordinating Team of the ESS since 2004. Since joining the ESS, she has been
working with Roger Jowell and Peter Lynn on the ESS-Gallup mixed mode methodology project, analysing data from mixed mode experiments and working on the design of the next phase of the research. Previously, she was a Senior Social Survey researcher at the Office for National Statistics, and before that, she studied at the London School of Economics for a research degree in Social Psychology. Her doctoral research included a web-survey experiment, investigating the influence of information on attitude change. She has taught survey methods and analysis at the LSE and carried out consultancy work involving complex statistical analyses.

**Gillian Eva** is a Researcher on the European Social Survey. Her responsibilities include dealing with queries from the ESS network and maintaining the ESS website. She also works closely with the rest of the ESS team on questionnaire design and management of the ESS. She completed her BA in European Studies and French at the University of Manchester in 2003 and in 2001-2002 spent a year studying at the Institut d’Etudes Politiques in Lyon where she received her Certificat d’Etudes Politiques. Since September 2004 she has been studying part-time for an MSc in Social Research Methods at City University.

**Mary Keane** is the research administrator of the European Social Survey, handling the coordination of meetings and conferences as well as their finances, and the research administration of the project itself. She continues to play a leading role in the coordination of institutions and tasks involved in running a 25-nation project, a role she has occupied since its outset.

**Participant 2: ZUMA, Mannheim, Germany**

ZUMA, the Centre for Survey Research and Methodology, is an independent, not-for-profit institute active in social research and academic consulting in numerous fields. ZUMA runs the German General Social Survey (ALLBUS), co-implements the German Social Welfare Studies and is a founding member of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP). It provides the scientific community with official data (German Microdata Laboratory) and regularly publishes the ZUMA-Nachrichten on major methodological developments.

Its research facilities include divisions for cross-cultural survey methods, public statistics, social indicators, fieldwork pretesting, text and media analyses, social science computing, mathematics and statistics. In-house Research Units include groups working on cognitive survey research, cross-cultural survey design and implementation, standardisation of background variables, social and regional mobility and computer-assisted text and content analysis.

Founded in 1974 and since 1987 one of the three members of the German Association of Social Science Infrastructure Establishments (GESIS), some 45 of ZUMA’s 104 staff are involved in R&D.

**Curriculum Vitae of key participants**

**Janet Harkness** is Senior Scientist at ZUMA and Professor of Survey Science at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. She is a member of the ESS Central Co-ordinating Team, and heads the Translation Expert Panel and translation work package of the ESS. She is co-coordinator of the ESA Network on comparative methods, RENCORE, co-ordinator of the International Workshop on Comparative Survey Design and Implementation (CSDI), convenor of the ISSP Methodology Committee, and a member of the international advisory board of European Societies. Her research and publications focus on survey translation and translation assessment, text and communications research relevant to questionnaires, and survey quality control. Her Master’s degree was in Comparative Medieval Studies; she received a doctorate in Linguistics and
English from Freiburg University, Germany. Janet Harkness has been a member of the CCT since its inception.

Sabine Häder, Dr in Statistics and Economics, has been a Senior Researcher in the Statistical Department at ZUMA since 1992. She has previously held posts as a research student and lecturer at the University of Economics in Berlin (1984-1987), junior researcher at the Institute of Sociology and Social Policy of the Academy of Sciences, GDR (1987-1991), and was a visiting scholar at the University of Michigan in the summer of 1992. She is also a member of the Methodological Section of the German Sociological Association. Her current research activities include: sampling design, especially for telephone surveys and for cross-cultural surveys; weighting for non-response and design effects. She is a member of the ESS Central Coordinating Team and heads the sampling panel of the ESS.

Achim Koch studied Sociology, Social Psychology and Business Studies at Mannheim University, joining ZUMA in 1986. He was Director of the German General Social Survey (ALLBUS) from 1995 to 2004. He is a member of the ESS Central Coordinating Team and heads the contract monitoring work package for the ESS. He has been a member of the CCT since its inception. He was a ZUMA consultant to the EU-funded project on health, ageing, and retirement, SHARE. His major research interests are survey methodology and social monitoring. Recent publications include several substantive articles on attitudes towards foreigners, articles on fieldwork and non-response, and co-editorship of two volumes, one on political participation and another on social change in Germany.

Peter Ph. Mohler is Director of ZUMA and a member of the Board of Directors of GESIS, the German Social Science Infrastructure Society and Professor of Sociology at Mannheim University. He is Programme Director of the European Centre for Cross-Cultural Surveys at ZUMA, the General Social Survey Germany (ALLBUS), and the German part of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP). He is also a member of the Nationaler Rat für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsdaten (German National Council for Social and Economic Data). His major research interests are comparative survey methodology and computer-assisted content analysis. Peter Mohler has been a member of the CCT since its inception.

Participant 3: SCP, The Hague, Netherlands

The Social and Cultural Planning Office (SCP) is a government agency and deals with social and cultural aspects of government policy. The Office was established by royal decree on March 30, 1973 and began work on January 1, 1974. As an inter-ministerial scientific institute, SCP research findings are mainly intended for the Government, the Upper and Lower Houses of Parliament, senior officials of ministries, and for professional and administrative staff in the public sector and academic circles.

SCP publishes the Social and Cultural Report (SCR) every two years in September. This report describes the social situation of the Dutch population and their attitudes to government policies on social and cultural matters. It covers health care, the social services, employment, social security, justice and criminal procedures, housing, education, leisure, the media and cultural affairs. The report also deals with government policy in general terms, including changes in public administration, participation in politics by the general public and their views on subjects such as how government functions.

SCP monitors the quality of life of target groups in Dutch Society (elderly, youth, women, handicapped and ethnic minorities) and publishes monographs on important social and cultural
issues, such as poverty and social exclusion, religion, cultural changes and time use. It produces a biannual in-depth report on social indicators *(the Social State of the Netherlands)*.

**Curriculum Vitae of key participants**

**Ineke Stoop** studied psychology at Leiden University. She worked as a scientific researcher at the Department of Data Theory of Leiden University and at the Department of Socio-Cultural Statistics of Statistics Netherlands. Since 1990 she has been head of the department of Data Services and Information Technology at SCP. A psychologist by training, she was previously a researcher at the Department of Data Theory at Leiden University and a member of the research staff at the Department of Socio-Cultural Statistics, Statistics Netherlands. She is a member of the European Advisory Committee on Statistical Information in the Economic and Social Spheres (CEIES) and the International Statistical Institute (ISI). She has written widely on data collection, non-response and survey research. She is a member of the ESS Central Coordinating Team and takes responsibility for Event Reporting. Her main research interests are survey quality and non-response. She has recently completed a PhD thesis on non-response in survey research.

**Participant 4: SRC, Barcelona, Spain**

The business school ESADE of the Universitat Ramon Llull recently founded the Survey Research Centre of Barcelona (SRC). SRC performs fundamental research with respect to data quality of surveys and applied research with respect to business and household studies. Both institutions have a long tradition in survey research in their field. Professor Saris at the SRC has been a member of the Central Co-ordinating Team since the start of the ESS.

**Curriculum Vitae of key participants**

**Willem Saris**, who will work on the estimation of reliability and validity, is a full-time professor in methodology at the University of Amsterdam and the ICREA professor at ESADE, Universitat Ramon Llull. He was previously assistant professor at the Free University in Amsterdam, received a Ph.D. in methodology of the social sciences, and in 1981 became a Professor at the University of Amsterdam. His current research areas are in structural equation models and the evaluation of survey questions and he combines these two specialisations in evaluations of survey questions. With others, he has developed a program to predict the quality of survey questions (SQP).

**Irmtraud Gallhofer** is Managing Director of the Sociometric Research Foundation, Amsterdam. She obtained a Ph.D. in History at the University of Vienna and in Linguistics at the University of Amsterdam. She was a Researcher at the Dutch Organisation for the Advancement of Pure Research (ZWO), working on “Dutch Foreign Policy Decision-Making”. Her current research interests are in the linguistic structure of questions, concept representation in assertions and argumentation of decision makers. She will work on Work Packages 8 and 9 and will be responsible for coding the different questions of the ESS questionnaires to make predictions of survey quality, assisting in the analysis of standard MTMM experiments.

**Participant 5: KUL, Leuven, Belgium**

The *Centre for Data Collection and Analysis (CDA)* is a research unit of the Department of Sociology, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (Belgium). It has a staff of 3 professors and 8 pre-doctoral researchers. The CDA is an integral part of the Department of Sociology (staff: 60 scientific and 5 technical).
The research of the Centre for Data Collection and Analysis is directed towards improving the quality of survey methodology. The basic idea behind its approach is that error is an inherent part of survey research and that researchers can counteract it only partially. Thus the Centre has adopted a twin strategy of improvement and control. Improvement consists of finding and applying rules for valid and reliable measurement whenever possible. Control is based on measuring and estimating errors within substantive models. The following domains are studied:

1. interviewer effects, including interviewer variance, interviewer-respondent interactions, and question-answer sequences
2. question wording and context effects in face-to-face interviews, and in internet surveys
3. the validity and reliability of measurement instruments, including the modelling of method effects in structural models
4. the adequacy of methods for analysis, such as models for categorical data, cluster analysis and, more recently, multilevel approaches
5. improving the validity of concepts by means of their theoretical grounding and method triangulation

The methodological research is applied in the context of substantial research projects on ethnocentrism and political attitudes with the help of large-scale national surveys. The Institute for Political and Social Research (ISPO) which has organised the Flemish part of the General Election Surveys since 1991, is located within CDA, which is also the leading unit of the scientific research network “Methodology of longitudinal and comparative analysis of social and cultural change” of the National Research Fund (Flanders). CDA also organised the 21st Biennial Conference of the Society for Multivariate Analysis in the Behavioural Sciences (SMABS’98) and is involved in the annual social and cultural survey in Flanders for which it is responsible for the data quality control.

Curriculum Vitae of key participants

Jaak Billiet is Professor of Social Science Methodology in the Centre for Sociological Research of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium, where he also earned his doctorate in sociology. He is in charge of the Centre for Data Collection and Analysis which organises the general election surveys in Flanders (Belgium) and is co-ordinator of the FWO research network ‘Methodology of Longitudinal and Comparative Research into Social and Cultural Change’. His main methodological research interests are validity assessment, interviewer and response effects, and the modelling of measurement error in social surveys. He is involved in longitudinal and comparative research in the domains of ethnocentrism and political attitudes and behaviour. He was holder of the national Francqui chair at the Free University of Brussels in 1993. From 1997-2000 he was a member of both the Steering Committee and the Methodological Committee of the Blueprint for a European Social Survey (European Science Foundation). He has been a member of the Central Coordinating Team of the ESS since its inception in 2001. Jaak Billiet will be assisted by a research assistant to be appointed.

Participant 6: NSD, Bergen, Norway

NSD was established in 1971 and is owned by the Ministry of Education and Research. It is funded mainly by the Research Council of Norway, the Norwegian universities and different ministries. NSD is a research infrastructure facility, its principal mission being to facilitate access to data for empirical research, providing a variety of services to researchers in Norway as well as abroad. Besides being a gateway to rich data holdings, NSD also serves as a competence centre, assisting researchers with respect to data gathering, questionnaire design, selection of
software tools, social science data analysis and methodology. A distinguishing characteristic of NSD is its multidisciplinary orientation.

NSD has built up a wide variety of data resources across all fields of the social sciences, such as survey data, micro-data from official registers, regional data, data about political elites, political parties, institutions and processes, historical data, etc. NSD is also part of a broad international network of data archives, through its memberships of international organisations and its participation in collaborative projects aimed at building a resource base for comparative quantitative research. This collaboration facilitates access to foreign data and competence benefiting NSD’s user groups.

In addition:

• NSD conducts and is responsible for the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) and is currently the ISSP secretariat
• It is the international data archive for the cross national survey Health Behaviour among School Children (HBSC)
• Through its privacy issue unit, NSD acts as an ombudsman for the Norwegian Data Inspectorate handling all privacy issues in the research sector in Norway where research involves the collection of personal data
• NSD takes an active part in the work of developing and promoting the use of the DDI meta data standard
• It develops software tools to improve the access to the data resources of the social sciences. This includes the development of the statistical package NSDstat, and state-of-the-art technologies for accessing and browsing data over the Internet (NESSTAR).

Curriculum Vitae of key participants

Bjørn Henrichsen is the Director of NSD and was Assistant University Director of the University of Bergen from 1981-1983. He has considerable experience of work at international level; as President of the Council of European Social Science Data Archives (CESSDA), as a board member, and earlier as Vice-President, of the International Federation of Data Organisations (IFDO), as Vice-President of IASSIST (1986-93), as a member of the EU-Study Panel on Large Scale Facilities for the Social Sciences (1994-95), and as an adviser to the European Science Foundation Standing Committee for the Social Sciences (SCSS) (2000 - ). He is also a Norwegian delegate to the European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures ESFRI, and chair of its steering group for the Social Sciences and Humanities. He chairs the Data Documentation Alliance, a programme to create new standards for data and metadata. He also holds numerous national positions, including Chair of the Governmental Committee on Access to Data from Medical Registers (1997), member of the Norwegian Council for Confidentiality in Public Administration and Research (1996 - ), and a Substitute Board Member, Statistics Norway (1996 - ). He is chair of UNINETT Ltd. the Norwegian Research Net. He has been a member of the CCT since its inception.

Kirstine Kolsrud is Senior Advisor at the Norwegian Social Science Data Services Ltd. (NSD), where she has worked since 1993. At NSD, she has worked with databases, individual level data from official registers, privacy issues and developed performance indicators on council services such as primary education, social services, and local health services. Kirstine Kolsrud has worked on the European Social Survey since its inception in 2001. She has also taken part in the planning and work of other cross national surveys at NSD, such Health Behaviour among School Children (HBSC), the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP), and the parallel
surveys to the Eurobarometers in Norway. Of particular relevance to this proposal is the publication:

**Knut Kalgraaff Skjåk** is Assistant Director of the Norwegian Social Science Data Services Ltd. (NSD) and head of the External Projects Division of NSD. He directs the Norwegian part of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP), of which NSD has been the Secretariat since 2003. Knut Kalgraaff Skjåk has directed a number of national surveys on social values, implemented and supervised various methodological experiments in survey research in Norway and has supervised parallel surveys to the Eurobarometers in Norway. He has also been working on the European Social Survey since its inception in 2001.

**Participant 7: UL, Ljubljana, Slovenia.**

The University of Ljubljana conducts basic, applied and development research in all fields of science and the arts. Based on its own research projects as well as advances in research at home and abroad, the University provides instruction and training to prominent scientists and experts and promotes interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary studies.

The Public Opinion and Mass Communications Research Centre (CJMMK) at Ljubljana University was founded in 1966 within the Social Sciences Faculty, Slovenia's central academic education and research institution in the field of sociology, political sciences and communications science. The Centre is one of 16 research units of the Institute of Social Sciences, which carries out around 80 basic, applied and developmental research projects per year, funded by government and other contracts. CJMMK has established itself as the principal Slovenian research institution in sociology and political science, most significantly by setting up the Slovenian Public Opinion Survey, the most prominent and methodologically controlled longitudinal data source for Slovenian social science community. The survey has been fielded annually since 1968. Its substantive areas include social stratification and mobility, migration, political attitudes, election processes and political parties, mass media, and religion.

CJMMK is also involved in a variety of distinguished comparative projects - World Values Survey, ISSP, European Social Survey, European Values Survey, Ostbarometer, Cross-national Survey of Electoral Systems and other bilateral and multilateral projects. Its research team has acquired broad experience in various aspects of cross-national surveys. In addition to its traditional face-to-face surveys, the Centre has extensive experience with telephone surveys and related methodology, as well as with opinion leader surveys and qualitative studies. As well as substantive research, the team also investigates sampling issues, measurement and semantic issues. Most CJMMK researchers are also lecturers in social science methodology.

**Curriculum Vitae of key participants**

**Brina Malnar** is Assistant Professor at the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana, working as a full time researcher at the Public Opinion and Mass Communications Research Centre. Her research interests include the study of social science methodology, study of values in cross-sectional and cross-cultural perspective, especially in the field of social inequality, health and health-systems, family, environment and transition. She has 7 years of teaching experience in the field of social science methodology. Her research experience includes 15 years of research work at CJMMK, involving the design and fielding of quantitative social surveys, training of interviewers, analytical and research work, publishing and editing. Many of these survey projects are cross-national, including the ESS, the International Social Survey Programme, and the World Values Survey. Other projects
she has been involved in are surveys of opinion leaders, employment satisfaction surveys, the annual Slovenian Public Opinion Survey, and small scale qualitative research projects.
Who’s who in the ESS

Central Co-ordinating Team (Management Board)

A seven-nation Central Co-ordinating Team is responsible for the overall design, development, implementation, archiving and dissemination of the project. It meets regularly and co-ordinates the work of both national and expert teams.

Roger Jowell (PI), Rory Fitzgerald, Caroline Roberts, City University, UK
Gillian Eva, Mary Keane

Jaak Billiet, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium

Bjørn Henrichsen, Knut Skjåk, Kirstine Kolsrud NSD, Norway

Peter Mohler, Janet Harkness, Sabine Häder, ZUMA, Germany

Achim Koch

Willem Saris, Irmtraud Gallhofer SRC, Spain

Ineke Stoop SCP, Netherlands

Brina Malnar University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Sampling Panel

A specialist team advises and ‘signs off’ the sample designs of all countries:

Sabine Häder ZUMA, Germany
Siegfried Gabler ZUMA, Germany
Seppo Laaksonen Statistics Finland
Peter Lynn University of Essex, UK

Translation Taskforce

Similarly, a group of specialists guides the translation process:

Janet Harkness ZUMA, Germany
Paul Kussmaul University of Mainz, Germany
Beth-Ellen Pennell University of Michigan, USA
Alisú Schoua-Glousberg Research Support Services, USA

Question Module Design Teams

Question Module Design Teams, selected at each Round following a competition, help to design the rotating modules of questions.

In Round 1, they were:

Citizenship, Involvement and Democracy

Ken Newton University of Southampton, UK
Hanspeter Kriesi University of Geneva, Switzerland
José Ramón Montero University of Madrid, Spain
Sigrid Rossteutscher University of Mannheim, Germany
Anders Westholm University of Uppsala, Sweden

Immigration

Ian Preston University College London, UK
Thomas Bauer Institut für de Zukunft der Arbeit, Germany
David Card University of California, USA
Christian Dustmann University College London, UK
James Nazroo University College London, UK
In Round 2, they were:

*Family, work and well-being*

**Robert Erikson**
SOFI, Stockholm University, Sweden

Jaane Jonsson
SOFI, Stockholm University, Sweden

Duncan Gallie
Nuffield College Oxford, UK

Josef Brueederl
University of Mannheim, Germany

Louis-Andre Vallet
LASMAS, France

Helen Russell
ESRI, Ireland

*Opinions on health & care seeking*

**Sjoerd Kooiker**
SCP, Netherlands

Nicky Britten
Peninsula Medical School Universities of Exeter & Plymouth, UK

Alicja Oltarzewska
Medical Univ of Bialystok, Poland

Jakob Kragstrup
University of Southern Denmark

Ebba Holme
Danish University of Pharmaceutical Sciences

*Economic morality in Europe: Market Society & Citizenship*

**Susanne Karstedt**
Keele University, UK

Stephen Farrall
Keele University, UK

Alexander Stoyanov
Center for the Study of Democracy, Bulgaria

Kai Bussman
Martin Luther Universitat, Germany

Grazyna Skapska
Jagiellonian University, Poland

In Round 3, they are:

*Personal and Social Well-being: Creating indicators for a flourishing Europe*

**Felicia Huppert**
University of Cambridge, UK

Andrew Clark,
Paris-Jourdan Sciences Economiques, France

Bruno Frey,
University of Zürich, Switzerland

Nic Marks,
New Economics Foundation, UK

Johannes Siegrist,
Düsseldorf University, Germany

*The Timing of Life: The organisation of the life course in Europe*

**Francesco Billari**
Università Bocconi, Italy

Gunhild Hagestad,
Ager University College, Norway

Aart Liebroer,
Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute & Free University of Amsterdam,

Zsolt Spéder
Hungarian Central Statistical Office, Hungary

*Methods Group*

A distinguished group of survey methodologists advises on technical aspects of the survey series:

**Denise Lievesley (Chair)**
Health and Social Care Information Centre (UK)

Norman Bradburn
NORC, USA

Paolo Garonna
Confindustria, Italy

Lars Lyberg
Statistics Sweden

Vasja Vehovar
University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
**Funders**

Representatives of our two international bodies sit on the project’s Scientific Advisory Board.

Andrew Sors, Virginia Vitorino from the **European Commission**
Henk Stronkhorst from the **European Science Foundation**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BOARD (CHAIR: Max Kaase, International University, Bremen)</th>
<th>NATIONAL CO-ORDINATOR</th>
<th>SURVEY ORGANISATION</th>
<th>FUNDING AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Karl H. Müller, WISDOM</td>
<td>Karl H. Müller, WISDOM</td>
<td>Institute for Panel Research (ipr)</td>
<td>Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Arbeit (BMWA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Flemish)</td>
<td>Ron Lesthaeghe, Vrije Universiteit Brussel</td>
<td>Geert Loosveldt, Centre for Survey Methodology, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven</td>
<td>Significant GfK</td>
<td>Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Francophone)</td>
<td>Pierre Desmaréz, Université Libre de Bruxelles</td>
<td>René Doutrelepont, University of Liège</td>
<td>Significant GfK</td>
<td>Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Martin Kreidl, Institute of Sociology, AS CR</td>
<td>Klára Plecitá-Vlachová, Institute of Sociology, AS CR</td>
<td>SC&amp;C</td>
<td>Grant Agency of the Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Niels Ploug, Danish National Institute for Social Research</td>
<td>Torben Fridberg, Danish National Institute for Social Research</td>
<td>SFI-Survey (Danish National Institute of Social Research)</td>
<td>Danish Social Science Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Dagmar Kutsar, University of Tartu</td>
<td>Mare Amsaar, University of Tartu</td>
<td>Statistical Office of Estonia</td>
<td>Estonian Science Foundation &amp; University of Tartu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Olli Kangas, University of Turku</td>
<td>Heikki Ervasti, University of Turku</td>
<td>Statistics Finland</td>
<td>Academy of Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Ursula Hoffmann-Lange, University of Bamberg</td>
<td>Jan van Deth, University of Mannheim</td>
<td>Institute for Applied Social Sciences (infas)</td>
<td>German Research Foundation (DFG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Christos Lyrintzis, National Centre for Social Research (EKKE)</td>
<td>Yannis Voulgaris, Institute of Political Sociology, National Centre for Social Research (EKKE)</td>
<td>OPINION – High Technology Market Research Agency</td>
<td>General Secretariat of Research and Technology, Ministry of Development; National Hellenic Research Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Andrea Szabo (tbc)</td>
<td>Peter Robert, TARKI</td>
<td>TARKI</td>
<td>Hungarian Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Fridrik Jonsson</td>
<td>Institute of Social Research, University of Iceland</td>
<td>Higher Education Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Sean O Riain, National University of Ireland at Maynooth, Ireland</td>
<td>Michael O’Connell, University College Dublin</td>
<td>Economic and Social Research Institute</td>
<td>Irish Research Council for the Humanities &amp; Social Sciences (IRCHSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Guido Martinotti, University of Milan Bicocca</td>
<td>Sonia Stefanizzi, University of Milano Bicocca</td>
<td>(tbc)</td>
<td>Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Gaston Schaber, CEPS/INSTEAD</td>
<td>Monique Borsenberger, CEPS/INSTEAD Uwe Warner, CEPS/INSTEAD</td>
<td>CEPS/INSTEAD</td>
<td>CEPS/INSTEAD; Fonds National de la Recherche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Jacques Thomassen, University of Twente</td>
<td>Rob Eisinga, Radboud University of Nijmegen</td>
<td>GfK Panel Services Benelux</td>
<td>Nederlandse organisatie voor wetenschappelijk onderzoek (NWO); Social and Cultural Planning Office (SCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Steine Kuhnle, University of Bergen</td>
<td>Kristen Ringdal, Norwegian University of Technology &amp; Science</td>
<td>Statistics Norway</td>
<td>Research Council of Norway (RCN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| COUNTRY | SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BOARD  
(CHAIR: Max Kaase, International University, Bremen) | NATIONAL CO-ORDINATOR | SURVEY ORGANISATION | FUNDING AGENCY |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Henryk Domanski, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>Pawel Sztabinski, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>Centre for Sociological Research, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>State Committee for Scientific Research; Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Manuel Villaverde Cabral, Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa; João Ferreira de Almeida, Instituto Superior de Ciências do Trabalho e da Empresa</td>
<td>Jorge Vala, Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa</td>
<td>TNS-Euroteste</td>
<td>Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia – Ministério da Ciência e do Ensino Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Tatiana Sedová, Slovak Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>Jozef Vyrost, Institute of Social Sciences, Slovak Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>MARKWIN Ltd</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Niko Tos, University of Ljubljana</td>
<td>Brina Malnar, University of Ljubljana</td>
<td>Public Opinion and Mass Communication Research Centre (CJMMK), Ljubljana University</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science and Sport; Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs; Ministry of Health; Government Office for European Affairs; IMAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>José Ramón Montero, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid</td>
<td>Mariano Torcal, Universitat Pompeu Fabra</td>
<td>TNS-Demoscopia</td>
<td>Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología (MCyT);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Rune Åberg, University of Umeå</td>
<td>Stefan Svalfors, University of Umeå</td>
<td>Statistics Sweden</td>
<td>Swedish Council for Working Life and Social Research; The Swedish Research Council; The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Peter Farago, Landert Farago and Partner</td>
<td>Dominique Joye, SIDOS</td>
<td>MIS Trend</td>
<td>Schweizerischer Nationalfonds zur Förderung der Wissenschaftlichen Forschung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey (tbc)</td>
<td>Yilmaz Esmer, Bogaziçi University</td>
<td>Yilmaz Esmer, Bogaziçi University</td>
<td>Birim Arastirma and/or Makro Arastirma</td>
<td>Turkish Academy of Sciences (TÜBA); Open Society Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Jackie Scott, University of Cambridge</td>
<td>Alison Park, National Centre for Social Research</td>
<td>British Market Research Bureau (BMRB)</td>
<td>Economic and Social Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Eugene Golovakha</td>
<td>Andriy Gorbachyk, Kyiv Taras Shevchenko University</td>
<td>Centre for Social &amp; Expert Investigations, Institute of Sociology, National Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>International Renaissance Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.2 Sub-contracting

KUL will subcontract the pilot fieldwork to a fieldwork agency in the UK. This would require carrying out field interviews to a pre arranged specification. This would be subject to a tendering process.

A.3 Third parties

This does not apply.

A.4 Funding of third country participants

There are no third country participants in this project.
A5. ESS Publicity and Dissemination

This section contains a list of publications using ESS data. These titles have been provided to us by authors and have not been vetted by the Central Coordinating Team.

Aktualności, (15.01.04), Obcokrajowiec szefem? [Foreigner as your boss?], http://www.egospodarka.pl

Aktualności, (20.01.04), Polacy ufaj? ONZ [Poles trust Organization of the United Nations], http://www.egospodarka.pl/

Alaminos A (2004), Improving survey methodology: the ESS Index and Measurement - The cultural borders of meaning, paper presented at Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Amsterdam, 16-20 August 2004.

Albrechtsen H (2004), 'The broken link - do trade unions represent the interests of the unemployed? Evidence from the UK, Germany and Denmark within the framework of the European Employment Strategy', in Transfer 4/04.


Bay H (2004), European Value Map: Based on ESS Data, paper presented at Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Amsterdam, 16-20 August 2004.

Bay H (2005), European Value Map: Generations and Countries, paper presented at the 1st Congress of the European Association for Survey Research, Barcelona, Spain.


Billiet J & Philippens M (2004), Data quality assessment in ESS Round 1: Between wishes and reality, paper presented at Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Amsterdam, 16-20 August 2004.

Billiet J, Phillipens M, Fitzgerald R & Stoop I (2005), Refusal conversion and estimation of non-response bias in the European Social Survey Round 1, paper at 60th AAPOR Annual Conference, Miami Beach, Florida, USA.


Domański H (2004), 'Selekcja pochodzeniowa do szkoły ?redniej i na studia' ['Selection to the secondary school and academic level by the socio-economic origin status'], Studia Socjologiczne, 2(173), 65-93.


Domański H (2004), Struktura społeczna [Social Structure], Warsaw: Scholar Press.


Domański H & Przybysz D (2003), ‘Analiza przydatności EGP jako wskaźnika pozycji społecznej’ ['Analysis of the usefulness of EGP as the index of the social position’], Ask, Społeczeństwo, Badania, Metody. No 12, 85-116

Domańskiego H (2004), O ruchliwości społecznej w Polsce [About the social mobility in Poland], Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.


Gąciarz B & Pańków W (2004), ‘Bariery samorządności lokalnej’ ['The barriers for the local authorities’] w: Nadwiślańskie niepokoje, Wydawnictwa IFiS PAN


Harkness J (2004), Trapped in Translation? ESS Translation Protocols Provide a Key, paper presented at Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Amsterdam, August.


Iedema J (2004), Influence of Media Reported Events on Attitudes and Opinions, paper presented at Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Amsterdam, 16-20 August 2004.

Jowell R, Fitzgerald R & Eva G (2005), From design to implementation: methodological innovation on the ESS, paper presented at 60th AAPOR Annual Conference, Miami Beach, Florida, USA.

Kafetsios K (in press), 'Social support and well-being in contemporary Greek Society: Examination of multiple indicators at different levels of analysis', Social Indicators Research.


Kafetsios K (2004), Relationship networks and well being in contemporary Greek Society: A multiple level approach, 1st International Conference: Quality of life and Psychology, Aristotle University, Thessaloniki, 3-5 December

Kolsrud K & Skjåk K. (2004), Harmonizing background variables in international surveys, paper presented at Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Amsterdam, 16-20 August 2004.


Lambert P S (2004), Ethnicity and the comparative analysis of contemporary survey data, paper presented at Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Amsterdam, 16-20 August 2004.

Lelkes O (forthcoming), 'Knowing what is good for you. Empirical analysis of personal preferences and the "objective good"', Journal of Socio-Economics
Loosveldt G & Philippens M (2004), Modelling interviewer-effects in the European Social Survey, paper presented at Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Amsterdam, 16-20 August 2004.


Matei S A, Romania, one of the most elitist countries in the world [Romania in topul modal al elitismului], published in Evenimentul Zilei http://www.evz.ro/social/?news_id=187230


Peytcheva E, Groves R, Manchin R, & Tortora R (2004), An Experimental Comparison of Four Modes of Data Collection Within the Eurobarometer Measurement Domain, paper presented at Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Amsterdam, 16-20 August 2004.


Roberts C, Lynn P, Manchin R & Agnes I, Methodological advances on the ESS: A mixed mode future?, paper at 60th AAPOR Annual Conference, Miami Beach, Florida, USA.

Rother N (2004), Measuring attitudes towards immigration across Countries: Potential problems of functional equivalence in the ESS, paper presented at Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Amsterdam, 16-20 August 2004.

Rubel T & Schwartz S H (2005), Sex differences in value priorities: Cross-cultural and multi-method studies, paper presented at VII International Association for Cross-cultural Psychology Regional Congress.

Saris W E (2004), Comparability across Countries of Responses in the ESS, paper presented at Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Amsterdam, 16-20 August 2004.

Schwartz S (July 2003), The European Social Survey: Introducing a new source of cross-national data, a Workshop at the VII Regional Meeting of the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Budapest, Hungary.


Schwartz S H (2005), What Determines Willingness to Accept Immigrants into One's Country?, paper presented at VII International Association for Cross-cultural Psychology Regional Congress.


Słomczyński K, ‘Europejski SondaŜ Społeczny a inne międzynarodowe badania surveyowe. Czego można nauczyć się z analiz porównawczych’ [‘European Social Survey vs. other international survey research. What can one learn from comparative analysis’] Ask, Społeczeństwo, Badania, Metody, No 13, pp 85-116.


Stathopoulou T (2004), Modelling events for ESS: Toward the creation of an autonomous tool for survey research, paper presented at Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Amsterdam, 16-20 August 2004.

Stoop I (2004), Context, events and attitudes, paper presented at Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Amsterdam, 16-20 August 2004.

Sztabiński F (2005), ‘Jak dotrzeć do respondenta i skłonić go do udziału w badaniu’ [‘How to reach the respondent and persuade him/her to take part in the interview’], Przegląd Socjologiczny [Sociological Review], tom LIII/I, pp 143–166.


Turner T & Cross C (2005), Perceptions of the economic and cultural impact of immigrants by people at work in Europe: A causal analysis, Department of Personnel and Employment Relations, January, University of Limerick.


Volf T, Problem zaupanja v sodobnih družbah (Problem of Trust in Modern Societies), Dissertation: University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences.


Wolf C (2004), Measuring religious membership and religiosity across Europe, paper presented at Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Amsterdam, 16-20 August 2004.