



ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Calibrating Questionnaires with Weekly Diaries : An Application in Religious Behavior, Netherlands 1975 to 2005

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Calibrating Questionnaires with Weekly Diaries : An Application in Religious Behavior, Netherlands 1975 to 2005 / Ettore Scappini. - In: SOCIOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY. - ISSN 0081-1750. - STAMPA. - 51:1(2021), pp. N.D..166-N.D..187. [10.1177/0081175020927438]

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/761641> since: 2021-01-26

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1177/0081175020927438>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

(Article begins on next page)

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

Sociological Methodology

Calibrating questionnaires with weekly diaries: an application in religious behavior (Netherlands 1975-2005)

Journal:	<i>Sociological Methodology</i>
Manuscript ID	SMX-19-0006.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Articles
Keywords:	Time use, Measurement problems, Calibrating questionnaires, Measured presence, Diaries
Abstract:	<p>This paper presents an innovative approach to improve the power of questionnaires by combining them with weekly diaries. The aim is to show how it is possible to calibrate information collected from the questionnaire, which provides a distribution that is in general biased, with diary data, which are more accurate but cannot provide any distribution across a range of frequencies. These problems become even more pronounced when the object of analysis is a specific issue such as religious practice, the focus of this study. The suggested user-friendly model uses the more accurate diary data to adjust the distribution produced by the standard questions and enables researchers to obviate the problems of the two data collection methods. To present a practical application we will use the Time-budget surveys (TBO), conducted at five-year intervals between 1975 and 2005 in the Netherlands.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Title

Calibrating Questionnaires with Weekly Diaries: An Application in Religious Behavior; Netherlands 1975 to 2005

Author's name

Ettore Scappini

Ettore Scappini, PhD, is a Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Bologna, Italy. His primary research interests are in the field of methodological problems in the social sciences with specific topics including measurement errors in social surveys with the use of indicators derived from stylized questionnaires and diaries, the validity of indicators for measuring religious behavior, and the problems of estimated APC models with specific applications in political behavior.

Affiliation

Department of Education Studies, University of Bologna, via Filippo Re, 6, 40129 Bologna Italy.

Keywords time-use; diaries; measured presence; calibrating questionnaires; measurement problems.

Corresponding author detail:

Email, ettore.scappini@unibo.it;

ORCID ID, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4909-8737>

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments, which made an important contribution to clarifying the issues discussed. I am also grateful to Anne Roeters for some personal recommendations about the use of the TBO data.

Abstract

This article presents an innovative approach to improve the power of questionnaires by combining them with weekly diaries. The aim is to show how one can calibrate information collected from questionnaires, which provide a distribution that is in general biased, with diary data, which are more accurate but cannot provide a distribution across a range of frequencies. These problems become even more pronounced when the object of analysis is a specific issue, such as religious practice, the focus of this study. The suggested user-friendly model uses the more accurate diary data to adjust the distribution produced by the standard questions and enables researchers to obviate the problems of the two data collection methods. To present a practical application, we use the time-budget surveys (TBO) conducted at five-year intervals between 1975 and 2005 in the Netherlands.

1. INTRODUCTION

This article presents a method to improve the information provided by questionnaires by combining them with weekly diaries and applies it to the issue of religious behavior in the Netherlands. The aim is to show how one can calibrate information collected from questionnaires, which is generally more complete but subject to bias, with data collected from diaries, which are usually much more accurate but less detailed. These problems become even more pronounced when the object of analysis is a specific issue such as religious practice, the focus of this study.

Current research recognizes two main data collection tools for measuring the frequency with which an activity is carried out: the stylized questionnaire (hereafter, simply questionnaire) and the diary. In the former case, respondents are generally asked to use a pre-coded scale to indicate how frequently they perform a given activity within an established period of time, which could be a week, a month, or more commonly a year. In the latter case, respondents compile a daily or weekly diary in which they

1
2
3
4 indicate which activity or activities they carry out at established intervals, typically 10
5
6 to 15 minutes. Both data collection methods have their advantages and drawbacks.
7
8

9 Questionnaires can be used to carry out extremely detailed surveys regarding the
10 distribution of the intensity with which a given activity is carried out by a population,
11 but the data collected are somewhat imprecise (Harms et al. 2019; Jacobs 1998; Juster,
12 Ono, and Stafford 2003; Kan and Pudney 2008; Robinson 1985). It is difficult to recall
13 accurately at a later date which activity was carried out or how frequently it was
14 performed (Gershuny 2012). Furthermore, questionnaires are disproportionately prone
15 to social desirability or demonstration effects, inasmuch as indicating that a given
16 activity was carried out, or a failure to do so, implies, at most, passive action (Gershuny
17 2012).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Questionnaires thus allow researchers to obtain detailed distributions of the degree of
30 intensity with which an activity is carried out in a given population over a relatively
31 broad pre-established period, such as the preceding year. However, as this result may be
32 subject to bias, its level of reliability can become problematic and can cause researchers
33 serious difficulties when analyzing the relevant phenomenon. The problem of
34 questionnaires' low precision level is exacerbated when a study addresses specific
35 issues, such as those related to some form of obligation or expectation, also in moral
36 terms, regarding anticipated behavior, such as in the case of religious behavior
37 (Hadaway and Marler 2005; Hadaway, Marler, and Chaves 1993, 1998; Presser and
38 Chaves 2007; Presser and Stinson 1998; Rossi and Scappini 2012).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Diaries, in contrast, can be used to carry out more precise studies on the average
53 intensity with which a given activity is performed. The chronological structure of a
54 diary makes it easier to record the timing and recollection of events (Belli 1998; Belli
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 and Callegaro 2009). Any bias due to memory gaps during the compilation phase is
5
6 relatively limited and drops even further when there are special events, typically of a
7
8 less frequent nature (Al Baghal et al. 2014). Yet diaries could have the problem of
9
10 “reactance,” that is, a change in participants’ behavior as an effect of their involvement
11
12 in the study (Bolger, Davis, and Rafaeli 2003). In other words, when a diary needs to be
13
14 filled out, the respondent is reminded of the behavior that needs to be reported, which
15
16 may lead to a change in behavior. This phenomenon has been observed in specific
17
18 limited contexts (Korotitsch and Nelson-Gray 1999), such as cases of drug abusers
19
20 (Hay, Hay, and Angle. 1977), but there is little evidence that this effect poses a general
21
22 threat to the validity of diaries (Barta, Tennen, and Litt 2012; Shiffman, Stone, and
23
24 Hufford 2008). Finally, unlike with questionnaires, any falsification requires episodes to
25
26 be actively invented. Consequently, as it is easier for respondents to behave honestly,
27
28 there are fewer desirability effects (Gershuny 2012).
29
30
31
32
33

34 However, diary data are much less detailed than questionnaires, as almost nothing is
35
36 known about the distribution of the intensity with which the given activity is carried out
37
38 in the period when the diary is not compiled (Frazis and Stewart 2012; Scappini 2010).
39
40 Therefore, although diaries make it possible to obtain a reliable measure of the average
41
42 intensity with which an activity is performed in a given population, they cannot
43
44 generate even a simple frequency distribution in reference to longer periods than the
45
46 duration of the diary. This situation can present researchers with serious problems, as
47
48 analyses often require one to identify groups of subjects that carry out a given activity
49
50 with different degrees of intensity for relatively long periods. For example, studies on
51
52 religious practice frequently seek to identify the group that attended a service at least
53
54 once a month over the preceding year.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 To overcome the difficulties arising from these two data collection methods, scholars
5
6 have suggested finding a model that can calibrate the values obtained from
7
8 questionnaires with those from diaries in such a way as to obtain data that are as
9
10 complete and reliable as possible. This requirement led to many attempts—above all by
11
12 Gershuny—to make combined use of the qualities of the two data collection tools. Kan
13
14 and Gershuny (2006, 2009) showed that it is possible to calibrate questionnaires by
15
16 combining two datasets: one derived from a survey that collected questionnaire and
17
18 diary data from the same respondents, and the other from a questionnaire-based survey.
19
20 This method was then perfected using the latest matching techniques (Borra, Sevilla,
21
22 and Gershuny 2013; Walthery and Gershuny 2019). Following a similar path, Gershuny
23
24 (2012) showed that by taking Bourdieu’s concept of *habitus* as a starting point, one can
25
26 use logistic regressions to estimate the probability of participating at least once over 14-
27
28 or 28-day periods.
29
30
31
32
33

34 The disadvantage of these methods is the use of unusual theoretical concepts and
35
36 relatively complex regression techniques. In contrast, we present a model that does not
37
38 require any particular assumptions and is easier to apply.
39
40

41 To summarize, diary data are more accurate than questionnaire data, but they cannot
42
43 generate a distribution across a range of attendance-frequency response categories. The
44
45 standard question, on the other hand, provides a distribution, but it is biased upward
46
47 because people generally tend to overstate their attendance frequency. The calibration
48
49 proposed here uses the more accurate diary data to adjust the distribution produced by
50
51 the standard question.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 To present a practical application, we use time-budget surveys conducted at five-year
5 intervals between 1975 and 2005 in the Netherlands.¹ The data collection methods used
6
7
8 were a questionnaire, including items about religion, and a weekly diary.
9

10
11 This study takes shape over three sections. In the first of these, we present the data
12 and discuss the different characteristics of the indicators, while in the second we
13
14 develop the reasoning that led us to create the model and discuss some necessary
15
16 premises for its application. The third section features comparisons highlighting the
17
18 significant differences between the calibrated and uncalibrated figures, as well as the
19
20 advantages deriving from use of the model. Finally, in the conclusion, we also suggest
21
22 some other possible areas of application.
23
24
25
26
27

28 **2. PRELIMINARY FEATURES: DATA AND INDICATORS**

29 **2.1 The Data: The Dutch Time-Budget Surveys**

30
31 This study uses the Time-Budget Survey (TBO), which was conducted every five
32
33 years by The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP) and partners; it was
34
35 repeated with a virtually unchanged format from 1975 to 2005. For the purposes of this
36
37 article, we only use surveys from four years: 1975, 1980, 2000, and 2005.²
38
39
40
41

42 In the survey, respondents kept a diary over a seven-day period in October,³
43
44 recording what they were doing (every 15 minutes) and where they were.⁴ In addition,
45
46 respondents were given a detailed core questionnaire in the weeks before they compiled
47
48 the diary and a shorter final questionnaire in subsequent weeks. Each wave is
49
50 representative of the entire Dutch population over age 12, but for the purposes of this
51
52 study, we single out respondents age 18 to 74.
53
54
55

56 Response rates are generally low in the Netherlands, particularly for time diaries,
57
58 which are time intensive. They varied between 76 percent in 1975, 54 percent in 1980,
59
60

1
2
3
4 and 20 percent (the low point) in 1995 (response formula AAPOR: RR1, see also
5
6 Mandemakers and Roeters 2014). More recently, various incentives have been offered
7
8 to increase the return (Dool 2006),⁵ with the result that the response rate climbed from
9
10 25 percent in 2000 to 37 percent in 2005.⁶ To minimize the potential bias, the analysis
11
12 was weighted to represent the population in terms of gender, age, occupational status,
13
14 urbanization, size and type of household, and place in the household (Mandemakers and
15
16 Roeters 2014).
17
18
19

20
21 Another difficulty concerns the different level of intensity of an individual's
22
23 attendance at religious services over the course of a year. Unfortunately, we have no
24
25 data about monthly variability in attendance in the Netherlands. However, October and
26
27 November are the months that come closest to the yearly average figure (Harvey 1993),
28
29 so we believe the result of the calibration is obtained with a reasonable degree of
30
31 approximation.⁷
32
33

34
35 As highlighted earlier, to make the comparison, the same activity (here, religious
36
37 practice) needs to be surveyed using both a diary and a questionnaire. For the diary, we
38
39 used the code regarding acts of worship, which excludes any such behavior carried out
40
41 at home. The definition of attendance we adopted for measured presence is "Going to
42
43 church, attending a humanist gathering etc. *not* at home⁸ *in the* survey week."
44
45

46
47 With regard to the questionnaire, we used two items.⁹ The first was a filter question:
48
49 "Do you regard yourself as belonging to a church community, religion or ideological
50
51 grouping?" with two answer categories: "yes" and "no." If yes was selected, the second
52
53 item about frequency of attendance at religious services was applied.¹⁰ This second
54
55 item—"Do you sometimes go to a church, mosque or other house of prayer? If so, how
56
57 often do you go on average?"—offered nine answer options: (a) never; (b) less than
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 once a year; (c) once every 7 to 12 months; (d) once every four to six months; (e) once
5
6 every two to three months; (f) once a month; (g) once every two to three weeks; (h)
7
8 once a week; and (i) twice a week or more.

11 2.2 The Indicators: Presence and Frequency

12
13 The data typically obtained from diaries and questionnaires are fundamentally
14
15 different in nature. We first present a simplified description of an indicator derived from
16
17 diary usage with exclusive reference to religious practice.

18
19
20 After determining the total number of subjects that have to fill in a diary (N), we
21
22 construct subsamples, each one consisting of N/W individuals. W is the number of
23
24 subsamples, which is the total period in weeks over which diaries are kept. This period
25
26 W is generally 52, although there are exceptions to the rule, such as in our case where
27
28 diaries are kept for two weeks ($W = 2$).

29
30
31 The members of the first subsample are asked to fill in a diary of all activities carried
32
33 out during the first week of the survey period. Similarly, members of the second
34
35 subsample fill in a diary about the second week, and so on with the acquisition of data
36
37 of presence/absence covering W weeks of the survey period.

38
39
40 The data are then arranged in a matrix with N/W rows and W columns. The box in the
41
42 first row and first column is used to record the presence/absence ($x = 1, 0$) of the first
43
44 respondent in the first week of the survey period, the next box in the same row is used
45
46 for the presence/absence of the second respondent, and so on. In this way, each column
47
48 contains the attendance data recorded by N/W respondents in the corresponding week.
49
50 Therefore, the ratio $\sum_{i=1}^{N/W} x_{i,1} / N/W$, regarding the first week (first column in the matrix),
51
52
53 can be referred directly to a group of individuals, as it shows the proportion of
54
55 respondents that attended a service during the week in question.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Yet, each row of the matrix contains data taken from diaries filled in by W different
5 respondents in the corresponding W weeks. As a result, the ratio $\sum_{j=1}^W x_{1,j}/W$, regarding
6 the first row of the matrix, only shows the proportion of positive events in the row. This
7 observation is useful to understand that each subsample N/W is completely independent
8 from the others and there is no connection between these subgroups. In other words,
9 these data are of little practical use. We will return to this issue.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 We can now extend the study to the entire matrix by calculating the ratio $P =$
19 $\sum_{j=1}^W \sum_{i=1}^{N/W} x_{i,j}/N$, thereby showing the proportion between positive and possible events.
20 We use the term *measured presence* to refer to the index P (Rossi and Scappini 2014).
21 This idea is not new. Similar definitions have been formulated, for example, “an
22 implicit estimate of the probability of her or his having attended church in «the last
23 seven days»,” (Hout and Greeley 1998), the “participation rate . . . of the diary week”
24 (Gershuny 2003); and the “probability of attending on any given week” (Presser and
25 Chaves 2007).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 We now examine the practical use of the indicator defined in this way. With regard
38 to the Netherlands, measured presence is 23.06 percent in the years 1975/1980. This
39 means the population attended 23.06 percent of the possible participation events over
40 the survey period. It also means that, on average, each inhabitant attended a religious
41 service in approximately 12 out of the 52 weeks in the year (0.2306×52).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 However, P is a poor index of information because it does not directly address the
50 respondents as individuals. We only know their share oscillates between a minimum of
51 23.06 percent for assiduous attendees (52 out of 52 weeks) and a maximum of 100
52 percent if everybody attends 12 weeks a year. Generally, one would find a combination
53 of the two situations.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 This limitation derives from the previously underlined fact that subjects surveyed in
5 different weeks belong to different subsamples. It is therefore not possible to select the
6 part of the population that carries out a given activity within a specific intensity range,
7 as we only know whether each respondent attended the event in the surveyed week and
8 nothing more. To make this distinction we would require access to diaries covering a
9 considerable period of time. For example, if we wanted to select respondents who
10 attended a religious service at least once a month during the past year, we would need to
11 have a diary kept on an annual basis (Scappini 2010). It would clearly be unworkable to
12 use a survey tool of this nature on a large scale.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 The typical solution to this problem is to adopt a questionnaire that can determine
26 how frequently each subject attends religious services on a weekly basis over a given
27 period, usually one year. Ideally, if n is the number of weeks in the given period
28 (generally $n = 52$), the $n + 1$ values f_x can be calculated, each of which shows the
29 number of people attending a service x times, with x ranging from 0 to 52. Each ratio
30 f_x/N , in which N is the size of the sample, provides the weekly attendance rate for each
31 single value or group of values of x . This rate can also assume the form of a cumulative
32 attendance rate (here simply cumulative rate) to indicate the proportion of people who
33 attend services at least x times per year, $Cr(x) = \sum_x^{52} f_x/N, \forall x \geq X$.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 However, it is unrealistic to ask respondents for such precise data about their
47 attendance at weekly religious services over the course of a year. In general, as in this
48 case, it is preferable to offer a limited number of answer options that correspond more
49 or less directly to frequency intervals.

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
As a follow-up to this study, we will need to make comparisons and quantify the
extent of bias between surveys based on questionnaires and diaries. Although the less

1
2
3
4 detailed data provided by diaries cannot be converted into the more substantial
5
6 questionnaire data, the reverse process is possible. Similar to prior work (e.g., Gershuny
7
8 2003; Hout and Greeley 1998; Presser and Chaves 2007; Presser and Stinson 1998;
9
10 Woodberry 1998), to make this conversion we add together the products of the number
11
12 of people and the relative typical attendance frequency x —thereby identifying the
13
14 positive events—and divide the result by the number of possible events: in formal
15
16 terms, $P(x) = \sum_{x=0}^{52} f_x \cdot x / (N \cdot 52)$. In this instance, we use the term *converted*
17
18 *presence*, indicated by P^c .
19
20
21
22

23 To make this conversion, we have to tackle an additional problem: identifying the
24
25 characteristic frequency for each category x of the items. For the purposes of this study,
26
27 the frequency values used will be those indicated in cases where the option refers to a
28
29 single value, or the central value where there is a range.¹¹
30
31

32 We needed to perform two data operations to draw our comparisons. First, we
33
34 combined the years used, so 1975 and 1980 are referred to as 1980, and 2000 and 2005
35
36 are referred to as 2000. Second, we grouped together options b , c , and d in the
37
38 questionnaire into a single category.¹² In this way, with the answer options ordered by
39
40 increasing frequency intervals, we reconstructed a correlated monotonic trend of
41
42 measured presence, which is needed to calibrate the estimates.
43
44
45

46 To quantify the extent of the bias, we then make comparisons between the
47
48 presence values with the assumption that the measured presence values are correct
49
50 and call this index I^p , obtained from $I^p = P^c/P$. We also make comparisons between
51
52 some values of the cumulative ratio, calculated using questionnaire data, $Cr(x)$, and
53
54 the relative values obtained from the cumulative density functions that will be
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 calculated with the calibration, which we call $Cc(x)$.¹³ We also assume that the
5
6 calibrated values are correct and call this index I^c , obtained from $I^c = Cr(x)/Cc(x)$.
7
8
9

10 3. CALIBRATING ESTIMATES

11
12 We now address the main focus of this study: calibrating estimates. First, we use data
13 from 1980 to make some comparisons between questionnaires and diaries. As Table 1
14 shows, the overall population (see last column) reported that they attend services, P^c , to
15 a significantly greater extent than they actually do, verified by the value of measured
16 presence, P . In our case, the former is 29.5 percent and the latter drops to 23.06 percent,
17 with an overestimate of 28 percent ($I^b = 1.28$).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 <Table 1 about here>

27
28 This bias is not constant but changes on the basis of the chosen option, roughly
29 following an inverted-U trend. It is lower for the most steadfast attendees (option 7 in
30 the questionnaire), with 4.8 percent of the population claiming to attend services twice a
31 week or more, $P^c = 100.0$ percent. In reality, however, this statement is optimistic: the
32 level of real presence measured using the diary is 87.2 percent, P , with an overestimate
33 of 15 percent, $I^b = 1.15$. Furthermore, the bias is higher among those who attend services
34 less frequently but regularly, options 4, 5, and 6 in the questionnaire. In these cases, the
35 overestimate ranges from a minimum of 29 to a maximum of 94 percent. Finally, the
36 figure drops again among respondents who attend services more occasionally (option 2)
37 or never (option 1), with notable underestimates of 38 percent ($I^b = .62$) and 100 percent
38 ($I^b = .00$), respectively.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Although there is broad scope and variability in terms of errors, respondents are
55 expected to give answers with a minimum level of accuracy reported with a certain
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 degree of honesty (Gershuny 2012:256). In other words, it is reasonable to assume that
5
6 respondents do not provide values randomly but answer with a certain degree of
7
8 rationality. Therefore, although the given value on the frequency scale is subject to bias,
9
10 it is in some way an indicator of “something real.” We could also see the strong
11
12 correlation between measured presence and converted presence as confirmation of this
13
14 assumption.¹⁴
15
16

17
18 Furthermore, measured presence is a continuous indicator, as in theory it could take
19
20 any of the infinite number of values included in the interval $P[0,100]$. As we have seen,
21
22 this figure cannot be used to make statements about intensity distribution in the
23
24 population. However, in this case we can obtain more precise information as we can
25
26 connect measured presence with the values of attendance frequency x stated in the
27
28 questionnaire. If we establish $X \{1,2, \dots,7\}$ as a discrete variable with $P_x \{p_1,p_2, \dots,p_7\}$
29
30 and $D_x\{d_1,d_2, \dots,d_7\}$, in which $1,2,\dots,7$ are the stated options in the questionnaire, p_i is
31
32 the measured presence in the specific subpopulation, and d_i is the relative fraction of
33
34 the population, then $P(X = p_i) \Rightarrow D = d_i$. We can now express the probability mass
35
36 function (PMF) for $P(x)$:
37
38
39
40
41

$$P(x) = \begin{cases} d_1 & \text{if } x = p_1 \\ d_2 & \text{if } x = p_2 \\ \dots & \dots \\ d_7 & \text{if } x = p_7 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

42
43
44
45
46
47
48 This solution has some advantages—it makes it possible to associate the exact
49
50 presence value for each subgroup, P_x , with the relative fraction of individuals, D_x —but
51
52 it nevertheless raises three problems. First, as we have seen, the measured presence for
53
54 each answer option does not generally coincide with the usable figure indicated by
55
56 converted presence. Second, the levels of P_x may be unstable: as we will see, such
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 values can vary significantly over time. Third, it is extremely unlikely that such broken-
5
6 down presence data would build up for specific values, as it would actually be
7
8 distributed along a continuum in which the identified figure is at most an average value.
9

10 11 3.1 Uniform Calibration 12

13 The next step is to find a way to interpolate the values of measured presence to be
14
15 able to solve the aforementioned problems. We will start with an example by
16
17 considering option (5) in the questionnaire, which corresponds to the code once every
18
19 two to three weeks and includes respondents who attend services 26 to 17 times a year.
20
21 As we have seen, this range is at best indicative, as the real frequency figure is much
22
23 lower. The measured presence of respondents that chose this option is $P(X = 5) = 32.1$
24
25 percent (referred to as p_5 here), which corresponds to an attendance rate of 16.7 times a
26
27 year, a figure lower than the lowest extreme specified in the option.
28
29
30

31
32 We will now analyze this situation in depth. Among questionnaire respondents, 5.4
33
34 percent chose this option. However, we must consider that the value p_5 is at best an
35
36 average value, as it is extremely improbable that all individuals who chose this answer
37
38 behave in an identical manner. There are likely notable variations in their attendance
39
40 levels: some individuals will attend more occasionally and others more frequently.
41
42

43
44 Figure 1 shows a simulation of a more realistic hypothetical situation. It might be
45
46 possible, for example, to distinguish three subgroups among respondents who selected
47
48 option (5), all made up of the same proportion of individuals ($d = 1.8$ percent). We can
49
50 identify a first group in which the average attendance is once a month ($p_{5,1} = 23.1$
51
52 percent), a second group with an average of 17 services a year ($p_{5,2} = 32.1$ percent),
53
54 and a third with an average attendance rate of almost twice a month ($p_{5,3} = 41.0$
55
56 percent). This simulation requires two assumptions: first, that no single group consists
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 of 5.4 percent of the sample, but three equal subgroups each consist of 1.8 percent, and
5
6 second, that the groups are equally spaced ($p_{5.3} - p_{5.2} = p_{5.2} - p_{5.1}$).
7
8

9 **<Figure 1 about here>**

10
11 One could claim that this simulation is too approximate, as it is extremely
12
13 improbable that individuals who chose this option would actually be distributed into
14
15 three subgroups. Instead, it is entirely plausible that a continuum of subject distribution
16
17 can be identified and represented by a function. To establish this function, we must first
18
19 set its minimum and maximum values. If we only consider answer option (5), these
20
21 values are unknown: they might range from a minimum of 23.1 percent to a maximum
22
23 of 41.0 percent, as exemplified, but they may also be different or unsymmetrical. We
24
25 know nothing about this point.
26
27
28

29
30 We now move to option (4), once a month. The same reasoning applied to (5) is also
31
32 plausible for this option, by first approximating three homogenous subgroups and then
33
34 using a continuum that can be described by a function. However, the problem of the
35
36 values used to define the function remains unresolved. Similar reasoning can also be
37
38 applied to option (6).
39
40

41
42 Although we cannot identify the values that define the function by working from the
43
44 single answer options (4), (5), and (6), we can assume it can be calculated in their
45
46 interlinking continuum. For example, we can imagine respondents selected option (5)
47
48 when they perceived it as the value that best represents their behavior. In other words, if
49
50 individuals think they attend services between 17 and 26 times a year, they will choose
51
52 this option even if the real figure is lower. Similarly, if they think their attendance is
53
54 around 12 times a year, they will carry out the same reasoning and select option (4).
55
56 They will probably choose this option even if their attendance is slightly more or less
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 regular, for example, 13 to 16 times a year in the latter case. We do not know the limit
5
6 value for the transition from (4) to (5), but measured values are somewhat different
7
8 from stated values, so we know the suggested range is partially hypothetical.
9

10
11 The problem we now have is to find a rule or criterion that allows us to identify a
12
13 continuum between the calibrated values corresponding to options (4) and (5). The
14
15 starting point is the aforementioned assumption that respondents choose questionnaire
16
17 options in a non-arbitrary manner, that is, they refer to their “real behavior” when
18
19 answering, albeit with approximation. Based on this consideration, we suggest a simple
20
21 solution.
22
23

24
25 *Our simple solution is to establish the left-hand limit of the distribution of option (5)*
26
27 *with the arithmetic mean of the two measured presence values for (4) and (5),*
28
29 *$(p_4 + p_5)/2$. Similarly, we identify the right-hand limit with the arithmetic mean of the*
30
31 *two measured presence values for (5) and (6).¹⁵*
32
33

34
35 It must be stressed that our underlying assumption of a continuum of subject
36
37 distribution that can be represented by a function is only valid if P_x is strictly monotonic
38
39 and therefore only if $p_{x-1} < p_x$, otherwise the behavior we assume to be reasonable
40
41 would not make much sense.
42
43

44
45 To further complicate the situation, the real function identified by these two points is
46
47 unknown: let us assume for now that there is an extremely simple PDF with uniform
48
49 distribution. We will see how to weaken this assumption. The underlying areas of each
50
51 identified interval of x are known, as they are simply the fractions of the subjects
52
53 associated with that option. It follows that $x_i = \left[\frac{p_{i-1} + p_i}{2}, \frac{p_i + p_{i+1}}{2} \right) \Rightarrow D = d_i$, in which d is
54
55 now the density of the group that attend services with a measured presence of x_i .
56
57
58
59
60

The interpolation of the uniform distribution of x_5 is shown in Figure 1. The left-hand limit, 22.0 percent, is the mean value between p_4 and p_5 , calculated from $\frac{11.9 + 32.1}{2}$. The right-hand limit is the mean value between p_5 and p_6 , calculated from $\frac{32.1 + 70.3}{2} = 51.2$. Finally, $d_5 = \frac{5.4}{51.2 - 22.0} = 0.2$.

Building on this idea, we now develop a more general formulation:

$$P(x_i) = \begin{cases} \frac{d_1}{(p_1 + p_2)/2 - p_{\min}} & \text{if } p_{\min} \leq x_1 < \frac{p_1 + p_2}{2} \\ \frac{d_i}{(p_{i+1} - p_{i-1})/2} & \text{if } \frac{p_{i-1} + p_i}{2} \leq x_i < \frac{p_i + p_{i+1}}{2} \\ \frac{d_7}{p_{\max} - (p_6 + p_7)/2} & \text{if } \frac{p_6 + p_7}{2} \leq x_7 \leq p_{\max} \end{cases}$$

defined $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 7\}$, in which $P_{\min} = [0, p_1]$ and $P_{\max} = [p_7, 100]$.

The minimum and maximum values are hypothetical, and in the case of P_{\min} can vary between an improbable maximum that coincides with p_1 and a possible minimum of zero. For our study, we chose the intermediate solution, which we feel is most likely, $p_{\min} = (0 + p_1)/2$. We followed a similar line of reasoning for $p_{\max} = (p_7 + 100)/2$. Although these are conjectured values, they are needed to calculate p_1 , p_7 , and thereby plot the overall pattern of the function.

With regard to P_{\min} , the problem stems from the non-negligible level of measured presence among respondents who stated they were unaffiliated with any denomination. Because these cases have no entry about the frequency of attending services, we cannot associate the value of measured presence with any value in the scale of frequency measured with the questionnaire.¹⁶ Albeit to a much lesser extent, the problem also arises in cases where affiliation with a given denomination was stated, namely for

respondents who answered (a) never. Given the demonstrative purposes of this study, we decided to suggest a general solution to the problem. However, one could consider this type of practice as more of a social than a religious activity. By following this last assumption, we could establish $p_1 = 0$.

Otherwise, there is no similar solution for p_{max} , also considering that $p_7 = 87.2$ percent, a value significantly lower than 100 percent. Furthermore, it would be extremely difficult to attend services in all 52 weeks a year, given that many factors (e.g., illness, temporary absences from home) stop even the most assiduous worshippers from achieving this goal. Therefore, in this case the suggested solution seems to be the most reasonable option.

Figure 2 shows the overall result of the reasoning carried out thus far (see uniform PDF). We can now integrate the PDF and establish the relative CDF.¹⁷

$$F(x_i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x_i < p_0 \\ d_1 \frac{x_i - p_0}{(p_1 + p_2)/2 - p_0} & \text{if } p_0 \leq x_1 < \frac{p_1 + p_2}{2} \\ \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} d_j + d_i \frac{x_i - (p_{i-1} + p_i)/2}{(p_{i+1} - p_{i-1})/2} \text{ if } \frac{p_{i-1} + p_i}{2} \leq x_i < \frac{p_i + p_{i+1}}{2} & (1) \\ \sum_{j=1}^6 d_j + d_7 \frac{x_i - (p_6 + p_7)/2}{p_8 - (p_6 + p_7)/2} & \text{if } \frac{p_6 + p_7}{2} \leq x_8 < p_8 \\ 1 & \text{if } x_i \geq p_8 \end{cases}$$

$\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 8\}$ in which i is defined from $\frac{p_{i-1} + p_i}{2} \leq x_i < \frac{p_i + p_{i+1}}{2}$, with $p_0 = \frac{0 + p_1}{2}$ and $p_8 = \frac{p_7 + 100}{2}$.

<Figure 2 about here>

The next step is to estimate the proportion of the population that carries out religious practice for specific intensity values, such as the fraction that attends a service at least once a month,¹⁸ and then calculate $Cc(x) = P(X \geq 23.1)$.

To carry out this procedure, we first need to identify the value of i and then calculate the value of $F(x)$ with (1). We then have $i = 5$, as $\frac{p_4 + p_5}{2} \leq x_5 < \frac{p_5 + p_6}{2} = \frac{11.9 + 32.1}{2} \leq x_5 < \frac{32.1 + 70.3}{2} = 22.0 \leq x_5 < 51.2$. It follows that $Cc(x_5) = 100 - (69.7 + 5.4 \cdot \frac{2 \cdot 23.1 - 11.9 - 33.1}{70.3 - 11.9}) = 30.1$ percent,¹⁹ against 36.6 percent of the estimate from data derived from questionnaires,²⁰ which corresponds to a value of $I^c = 1.22$.

In this way, we obtained an initial result that is much less subject to bias than that derived solely from using a questionnaire. However, the assumption of uniform distribution is extremely improbable in practice; it is unlikely the PDF pattern would feature breaks at the transition between the different values of $P(x_i)$. A more reasonable solution is that the evolution from $P(x_i)$ to $P(x_{i+1})$ needs to be more progressive. We address this issue in the next section.

3.2 An Improved Model, Linear Calibration

The procedure followed thus far has not been purely illustrative, as it has allowed us to establish the coordinates (x_i, y_i) of some important points (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_7) . Therefore, given the *abscissa* (p_i), the *ordinate* will be $y_i = \frac{d_i}{(p_{i+1} - p_{i-1})/2}$, $\forall i \in \{2, 4, \dots, 6\}$. For the two tails we have $y_i = \frac{d_i}{(p_i - p_{i-1}) + (p_{i+1} - p_i)/2}$ if $i = 1$ and $y_i = \frac{d_i}{(p_i - p_{i-1})/2 + (p_{i+1} - p_i)}$ if $i = 7$, with $p_0 = \frac{0 + p_1}{2}$ and $p_8 = \frac{p_7 + 100}{2}$. The next step is to produce a linear interpolation starting from the recognized information.

If we now establish $m_i = \frac{y_i - y_{i-1}}{p_i - p_{i-1}}$ and $q_i = \frac{p_i \cdot y_{i-1} - p_{i-1} \cdot y_i}{p_i - p_{i-1}}$, then

$$P(x_i) = \{m_i \cdot x_i + q_i \quad \text{if} \quad p_{i-1} \leq x_i < p_i \quad (2)$$

with $p_{i-1} < p_i$ by assumption and defined $\forall i \in \{2, 3, \dots, 7\}$.

Note that if x_i is lower than p_1 and higher than p_7 , we again apply the uniform model, as these values can only be conjectured and are therefore only useful for the completion of the function. In particular, the ordinates of p_0 and p_8 will be equal to y_1 and y_7 , respectively. Figure 3 shows the procedure followed for x_5 (values 32.1 and 0.2).

<Figure 3 about here>

We can now integrate the PDF and establish the relative CDF.²¹

$$F(x_i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x < p_0 \\ d_1 \frac{x_i - p_0}{(p_1 + p_2)/2 - p_0} & \text{if } p_0 \leq x_1 < p_1 \\ d_1 \frac{(p_1 - p_0)}{(p_1 + p_2)/2 - p_0} + m_2 \left(\frac{x_i^2 - p_1^2}{2} \right) + q_2(x_2 - p_1) & \text{if } p_1 \leq x_2 < p_2 \\ \sum_{j=1}^{i-2} d_j + d_{i-1} \frac{(p_{i-1} - p_{i-2})}{p_i - p_{i-2}} + m_i \left(\frac{x_i^2 - p_{i-1}^2}{2} \right) + q_i(x_i - p_{i-1}) & \text{if } p_{i-1} \leq x_i < p_i \\ \sum_{j=1}^6 d_j + d_7 \frac{x_i - (p_6 + p_7)/2}{p_8 - (p_6 + p_7)/2} & \text{if } p_7 \leq x_8 < p_8 \\ 1 & \text{if } x \geq p_8 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

defined $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 8\}$.

The limits would be defined between p_2 and p_6 , as p_1 and p_7 can be calculated with the previously discussed hypothetical assumptions. However, we believe it is also possible to obtain a good approximation for the values between $[p_1, p_2]$ and $[p_6, p_7]$, especially if they are close to p_2 and p_6 , respectively. Finally, to obtain a measure of potential error it is sufficient to vary the values of p_0 and p_8 . We have now obtained a less approximate description of the PDF pattern, from which we can establish the corresponding CDF (see Figure 4).

[Figure 4 about here]

The proportion of the population that attends a service at least once a month will now be estimated. In a similar way to the previous procedure, we first need to identify the value

of i and then calculate the value $F(x)$. We have $I = 5$, as $p_4 \leq x_5 < p_5 = 11.9 \leq x_5 < 32.1$, so for (2), it follows that

$$m_5 = \frac{\frac{5.4}{(70.3-11.9)/2} - \frac{6.3}{(32.1-8.4)/2}}{32.1-11.9} = -.017 \quad \text{and} \quad q_5 = \frac{\frac{32.1 \cdot 6.3}{(32.1-8.4)/2} - \frac{11.9 \cdot 5.4}{(70.3-11.9)/2}}{32.1-11.9} = .738$$

and for (3)

$$Cc(x_5) = 100 - \left(63.4 + \frac{6.3 \cdot (11.9 - 8.4)}{32.1 - 8.4} - .017 \cdot \left(\frac{23.1^2 - 11.9^2}{2} \right) + .738 \cdot (23.1 - 11.9) \right) = 30.8$$

percent, which corresponds to a value of $I^c = 1.19$. In this case, there is more limited relative improvement compared to the uniform model.

4. SUMMARY

We will now provide a more complete overview of the situation and recapitulate the advantages of the suggested calibration technique. Table 2 summarizes the main results for 1980 and 2000. For simplicity, we only present two measures of attendance at services, once a month and once every two to three weeks; the other two are the minimum and maximum values that can be calculated with the calibration, also taking into account the figures recorded for 2000.

<Table 2 about here>

We will start with the two extreme values for 1980. In Table 2, we see that only a small fraction of the population, 3 percent, attends services with a relatively high intensity—more than 44 services a year, or an attendance rate of 84.6 percent or more. Assiduous worshippers were already extremely rare in 1980. However, when considering the uncalibrated values, about 25 percent of the population attended a service once a week or more frequently. In this case, the level of overestimate is enormous, with $I^c > 8$.²² By contrast, a relatively low fraction of the population accounts for occasional or very limited intensity of attendance (about 40 percent attended less

1
2
3
4 than twice a year) compared to the uncalibrated values, where 53 percent of the
5
6 population stated they very rarely or never attend services.²³ In this case, the level of
7
8 overestimate is still high, but it is significantly lower than the previous instance (I^c
9
10 = 1.33).
11
12

13 We now turn to the other two cases included in Table 2. In these situations, we have
14
15 little to add to what has already been highlighted. We simply reiterate that the
16
17 cumulative values calculated using questionnaires overestimate the fraction of the
18
19 population that attends services much more significantly than the calibrated values.
20
21 Indeed, the I^c values are high among respondents who said they attend a service once or
22
23 twice a month, 1.19 and 1.16, respectively.
24
25
26

27 We will now make a diachronic comparison between 1980 and 2000. Note that this
28
29 comparison is made possible through the calibration of estimates, as data collected with
30
31 questionnaires would not be directly usable. If we look, for example, at respondents
32
33 who stated they attend a service at least once a month, there is a measured presence of
34
35 11.9 percent in 1980 (see Table 1), which rises to 16.2 percent in 2000 (see Appendix
36
37 Table A2). The actual behavior of respondents who chose this option changed quite
38
39 notably at different times, even though the scale of frequency was the same. Conversely,
40
41 in the diachronic comparison, the measured presence of respondents who said they
42
43 attend a service once every two to three weeks or every week was similar. In 2000, we
44
45 see a significant relative drop in the fraction of the population attending religious
46
47 services at least once a month. In all cases, the change is only partially highlighted by
48
49 the collected frequency values compared to the calibrated values.
50
51
52
53
54

55 If we consider the group that attends religious services most consistently, the
56
57 calibrated values feature a 33 percent drop in relative terms (C_r falling from 3.0 to 2.0
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 percentage points), and the uncalibrated figures show a relative 56 percent drop (Cc
5 plummeting from 24.8 to 11.0 percentage points), with a consistent reduction in the
6
7 level of overestimate (I^c dropping from 8 to 5). For the population that attends at least
8
9 once a month, the calibrated values reveal a 47 percent drop in relative terms, falling
10
11 from 30.8 to 16.2 percentage points, and the uncalibrated figures show a 43 percent
12
13 drop from 36.6 to 21.0 percentage points, with an increase in the level of overestimate (
14
15 I^c rising from 1.19 to 1.30). Finally, unlike in 1980, in 2000 a similar fraction of
16
17 respondents attended fewer than two services a year, around 65 percent of the
18
19 population in the calibrated values compared to 70.6 percent in the uncalibrated figures,
20
21 with a drop in the level of overestimate (I^c falling from 1.33 to 1.09).
22
23
24
25
26

27 The raw numbers might not be sufficiently indicative of the extent of bias in the
28
29 uncalibrated figures, and although we cannot examine the development of secularization
30
31 in the Netherlands in depth here, we would like to focus on two important aspects of a
32
33 dimensional and comparative nature. With regard to the first aspect, it should be clear
34
35 that calibrated figures can be used to measure the extent of religious practice more
36
37 accurately. In 1980 and in 2000, we see that the real level of attendance at services is
38
39 much lower than the results typically recorded by questionnaires.
40
41
42

43 If we analyze what happened in 1980 in more detail, we see that the number of
44
45 respondents who said they attend services on a regular basis was far greater than the real
46
47 figure. Paradoxically, the same was true for respondents who said they attend services
48
49 rarely or never. In other words, even though there was a greater degree of secularization
50
51 in society than the questionnaires suggested, religion still constituted a socially
52
53 significant phenomenon, as relatively few people never attended services.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 When comparing this situation to the picture in 2000, we see that the drop in
5 religious practice was greater than the questionnaires indicate, on average. However,
6 certain distinctions need to be made. The average overall level of practice fell
7 significantly, especially for respondents attending once a month or more, but there was
8 a smaller decrease in the most regular attendees, that is, those who said they go every
9 week. Conversely, we see a significant increase in relative terms, far greater than the
10 questionnaires suggest, in people who never or hardly ever attend services (see also the
11 drop in I^c from 1980 to 2000).

12
13 In short, calibrated and uncalibrated figures offer significantly different pictures. The
14 questionnaires depict a society with a low degree of secularization and a relatively slow
15 but constant and homogeneous shift away from religion. In contrast, the calibrated
16 figures reveal a society in which the process of secularization is further advanced and
17 developing more rapidly in a seemingly less homogeneous and more polarized way.²⁴

35 5. CONCLUSIONS

36
37
38 Questionnaires provide extremely detailed but unreliable estimates, and diaries
39 supply data that are highly precise but extremely poor. Both instruments provide
40 information that is useful and problematic at the same time. We have seen that
41 calibration can be used to overcome these limits, obviating the scarce precision of
42 questionnaires and the scarce detail of diaries. We have also seen that calibration is
43 simple to apply and requires just a few assumptions limited to the monotonicity of the
44 distribution of presence values across a range of attendance frequency response
45 categories and the linearity of the interpolating function. Therefore, the technique is not
46 only recommended for studying attendance at religious services, but it can be applied to
47 any survey in which a given activity was recorded using both a diary and a
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 questionnaire featuring a coherent item that measures the frequency of repetition over a
5
6 broad time base such as several weeks, a month, or a year.
7

8
9 There are indeed highly diversified fields of application for these two instruments.
10
11 We will now examine some, but by no means all, of the possible areas of
12
13 implementation. First, future research could simply extend the application suggested in
14
15 this study. Indeed, time use surveys often include a questionnaire with frequency
16
17 questions, alongside diaries; this is seen in studies of free time in England (Kan and
18
19 Gershuny 2009), Mass attendance in Canada (Brenner 2011), and work in Germany
20
21 (Otterbach Sousa-Poza 2010). The technique could also be used effectively in studies
22
23 measuring use of transport. In this case, the need for diaries covering many weeks could
24
25 be simplified by joint use of diaries and questionnaires (Axhausen et al. 2002; Hanson
26
27 and Hanson 1981).
28
29
30
31

32 Finally, this method could be extended to the medical/psychological sphere, such as
33
34 studies on the consumption of alcohol (Townshend and Duka 2002) or food (Brunner et
35
36 al. 2001; Vereecken and Maes 2003). The two instruments are often used
37
38 interchangeably in these areas. Using them together could increase accuracy and
39
40 simplify data collection in cases where the analysis needs to be extended over the long
41
42 term.
43
44

45 This is not the only advantage. With calibration we can make evaluations and
46
47 comparisons even if the measured presence $P(X = p_i)$ for a given questionnaire option
48
49 has different values from the useful figures. In this way, it is possible to analyze values
50
51 that were not envisaged at the planning stage or, within certain limits, special values
52
53 such as extreme ones, and make comparisons between sources with different
54
55 characteristics.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 In conclusion, this study has proposed—hopefully in a convincing manner—a useful
5
6 technique for overcoming the limitations of a single data collection instrument that is
7
8 also easy to apply. In short, it offers a return in terms of data usability in view of the
9
10 higher cost incurred for obtaining two different measures of a given activity in the same
11
12 survey.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

REFERENCES

- Al Baghal, Tarek, Robert F. Belli, A. Lynn Phillips, and Nicholas Ruther. 2014. "What Are You Doing Now? Activity-Level Responses and Recall Failures in the American Time Use Survey." *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 2(4):519–37.
- Axhausen, Kay W., Andrea Zimmermann, Stefan Schönfelder, Guido Rindsfuser, and Thomas Haupt. 2002. "Observing the Rhythms of Daily Life: A Six-Week Travel Diary." *Transportation* 29(2):95–124.
- Barta, William D., Howard Tennen, and Mark D. Litt. 2012. "Measurement Reactivity in Diary Research." Pp. 108–123 in *Handbook of Research Methods for Studying Daily Life*, Vol. 23, edited by M. R. Mehl and T. S. Conner. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Belli, Robert F. 1998. "The Structure of Autobiographical Memory and the Event History Calendar: Potential Improvements in the Quality of Retrospective Reports in Surveys." *Memory* 6(4):383–406.
- Belli, Robert F., and Mario Callegaro. 2009. "The Emergence of Calendar Interviewing: A Theoretical and Empirical Rationale." Pp. 31–52 in *Calendar and Time Diary Methods in Life Course Research*, edited by R. F. Belli, F. P. Stafford, and A. F. Duane. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bolger, Niall, Angelina Davis, and Eshkol Rafaeli. 2003. "Diary Methods: Capturing Life as It Is Lived." *Annual Review of Psychology* 54(1):579–616.
- Borra, Cristina, Almudena Sevilla, and Jonathan Gershuny. 2013. "Calibrating Time-Use Estimates for the British Household Panel Survey." *Social Indicators Research* 114(3):1211–24.

- 1
2
3
4 Brenner, Philip S. 2011. "Identity Importance and the Overreporting of Religious
5 Service Attendance: Multiple Imputation of Religious Attendance Using the
6 American Time Use Study and the General Social Survey." *Journal for the
7 Scientific Study of Religion* 50(1):103–15.
8
9
10
11
12
13 Brenner, Philip S., and John DeLamater. 2016. "Measurement Directiveness as a Cause
14 of Response Bias Evidence from Two Survey Experiments." *Sociological Methods
15 & Research* 45(2):348–71.
16
17
18
19
20
21 Bruce, Steve. 2016. "The Sociology of Late Secularization: Social Divisions and
22 Religiosity." *The British Journal of Sociology* 67(4):613–31.
23
24
25 Brunner, Eric, Daryth Stallone, Maneesh Juneja, Sheila Bingham, and Michael Marmot.
26
27 2001. "Dietary Assessment in Whitehall II: Comparison of 7 d Diet Diary and
28 Food-Frequency Questionnaire and Validity against Biomarkers." *British Journal
29 of Nutrition* 86(3):405–14.
30
31
32
33
34 Dool, R. van den 2006. "Veldwerkverslag Tijdbestedingsonderzoek 2005 (Oude stijl).
35 [Field work report Time Use Research 2005 (Old style)]." Hilversum: Intomart
36 GfK bv
37
38 (http://www.scp.nl/Onderzoek/Bronnen/Beknopte_onderzoeksbeschrijvingen/Tijds
39 bestedingsonderzoek_TBO).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 Eagle, David E. 2011. "Changing Patterns of Attendance at Religious Services in
47 Canada, 1986–2008." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 50 (1):187–200.
48
49
50
51 Frazis, Harley, and Jay Stewart. 2012. "How to Think about Time-Use Data: What
52 Inferences Can We Make about Long- and Short-Run Time Use from Time
53 Diaries?" *Annals of Economic and Statistics* 105/106:231–45.
54
55
56
57 Gershuny, Jonathan. 2003. *Changing Times: Work and Leisure in Postindustrial*
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 *Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
5
6
7 Gershuny, Jonathan. 2012. "Too Many Zeros: A Method for Estimating Long-Term
8
9 Time-Use from Short Diaries." *Annals of Economic and Statistics* 105/106:247–70.
10
11 Hadaway, C. Kirk, and Penny Long Marler. 2005. "How Many Americans Attend
12
13 Worship Each Week? An Alternative Approach to Measurement." *Journal for the*
14
15 *Scientific Study of Religion* 44(3):307–22.
16
17
18 Hadaway, C. Kirk, Penny Long Marler, and Mark Chaves. 1993. "What the Pools Don't
19
20 Show: A Closer Look at U.S. Church Attendance." *American Sociological Review*
21
22 58(6):741–52.
23
24
25 Hadaway, C. Kirk, Penny Long Marler, and Mark Chaves. 1998. "Overreporting
26
27 Church Attendance in America: Evidence That Demands the Same Verdict."
28
29 *American Political Science Review* 63(1):122–30.
30
31
32 Hanson, Susan, and Perry Hanson. 1981. "The Travel-Activity Patterns of Urban
33
34 Residents: Dimensions and Relationships to Sociodemographic Characteristics."
35
36 *Economic Geography* 57(4):332–47.
37
38
39 Harms, Teresa, Jonathan Gershuny, Aiden Doherty, Emma Thomas, Karen Milton, and
40
41 Charlie Foster. 2019. "A Validation Study of the Eurostat Harmonised European
42
43 Time Use Study (HETUS) Diary Using Wearable Technology." *BMC Public*
44
45 *Health* 19(Suppl 2), 455 (<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6761-x>).
46
47
48 Harvey, Andrew S. 1993. "Guidelines for Time Use Data Collection." *Social Indicators*
49
50 *Research* 30:197–228.
51
52
53 Hay, Linda Rudin, William M. Hay, and Hugh V. Angle. 1977. "The Reactivity of Self
54
55 Recording: A Case Report of a Drug Abuser." *Behavior Therapy* 8(5):1004–07.
56
57
58 Hout, Michael, and Andrew M. Greeley. 1998. "What Church Officials' Reports Don't
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Show: Another Look at Church Attendance Data.” *American Sociological Review*
5
6 63(1):113–19.
7
8
9 Jacobs, Jerry A. 1998. “Measuring Time at Work: Are Self-Reports Accurate?” *Monthly*
10
11 *Labor Review* 121(12):42–53.
12
13 Jansen, Giedo, Nan Dirk De Graaf, and Ariana Need. 2012. “Explaining the Breakdown
14
15 of the Religion–Vote Relationship in The Netherlands, 1971–2006.” *West*
16
17 *European Politics* 35(4):756–83.
18
19
20 Juster, F. Thomas, Hiromi Ono, and Frank P. Stafford. 2003. “An Assessment of
21
22 Alternative Measures of Time Use.” *Sociological Methodology* 33(1):19–54.
23
24
25 Kan, Man Yee, and Jonathan Gershuny. 2006. *Infusing Time Diary Evidence into Panel*
26
27 *Data: An Exercise in Calibrating Time-Use Estimates for the BHPS*. Colchester:
28
29 University of Essex (<http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/pubs/workpaps/>).
30
31
32 Kan, Man Yee, and Jonathan Gershuny. 2009. “Calibrating Stylised Time Estimates
33
34 Using UK Diary Data.” *Social Indicators Research* 93(1):239–43.
35
36
37 Kan, Man Yee, and Stephen Pudney. 2008. “Measurement Error in Stylized and Diary
38
39 Data on Time Use.” *Sociological Methodology* 38(1):101–32.
40
41
42 Knippenberg, Hans. 2015. “Secularization and Transformation of Religion in Post-War
43
44 Europe.” Pp. 2101–27 in *The Changing World Religion Map: Sacred Places,*
45
46 *Identities, Practices and Politics*, Vol. 4, edited by S. D. Brunn. New York:
47
48 Springer.
49
50
51 Korotitsch, William J., and Rosemary O. Nelson-Gray. 1999. “An Overview of Self-
52
53 Monitoring Research in Assessment and Treatment.” *Psychological Assessment*
54
55 11(4):415–25.
56
57
58 Lechner, Frank J. 1996. “Secularization in the Netherlands?” *Journal for the Scientific*
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 *Study of Religion* 35(3):252–64.
5
6
7 Mandemakers, Jornt J., and Anne Roeters. 2014. “Fast or Slow Food? Explaining
8
9 Trends in Food-Related Time in the Netherlands, 1975–2005.” *Acta Sociologica*
10
11 58(2):121–37.
12
13
14 Otterbach, Steffen, and Alfonso Sousa-Poza. 2010. “How Accurate Are German Work-
15
16 Time Data? A Comparison of Time-Diary Reports and Stylized Estimates.” *Social*
17
18 *Indicators Research* 97(3):325–39.
19
20
21 Presser, Stanley, and Mark Chaves. 2007. “Is Religious Service Attendance Declining?”
22
23 *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 46(3):417–23.
24
25
26 Presser, Stanley, and Linda Stinson. 1998. “Data Collection Mode and Social
27
28 Desirability Bias in Self-Reported Religious Attendance.” *American Sociological*
29
30 *Review* 63(1):137–45.
31
32
33 Robinson, John P. 1985. “The Validity and Reliability of Diaries versus Alternative
34
35 Time Use Measures.” Pp. 33–62 in *Time, Goods, and Well-Being*, edited by F. T.
36
37 Juster and F. P. Stafford. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of
38
39 Michigan.
40
41
42 Rossi, Maurizio, and Ettore Scappini. 2012. “How Should Mass Attendance Be
43
44 Measured? An Italian Case Study.” *Quality & Quantity* 46(6):1897–916.
45
46
47 Rossi, Maurizio, and Ettore Scappini. 2014. “Church Attendance, Problems of
48
49 Measurement, and Interpreting Indicators: A Study of Religious Practice in the
50
51 United States, 1975–2010.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 53(2):249–
52
53 67.
54
55
56 Scappini, Ettore. 2010. “Daily Diaries in Time Use Surveys: A Solution to Overcome
57
58 Measurement Problems in Single-Activity Events with Long Characteristic
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Rhythms.” *Quality & Quantity* 44(5):915–39.
5
6 Shiffman, Saul, Arthur A. Stone, and Michael R. Hufford. 2008. “Ecological
7
8 Momentary Assessment.” *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology* 4:1–32.
9
10
11 Townshend, J. M., and T. Duka. 2002. “Patterns of Alcohol Drinking in a Population of
12
13 Young Social Drinkers: A Comparison of Questionnaire and Diary Measures.”
14
15 *Alcohol & Alcoholism* 37(2):187–92.
16
17
18 Vereecken, Carine A., and Lea Maes. 2003. “A Belgian Study on the Reliability and
19
20 Relative Validity of the Health Behaviour in School-Aged Children Food-
21
22 Frequency Questionnaire.” *Public Health Nutrition* 6(6):581–88.
23
24
25 Voas, David, and Mark Chaves. 2016. “Is the United States a Counterexample to the
26
27 Secularization Thesis?” *American Journal of Sociology* 121(5):1517–56.
28
29
30 Walpole, Ronald E., Raymond H. Myers, Sharon L. Myers, and Keying Ye. 2012.
31
32 *Probability and Statistics for Engineers and Scientists*, 9th ed. New York: Prentice
33
34 Hall.
35
36
37 Walthery, Pierre, and Jonathan Gershuny. 2019. “Improving Stylised Working Time
38
39 Estimates with Time Diary Data: A Multi Study Assessment for the UK.” *Social*
40
41 *Indicators Research* 144(3):1303–21.
42
43
44 Woodberry, Robert D. 1998. “When Surveys Lie and People Tell the Truth: How
45
46 Surveys Oversample Church Attenders.” *American Sociological Review*
47
48 63(1):119–22.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ENDNOTES

1. Data source: <https://easy.dans.knaw.nl/ui/home>.
2. We used these years for two reasons. The first is to increase the sample analyzed in order to reduce the instability of the estimates. We thus grouped together the years 1975/1980 and 2000/2005. The second is to use year groupings that are far apart to maximize differences in the comparisons. We thus removed the years 1985, 1990, and 1995 from the analysis.
3. In 2005, for example, the diary was administered October 2 to 8 and October 9 to 15.
4. Respondents are asked to fill out the diaries at the end of each day. However, the interviewers do not verify this; there is a check at the end of the week when the diaries are collected.
5. Respondents who completed the two interviews and presented a complete diary received remuneration in the form of a gift voucher or a donation to a good cause. In 2005, 15 percent of respondents chose the latter option.
6. In 2005, 6,303 addresses were contacted for the initial interview, of which 5,950 were eligible. Of those, 2,892 agreed to take part in the three research phases, and 2,222 were actually interviewed. The clean sample contains 2,188 cases without age selection, consisting of respondents who completed the pre-interview, diary, and post-interview phases.
- 7 One added problem is that there is no data collection during periods when major festivals are celebrated, such as Easter and Christmas. However, even if these festivals involved a significant part of the population—assuming the presence value on the two days is 50 percent—the underestimate in the presence value for 1980 would be about 1 percent. In any case, it is improbable that these subjects would be evenly distributed among the different frequencies of Mass attendance. We feel it would be reasonable to position them among respondents with a low level of attendance, therefore introducing a further element of bias into the calculation of $Cc \leq 2.0$.
8. Activity code = 650, place code \neq 1.

-
- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 9. Variables v176 and v179 in the questionnaire.
8
9
10 10. We will only refer to churchgoing. Although the Netherlands is a multi-faith country, non-
11 Christian worship still only accounts for a minority of people: 4 percent in 1975 and 6.1
12 percent in 2005 (estimates from the time-budget surveys).
13
14
15 11. The frequency values we identified with ($x/52$) and applied to the different answer options
16 correspond to the following weights: (a) 0 times out of 52 = 0.00; (b) 0.5 times = 0.010; (c)
17 from 1.7 to 1 times = 0.026; (d) from 3 to 2 times = 0.048; (e) from 6 to 4 times = 0.096; (f)
18 12 times = 0.231; (g) from 26 to 17 times = 0.413; (h) and (i) 52 out of 52 = 1.000.
19
20
21
22
23 12. The groupings are due to low numbers in some subsamples. In cases in which churchgoing
24 is rare, even a few cases can cause significant variations in estimates. See also Appendix
25 Tables A1 and A3.
26
27
28
29
30 13. Regarding this point, analyses of religious behavior generally present the results of a frequency
31 survey through cumulative estimates, a method often used to simplify discussion of results
32 that could otherwise become unnecessarily complex and elaborate.
33
34
35
36 14. For example, in Table 1 $R = .992$.
37
38
39 15. In other words, we tried to contextualize and validate the fact that discrete distribution is
40 being approximated by continuous distribution. This is a similar operation to the one often
41 called *continuity correction* (Walpole et al. 2012).
42
43
44
45 16. Regarding this point, the form of the items in a questionnaire tend to reflect the habits of the
46 individuals in the society in which it is administered. In this case, it was assumed that non-
47 affiliates never attend services. In practice, this is almost the case: for 1980 $P = 2.7$ percent,
48 about one service a year. This behavior is similar to respondents who stated some affiliation
49 but chose the option “never” ($P = 2.0$ percent). The situation does not change much for 2000
50
51
52
53
54
55 (see Appendix Tables A1 and A3).
56
57
58
59
60

-
- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 17. We assume that the described functions comply with the properties of a CDF. Although this
8
9 is obvious, we want to underline that $d_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_1^n d_i = 1$ by definition as the values d_i are
10
11 normalized. The following manipulation work will simply be the breakdown and
12
13 reconstruction of the values of d_i .
14
- 15
16 18. Typically, the rule is to distinguish between regular worshippers (those who go to church at
17
18 least once a month or more) and irregular or non-worshippers (all others) (see, e.g., Brenner
19
20 and DeLamater 2016; Eagle 2011; Jansen, De Graaf, and Need 2012; Voas and Chaves
21
22 2016). This is not the only solution; there are variations in which regular churchgoers are
23
24 those who attend a service at least every two weeks (Lechner 1996) or every week
25
26 (Knippenberg 2015). For discussion about the model, it is not important which solution is
27
28 adopted. However, we mainly refer to the most widespread one.
29
- 30
31 19. These and the following calculations were made with a greater number of digits than
32
33 reported.
34
- 35
36 20. See Table 1, sum of the values of the specific population for options 4 to 7.
37
- 38
39 21. For further analysis of note 17, note that $\forall x_i = p_i$, with $i = \{0,1, \dots,8\}$, linear CDF = uniform
40
41 CDF.
42
- 43
44 22. We have given an approximate overestimate, as C_r and C_c refer to different presence figures
45
46 ($P^c = 100.0$ percent and $P = 84.6$ percent) that are not directly comparable. The observations
47
48 are made by default, inasmuch as if we could estimate C_c for $P = 100.0$, we would obtain a
49
50 much lower figure than the 3 percent indicated.
51
- 52
53 23. “The penumbra of occasional attenders” (Bruce 2016:614) is an aspect that has probably not
54
55 been explored enough. One possible explanation is the fact that, as we have seen, when a
56
57 questionnaire is used, it is difficult to estimate with precision the size of the population that
58
59 attends religious services rarely or never.
60

24 Without diminishing the importance of these considerations, note that the inferences we can make about trends in religious practice over time using questionnaires and calibrated values are not so dissimilar in certain respects. However, this convergence is the result of the fact that the trend is extremely pronounced. The advantages that could be derived from the application of the model would probably be even greater if the variations were less evident.




Figure 1. Interpolated Uniform PDF (1980, percent)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2. Interpolated Uniform PDF and CDF (1980, percent)




Figure 3. Interpolated Linear PDF (1980, percent)




Figure 4. Interpolated Linear PDF and CDF (1980, percent)

Table 1. Presence at religious services (percent) and I^b , by stated frequency of attendance (1980)

Questionnaire options	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Converted presence, P^c	0.0	3.5	9.6	23.1	41.3	100.0	100.0	29.5
Measured presence, P	2.6	5.7	8.4	11.9	32.1	70.3	87.2	23.06
Index I^b	0.00	0.62	1.14	1.94	1.29	1.42	1.15	1.28
Specific population, D	48.7	8.7	6.0	6.3	5.4	20.1	4.8	100.0
Cumulative population, Cr	100.0	51.3	42.6	36.6	30.3	24.9	4.8	
(Unweight N)	(1,643)	(293)	(216)	(229)	(195)	(613)	(131)	(3,320)

Note: 1 = never; 2 = less than once a year, once every 7/12 months, once every 4/6 months; 3 = once every 2/3 months; 4 = once a month; 5 = once every 2/3 weeks; 6 = once a week; 7 = twice a week or more.

Table 2. Cumulative population (percent) and values of I^c , by frequency of attendance at religious services (1980 and 2000)

Number of annual services (converted and measured presence)	≤ 2.0 (3.8) ^a	≥ 12.0 (23.1) ^b	≥ 21.5 (41.3) ^c	≥ 44.0 (84.6) ^d
Years 1975/1980				
Cumulative population, Cr	53.1	36.6	30.3	24.9

Calibrated cumulative population, Cc	39.8	30.8	26.1	3.0
Index I^c	1.33	1.19	1.16	>8
<i>Years 2000/2005</i>				
Cumulative population, Cr	70.6	21.0	15.2	11.0
Calibrated cumulative population, Cc	64.6	16.2	12.4	2.0
Index I^c	1.09	1.30	1.23	>5

^aIn this case, the Cr figures were calculated by merging the original answers, not the aggregated answers shown in Table 1. See Appendix Tables A1 and A3, answers (a), (b) and (c).

^bOption corresponding to the stated frequency in the questionnaire “once a month”.

^cOption corresponding to the stated frequency “once every 2 to 3 weeks”.

^dIn this case, Cr was calculated by selecting the answer options corresponding to the stated frequency in the questionnaire (6 = once a week and 7 = twice a week or more), in which $P^c = 100.0$ percent.

APPENDIX

Table A1. Presence at religious services (percent) and I^b , by stated frequency of attendance (1980)

<i>Questionnaire options</i>	Only non-affiliates	Affiliates and answer (a)	<i>Total</i>	Affiliates and answer:			<i>Total (b+c+d)</i>
				(b)	(c)	(d)	
Converted presence, P^c	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.6	4.8	3.5
Measured presence, P	2.7	2.0	2.6	5.1	0.8	9.9	5.7
Index I^b	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.19	3.28	0.48	0.62
Specific population, D (Unweight N)	42.7 (1,466)	6.0 (177)	48.7 (1,643)	0.8 (23)	3.6 (108)	4.3 (162)	8.7 (293)

Note: (a) never; (b) less than once a year; (c) once every 7/12 months; (d) once every 4/6 months.

Option 1 in Table 1 is the aggregation of non-affiliates and affiliates and answer (a).

Option 2 in Table 1 is the aggregation of affiliates and answers (b), (c) and (d).

Table A2. Presence at religious services (percent) and I^b , by stated frequency of attendance (2000)

<i>Questionnaire options</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>Total</i>
Converted presence, P^c	0.0	2.8	9.6	23.1	41.3	100.0	100.0	14.9
Measured presence, P	0.8	4.5	8.8	16.2	32.0	69.7	86.9	12.0
Index I^b	0.00	0.63	1.09	1.42	1.29	1.44	1.15	1.24
Specific population, D	62.3	12.1	4.6	5.8	4.1	7.6	3.4	100.0
Cumulative population, Cr (Unweight N)	100.0 (2,149)	37.7 (416)	25.6 (163)	21.0 (184)	15.2 (146)	11.0 (271)	3.4 (109)	3.4 (3,438)

Note: 1 = never; 2 = less than once a year, once every 7/12 months, once every 4/6 months; 3 = once every 2/3 months; 4 = once a month; 5 = once every 2/3 weeks; 6 = once a week; 7 = twice a week or more.

Table A3. Presence at religious services (percent) and I^b , by stated frequency of attendance (2000)

<i>Questionnaire options</i>	Only non-affiliates	Affiliates and answer (a)	<i>Total</i>	Affiliates and answer:			<i>Total (b+c+d)</i>
				(b)	(c)	(d)	
Converted presence, P^c	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.6	4.8	2.8
Measured presence, P	0.7	2.0	0.8	1.5	3.2	8.9	4.5
Index I^b	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.66	0.82	0.54	0.63
Specific population, D (Unweight N)	56.4 (1,940)	5.9 (209)	62.3 (2,149)	3.5 (114)	4.8 (161)	3.8 (141)	12.1 (416)

Note: (a) never; (b) less than once a year; (c) once every 7/12 months; (d) once every 4/6 months.

Option 1 in Table A2 is the aggregation of non-affiliates and affiliates and answer (a).

Option 2 in Table A2 is the aggregation of affiliates and answers (b), (c) and (d).

For Peer Review