

Table 2.11a Non-valid cases by sample and mode of interviewing

<i>Non-valid cases</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>The</i>	<i>Amsterdam</i>	<i>Rotterdam</i>	<i>Other</i>				
	<i>interviews</i>	<i>Netherlands</i>			<i>Highest a.d.</i>	<i>High a.d</i>	<i>Moderate a.d</i>	<i>Low a.d.</i>	<i>Lowest a.d.</i>
	<i>by mode</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
Wrong person interviewed		627	69	105	83	92	43	124	11
Variable missings (>3 LTP)		183	34	34	15	20	42	21	17
Illogical answers (>3)		21	1	3	4	3	0	8	2
Total		832	104	142	102	115	85	153	30
<i>Wrong person interviewed by mode</i>									
Telephone	1,974	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
CAPI	2,999	29	5	5	0	6	2	7	4
Disk	2,666	126	13	26	18	24	1	21	23
Internet	607	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
PAPI	9,409	468	49	74	64	61	40	96	84
Total	17,655	627	69	105	83	92	43	124	11

Source: Manja D. Abraham, Hendrien L. Kaal, & Peter D.A. Cohen (2002), *Licit and Illicit Drug Use in the Netherlands, 2001*. Amsterdam: CEDRO / Mets & Schilt. p. 78.

Table 2.11b Non-valid cases by sample and mode of interviewing (continued)

<i>Variable missings (>3 LTP) by mode</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>The</i>			<i>Other</i>				
	<i>interviews</i> <i>by mode</i>	<i>Netherlands</i> <i>n</i>	<i>Amsterdam</i> <i>n</i>	<i>Rotterdam</i> <i>n</i>	<i>Highest a.d.</i> <i>n</i>	<i>High a.d</i> <i>n</i>	<i>Moderate a.d</i> <i>n</i>	<i>Low a.d.</i> <i>n</i>	<i>Lowest a.d.</i> <i>n</i>
Telephone	1,974	9	0	0	0	5	0	2	2
CAPI	2,999	5	1	2	1	0	1	0	0
Disk	2,666	7	0	4	0	0	2	0	1
Internet	607	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PAPI	9,409	162	33	28	14	15	39	19	14
Total	17,655	183	34	34	15	20	42	21	17
<i>Illogical answers</i>									
Telephone	1,974	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CAPI	2,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disk	2,666	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Internet	607	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PAPI	9,409	21	1	3	4	3	0	8	2
Total	17,655	21	1	3	4	3	0	8	2

Source: Manja D. Abraham, Hendrien L. Kaal, & Peter D.A. Cohen (2002), *Licit and Illicit Drug Use in the Netherlands, 2001*. Amsterdam: CEDRO / Mets & Schilt. p. 79.