

3rd European Quality of Life Survey

Quality control report

Contents

3 rd European Quality of Life Survey Quality control report	1
1. Introduction	3
2. Questionnaire	4
a) Questionnaire development and validation.....	4
b) Translation.....	5
c) Technical set-up of the questionnaire.....	5
3. Sampling	7
4. Field force	9
5. Fieldwork	10
a) Measures to increase response rate	10
b) Fieldwork progress reports	10
c) Fieldwork visits	10
6. Interviewer back-checks	11
7. Data processing	12
ANNEX 1: MEASURES TAKEN CONCERNING QUALITY CONTROL FOR EQLS3	13
ANNEX 2: TRANSLATION ANNOTATION FILE	18
ANNEX 3: EXAMPLE TRANSLATION FILE.....	19
ANNEX 4: PILOT REVISION FILE	20
ANNEX 5. EQLS FIELDFORCE TEMPLATE: ENUMERATORS	21
ANNEX 6. EQLS FIELDFORCE TEMPLATE: INTERVIEWERS	22
ANNEX 7: WEEKLY FIELDWORK TECHNICAL REPORTS	23
ANNEX 8: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE BACK-CHECKING OF THE INTERVIEWERS.....	24

1. Introduction

In autumn 2011, the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound) fielded the 3rd European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS) in the 27 EU Member States. During the separate phases requirements and measures for quality assurance were taken following the Terms of Reference and specific contracts.

The EQLS puts a strong emphasis on quality. Hence, each stage of the study was subject to detailed documentation, and specific controls were put in place to verify compliance with the technical specifications. Important steps taken to ensure the quality of the survey and data gathered can be found throughout the whole process: in the sample stage regarding sample allocation and enumeration (e.g. geocoding and mapping); in the drafting questionnaire stage concerning questionnaire verification (e.g. pre-testing, pilot interviewing); in the translation process; during the interview process via back checking and Eurofound's fieldwork visits; in reporting and field follow-up via the weekly fieldwork reports and in final reporting via draft deliverables of specific reports (e.g. technical fieldwork report, coding report, translation report ...).

This specific Quality Control Report was prepared to summarise all efforts and procedures that were in place to maintain survey integrity.

It is acknowledged that the fieldwork in non-EU countries will take place in the spring of 2012: therefore the particular dates indicated in this report refer to the survey in EU27. The adjustment of the quality control report for the non-EU countries will be done once the information on IPA funding is received.

2. Questionnaire

a) Questionnaire development and validation

Following several consultations with the EQLS Questionnaire Development Group, the 2007 questionnaire has been improved. Questions that didn't work well in 2007 have been replaced by new ones or amended substantially. Next to this also a glossary with explanation of the concepts and terms used in the questionnaire as well as with the interviewer instructions was developed. The changes required that the questionnaire and glossary were tested and thus a pre-test phase was organised in the UK and Belgium in March 2011. After this pre-test, the questionnaire was finalised and translated into the survey's national languages. It was piloted in all countries in July-August, as to be ready for fieldwork in September 2011 (see Table 1).

The pre-test phase was carried out in Belgium and the United Kingdom in March and April 2011 and in each country consisted of 30 field interviews and 15 cognitive interviews. Thereby the master English questionnaire was tested in the UK and the French translation was tested in Belgium.

Between 20 July, 2011 and 8 August, 2011 a pilot was carried out to test the EQLS questionnaire and fieldwork, with at least 25 cases in each country covered by the EQLS, in at least three sampling points. The goal of this exercise was to simulate the real study and to verify if all fieldwork materials (contact sheet, introductory letter, questionnaire, etc.) were appropriate. National implementation teams made proposals for final revisions on the basis of the pilot tests in each country. Based on the observations of the report, a number of questions were revised in August 2011 addressing issues such as clearer formulation of unclear questions and response options and addition of extra instructions (in the questionnaire and/or in the glossary).

Table 1 EQLS Questionnaire testing activities

Country	Pre-test cognitive	Pre-test live EQLS interviews	Pilot (field trial)	Country	Pre-test cognitive	Pre-test live EQLS interviews	Pilot (field trial)
AT			X	IT			X
BE	X	X	X	LU			X
BG			X	LT			X
CY			X	LV			X
CZ			X	MT			X
DE			X	NL			X
DK			X	PL			X
EE			X	PT			X
EL			X	RO			X
ES			X	SE			X
FI			X	SI			X
FR			X	SK			X
HU			X	UK	X	X	X
IE			X				

The project was managed by the **EQLS Central Coordination Team GfK EU3C** of **GfK Significant**. All the phases of this process quality process can be found in annex 1. The revision process of the main questionnaire is also documented in annex 4.

b) Translation

The EQLS is a cross-cultural survey, which asks the same questions in all participating countries. This requires the translation of the questionnaire to all target languages, which is one of the most challenging parts of the survey's preparation. At the same time translation is crucial for the quality of the survey, affecting the comparability of the data. The translated versions of the questionnaire have to be comparable in the following ways:

- The meaning has to be the same (within the boundaries of the target language)
- The question format has to be the same
- The measurement properties have to be the same (range of response options)
- They have to maintain the stimulus the original question provokes/incites
- The questions have to be at the same time consistent over time, comparable across countries, and across population (language) groups

To comply with the above criteria, Eurofound has designed a translation process plan, which is the result of an ongoing learning process based on Eurofound's work on surveys. More specifically, the translation process for the 2011 EQLS was informed by the observations during the questionnaire development process and by the experience of the European Working Conditions Survey 2010.

With the aim of developing a valid and reliable measurement instrument, which is internationally comparable, the following steps were taken:

1. For each language, two independent experts translated the questionnaire into local languages
2. Each questionnaire was back translated into English
3. The translations were validated by Eurofound

The full translation process is elaborately described in the translation report. The different steps concerning quality control are shown in annex 1 of this report. Examples of templates and logbooks used for this process are also included here in annex 2 & 3.

c) Technical set-up of the questionnaire

All EQLS interviews were carried out face-to-face, in the respondents' homes. Several fieldwork documents were checked on validity next to the questionnaire. More in particular it concerned a glossary, show cards, contact sheets; introduction letters, national briefing documents and sorry you were out cards. A more detailed description of these documents can be found in the technical fieldwork report.

In 20 countries, a CAPI (Computer Aided Personal Interviewing) data collection technique was used; elsewhere, national agencies implemented the study with pen-and-paper questionnaires. Table 2 gives a comprehensive overview per country.

Table 2 Data collection technique (CAPI/PAPI)

Country Code	Interview Method	Country Code	Interview Method
AT	CAPI	IT	CAPI
BE	CAPI	LT	CAPI
BG	PAPI	LU	CAPI
CY	PAPI	LV	CAPI
CZ	CAPI	MT	CAPI
DE	CAPI	NL	CAPI
DK	PAPI	PL	CAPI
EE	CAPI	PT	CAPI
EL	PAPI	RO	CAPI
ES	CAPI	SE	PAPI
FI	CAPI	SI	PAPI
FR	CAPI	SK	PAPI
HU	CAPI	UK	CAPI
IE	CAPI		

GfKEU3C provided the countries with the programmation of the questionnaire and the contact sheet. Also the PAPI countries could use this, because it was also fit for input purposes.

CAPI testing

The interviewing in the 3th EQLS is supported by Computer Aided Personal Interviewing (CAPI) in 20 countries. A centralized scripting / programming solution was used in 25 out of the 27 countries. Only in Luxembourg and Italy the main questionnaire was programmed by local institutes. Based on the pilot test results and further checks using pre-scripted (dummy) interviews, the EQLS implemented a rigorous control of CAPI programming accuracy. The process of verification included several layers: verification of the centraldummy datafile to verify filters and answer options. Beside the technical check of the survey structure, the actual script was reviewed by GfK EU3C for the final go-ahead in all languages.

The detailed steps of the technical set-up of the questionnaires can be found in annex 1.

3. Sampling

The sampling procedure for the EQLS was an elaborate and carefully monitored process which started at the tendering phase when the basic sample design features (number of PSUs, coverage of sampling frames, etc.) were described for each country. These features were discussed and fine-tuned early on in the project and formed the basis for the presentation of formal national sampling and stratification plans. The sampling plans present a precise description of the sample design whilst the stratification plans present the distribution of the sample by region and urbanisation level on the basis of the most recently available population figures. These sampling plans have been checked thoroughly and are included in the sampling report of the EQLS3 study.

In each Member State, a strictly random sample of individuals was surveyed. Probability sampling procedures have been used for sample selection, i.e. all members of the statistical population have a non-zero probability of inclusion in the sample.

In the end, 15 Member States were classified as 'Random Probability Countries': the samples were drawn from suitable and up-to-date registers (sampling frames) which cover at least 95% of the survey population. The Random Probability Countries are:

1. Belgium	2. Czech Republic	3. Denmark
4. Hungary	5. Ireland	6. Latvia
7. Luxembourg	8. Malta	9. Netherlands
10. Austria	11. Poland	12. Slovenia
13. Finland	14. Sweden	15. United Kingdom

The other 12 Member States are classified as 'Enumerated Random Route Countries' because good sampling frames (as defined before, covering 95% of the households/persons in a country) were not available. Samples of addresses were enumerated in advance by the national agencies.

1. Bulgaria	2. Cyprus	3. Germany
4. Estonia	5. Greece	6. Spain
7. France	8. Italy	9. Lithuania
10. Portugal	11. Romania	12. Slovakia

For the 12 random route countries the GfK EU3C team carried out two quality control steps: an initial review of the enumerated main sample and a 10% random back-check.

Initial review of sample characteristics

The decision to first enumerate the pilot sample (60 addresses) provided the opportunity for an additional quality check as it was possible to check compliance with the enumeration of the random route and to detect at an early stage any misunderstandings about the enumeration requirements. This stage proved very useful in highlighting the close guidance that the countries needed in doing the enumeration and ensured that the following checks were carried out in each country during the initial review of the enumerated main sample:

- ✓ Enumeration of all the sampling points
- ✓ Enumeration of sufficient main and back-up addresses within each sample point
- ✓ Correct number of stratification strata
- ✓ Correct number of sampling points
- ✓ Correct distribution of sampling points per strata
- ✓ Correct batch size per sampling point
- ✓ Inclusion of ineligible addresses
- ✓ Compliance with random route
- ✓ Correct application of selection interval
- ✓ Provision of name or number of enumerator for each sampling point
- ✓ Reference to enumeration period
- ✓ Provision of all the requested information

Back-check of enumerated samples

The last stage of the quality control process consisted in checking compliance with the random route on three levels:

- Fully compliant
- Small errors (compliance with the 'spirit' of the rules)
- Non-compliant

For each country, 10% of the sample plus two sample points were back-checked. The selection of the sample points was done by FME, a well-known software for data management. The workbench selected 10% + 2 sample points for each country and immediately created Excel files that could be used for manual checking and automatic geocoding. The details of these checks can be found in the sampling report. The enumerations instruction for the enumerators are included in the technical fieldwork report.

The quality control steps that were taken are also listed in annex 1 of this report.

4. Field force

Concerning field force, Eurofound's requirements were that the EQLS used interviewers with at least one year experience in survey research and who had participated in at least three face-to-face non-marketing surveys in the past 5 years and that the number of interviews per interviewer was a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 30. To check these requirements GfK filled out the table included in annex 6 before fieldwork for Eurofound's approval. After fieldwork the actual number of interviewers was reported in the technical fieldwork report.

Next to the detailed information about the interviewers working on the EQLS3 project, GfKEU3C also arranged a central briefing moment in Brussels for the national coordinators (02.09.2011) as to ensure homogeneous fieldwork information throughout EU27.

After this all interviewers participated in detailed briefings held by the national project coordinators. Trainings were predominantly held in-person, with the help of the EQLS Project Manual. Trainings took about half a day, and they covered a general introduction of the study and an explanation of the expected fieldwork conduct (general interviewing, refusal conversion, fieldwork protocol, fieldwork materials (Sorry you were out card, glossary, introduction letter, show cards)) and usage of the contact sheet. No interviewer was allowed to conduct interviews without the training described above. More details on the training can be found in the technical fieldwork report.

All the quality measures taken concerning field force in EQLS3 are listed in annex 1.

5. Fieldwork

a) Measures to increase response rate

The contact procedures themselves are covered in GfK Project manual and interviewer instructions that were introduced in interviewer training. The detailed information about these steps can hence be found in these documents. An overview of all the fieldwork documents used for this purpose can also be found in the technical fieldwork report of the study. GfKEU3C also monitored the amount of addresses issued to an interviewer via a field follow up tool that was accessible to all countries during the fieldwork period.

For the control of the contact making measures and contact sheet information, see section 'Interviewer back-checks'.

b) Fieldwork progress reports

To check the EQLS3 fieldwork progress week by week Eurofound required a weekly technical fieldwork report reporting on the issues that can be found in annex 7. GfKEU3C provided 17 of these weekly reports on the following dates.

07.10.2011	10.11.2011	09.12.2011	13.01.2012
14.10.2011	21.11.2011	16.12.2011	20.01.2012
21.10.2011	25.11.2011	22.12.2011	27.01.2012
28.10.2011	02.12.2011	06.01.2012	03.02.2012
			10.02.2012

After seven weeks of fieldwork GfK provided Eurofound with an interim report on the first seven weeks of fieldwork (delivered on 7.11.2011, final version 14.12.2011).

c) Fieldwork visits

EF representatives have visited a number of selected local agencies during the fieldwork. In agreement with the contractor and local agencies, EF representatives

- held a meeting with the fieldwork managers
- followed an interviewer at his/her work to see a sample of interviews.

The feedback from the fieldwork visits was provided by EF to the central coordinator (GfKEU3C).

6. Interviewer back-checks

As part of the Quality Control Plan for the 3rd EQLS back checks have been carried out by the agencies in the different countries during the fieldwork. Back checking aims at checking the quality of the work of the interviewers and the response data that are gathered. Regular back checking is also likely to prevent interviewers from working incorrectly or inaccurately. Feedback on the basis of the outcomes of the back checks is looped back to the local field responsible and the individual interviewer with the aim to address problematic aspects and to optimise quality throughout the field.

Back checks in the 3rd EQLS involved re-contacting three types of target persons to verify important issues in the contact procedure, the interview process and the data collection:

- respondents with whom a completed interview has been conducted (back check of completes),
- individuals who refused to participate in the study (back check of refusals), and
- addresses/households whom the interviewer has not been able to contact during the EQLS field (back check of non-contacts).

For each back check round a fixed percentage of the completes, refusals and no contacts in each country has been randomly selected and checked. The whole process is described in detail in the data editing and cleaning report. An overview of the quality measures taken in this respect can also be found in annex 1.

7. Data processing

First of all it has to be said that regarding coding GfKEU3C provided Eurofound with the appropriated national and international (ISCED) codes for education. Also regarding occupation (ISCO) and currency use some coding measures were taken. These measures are listed in the coding report.

Regarding data processing we can say that due to the use of one programming software with one Master questionnaire a big part of the cleaning process necessary to complete in many other surveys was facilitated. Filters and skips were thoroughly checked before the beginning of the field (via test interviews and dummy datafiles).

GfK EU3C accords great importance to data validation and data editing. In order to draw the line between data manipulation and responsible data editing we follow a three step process explained in the data cleaning report:

- Screening Phase: systematically looking for problems with the data;
- Diagnostic Phase, identifying the condition of the suspect data;
- Treatment Phase, deleting or editing the data or leaving it as is.

The quality control measures taken are listed in the data editing and cleaning report and are also mentioned here in annex 1.

ANNEX 1: MEASURES TAKEN CONCERNING QUALITY CONTROL FOR EQLS3

1. Questionnaire Development and Organisation

Timeframe	Measure / action	Responsible	Done
February 2012	Questionnaire development: Draft master questionnaire review by GfK and Eurofound in search for best operationalisations, question formulations, and question sequence.	EF	GfK ✓
February 2012	Glossary: Eurofound provided Glossary with explanation of the concepts and terms used in the questionnaire as well as with the interviewer instructions.	EF	✓
March 2011: 07.03.2011- 28.03.2011	Pretest: carried out in Belgium and UK, including cognitive interviewing (15 interviews in each country). Pretest results discussed in a meeting with EF and used to further adjust master questionnaire before pilot.		GfK ✓
May 2011: 06.05. 2011	Approval of the master questionnaire for the pilot	EF	✓
July-August 2011: 20.07.2011- 08.08.2011	25 pilot interviews in each of the countries (C.4.4 of ToR)		GfK ✓
August 2011	Review of the master questionnaire and revisions based on pilot results		GfK ✓
26.08.2011	Approval of the final master questionnaire in English for the fieldwork (as a part of the final fieldwork materials)	EF	✓

2. Translation

Timeframe	Measure / action	Responsible	Done
February 2011: 11.02.2011	Engagement of the qualified translation staff (C.4.2.1 of ToR): GfK submits the CVs of the proposed translators to Eurofound for approval before the beginning of the translation process.		GfK ✓
18.02.2011	Approval of the translators list (based on request to ensure the appropriate capacity and supervision of the translators)	EF	✓
May – June 2011	Questionnaire and Glossary translation (in line with C.4.2.1 of ToR): GfK creates templates to use during translation process (Annex 2, Annex 3 and Annex 4) GfK creates a template – questionnaire translation log-book. In this format, the translations are to be submitted for validation to EF.		GfK ✓
June-July 2011	Translation validation: Eurofound validates the translated national language versions of the questionnaire and glossary on the basis of inhouse human resources and provides feedback to the contractor before the pilot.	EF	✓
July 2011	For languages not available in Eurofound, GfK ensured that the translations were double-checked by national agencies.		GfK ✓

3. Technical Set-up of the Questionnaire

Deadline / timeframe	Measure / action	Responsible	Done
February-September 2011	Centralised development of CAPI scripts by GfK Significant (CAPI in English and French for the pre-test, and CAPI in all the languages where CAPI is applied for the pilot and main fieldwork).		GfK ✓
12.09.2011	Approval of all final master fieldwork materials in English	EF	✓
September 2011	Verification of fieldwork materials in all languages of the survey: PAPI questionnaires, showcards, interviewer instructions (manual), introduction letter, and submission of them to EF thereof	GfK	✓

4. Sampling

Deadline / timeframe	Measure / action	Responsible	Done
March-July 2011	Sampling plans: Sampling plans for each country should contain information on sample size, sampling method, sampling design and description of sampling stages, sampling frame and its coverage and date, stratification and stratification variables (NUTS2 regions, source of the population figures), definition of PSU (primary sampling unit), number of sampling points and maximum cluster size, description of contingency plan (in case the initial sample does not yield requested number of the interviews in a given country).		GfK ✓
May-July 2011: 15.06.2011	Sampling plans submitted to Eurofound were approved for each country.	EF	✓
July 16.08.2011	Enumeration and enumerators: GfK to provide training to and supervise the qualification of the enumerators. The information on enumerators to be provided to EF on the basis of the Template 'Fieldforce size, experience and training - Enumerators' (Annex)	GfK	✓
16.08.2011	Detailed samples will be submitted to GfK by each country. GfK will check the compliance of the actual samples with the sampling plans	GfK	✓
30.08.2011	Completion of 10% back-check of enumerated addresses: At minimum 10% of the routes must be checked against the selection rule. Checks will be done electronically; in case the address cannot be located electronically, the local survey agencies will provide assistance in checking. The quality control consists of checking compliance with the random route on three levels: Fully compliant Small errors (compliance with the 'spirit' of the rules) Non-compliant In the case of non-compliance, all routes of the enumerator will be rechecked and if necessary replaced. In that case it will be necessary to enumerate the route again. The reported results of the back-checks for each country will contain information on: % of routes with full compliance % of routes with small errors % of routes with systematic deviation, but carried out randomly (e.g. random procedure always to the left instead of to the right) number of sampling points that were re-enumerated on the basis of the back-check	GfK	✓
30.09.2011	The results of the <i>Enumeration and register checking</i> will be a part of the	GfK	✓

	<p>Sampling report submitted to EF.</p> <p>The sampling report to EF has to contain:</p> <p>Introduction – information about sampling methodology, description of sampling design and sampling procedures;</p> <p>Random Probability Sampling – information about the sampling frames, dates frames where issued/purchased, any deviations to sampling;</p> <p>Enumeration – process, results of back-checking, corrective actions taken;</p> <p>Appendices – country sampling plans, country stratification plans.</p>		
October 2011	Approval of Sampling report (before fieldwork)	EF	<input type="checkbox"/>
April 2012	Approval of Sampling report (after fieldwork)	EF	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Field force

Deadline / timeframe	Measure / action	Responsible	Done
02.09.2011	GfK to supervise the qualification of the interviewers in order to comply with ToR prior to the beginning of the fieldwork. The information on the interviewers to be recorded and provided on the basis of the Template 'Fieldforce size, experience and training - Interviewers' (see Annex)	GfK	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
September 2011 (in batches)	Written Interviewer Instructions: GfK produces written Interviewer Instructions that will be included into the 'Project manual' distributed to and adapted by the national agencies. National agencies to ensure translation of the interviewer instructions into their working languages.	GfK	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
02.09.2011	Training of the national coordinators GfK to provide training to the interviewers in order to comply with ToR prior to the beginning of the fieldwork.	GfK	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
September 2011 (in batches)	Submission of all final fieldwork materials (<i>interviewer's assignment pack</i> , including interviewer instructions) in all languages to Eurofound	GfK	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13.09.2011 - 15.10.2011	Briefing of the interviewers by local agencies	GfK	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
After fieldwork	Reporting on changes in the fieldforce: actual field force used In case the survey agencies need to replace the fieldforce or employ new enumerators or interviewers, they must comply with the qualification requirements as indicated in ToR, have to provide proper training to them and document this accordingly.	GfK	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

6. Measures to increase response rates

Deadline / timeframe	Measure / action	Responsible	Done
Prior to the beginning of the fieldwork	Promocard of the survey: Produced, translated into languages of the survey and supplied to the contractor.	EF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Duration of the fieldwork	Limit to the number of addresses issued to an interviewer / open at a time. Information about the open addresses was provided in the field follow up tool.	GfK	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

7. Weekly fieldwork reports

Deadline / timeframe	Measure / action	Responsible	Done
Duration of the fieldwork	Weekly fieldwork progress reports including information on country level on a range of dimensions as per GfK tender proposal, quoted in a table (see Annex 7).	GfK	✓

8. Fieldwork visits

Deadline / timeframe	Measure / action	Responsible	Done
Duration of the fieldwork	EF representatives visited a number of selected local agencies during the fieldwork. In agreement with the contractor and local agencies, EF representatives 1) held a meeting with the fieldwork managers, 2) followed an interviewer at his/her work to see a sample of interviews. The feedback from the fieldwork visits was provided by EF to the central coordinator (GfK EU3C).	EF	✓

9. Interviewer back-checks

Deadline / timeframe	Measure / action	Responsible	Done
Duration of the fieldwork	Implementation and number of back-checks: <i>Contractor will have to ensure that the quality control procedures (back-checks) cover at least 10% of respondents, 10 % of refusals and 10% of non-contacts.</i> GfK proposed higher percentage of back-checks in certain countries, especially in those applying PAPI. GfK implemented back-checks on regular basis as the fieldwork progressed so that the respondents can respond while their EQLS interview experience is still recent and ensuring that any problems are spotted early on. Number and percentage of back-checks, including outcomes, were included bi-weekly in the fieldwork report.	GfK	✓
Duration of the fieldwork	Checking non-contacts: was implemented on the basis of contact sheet information and will check the contact procedure: Call at each address/individual did take place on at least four occasions, at different times of the day and must be spread across the fieldwork period before classifying it as unproductive. ➤ At least one of these contacts was in the evening and one at the weekend. ➤ The four contact attempts were spread over a minimum of two weeks. If countries did not follow the aforementioned rules of contacting, they were requested to do additional visits until they meet the rules. Subsequently, additional contact attempts may lead to an interview. Remark: GfK EU3C encouraged more than 4 visits per address as to enhance the response rate.	GfK	✓
01 09 2011	Questionnaire for back-checking the interviews (with regard to at least 10% of respondents) was developed and can be found in annex .	GfK	✓

Duration of the fieldwork	<p>Back-checking the interviews and refusals was carried out in the following way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GfK EU3C delivered back-check samples to the countries - countries performed back checks - GfK EU3C reviewed and delivered results of quality control of back-checks to the countries - appropriate actions were taken. <p>Note: priority was given to telephone back-checks due to the aim of timelines, i.e. to speed up the process, to make sure the respondent remembers everything correctly, to take appropriate actions towards interviewers.</p>		GfK	✓
----------------------------------	---	--	-----	---

10. Data processing

Deadline / timeframe	Measure / action		Responsible	Done
15. 11.2011	Submission of codebook for the EQLS (information on conversion of country educational level codes into ISCED)		GfK	✓
	Providing contractor with the concordance grid – an Excel file containing list of variables for all the three rounds of the EQLS	EF		✓
15.11.2011	Submission of 'empty' SPSS file:		GfK	✓
November 2011	Approval of codebook and 'empty' SPSS file	EF		✓
	Instructions for data editing (for data validation and subsequent modification) (on the basis of C.4.6.2 ToR)		GfK	✓
January – March 2012	Data validation (implementation of data editing)		GfK	✓

ANNEX 2: TRANSLATION ANNOTATION FILE

Q nr.	Reference; nr are from 2007 EQLS (unless otherwise stated)	Action	Annotation	Comment
HH0	HH0	Modified: translate		
HH1	HH1	Trend: review		
HH2a	HH2a	Trend: review		
HH2b	HH2b	Trend: review		
HH2c	HH2c	Trend: review	Card D: Principal economic status: people's main form of participation in the economy; A full-time homemaker is a full-time housewife, househusband. The person that stays at home to cook, do the shopping, look after the children; Long-term: permanent or at least without the foresight of being able to return to work in the near future.	
HH2d	HH2d	Trend: review		
HH3a	HH3a	Trend: review		
HH3b	HH3b	Trend: review		
HH3c	HH3c	Trend: review		
HH3d	HH3d	Trend: review		
Q1	Q1	Trend: review		
Q2	New	Translate		
Q3	Q4	Trend: review	Unlimited permanent contract: open-ended contract; Temporary employment agency implies that one is paid through an agency that has arranged the job; that the contract is with the agency and not with the company where one is working; Apprenticeship / training scheme: different from a temporary / fixed term contract in that the aim is to learn a skill	Interviewer instructions modified. Past versus present tense (now present tense)
Q4	Q2	Modified: translate	Please see http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/isco/docs/resol08.pdf . Next to the text of the master questionnaire, national questionnaires may contain other examples that list out the most typical occupations in a given country	New answer categories
Q5	Q3	Modified: translate		New answer categories
Q6	Q5	Modified: adapt	Central, regional or local government administration: the state administration proper (at various levels as listed) and includes civil officials and all the employees in institutions or organisations where civil officials work. Other public sector: here we mean institutions/organisations which are fully owned by the state (e.g. schools, hospitals as long as they are not private). Private sector: companies/businesses that are in private hands, not owned by the state; companies/businesses that are in private hands, not owned by the state.	Answer categories have changed

ANNEX 3: EXAMPLE TRANSLATION FILE

A	B	C	H	O	P
Question	Reference 2007	Action	PILOT ENGLISH MASTER	Comments Eurofound	PILOT France_FRENCH
HH2d	HH2d	Trend: review	unable to work due to long-term illness or disability		En incapacité de travailler en raison d'une longue maladie ou d'un handicap
HH2d	HH2d	Trend: review	retired		Retraité
HH2d	HH2d	Trend: review	full time homemaker/ responsible for ordinary shopping and looking after the home		Homme/ femme au foyer
HH2d	HH2d	Trend: review	in education (at school, university, etc.) / student	Etudiant(e) MODIFIED	Lycéen/ étudiant/écolier
HH2d	HH2d	Trend: review	other		Autre situation
dataprocessing	dataprocessing	dataprocessing	HH3LOOP:HH3LOOP		
HH3a	HH3a	Trend: review	HH3A<U>??HH3LOOP??</U><IS TRONG> (INT.: START WITH THE OLDEST MEMBER OF THE HOUSEHOLD.) Now thinking about the other members of your household, starting with the oldest ... Could you tell me whether ??HH3LOOP?? is a male or a female?		HH3A<U>??HH3LOOP??</U><IS TRONG> (ENQ. : commencer par la personne la plus âgée du ménage) Parlons maintenant des autres membres du foyer, en commençant par la personne la plus âgée. Pouvez-vous me dire s'il s'agit d'un homme ou d'une femme ?
HH3a	HH3a	Trend: review	Male		Homme
HH3a	HH3a	Trend: review	Female		Femme
HH3b	HH3b	Trend: review	HH3B<U>??HH3LOOP??</U><IS TRONG> What was this person's age last birthday?		HH3B<U>??HH3LOOP??</U><IS TRONG> Quel était l'âge de cette personne à son dernier anniversaire ?
HH3c	HH3c	Trend: review	HH3C<U>??HH3LOOP??</U><IS TRONG> (INT.: SHOW CARD C) What is this person's relationship to you? Is he/she your ...?		HH3C<U>??HH3LOOP??</U><IS TRONG> (TENDRE LISTE REPONSE C) Quelle est la nature de la relation entre cette personne et vous ? Est-il / elle votre ... ?
HH3c	HH3c	Trend: review	spouse/partner		Epoux(se) / compagnon ou compagne
HH3c	HH3c	Trend: review	son/daughter		Fils/ fille
HH3c	HH3c	Trend: review	parent, step-parent or parent in law		Parent, conjoint de l'un des parents ou parent par alliance
HH3c	HH3c	Trend: review	daughter or son in law		Belle-fille ou gendre
HH3c	HH3c	Trend: review	grandchild		Petit-fils / Petite-fille
HH3c	HH3c	Trend: review	brother/sister (incl. half and step siblings)		Frère / soeur / demi-frère / demi-soeur et frère / soeur du conjoint inclus)
HH3c	HH3c	Trend: review	other relative		Autre membre de la famille
HH3c	HH3c	Trend: review	other non relative		Autre proche non membre de la famille
HH3d	HH3d	Trend: review	HH3D<U>??HH3LOOP??</U><IS TRONG> (INT.: SHOW CARD D) Which of these best describes his/her situation?		HH3D<U>??HH3LOOP??</U><IS TRONG> (TENDRE LISTE REPONSE D) Parmi ces situations, laquelle décrit le mieux celle de cette personne ?
HH3d	HH3d	Trend: review	at work as employee or employer/self-employed		Actif en tant que salarié ou employeur/travailleur indépendant
HH3d	HH3d	Trend: review	employed, on child-care leave or other leave		Salarié en congé parental ou autre congé
HH3d	HH3d	Trend: review	at work as relative assisting on family farm or business	(sans percevoir de salaire) is not in the master questionnaire. REMOVED IN FRENCH AS WELL	Actif en tant que membre de la famille participant à l'exploitation agricole ou au commerce
HH3d	HH3d	Trend: review	unemployed less than 12 months		Au chômage depuis moins de 12 mois
HH3d	HH3d	Trend: review	unemployed 12 months or more		Au chômage depuis 12 mois ou plus
HH3d	HH3d	Trend: review	unable to work due to long-term illness or disability		En incapacité de travailler en raison d'une longue maladie ou d'un handicap
HH3d	HH3d	Trend: review	retired		Retraité
HH3d	HH3d	Trend: review	full time homemaker/ responsible for ordinary shopping and looking after the home		Homme/ femme au foyer

ANNEX 4: PILOT REVISION FILE

GfK Programming Revision Sheet - EQLS3 Pilot Local Qre - Requested revisions to be taken into account POST PILOT						
Study Name/Project number: EQLS3 7347 - Pilot phase				to amend		
Research contact: EQLS team						
				Scripting team at GfK Belgium		Agency
Date	Question number	Requested Revision	Type of revision	Corrected (Y/N). If no, mention reason	Revision corrected by (insert name)	Date corrected
Comments	Correction checked/re tested by (insert name)					
	Q2	It's very confusing that Q2 asks about respondent immediately after a question about partner's employment status	content			
	Q3	Some people work in more than one place and it can has different characteristics. Maybe it should be multi-answer or add "your main job"? Same goes for Q13	content			
	Q4/Q5	According the instruction in the questionnaire text "RECORD 98 FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 99 FOR 'REFUSED', however these options should be entered under codes 12 for "don't know" and 13 for "refusal"	instruction/structure			For the pilot phase the interviewers where instructed how to indicate "don't know" or "refusal" regardless of numbering.
	Q4/Q5	Very long text on screen, which makes it difficult to have a nice lay-out	lay-out			Suggestion : show on screen only the category headers and show the examples on the showcard ?
	Q5	Missing options "Don't know" and "Refusal" in master and local script; also missing in excel translation file (correct in English word master).	structure			
	Q32/33/34	Can we really not avoid repeating children or parents if they've already told us at Q33 that they don't have any?	structure/filter			The filter is : IF Q33a = 6 (don't have such relatives), OMIT Q34a; IF Q33b = 6, OMIT Q34b; IF Q33c = 6, OMIT Q34c. There is no filter on Q32 (was decided as such in the pilot master).
	Q33/Q34 item on friends or neighbours	Although we are talking about friends or neighbours the instruction about children appears again (INT.: IF SEVERAL CHILDREN THEN ANSWER FOR THE ONE WITH WHICH THE RESPONDENT HAS THE MOST CONTACT). Shouldn't it be removed from this question item? May be confusing that 'Any of your friends or neighbours' includes instruction relating to children	content			
	Q34 first three items	Items in different order on screen at Q34 though correct order for those same items at Q33, and correct order for both questions in the excel translation file.	structure			Check with Askia ("label wissel"). For the pilot, the datapunchers were instructed to pay special attention to this question as to enter the right

ANNEX 5. EQLS FIELDFORCE TEMPLATE: ENUMERATORS

	Number of addresses enumerated for EQLS (insert the total number)	Number of enumerators used for EQLS* (insert the total number)	Job titles/Functions of enumerators used (describe the job title/function)	EQLS Enumerators' experience (years) in random route surveys* (fill in minimum number of years, maximum number of years, average number of years)			Number of random route surveys worked on* (fill in the minimum number of surveys, the maximum number and the average number)			Type of training received for this project (please describe if it concerns written/oral training and mention by whom it was prepared/given)
			Description	Min.	Max.	Average	Min.	Max.	Average	Description
EU27										
Bulgaria										
Cyprus										
Estonia										
France										
Germany										
Greece										
Italy										
Lithuania										
Portugal										
Romania										
Slovakia										
Spain										

ANNEX 6. EQLS FIELDFORCE TEMPLATE: INTERVIEWERS

	INFORMATION ABOUT TOTAL F2F FIELDFORCE					INFORMATION ABOUT EQLS INTERVIEWERS												EQLS training to be given "how and by whom" (indicate which option is appropriate for your country)			
	Total F2F fieldforce size (insert the total number of interviewers)	Number of CAPI/PAPI interviewers (insert the number for both options)	Total F2F fieldforce experience (years) (fill in minimum number of years, maximum number of years, average number of years)	Sample size	Average no of interviewers per interviewer	Number of interviewers to be assigned to EQLS (fill in the total number)	If interviewing in more than one language, please indicate number of EQLS interviewers per language (fill in the number next to the language)			EQLS Interviewers' experience (fill in minimum number of years, maximum number of years, average number of years)			Number of F2F surveys covered within past 5 years by EQLS interviewers* (fill in minimum number, maximum number, average number)								
	CAPI	PAPI	Min.	Max.	Average		CAPI	PAPI	Language 1	Language 2	Language 3	Min.	Max.	Average	Min.	Max.	Average	In central location by local research director/project manager	Personally by supervisors in regional centres by supervisor	By telephone (teleconference)	Other (please specify)
EU27																					
Austria																					
Belgium																					
Bulgaria																					
Cyprus																					
Czech Republic																					
Denmark																					
Estonia																					
Finland																					
France																					
Germany																					
Greece																					
Hungary																					
Ireland																					
Italy																					
Latvia																					
Lithuania																					
Luxembourg																					
Malta																					
Netherlands																					
Poland																					
Portugal																					
Romania																					
Slovakia																					
Slovenia																					
Spain																					
Sweden																					
United Kingdom																					

ANNEX 7: WEEKLY FIELDWORK TECHNICAL REPORTS

	Weekly reports
Weekly and accumulated number of selected individual contacted (at each contact/visit)	X
Weekly and accumulated number of full and partial interviews planned and achieved (including reasons for stopping the interview before completion)	X
Weekly and accumulated number of partial interviews achieved (including reasons for stopping the interview before completion)	X
Weekly and total number of interviewers involved in the project	X
Weekly and accumulated number of interviews planned and achieved per interviewer	X
Weekly and accumulated refusals (number and in percentage of total individuals contacted – per week and per interviewer – including reasons for refusals)	X
Weekly and accumulated other non contacts (number and in percentage of total individuals contacted – per week and per interviewer – including reasons for non contact)	X
Weekly and accumulated response (number and in percentage of total individuals contacted – per week and per interviewer)	X
Changes in and outcomes of quality control procedures	X
Number and percentage of back checks including outcomes	X
Response enhancement procedures (standard and additional)	X

ANNEX 8: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE BACK-CHECKING OF THE INTERVIEWERS

BCS0 Goodday madam, sir, this is... calling from the research agency ...

BCS00 Recently, one of our employees has contacted you regarding a survey about Quality of Life. I would like to ask you a few more questions to check and verify the quality of our work and the interviewers. We would like to know whether you were contacted in a professional manner.

BCS1 What kind of contact did you have with one of our employees?

- 1 I participated in the survey myself
- 2 Someone else from my household has participated in the survey
- 3 Someone came and rang my doorbell and I received an explanation concerning the survey, however I was not interested
- 4 Someone contacted me by telephone and I received an explanation concerning the survey, however I was not interested.
- 5 I received a note in my mailbox, indicating that an interviewer had passed by and would like to make an appointment
- 6 I found a note underneath my front door/on my doormat, indicating that an interviewer would like to see/meet me
- 7 None of the above
- 8 Respondent refuses to participate in back check

IF (BCS1=3) or (BCS1=4)

BCS1b Can you specify why not?

IF (BCS1=2)

BCS2 Can I talk to the person that has participated in the survey?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

IF (BCS2=2)

BCS3 When can I reach this person/the person that participated in the survey?

IF (BCS1=7)

BCS4 Is it possible that you might not have noticed the documentation regarding the survey?

1 Yes

2 No

IF (FILE=3) AND (BCS1=1) OR (BCS1=2)

BCS5 Firstly we would like to thank you for your participation in the survey of Quality of Life. Secondly I would like to ask you a few more questions to check and verify the quality of our work and the interviewers. We would like to know whether you were contacted in a professional manner.

IF (FILE=3) AND (BCS1=1) OR (BCS1=2)

BCS6 Do you still remember why you - and not someone else in your household - participated in this study?

1 I was the only one at home at that time

2 My birthday was the first upcoming birthday of my household

3 The other members of my Household were not interested in the research study

4 I am the only person in this household

5 Other. Please specify.

IF (FILE=3) AND (BCS1=1) OR (BCS1=2)

BCQ1 How long did the interview take?

1 Less than 20 minutes

2 Between 20 and 60 minutes

3 More than 60 minutes

IF (FILE=3) AND (BCS1=1) OR (BCS1=2)

BCQ5 Have you been offered some kind of documentation?

1 A card : you were not present

2 Introduction letter

3 A brochure

4 A questionnaire

5 Other (specify)

6 None of the above

IF (FILE=3) AND (BCS1=1) OR (BCS1=2)

BCQ3 When you were giving your answers, were they entered in a computer OR noted on paper?

1 entered in a computer

2 noted on paper

IF (FILE=3) AND (BCS1=1) OR (BCS1=2)

BCQ2 Did the interviewer show you some cards with the different answer possibilities during the interview?

1 Yes

2 No

IF (FILE=3) AND (BCS1=1) OR (BCS1=2)

BCQ9 How many rooms does the accommodation in which you live have, excluding the kitchen, bathrooms, hallways, storerooms and rooms used solely for business?

IF (FILE=3) AND (BCS1=1) OR (BCS1=2)

BCQ10 Did the interviewer ask you this question during the EQLS survey?

1 Yes

2 No

3 Don't Know

IF (FILE=3) AND (BCS1=1) OR (BCS1=2)

BCQ6 Including yourself, can you please tell me how many people live in this household?

IF (FILE=3) AND (BCS1=1) OR (BCS1=2)

BCQ4 Did you feel that the interviewer conducted the interview in a professional way? (asking clearly, interviewer friendly and polite)?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

BCQ7 What is the gender of the respondent?

- 1 Male
- 2 Female

BCQ8 May I ask how old you are ?

IF (FILE=3) AND (BCS1=1) OR (BCS1=2)

BCQ11 Do you have an important remark?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

BCQ12 Thank you for your cooperation and have a nice day !