Technical Report Data Collection the Netherlands

To: EIGE

From: OQ Consulting BV and NETSHEILA

Date: 17 July 2015

Revised report

1. Identification of partners and structure of collaboration

Ditmeijers' Research² was responsible for the execution of the fieldwork and the production of both the Qre 1 and Qre 2 file. During the entire process we have worked in close cooperation with OQ Consulting, NETSHEILA and expert Boris Kragelj. OQ Consulting and NETSHEILA maintained the contact with EIGE and involved the team in all relevant correspondence.

2. Acknowledgements

Ditmeijer worked in close cooperation with Thera van Osch and Margherita Sofia Zambelli from OQ Consulting, Lin McDevitt-Pugh, from NETSHEILA and Boris Kragelj, an external expert contracted by the Consortium for the Quality Control. Bas van Helden and Philip Rouwenhorst guided the process of the fieldwork at Ditmeijers' Research².

Six representatives of Ditmeijer's team of senior interviewers.

3. Questionnaire development (translation) and CATI programming

Translation of the questionnaire went very well. Our translators have made the first draft of the Dutch translation. We have done our best to remain as close as possible to the structure of the sentences in English, and at the same time produce ordinary Dutch sentences. Thera van Osch performed the quality check of the translation, and made adjustments. EIGE reviewed this translation and highlighted several terms that seemed to depart from the original English. Part of this had to do with sentence structure and where necessary, the structure of the sentences was changed.

We feel that the pre-test phase was very useful, and welcomed all changes EIGE made following the pre-test. The document with guidelines to each question was also very helpful during the process. Especially with regard to the procedures when people had moved (for instance from a large to a small town) within the past 10 years.

The process of CATI-programming went smoothly. Calling times and the results of each call were automatically stored in the Qre 2 file.

4. Sampling frame and sample

Our aim was to deliver a perfect sample according to the stratification criteria of gender, age, and region. The draft sampling report produced by the researchers of Ditmeijers was reviewed by Boris Kragelj. His technical remarks on the first draft were answered by Bas van Helden. Taking all this feedback into consideration, Thera van Osch edited the final sampling report, which was approved by EIGE. As outlined in the Sampling Report, the attitude towards cold-calling is fairly negative in the Netherlands, and therefore our approach was to target people through e-mail first.

One of the advantages of this approach was that we had some prior knowledge on age, gender, and region. Based on this information we could select a sample file in which each segment was properly represented (and weighted for difficult to reach target groups).
This strategy has led to a sample that forms a good representation of the general Dutch population. It has a fifty/fifty division of men and women and the two requirements (besides the stratification criteria) have been met: 66.4% are employed workers, and 25.8% of respondents live in rural areas.

A closer look at the sample

In total we have interviewed 137 men, and 143 women. We have interviewed 98 respondents in the age group 18 – 39, 141 respondents in the age group 40 – 64, and 41 respondents who were at least 65 years old.

In Table A the number of respondents per sub-stratum is depicted. The numbers between brackets indicate what the perfect stratification would have been. From this we can learn that people from Gelderland, Limburg and Zeeland are slightly underrepresented in the sample, while people from Utrecht and Noord-Holland are somewhat overrepresented in the sample. With regard to age, elderly (65+) are slightly under-represented.

Table A

	18-39 Men	18-39 Women	40-64 Men	40-64 Women	65+ Men	65+ Women	Total per region
Groningen	1	2	7	0	0	1	11 (10)
Friesland	0	2	1	2	0	1	6 (11)
Drenthe	0	1	1	1	1	0	4 (8)
Overijssel	5	4	1	5	0	1	16 (19)
Flevoland	1	5	2	3	0	0	11 (6)
Gelderland	2	2	3	2	3	0	12 (33)
Utrecht	7	8	7	6	6	3	37 (20)
Noord Holland	11	14	13	22	7	6	73 (46)
Zuid Holland	8	10	18	19	1	3	59 (59)
Zeeland	0	0	1	0	0	0	1 (6)
Noord Brabant	6	7	15	11	5	2	46 (41)
Limburg	2	0	1	0	1	0	4 (19)
Total age and gender	43	55	70	71	24	17	280
Total per age group	98 (89)		141 (128)		41 (63)		

Though it was an advantage that we had prior knowledge about the age, gender, and region of possible respondents, this information was not always correct. During interviews we learned for instance that people had moved to another region or that the age was different than indicated.
All in all the sample presents a good representation of the Dutch population with respondents from all regions, ages, and a fifty/fifty division on gender.

5. Fieldwork achieved

In total 280 interviews were conducted. The fieldwork started on the 20th of May, and ended on the 11th of June. In week 21 a number of 78 interviews were completed, 85 interviews in week 22, 73 interviews in week 23, and 44 interviews in week 24. The average duration of a completed interview was slightly over 34 minutes.

6. Challenges encountered during fieldwork

Due to our approach of avoiding cold-calling (as described in the Sampling Report), and scheduling interviews with motivated participants we encountered little problems during the interviews.
Some interviews took much longer than planned. This was especially the case with the interviews of elderly people, which could take more than 45 minutes. This was partly because they found it quite difficult to process questions, and partly because they wanted to illustrate their answers with personal stories.
Our interviewers are trained to remain in their professional role under these circumstances, and to try to get people back to the questionnaire.

7. Response rate

As mentioned earlier and described in the Sampling Report our approach was to e-mail people first. We were aiming at a response rate of 25% (meaning that 1 in 4 of the approached people would schedule an interview and complete the survey).
This led to 1,120 invitations being sent initially. However, response proved to be a bit more difficult, and in the end a total number of 1,539 invitations were sent. Interviews were scheduled with 314 people. There were 34 people who, for different reasons, were unable to participate in the survey. Thus, N=280 interviews were completed.

	N in sample	Invitations sent	Response rate
Men	137	786	17%
Women	143	753	19%
Total	280	1,539	18%
18-39	98	594	16%
40-65	141	678	21%
65+	41	267	15%
Total	280	1,539	18%

8. Non response + non-response bias

We believe there is no significant non-response bias in the sample. Response numbers were quite consistent through different ages and gender. They ranged from 15% – 21%. Women were a bit more likely to participate than men. The age group 65+ proved to be most challenging in terms of response rate.

9. Details of interview team per country

The team that was responsible for the interviews consisted of 6 experienced interviewers, 3 men and 3 women. Two were in the age group 18 – 39, and 4 in the group 40 – 65. The team was supervised by the project manager, and two different coaches who were always present during the interviews.

10. Quality check report

The data file specified 280 survey interviews in the format. It is in a good shape and follows rigorously the technical instructions prepared by the contracting authority: data matrix, questions, coding of responses and non-responses is consistent and in line with requirements.

There is no sign of repetitive answers or data entry duplication. With few exceptions (see discussion on Outliers) all entries seem to be largely consistent with the inherent logic of questionnaire.
The survey non-response is acceptable and does not vary across different sample stratums. This would indicate that there is no important non-response bias when considering different population strata.

The data matrix is indeed complete with item-non response very limited to non-existing. This corroborates with high quality of the survey execution and data provided from it.
The key conditions on sample requirements (share of employed respondents, share of respondents from rural areas, shares of population stratums) have been met and indicate that results of the survey can be considered representative for the whole Dutch population, with taking into account reservations of the sample frame raised in the early stage of the study (pre-selection of respondents is biased towards survey volunteers and email users).

Survey results cannot be considered representative on the regional level and any comparison on the regional level should not be considered as highly reliable due to the small sample sizes per region. This is inherent to the sample size of N=280. In fact, this sample size is already rather small to make statements on the entire population of the Netherlands (N=400 would have been better in order to reach a sample with 95% level of reliability and a foul margin of 5%). Therefore, even if our stratification according to region were perfect, this problem would still exist.

We considered the following question: *If the provisions of public services addressed in the survey differ significantly between different NL regions a similar reservation should be applied to the population/sample results overall.* We felt a reservation towards the overall result not necessary; first, as provisions in the Netherlands do not tend to differ greatly between regions, and secondly, all regions are incorporated in the sample and most are rather perfect. Overall we feel the sample provides a balanced representation of the Dutch population. One thing that may distort the view for the Netherlands is the condition defined by EIGE that 25% of respondents live in small towns or the countryside. With regard to the Dutch population, this has created an over-representation of rural people in the survey.

Outliers

We notice there are instances of over-reported working hours (Q 17 + Q 18) and over-reported care hours (Q 18) which we think is important to address. In each interview whenever an 'out of the ordinary' answer was given, our interviewers double-checked with respondents whether they understood the question correctly and the implications of the answer they gave.

Q17 Working hours: the highest reported working hours were 80 en 70 hours. While quite high, in a sample of N=280 two very hard working people are possible. There is no indication this would be not true.

Q18 / Q19 very high: One respondent (NL 273) answered she spends 168 a week (24 hours a day) caring for her two children. To question this, we would have to have a definition of caring. Is it performing tasks? Or being present? It is not difficult to reason that all hours spent with the children are child care hours; small children cannot be left, even at night, alone. The parent or care-giver has a constant duty of care, even when asleep in the place where the child or children are. We have therefore chosen to accept the answers given.

To avoid this kind of outlier response in future research, we suggest EIGE specifies what it means by ‘”care”.

Note: In the initial dataset that was sent to EIGE there was a typo in one of the variable names. Q10_6_7 was accidently changed in Q10_7_7. Therefore two variables with the name Q10_7_7 existed, and SPSS automatically changed the second variable Q10_7_7 into Q10_7_7_A. This has been corrected in the data file attached to this report.