



## Project Paper 7

# Survey report

Final Version, 12-6-2012

Responsible institution: **International Migration Institute**

Authors: **Evelyn Ersanilli**



University of Antwerp  
Belgium



International Migration Institute,  
University of Oxford  
United Kingdom



Centre on Migration, Policy and Society,  
University of Oxford  
United Kingdom



Peace Research Institute Oslo  
Norway



Koç University  
Turkey



Université Mohammed V Agdal  
Morocco



Centre of Sociological Research  
Ukraine



Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar  
Senegal



Funded by the European Union  
7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme for Research



# Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Fieldwork</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<i>Fieldwork period</i> .....	4
<i>Interview duration</i> .....	5
<i>Language</i> .....	6
<i>Collaboration with local authorities</i> .....	8
<i>Problems encountered during fieldwork</i> .....	8
Suspicion and security issues.....	8
Problems with reaching the target population.....	9
Problems with questions.....	9
<b>Sampling</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<i>Response rates</i> .....	18
<i>Bias</i> .....	21
<b>Data entry and cleaning</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>Weights</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Appendices</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<i>Random sticker syntax for Stata</i> .....	28
<i>Interviewer characteristics</i> .....	29

## Introduction

The EUMAGINE project focuses on four countries; Morocco, Turkey, Senegal and the Ukraine. Within these countries four research areas (see table 1) have been selected for data collection. A survey was conducted in the first half of 2011. The aim was to survey a representative random sample of 500 members of the population aged 18-39 in each research area. Fieldwork was organized by the local EUMAGINE consortium members; for Morocco by Université Mohammed V-Agdal, Rabat; for Turkey by Koç University, Istanbul; for Senegal by Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar; and for Ukraine by the Centre of Sociological Research, Ternopil.

Table 1 Research Area codes

<b>Morocco</b>	<b>Turkey</b>	<b>Senegal</b>	<b>Ukraine</b>
11 Todgha Valley	21 Emirdağ	31 Darou Mousty	41 Zbarazh Rayon
12 Central Plateau	22 Dinar	32 Lambaye	42 Znamyanska Rayon
13 Tanger	23 Fatih	33 Golf Sud	43 Solomyansky Rayon
14 Tounfite	24 Van Merkez	34 Orkadiere	44 Novovodolaz'ka Rayon

In preparation of the quantitative data collection project-wide guidelines were developed (see Ersanilli, Carling and De Haas, 2011) to ensure high quality data and comparable collection procedures across the four countries. These guidelines had been refined during two rounds of pilot tests held in 2010. At the end of data collection a fieldwork report was written for each research area and submitted to the work package coordinator, IMI.

Drawing on the fieldwork reports, this paper presents an overview of the fieldwork and sampling procedures, noting problems encountered and divergences from the general guidelines. It also presents response rates. The challenges that research teams faced varied across countries and research areas. This variation is closely related to cultural factors such as levels of social trust, family structure and life rhythm.

The paper finishes by discussing data cleaning procedures and explaining how the survey weights were calculated.

Researchers planning to use the EUMAGINE dataset are strongly advised to read this report before doing their analyses.

# Fieldwork

Before the start of fieldwork all interviewers received 1-2 days of intensive training. During the training the questionnaire and data collection guidelines were discussed. To ensure that interviewers had a good understanding of the more complex parts of the questionnaire, the trainings included a series of test cases for the household definition, migration scenarios and principal activity coding. Like the guidelines and survey, the test cases were translated into the language of the trainings. Supervisors received additional instructions on the sampling procedure.

Data was collected using paper questionnaires and pencils. The questionnaire consisted of two parts; a household grid and an individual questionnaire (see Ersanilli, Carling and de Haas, 2011). The respondent for the individual questionnaire was selected randomly from all eligible household members (see below for details).

Several of the survey questions make reference to the name of the research area (e.g. questions HH12, HH17, MG9, MG25, A31, A10, A11, P12). For the neighbourhoods of some of the major cities it was decided to have these questions refer to the city as a whole and not to the neighbourhood. In Fatih (23) the questions referred to 'Istanbul', in Solomyansky (43) to 'Kyiv'. In Golf Sud the reference was to 'Golf Sud' and not to Dakar, as people perceive this as their place of residence.

## Fieldwork period

The length of the fieldwork period and the number of interviewers in the field varied across countries and research area. Table 2 displays the length of the fieldwork period and the number of interviewers and supervisors in each area. In the Ukraine fieldwork was hindered by prolonged winter weather. Not all teams worked every day of the fieldwork period. Teams usually worked from early morning to late evening on weekdays and also on weekends to reach a maximum number of respondents and reduce the risk of non-response bias. Interviewer teams were always accompanied by supervisors who were responsible for sampling. The supervisors also checked completed questionnaires for inconsistencies with help of a checklist. When necessary, interviewers were sent back to a household to complete missing information. In the Ukraine and Senegal the phone numbers of participating households were collected so that they could be reached for later data checks.

Table 2 Fieldwork period and team size per Research Area

Research Area	Fieldwork period	Nr of interviewers	Nr of supervisors
11 Todgha Valley	14 - 20 March	8	2
12 Central Plateau	22 Feb – 2 March	8	2
13 Tanger	11- 20 April	8	2
14 Tounfite	24 April – 4 May	8	2
21 Emirdağ	12 -24 April	14	1
22 Dinar	12 -25 April	12	1
23 Fatih	24 Feb. – 25 March	8	2
24 Van Merkez	7 – 15 March	15	2
31 Darou Mousty	15 – 24 March	13	2
32 Lambaye	23 – 29 April	12	2
33 Golf Sud	26 May – 2 June	7	2
34 Orkadiere	26 Feb – 10 March	11	2
41 Zbarazh Rayon	7 March – 20 May	11	1
42 Znamyanska Rayon	19 March – 15 May	17	2
43 Solomyansky Rayon	19 March – 22 May	22	2
44 Novovodolaz'ka Rayon	13 March – 27 May	24	2

## Interview duration

The length of the interviews varied across research areas and countries, partly as a function of household size. Table 3 displays the average and median duration of the household interview and individual interview by research area. As to be expected, the household interviews took longest in the three research areas in Senegal where polygamy and intergenerational households have led to large and complex household structures.

Table 3 Average interview duration in minutes – unweighted

Research Area	Household questionnaire			N	Individual questionnaire		
	mean	median	<i>mean house- hold size</i>		mean	median	N
11 Todgha Valley	7.0	5	6.3	487	15.5	14	488
12 Central Plateau	7.8	6	5.1	485	16.5	15	479
13 Tanger	6.7	5	5.4	488	14.5	13	489
14 Tounfite	5.8	5	5.6	490	10.8	10	470
21 Emirdağ	6.0	5	4.3	500	21.9	20	500
22 Dinar	5.8	5	4.2	500	23.1	23	499
23 Fatih	6.1	5	3.6	500	22.9	22	496
24 Van Merkez	8.2	7	6.1	500	20.8	19	493
31 Darou Mousty	26.8	21	11.4	477	29.0	25	479
32 Lambaye	22.6	17	13.5	488	20.2	17	481
33 Golf Sud	12.6	10	6.7	470	20.1	17	474
34 Orkadiere	28.4	23	13.6	489	26.0	22	483
41 Zbarazh Rayon	6.7	6	4.5	496	21.7	20	490
42 Znamyanska Rayon	9.0	10	3.3	498	23.7	20	498
43 Solomyansky Rayon	9.8	10	2.9	493	24.5	22	493
44 Novovodolaz'ka Rayon	13.2	11	3.5	493	28.9	28	493

Source: EUMAGINE dataset version 20120530, unweighted. N<500 due to missing values

## Language

All countries in EUMAGINE have linguistic pluralism, mostly related to national minorities. In Morocco, the main language spoken by the population, colloquial Arabic or 'Darija', is not a written language. The questionnaire was therefore translated in the Modern Standard Arabic. To ensure that respondents understood the questions and interviewers did not need to do 'on-the-spot' translations, key concepts and phrases (incl. all answers scales and attitude questions) were translated into Darija and written phonetically. These translations were created in extensive discussions within the fieldwork team and with duo-partner IMI. Many Moroccans have one of the Berber (Tamazight) languages as mother tongue. Tamazight is also a common language in several of the EUMAGINE research areas. However it was decided not to make a written translation into Tamazight because of the strong regional variations and low levels of standardisation. Only in one village in Tounfite (14) (village code 1421) it was deemed necessary to have linguistic assistance. However this was more a trust issue than a linguistic one. Three local youth were recruited to assist the interviewers. These youngsters (aged 18-22) were trained by one of the supervisors who is a native speaker of Tamazight. The interviews were conducted in the presence of these youngsters, who, when necessary, translated the questions into Tamazight. These interviews were incorrectly registered as being conducted fully in Arabic. As part of the data cleaning process it was recoded that a second language was used (iq3=1) namely Tamazight (iq4=2).

In Turkey the research area of Van Merkez (24) posed a linguistic challenge as most of the population is Kurdish. During the pilot in Van a Kurdish translation of the questionnaire was used. This translation however proved to be of little use because the language was too formal. Therefore in preparation for the actual survey another translation was made of all key concepts and phrases. This translation and the full translation were discussed with a group of interviewers familiar with the Kurdish dialect in Van, to come to a translation that is as close as possible to common language in the area. Where necessary (for instance questions W8, W11, W16) the Turkish terms were also included in the questionnaire. The interviewers were equipped with both Kurdish and Turkish versions of the questionnaire. When a respondent had problems understanding a question in the main language of that questionnaire (either Kurdish or Turkish), the interviewer repeated the question in the other language.

Senegal has seven national languages - French, Wolof, Peul/Pulaar, Sérère, Diola, Mandingue, and Soninké. In the EUMAGINE research areas Wolof and Pulaar are the most important languages. Though both languages have a standardized written version, the fact that French is the language of education has led to low proficiency in written Wolof and Pulaar. Most interviewers were not familiar with reading and writing their mother tongues or other Senegalese languages. It was therefore decided to use a French standardized questionnaire translation in which key concepts and phrases were printed in both French and Wolof, or French and Pulaar.

For example

A1 Dans l'idéal, si la possibilité se présentait, aimeriez-vous aller vivre ou travailler à l'étranger dans les cinq ans à venir, ou préféreriez-vous rester au Sénégal ? Su fekkoon ni li gën man naa am, nga man a génn, ndax dangay dem bitim réew liggéeyi fa, ci juroomi at yii di fiëw, walla dangay toog Senegaal

1  Aller à l'étranger

0  Rester au Sénégal → **Passez à A4**

In the trainings both French and Wolof/Pulaar versions were discussed at length. It was uncovered that in the Wolof version ‘you’ had accidentally been translated into plural instead of singular and the translations of the life satisfaction questions was a bit imprecise. It was not possible to reprint all questionnaires but interviewers took good note of the changes.

For some of the questionnaires in Senegal, the interviewers recorded that the respondent had very low fluency in the questionnaire language. Part of these remarkable answers could be due to the French translation of the category ‘1 not at all’ as ‘1 très peu’, which comes closer to ‘very little’ implying there is still some understanding.

In Ukraine all interviewers carried copies of the questionnaire in both Ukrainian and Russian and were able to speak both languages, with the exception of some interviewers in Novovodolaz’ka (44) which is a Russian oriented area.

Table 4 Questionnaire language – unweighted

Research Area	Language available	Most common languages used
11 Todgha Valley	MSA with Darija key concepts and phrases	Arabic (100%)
12 Central Plateau	MSA with Darija key concepts and phrases	Arabic (100%)
13 Tanger	MSA with Darija key concepts and phrases	Arabic (100%)
14 Tounfite	MSA with Darija key concepts and phrases	Arabic (100%)
21 Emirdağ	Turkish	Turkish (100 %)
22 Dinar	Turkish	Turkish (100%)
23 Fatih	Turkish	Turkish (100%)
24 Van Merkez	Turkish and Kurdish	Turkish (74.6%) Kurdish (25.4%)
31 Darou Mousty	French with Wolof key concepts and phrases	Wolof (96 %) Pulaar (3.2%)
32 Lambaye	French with Wolof key concepts and phrases	Wolof (100%)
33 Golf Sud	French with Wolof key concepts and phrases	Wolof (89.4 %) French (8.6%)
34 Orkadiere	French with Pulaar key concepts and phrases	Pulaar (92.8%) Soninké (6.2 %)
41 Zbarazh Rayon	Ukrainian and Russian	Ukrainian (100%)
42 Znamyanska Rayon	Ukrainian and Russian	Ukrainian (24.4%) Russian (75.6%)
43 Solomyansky Rayon	Ukrainian and Russian	Ukrainian (34.6%) Russian (65.4%)
44 Novovodolaz’ka Rayon	Ukrainian and Russian	Ukrainian (1.8%) Russian (98.2%)

Source: EUMAGINE dataset version 20120530, unweighted.

Table 4 displays the languages in which the written translation was available for each of the research areas and the most common languages used as main questionnaire language (question iq1). Interviewers also registered their estimate of the respondent’s proficiency in that language (iq2), whether a second language was used during the interview (iq3) and if so, which one (iq4). There were a few cases in which interviewers had to revert to a language for which no standardised written translation was available, such as Soninké in Senegal (see table 4). Where the random sample included immigrants and refugees language barriers sometimes made it impossible to conduct an interview. These cases were registered as non-response (see below).

## **Collaboration with local authorities**

In Senegal and Morocco the fieldwork teams worked closely with the local authorities. This was a necessity partly because of local custom and a lack of up-to-date area maps and population information, but teams also felt it was an advantage because these intermediaries could instill trust in the respondents. By and large the interviews took place without the presence of the representatives of the local authorities.

In Morocco the team worked with the village and neighbourhood chiefs (moqaddems). In towns moqaddems helped determine the boundaries of the neighbourhoods and accompanied interviewers on their random walks. In villages they often helped the supervisors with creating a list of households and their location.

In the Senegalese research area of Darou Mousty (31) contacts were established not only with the village chiefs but also with the religious authority, the khalif, and his relatives, because they play an important role in that area. In all areas the team contacted the village chief, or in the case of Dakar the neighbourhood chief, before commencing the survey. In Darou Mousty (31) a radio announcement was made by the local authorities encouraging people to participate in the survey. In Orkadiere (34) a similar announcement was made via the loudspeakers of the mosques. In Darou Mousty a local official who knew the area and its population well accompanied the team to help them locate the villages to be surveyed (good quality maps are absent). His presence had a reassuring effect on the villagers.

In Turkey and the Ukraine the teams only contacted local authorities to request research permits.

## **Problems encountered during fieldwork**

In most research areas fieldwork went smoothly and teams were able to finish within the planned time frame. Only in the Ukraine a long cold winter and high non-response (see below) led to delays in the data collection. The fieldwork teams encountered a number of problems. Most problems can be grouped into three categories; suspicion, reaching the target population, and question understanding.

### *Suspicion and security issues*

In the Turkish research areas of Emirdağ (21) and Dinar (22) the interviewers were repeatedly met with suspicion by residents and in some locations also by the police or lower authorities. The team was always able to clear up the situation by showing their permits and talking to higher-level authorities. In Van (24) a recent terror incident in a nearby district had led to tensions and a highly visible presence of the military. The data collection was therefore done as quickly as possible. It is possible that the high tensions have influenced the answers of the respondents in Van. In Zbarazh (41) and Solomyanska (43) some residents feared that the interviewers were not part of a research project but of a criminal group looking for households to rob. In Novovodolaz'ka (44) the fear was so strong that the supervisor decided to contact the local authorities to clarify the reasons for their presence in the area. In Zbarazh (41) and Novovodolaz'ka (44) respondents were reluctant to answer questions related to household assets. This might be related to the recent introduction of a new tax code in the Ukraine; respondents might have feared that the information they gave would



be communicated to the tax office. In Fatih (23) interviewers were harassed and in Zbarazh (41) even threatened.

### *Problems with reaching the target population*

In some of the villages selected in the samples for Turkey and the Ukraine, it turned out to be impossible to complete a full batch of 10 interviews. This was partly because the population records used overestimated the population size (many emigrants do not notify the authorities that they have left) and partly because too few members of the population belonged to the EUMAGINE target group of 18-39 year olds. In these cases additional villages were sampled in order to complete the 500 interviews.

In the Solomyanska rayon in Kyiv (43) a particular challenge was getting access to the sampled buildings. The almost exclusively high-rise buildings in this area are locked with downstairs doors and without a clear doorbell system. Some buildings have concierges sitting downstairs. These concierges sometimes allowed conducting the interviews, but at times to the displeasure of the inhabitants who sent the interviewers out from the building and in one case even called the police. The interviewers often had little alternative but to just wait around for the door to open and try to get into the building. These problems severely lengthened the fieldwork duration in Kyiv.

### *Problems with questions*

Consistency checks on the data done by IMI, showed that in several countries there were problems with coding family relations. Two key problems were the absence of codes for certain types of family relations and cultural differences in the conceptions of family relations. In Morocco and Senegal and to a lesser extent in Turkey, daughters-in-law were sometimes coded as 'non-family'. Similarly in Senegal heads of household often refer to their nephews as their sons. The codes for relationships with the head of household did not fully cover the complex nature of Senegalese household where polygamy is frequent. The codes do not allow a distinction between siblings from the same mother and from those of the other wives. Polygamy also complicated the coding of question hh10 on the current location of the partner; the answer categories do not include the option of a partner living elsewhere in the same village/city. Unfortunately the interviewers have used different systems in coding this type of situation and sometimes coded them as '0' and sometimes as '1'. The information on the location of polygamous heads of household should therefore be interpreted with care. It is unclear why these problems with the family relation and partner location codes were not detected during the two rounds of pilot testing in 2010. Possibly the size of the pilot studies, 30 interviews in each of the four research areas, is a factor.

In Van (24) heads of household did not automatically mention female household members when listing all household members at the start of the survey. When this was discovered, field supervisors required the interviewers to ask additional questions such as "Do you have any daughters or daughters-in-law living with you?". Respondents often also listed family members who live outside the household for more than three months. This was easily uncovered when such a person was selected for the individual questionnaire. Interviewers were warned to be very careful about this.

Moroccan-Arabic does not clearly distinguish between family and household. Since some of the questions in the English language questionnaire refer to 'household' and others to 'family' this can lead to incorrect answers. Interviewers were instructed to make sure that the respondents were answering for the correct unit, and to verify with the respondent in case of doubt, but it is possible that some answers are incorrect.

For the fieldwork in Central Plateau (12) in Morocco, an old version of the principal activity (question HH8) code sheet was used. This was uncovered during the first day of fieldwork in Todgha Valley (11), the second area to be surveyed. Interviewers in Todgha therefore wrote down the names of the activities instead of the codes. The codes were added later on, before data entry. The codes for Central Plateau were adjusted to the correct version of the code sheet. Because it was not possible to recode all professions from the old to the new version, the code "404 artisan" was added. This code has only been used in Morocco. It was noted that the principal activity codes do not account for the difference between people in (regular) employment and day labourers, even though this is an important factor impacting socio-economic status. Also in Senegal several professions were not captured by the list of codes. This was the case for the 'griots' (story tellers) and other artists who were later assigned code '700'.

Questions about year of birth of household members were often seen as difficult in Senegal, rural Morocco and Van. In Van (24) the official year of birth sometimes differed from the known year of birth; in these cases the known year of birth was taken.

Education was measured in years. A nation-specific coding scheme has been developed to consistently transfer a certain level of schooling to a certain number of years. This scheme was printed on the code sheets. Quran school and literacy education were given special codes (55 and 56 respectively). However in Senegal the years spent in Quran school have sometimes been added to years of regular education. This means that for example a person who has been to both Quran school and completed elementary school may have a higher score on the education variable (hh7) than a person who has only gone to elementary school. In Morocco time spent in kindergarten was in some cases added to the years of education. It is not possible to fully determine in which cases this addition has occurred. However it can be assumed that in most cases where the difference between the number of years spent in education and the age of the household member is less than 4 years (implying that s/he started school before the age of 4) is incorrect. No such rudimentary check is available for people who have left education more than 4 years ago. This means that the variable 'years of education' (hh7) should be taken as an approximate indicator rather than a precise measure.

In the Ukraine some respondents were confused by the terms 'nationality' and 'citizenship' in questions i9 and i10. This can be related to Soviet times, when people had Soviet citizenship but their identity cards also registered their nationality (more or less their ethnicity). This may mean that some of the information in the questions i9 and i10 is not correct.

In Morocco the translation of 'dating website' (t5) has led to confusion. The connotation of the term used in the translation is more of a general chat room than a dating website, which probably explains why a relatively large share of married people gave an affirmative answer. In Senegal where dating website was translated as 'site de rencontre', also a word with a more general social connotation, a similar problem may have occurred.

# Sampling

As outlined in Project Paper 6A, EUMAGINE uses a stratified cluster sample with random walks. Villages visited for the pilot studies were excluded from the sampling. Table 5 lists the sampling frame and steps for each of the research areas. Teams did their best to obtain the most recent population statistics to use as a basis for stratification and sampling. It was not possible to find information on the size of the EUMAGINE target population of 18-39 year olds for the villages and urban neighbourhoods in any of the research areas. Instead information on the total population was used. This may have led to some skewing in the sample if the share of 18-39 year olds within a research area is distributed unevenly. In Morocco it wasn't always possible to obtain information on the number of inhabitants of the urban neighbourhoods. In those cases sampling was based on estimates of the number of households (see Table 5 for details).

In all research areas that had both a rural and an urban part, the first step in sampling was **urban-rural stratification**. In Morocco and Turkey a **second layer of stratification** consisted of the rural sub-counties (communes rurales).

In most research areas, the second step was **probability-proportional-to-size sampling** of villages/neighbourhoods within each stratum (see table for exceptions). Interviews were distributed using **systematic sampling in batches of 10**. To ensure that 10 interviews could be completed, villages in the research areas deemed too small to conduct 10 interviews were added to neighbouring villages before the systematic sampling stage. In the Ukraine villages were merged along bus lines to facilitate interviewer transportation. If 'merged' villages ended up in the sample, the 10 interviews were distributed across the component villages in relation to their relative size.

Within each sampled unit – village or neighbourhood – households were selected via a **random walk method**. Since there are no maps of the rural parts of the research areas, Google Earth images and aerial photographs were used to get an impression of the shape of the village. The random walk structure was adapted to the shape of the village to ensure optimal coverage. If more than 1 batch of interviews fell in the same village or neighbourhood, some supervisors preferred to select all households along one random route whereas others preferred to do a separate random walk for each batch of 10 interviews.

There are three variables in the dataset that reflect the sampling structure. These are

*strat*: stratum (urban or (sub-county) rural).

*clust*: batch of interviews that were part of the same random walk

*vill\_neigh\_code*: village or neighbourhood code

Villages 'merged' for the purpose of systematic sampling share the same code, but the interviews will be in different clusters.

In several locations it was not possible to conduct random walks according to the project wide guidelines.

The **Solomyanska** (43) area in the Ukraine consists almost exclusively of large high rise buildings. The structure of the streets makes it difficult to develop a clear pattern with left and right turns without creating overlapping walks. Therefore it was decided to draw a sample of streets from lists of streets by micro rayons obtained from the local authorities. The goal was to conduct a batch of 10 interviews on each of the sampled streets. Within each street, households were sampled at a regular, 5-step, interval in the high rise buildings. On several streets it was not possible to conduct a full batch of 10 interviews. For these cases additional streets were sampled.

In some parts of the **Moroccan** areas the dispersion of the houses belonging to the same villages made random walks infeasible. In the rural parts of the Central Plateau (12) the supervisor worked with the village chiefs (mokaddem) to make a list of places where families belonging to the village were living. For each place a list of households was drawn up from which a systematic random sample was drawn. In the Toghda valley (11) the supervisors also asked the local chiefs to list all the households in their village. Often households belonging to different clans were living in the same village. To avoid social tensions it was important to ensure that households from all clans would be included in the sample. This was established by ordering the household lists by clan before drawing the systematic sample.

The rural research areas in **Senegal**, with a high number of villages, spread along poorly accessible roads called for an adjustment to the general sampling strategy. Taking a random sample of villages and doing random walks within these villages would have taken too much time. In Lambaye (32) and the rural parts of Darou Mousty (31) the “all compound” method was used instead<sup>1</sup>. In Golf Sud (33), Orkadiere (34) and the urban parts of Darou Mousty (31) the general random walk method was used.

The “all compound” method is essentially a bottom-up way of defining a research area. First a coverage plan was made using maps and Google Earth images. The coverage area consists of zones or layers in concentric (semi)circles spreading from the central town that were visited zone by zone consecutively enlarging the research area until 500 interviews have been completed. The borders of the survey zones are between the villages, and not along the roads. Consequently, covering an area often meant travelling along a main road and visiting all the villages along the road. Villages were surveyed systematically in a predetermined order. Google Earth was consulted to ensure that all the settlements in a zone were visited by interviewers. In each zone, the sampling method involved visiting every compound and randomly sampling one household in each compound.

**Within each household** a respondent for the individual interview was selected at random from all household members belonging to the target population and deemed eligible (defined as aged 18-39 and at home the previous day/night). In the Ukraine the within household selection was done on the basis of the first birthday criterion. In the three other countries random number stickers were used<sup>2</sup>. If the selected household member was not at home, a return visit had to be scheduled for a time that that person was likely to be at home. If the selected person was not at home at the time

<sup>1</sup> The method was developed by Jørgen Carling in consultation with Papa Demba Fall

<sup>2</sup> The idea to use random number stickers was copied from the Worldbank LSMS survey. I'd like to thank Maarten Buis for writing the syntax that allowed creating random number stickers in Stata. The syntax is included in the appendix. This syntax and several alternative suggestions can be found in the Statalist archives <http://www.stata.com/statalist/archive/2010-08/msg01356.html> .

of the return visit, a second random selection was made among the remaining eligible household members (variable id2). In rural areas supervisors often decided to make a second draw immediately if the randomly selected household member was not present, as the travel time made it infeasible to return to these households at a later point. The Turkish team decided to only select one respondent in each household and do up to two return visits to contact this person. The team has been able to locate absentee selected household members elsewhere, such as at work or in the coffee house. In other cases they had to proceed to another household. In Senegal it was sometimes deemed necessary to make a third random selection (variable id3).

Table 5 Sampling method by Research Area

Research Area	Data source	Stratification	Random walk	Comments
11 Todgha Valley	2004 population census  For the town of Tinghir 2004 census data on the size of neighbourhoods was obtained.  Attempts to update the 2004 data with help of local authorities and village chiefs were fruitless as their estimates proved too unreliable.	1. rural – urban 2. rural by sub-counties (3 communes rurales)	Urban: for each cluster the supervisor and chief (mokaddem) chose a central point such as a school or mosque and set out the walk from there. A separate walk was done for each batch of 10 interviews  Rural: chiefs (mokaddem) helped draw up a list of households by clan. Households were drawn from this list with systematic sampling.	
12 Central Plateau	2004 population census.  For this area the census did not contain information on the size of neighbourhoods. Sampling was done based on information obtained from the urban planning agency and other local officials. The borders of the neighbourhoods were determined with help of google earth and planning maps.	1. rural – urban 2. rural and urban by sub-counties (3 communes rurales)	Rural: not possible to do random walk because habitation in this area is very scattered. Asked village chief name of all 'places' (lieux), and for each place names of households. Systematic sampling from those lists.  Urban: random walks with mokaddems	Stratification was based on number of households instead of inhabitants. Since urban households have fewer members, this led to an overrepresentation of urban households in the sample. This was corrected in the survey weight.
13 Tanger	Conducted in arrondissement Beni Makada and parts of Chorf Mghogha and Chorf Souani.  Stratification by arrondissement based on 2004 population census. Stratification by annex was based on information from the municipal authorities.  PPS sampling of neighbourhoods was based on estimates given by mokaddems.	stratification by «annex»	Separate random walks by the supervisors for each batch of 10 interviews	In one villa neighbourhood in annex 12, interviewers were unable to get past the inter-coms. It was decided to continue in an adjacent neighbourhood in annex 12.
14 Tounfite	2004 population census	1. rural – urban 2. rural by sub-counties (commune rural) and urban by neighbourhood	Separate random walk for each batch of 10 with help of representatives of local administration	

21 Emirdağ	For urban-rural and sub-county stratification and PPS sampling of villages; 2009 address register (ADNKS) Sampling of neighbourhoods in Emirdağ town: 2009 local election register	1. urban (county centre) – rural (villages) 2. Within rural by sub-county (3 sub-counties)	Done by supervisor. 1 random walk per sampled neighbourhood / village	Due to high number of empty houses in the town, long walks were needed. Supervisors had to be creative in finding new directions  In one of the villages it was not possible to complete an entire batch so an additional village was sampled (vill_neigh_code =2111)
22 Dinar	For urban-rural and sub-county stratification and PPS sampling of villages; 2009 address register (ADNKS) Sampling of neighbourhoods in Dinar town: 2009 election register	1. urban (county centre) – rural (villages) 2. Within rural by sub-county (3 sub-counties)	Done by supervisor. 1 random walk per sampled neighbourhood / village	
23 Fatih	2009 local election register	None (all urban)	Done by supervisor. 1 random walk per sampled neighbourhood	In some neighbourhoods most buildings were commercial and long walks were needed to obtain all 10 interviews
24 Van Merkez	For urban-rural and sub-county stratification and PPS sampling of villages; 2009 address register (ADNKS) Sampling of neighbourhoods in Van town: 2009 local election register	1. urban (county centre) – rural (villages) 2. Within rural by sub-county (3 sub-counties)	Done by supervisor. 1 random walk per sampled neighbourhood / village	
31 Darou Mousty	Recensement administrative 2009	urban– rural	Urban: a list was made of all entry points to the town. One of these was randomly selected as a starting point. From there 1 continuous random walk was made by the supervisor. Because of the absence of street name signs and house numbers, the interviewers accompanied the supervisor on the random walk so that they had a clear idea of which houses to visit.  Rural: village chiefs often accompanied the interviewers on their walks.	Several villages had to be deleted from the sampling frame as it was uncovered that nearly the entire population had moved to the town of Darou Mousty. Because the all-compound method did not work with batches but proceeds by sampling complete villages, the sample in this area ended up containing 501 surveys.

32 Lambaye	Recensement administrative 2009	None (all rural)	n/a All compound method employed.	
33 Golf Sud	2002 population census (RGPH)  Efforts have been made to update this frame but no data were available from the statistics agency or municipal authorities	None (all urban)	In each sampled neighbourhood, one random walk was done.	
34 Orkadiere	2002 population census (RGPH) & recensement administrative 2006 These data were updated using information from the 2010 "programme distribution des vivre"	None (officially all rural)	In the urban parts of Orkadiere (3409) and Wendou Bosseybé (3413) sampling was done with random walks. In each urban area one random walk was done to sample all necessary households.  In the villages sampling was done with random walks with help of village chiefs	
41 Zbarazh Rayon	2011 population data from hospital records	urban– rural	Urban: a random walk was done by the supervisor in each medical service district. The starting point was randomly selected from a list of streets.  Rural: random walk was done by the supervisor for each batch of 10 interviews that fall on that village. A central point was taking as starting point; e.g. a store, bus stop, or a church.	In one village it was not possible to do any interviews, and in another the batch of 10 could not be completed. For both cases additional villages were sampled.
42 Znamyanska Rayon	Population registries rajon and oblast statistic department. For 2011 only information on the number of households was obtained. Information from 2007 on number of households and population size were used to estimate population size in 2011.	urban– rural	Urban: It was not possible to obtain a map of Znamyanska town. A random walk without a map would have a high risk of interviewers getting lost. The town was therefore subdivided into postal office zones, within which the random walks were conducted.  Rural: random walk was done by the supervisor for each batch of 10 interviews that fall on that village (with the exception of 1 village were all 20 were sampled on same walk)	



43 Solomyansky Rayon	2010 population register data on the population size of each micro rayon	1. private vs high-rise sections 2. Within the high-rise areas stratification by micro rayon	Every 5th apartment in a high rise building.	It was not possible to complete a batch of 10 interviews on each of the sampled street. A number of replacement streets had to be sampled. In some cases this led to interviewers crossing the boundaries of the micro rayon. Because of this the stratification by micro rayon could not be realised and only the first level of stratification is included in the dataset.
44 Novo- vodolaz'ka Rayon	2010 population register data from the oblast.	urban– rural	Random walks were done by the supervisor for each batch of 10 interviews to be completed in that village/neighbourhood.	In one village it was not possible to complete the batch of 10. Therefore an additional village was drawn.

## Response rates

To register response and different types of non-response sample tracking forms were developed (see EUMAGINE Project Paper 6A for an example). In Morocco there were problems with these forms, leading to no registration of response in the Central Plateau (12). In the three other regions a slightly adapted response registration form was used. This form only distinguished “completed interviews”, “vacant / no-one at home” (combination of categories 2 and 3 of the original form), “nobody in the household is between the ages of 18-39”, “no household member aged 18-39 is present during the entire period of the survey”, “refusal” (combination of categories 2 and 3 of the original form) and “other”.

Table 5 presents the sample size and types of response for each of the research areas where response was tracked. From the table it becomes clear that there is a strong variation in the number of households contacted in order to achieve the desired 500 interviews.

There is a range of different ways to calculate the response rate of a survey. We follow the guidelines of the AAPOR<sup>3</sup>. The basic formula for calculating the response rate is

$$\text{response rate 1} = I / (I + P) + (R + NC + O) + (UH + UO)$$

where

*I*: Interview

*P*: Partial interview

*R*: Refusal

*NC*: non-contact

*O*: Other

*UH*: Unknown household

*UO*: Unknown other

However since EUMAGINE focuses on a specific target population – 18-39 year olds – it is likely that there are some ineligible households hiding in the non-response. For example, part of the households that were not reached because all members were absent, will not have had any members in the EUMAGINE age group and should therefore not be treated as non-response.

To correct for eligibility, AAPOR has developed another response rate formula:

$$\text{response rate 3} = I / (I + P) + (R + NC + O) + e * (UH + UO)$$

where

*e*: estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.aapor.org/Standard\\_Definitions2.htm](http://www.aapor.org/Standard_Definitions2.htm)

Table 5 Response overview by research area, absolute and % of sampled households

	11 Todgha Valley	13 Tanger	14 Tounfite	21 Emirdağ	22 Dinar	23 Fatih	24 Van Mer- kez	31 Darou Mousty	32 Lambaye	33 Golf Sud	34 Orkadie- re	41 Zbarazh Rayon	42 Zna- myanska	43 Solo- myansky	44 Novovo- dolaz'ka
<i>Total number of contacted households</i>	829	861	517	2495	1751	2127	607	501	510	556	512	1324	1441	3233	1657
1 Households where interviews were completed	500 60.31%	500 58.07%	500 96.71%	500 20.04%	500 28.56%	500 23.51%	500 82.37%	501 100.00%	500 98.04%	500 89.93%	500 97.66%	500 37.76%	500 34.70%	500 15.47%	500 30.18%
2 No household member at home	134 16.16%	82 9.52%	7 1.35%	1 0.04%	275 15.71%	50 2.35%	7 1.15%	0 0.00%	2 0.39%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	66 4.98%	48 3.33%	57 1.76%	26 1.57%
3 Selected address is vacated / nobody is at home for the entire survey period	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	976 39.12%	238 13.59%	133 6.25%	9 1.48%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	50 3.78%	64 4.44%	15 0.46%	73 4.41%
4 Selected address is a company or other work place	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	20 0.80%	76 4.34%	44 2.07%	3 0.49%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	10 0.76%	3 0.21%	13 0.40%	12 0.72%
5 Address not found	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	9 0.51%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	3 0.21%	2 0.06%	0 0.00%
6 Address unreachable	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	3 0.17%	22 1.03%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	11 0.83%	40 2.78%	424 13.11%	79 4.77%
7 Randomly selected household member is not home	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	48 2.74%	2 0.09%	1 0.16%	0 0.00%	1 0.20%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	11 0.83%	34 2.36%	2 0.06%	23 1.39%
8 Nobody in the household is between the ages of 18-39	80 9.65%	58 6.74%	4 0.77%	854 34.23%	348 19.87%	591 27.79%	22 3.62%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	397 29.98%	544 37.75%	1193 36.90%	754 45.50%
9 No household member aged 18-39 is present during the entire period of the survey	59 7.12%	66 7.67%	3 0.58%	6 0.24%	41 2.34%	8 0.38%	3 0.49%	0 0.00%	6 1.18%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	35 2.64%	77 5.34%	17 0.53%	9 0.54%
10 Nobody in the household speaks the language of the survey	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	17 0.80%	1 0.16%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	3 0.09%	0 0.00%
11 Refusal by household	55 6.63%	153 17.77%	2 0.39%	134 5.37%	205 11.71%	747 35.12%	55 9.06%	0 0.00%	1 0.20%	54 9.71%	12 2.34%	233 17.60%	124 8.61%	732 22.64%	147 8.87%
12 Refusal by randomly selected household member	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	4 0.16%	7 0.40%	13 0.61%	6 0.99%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	3 0.54%	0 0.00%	14 1.06%	4 0.28%	275 8.51%	34 2.05%
other	1 0.12%	2 0.23%	1 0.19%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%
<i>Response Rate 1</i>	66.76%	62.27%	97.47%	30.85%	37.68%	33.51%	85.91%	100.00%	98.04%	89.77%	97.66%	54.35%	55.93%	24.67%	56.12%
<i>Response Rate 3A</i>	68.28%	62.86%	97.48%	39.82%	50.23%	36.03%	88.39%	100.00%	98.43%	89.77%	97.66%	59.12%	61.60%	27.37%	61.37%
<i>Response Rate 3B</i>	66.76%	62.27%	97.47%	77.56%	55.08%	37.96%	88.44%	100.00%	98.43%	89.77%	97.66%	60.61%	63.96%	27.51%	64.68%

We treat “No household member at home” and “Selected address is vacated / nobody is at home for the entire survey period” as instances of UH, but refusal by the household as a refusal and not as UH because the interviewers were often able to establish the presence or absence of target group members. It is difficult to determine how to treat the category “3 selected house is vacated / nobody is at home for the entire survey period”. Migrants who live elsewhere often still have a house in the village of origin or even build one after migration. Certain high migration areas have a high number of ‘migrant houses’ that are only inhabited during the summer and should therefore be treated as uneligible. It is however hard for interviewers to determine whether a house is just vacated for the time of the survey or for most of the year. Therefore two variations of response rate 3 have been calculated, 3A in which this category is treated as non-response, and 3B where it is treated as not-eligible.

Figure 1 shows the response rates by research area for each of the three above mentioned response rate calculations. Again there seems to be a strong variation across research areas and especially across countries.




Figure 1. Response Rates 1, 3A and 3B by Research Area.  
 Note: Response rates could not be calculated for Plateau Central (12).

It is notable that the response rate in Senegal is close to 100 per cent. Other surveys in Senegal have also obtained (very) high response rates. The local social structures are an important factor. After the village chief had announced the arrival of the survey teams, people often stayed at home to wait for the interviewers to come by. The support of the village chiefs and other local authority figures for the survey lead to very low levels of refusal. Similar factors influenced the much higher response rate in Van compared to the other research areas in Turkey. The size of households may also have a positive role as larger households are easier to contact. In Emirdağ the large difference between response rates 3A and 3B reflects the high emigration rate and abandoned and migrant houses in the area.

## Bias

If the within household selection of the respondent for the individual questionnaire was truly random, the respondents of the individual questionnaire should constitute a representative sample of all eligible household members in that research area. Figures 2 through 9 compare the respondents of the individual interview (weighted) to all eligible household members in that research area for a number of key demographic variables. The figures show the mean scores and error bars for the 95%-Confidence Interval. If the confidence intervals of the respondents of the individual interview overlap with all eligible respondents there is no significant difference between the two. If the intervals do not overlap, there is a statistically significant difference.

For the most part the two groups are highly similar. There are however also some noteworthy differences. In Tanger women are significantly underrepresented among respondents of the individual questionnaire, whereas in Fatih and Zbarazh there is a significant overrepresentation. Women are often overrepresented in survey research due to their higher likelihood of being at home and higher willingness to participate. The underrepresentation in Tanger might be due to the reluctance of some women to be interviewed by (male) interviewers. Despite the underrepresentation of women in Tanger there is a significant overrepresentation of people involved in housework. In Dinar and Fatih there is a significant underrepresentation of people doing housework among the respondents of the individual interview. There are no significant differences for unemployment, share of married people or years of education.




Figure 2. Mean age of respondents of individual questionnaire vs all eligible household members, by Research Area. Source: EUMAGINE dataset 20120530 - weighted




Figure 3. Share of women among respondents of individual questionnaire vs all eligible household members, by Research Area. Source: EUMAGINE dataset 20120530 - weighted




Figure 4. Share of people doing housework among respondents of individual questionnaire vs all eligible household members, by Research Area. Source: EUMAGINE dataset 20120530 - weighted




Figure 5. Share of unemployed among respondents of individual questionnaire vs all eligible household members, by Research Area. Source: EUMAGINE dataset 20120530 - weighted




Figure 6. Share of married people among respondents of individual questionnaire vs all eligible household members, by Research Area. Source: EUMAGINE dataset 20120530 - weighted




Figure 7. Means years of education of respondents of individual questionnaire vs all eligible household members, by Research Area. Source: EUMAGINE dataset 20120530 - weighted

Differences in migration experience are also very limited. There is only a significant overrepresentation of people who lived elsewhere (ie internal or international migrants) in Todgha (11), but in none of the other areas. There are also no significant differences in the share of people who have lived abroad, however that is partly due to the large confidence intervals in relation to the low general share of people with international migration experience.




Figure 8. Share of migration experience among respondents of individual questionnaire vs all eligible household members, by Research Area. Source: EUMAGINE dataset 20120530 - weighted




Figure 9. Share of international migration experience among respondents of individual questionnaire vs all eligible household members, by Research Area. Source: EUMAGINE dataset 20120530 - weighted

The data in figures 2-9 might underrepresent the actual level of bias, since the respondents can only be compared to the other members of the interviewed households and not to those of households that refused to be interviewed. It is also important to realise that the data in EUMAGINE can only claim to be representative for the households with members aged 18-39 within a research area and not for the entire research area.



## Data entry and cleaning

After the teams involved in data collection entered the data and conducted some checks in SPSS the data was sent to IMI for verification. IMI performed a number of consistency checks. Data collection teams were sent lists of comments based on these consistency checks. Based on the outcomes of these checks, data collection teams verified if the data had been entered correctly. The teams were also requested to double check extreme values (high contact or remittance frequencies) and unusual destination countries. Where inconsistencies were not due to data entry but to mistakes made in the field by interviewers or respondents, some could be repaired by contacting the respondents. The Senegalese team had often taken pictures of the interviewed households. These pictures allowed a detailed reconstruction of household relations to help the data verifications. In most cases however the inconsistencies had to be left as they were.

All people who were listed in the household grid but coded as **current migrants** (hh13=1, hh14=0) were deleted from the household grid. If necessary the person numbering (PERSONid) in the household grid was adjusted to ensure consecutive numbers. A similar procedure was followed for relations listed in migrant grid 1 with who there had been no contact during the past 12 months (mg7=0).

Most inconsistencies were found in the **household grid**. It was not always possible to reconstruct the household structure. Most mistakes were found in the coding of the relation to the head of household (hh2) and the marital status (hh9). The former type of inconsistencies was partly caused by culture dependent interpretations and expressions of relations (see above).

Especially the polygamous households in Senegal show a highly complex structure that is not always well-captured by the available answer categories. For instance there are cases of polygamous households where one of the wives is listed as the head of household and the other wives as partner of the head of household. The household relations and the information on the location of the partner (question hh10) should therefore always be treated with care.

Often information on the **year of events** is inaccurate. This is most evident in cases where the year of birth and the year of migration are inconsistent (ie the year of migration, hh12, lies before the year of birth, hh4), or where the years in education (hh7) are close to or even exceed the age of the respondent. It is not always clear what information is most accurate. It is likely that often these years are 'estimates' by the respondent that lie close to the actual year. It is up to the individual user of the EUMAGINE data to determine how to best deal with these types of situations.

Some of the respondents of the individual interview are (just) outside of the target group – ie they are either younger than 18 or older than 39. They were nevertheless kept in the dataset to maintain 500 surveys per research area.

Data in the household grid suggest that some respondents have misunderstood the questions on **place of birth** (hh11) and have listed household members born in hospital in nearby towns as being 'born elsewhere' and migrated to the place of survey in the year of birth (hh12). This can potentially lead to an overestimation of the number of people who have migrated internally.

It is also likely that the **time and date registration of the interview** contains inaccuracies. Extreme values (interviews lasting 1 minute or several hours) have been set to missing.

Because contrary to the questionnaire instructions some of the interviewers only wrote down **country codes** and not country names it was not always possible to ascertain if unusual migration destinations reflected the answers of the respondents or mistakes by the interviewers. Therefore it is recommended to be careful with the interpretation of unusual destination choices.

For some of the variables additional codes had to be generated, for example for certain geographical regions and the generic religion category “muslim other” (for question i3). The codebook lists all these additional codes.

In several countries interviewers come across hard to code **principle activities** (hh8). Only ‘griots’ in Senegal were encountered on a sufficiently large scale to warrant a new code. The professional footballer and wrestler in Golf Sud (13) were coded as “503 skilled manual”, a musician in Turkey was coded as “506 skilled non-manual”. In Morocco a number of people aged over 16 had been incorrectly coded as “102 child 6-16 not in school not working”. This is most likely due to the initial use of an old version of the codesheet (see above). Most cases were women; these were all recoded as “103 housework”. The six male cases were recoded as “104 unemployed”.

With the first use of the full database more errors will likely be revealed. The database will subsequently be updated. It is therefore essential to always mention the version number of the database with all presentations of results.

## Weights

Since EUMAGINE is not based on a Simple Random Sample, weights are needed to account for differences in selection probability. It is generally recommended to calculate selection weights for each step of the sampling procedure. For EUMAGINE that would be the selection of households within villages and then people within households.

To our knowledge there is no recent population data on the number of households with members belonging to the EUMAGINE target group within each village/neighbourhood in the research areas – and for several areas not even on the number of households. The dataset does contain information on the number of households at the selected address, but since there has not been a household listing in the selected villages there is no exact knowledge on the number of households. Because there is no reliable data available on the number of households with members belonging to the EUMAGINE target group within each village/neighbourhood, it was decided to only calculate a selection probability weight for the within-household selection.

This weight has been calculated within each stratum and was normalised to maintain a weighted N of 500 per research area. The formula is:

$$W_s = \frac{N_{stratum}}{N_{eligible\ stratum}} * N_{eligible\ member\ in\ household}$$

For Central Plateau this weight was further adjusted to correct for the urban-rural stratification error.

Despite some apparent biases between the respondents of the individual interviews and all eligible household members it was decided not to add post-stratification weights. Without reliable information on the composition of all households in the research areas instead of only those interviewed, it is impossible to correctly determine the size of the bias and the introduction of poststratification weights might do more harm than good.

## References

Ersanilli, Evelyn, Jørgen Carling & Hein de Haas (2011) *Methodology for quantitative data collection*. EUMAGINE Project paper 6A.

# Appendices

## Random sticker syntax for Stata

```
-----  
drop _all  
set obs 100 //adjust this to the number of stickers you want  
gen hhid = _n  
  
//make twenty copies of each household and assigning them numbers 1 till 20  
//(so if you want a different stickers size you should adjust this step accordingly)  
expand 20  
bys hhid : gen nr = _n  
  
//sort on the random variable 'u' within each household  
gen u = runiform()  
bys hhid (u) : gen random_order = _n  
  
//variable 'u' no longer needed, so can be deleted  
drop u  
  
//turn into a dataset with one observation per household with 20 numbers in random order  
reshape wide nr , i(hhid) j(random_order)  
  
//variable 'hhid' no longer needed, so can be deleted  
drop hhid  
  
//Then you can export the stickers from Stata to Excel  
outsheet using [filename and path], replace
```

```
-----  
Based on an example from Maarten Buis, see http://www.stata.com/statalist/archive/2010-08/msg01356.html
```

## Interviewer characteristics

Interviewerid	Gender	Age	Education	Languages
101	F	29	21	Arabic
102	F	21	21	Arabic
103	M	22	21	Arabic
104	M	25	21	Arabic – Amazigh
105	F	22	21	Arabic
106	M	27	21	Arabic – Amazigh
107	F	22	21	Arabic
108	M	28	21	Arabic
201	M	22	15	Turkish, Kurdish
202	F	21	15	Turkish
203	M	26	15	Turkish, Kurdish
204	F	21	15	Turkish
205	F	22	15	Turkish
206	M	24	15	Turkish, Kurdish
207	M	22	15	Turkish, Kurdish
208	M	20	15	Turkish
209	F	20	15	Turkish
210	F	21	15	Turkish
211	M	22	15	Turkish, English
212	M	23	14	Turkish
213	F	20	15	Turkish
214	F	21	15	Turkish
215	F	21	15	Turkish
216	F	22	15	Turkish
217	F	21	15	Turkish
218	F	21	15	Turkish
219	F	22	15	Turkish
220	F	21	14	Turkish
221	F	21	15	Turkish
222	M	21	15	Turkish
223	M	20	14	Turkish
224	M	22	15	Turkish
225	M	21	14	Turkish
226	M	20	14	Turkish
227	F	21	15	Turkish
228	M	35	13	Turkish, Kurdish
229	F	21	14	Turkish
230	M	26	16	Turkish, Kurdish
231	F	37	14	Turkish
232	F	21	15	Turkish, English
233	M	22	15	Turkish, Kurdish
234	M	21	15	Turkish
235	M	26	13	Turkish
236	F	26	16	Turkish, Kurdish
237	M	22	15	Turkish, Kurdish
238	M	23	15	Turkish, Kurdish
239	M	22	15	Turkish, Kurdish
240	M	22	15	Turkish, Kurdish
241	F	21	14	Turkish, Kurdish

242	F	24	15	Turkish, Kurdish
243	M	27	15	Turkish, Kurdish, Arabic
244	F	32	16	Turkish, Kurdish
245	F	29	16	Turkish, Kurdish
246	M	22	15	Turkish, Kurdish
247	M	53	13	Turkish, Kurdish
248	F	29	16	Turkish, Kurdish
249	M	56	16	Turkish, Kurdish, Arabic
250	M	24	15	Turkish, Kurdish
302	M	38	10	French, Wolof, Pulaar
304	M	33	15	French, Wolof,
305	F	28	17	French, Wolof,
306	F	44	6	French, Wolof,
307	F	40	15	French, Wolof,
308	F	44	6	French, Wolof, Pulaar
309	M	33	8	French, Pulaar
310	M	40	6	French, Wolof, Pulaar
311	M	25	13	French, Wolof, Pulaar, Soninké
312	M	39	12	French, Wolof, Pulaar
313	M	40	10	French, Wolof, Pulaar
314	F	27	10	French, Wolof, Pulaar, Soninké
315	F	28	10	French, Wolof, Pulaar, Soninké
316	M	33	10	French, Wolof, Pulaar
318	M	27	10	French, Wolof, Pulaar
319	M	34	10	French, Wolof, Pulaar
350	M	41	13	French, Wolof, Pulaar, Soninké
351	M	36	14	French, Wolof,
352	F	?	14	French, Wolof,
353	M	26	14	French, Wolof,
354	F	?	14	French, Wolof,
355	F	25	16	French, Wolof,
356	M	45	10	French, Wolof,
411	F	20	15	Ukrainian, Russian
412	F	20	15	Ukrainian, Russian
413	F	21	15	Ukrainian, Russian
414	F	21	15	Ukrainian, Russian
415	F	20	15	Ukrainian, Russian
416	F	20	15	Ukrainian, Russian
417	F	27	17	Ukrainian, Russian
418	F	29	17	Ukrainian, Russian
419	F	23	17	Ukrainian, Russian
421	F	47	13	Ukrainian. Russian
422	F	55	13	Ukrainian. Russian
423	F	60	17	Ukrainian. Russian
424	F	57	17	Ukrainian. Russian
425	F	44	17	Ukrainian. Russian
426	F	24	13	Ukrainian. Russian
427	F	23	13	Ukrainian. Russian
428	F	46	17	Ukrainian. Russian
429	F	48	17	Ukrainian. Russian
430	F	47	17	Ukrainian. Russian
4110	F	21	15	Ukrainian, Russian

4111	M	23	17	Ukrainian, Russian
4301	F	40	13	Ukrainian., Russian
4302	F	56	17	Ukrainian., Russian
4303	F	30	17	Ukrainian., Russian, English
4304	F	45	17	Ukrainian., Russian
4305	F	49	17	Ukrainian., Russian, English
4306	F	44	17	Ukrainian., Russian
4307	F	37	13	Ukrainian., Russian
4308	F	46	17	Ukrainian., Russian
4309	F	54	17	Ukrainian., Russian, Hungarian, Polish, Serbian, English
4310	F	57	17	Ukrainian., Russian
4311	F	56	17	Ukrainian., Russian
4312	F	54	17	Ukrainian., Russian
4313	F	48	17	Ukrainian., Russian, German, French
4314	F	32	17	Ukrainian., Russian
4315	F	33	17	Ukrainian., Russian
4316	F	35	13	Ukrainian., Russian
4317	F	59	13	Ukrainian., Russian
4318	F	42	13	Ukrainian., Russian
4401	F	49	13	Russian, Ukrainian
4402	F	42	22	Russian, Ukrainian
4403	F	29	17	Russian, Ukrainian
4404	F	45	17	Russian
4405	F	25	17	Russian, Ukrainian
4406	F	36	13	Russian
4407	M	20	15	Russian, Ukrainian
4408	F	39	13	Russian
4409	F	40	13	Russian
4410	F	55	17	Russian
4411	F	30	13	Russian
4412	F	26	17	Russian, Ukrainian.
4413	F	22	17	Russian, Ukrainian, English
4414	M	42	17	Russian
4415	F	56	17	Russian
4416	F	47	13	Russian
4417	M	35	17	Russian, Ukrainian.
4418	F	35	17	Russian
4419	F	38	17	Russian, English, Ukrainian
4420	F	54	13	Russian
4421	F	28	17	Russian, Ukrainian
4423	F	36	13	Russian
4424	F	33	17	Russian, Ukrainian
4425	F	46	17	Russian, Ukrainian