

« GGS » : THE FRENCH PILOT STUDY

A rapid assessment

*By Arnaud Régnier-Loilier (Ined)
2004, May.*

Introduction

Following the translation in French of the English version of the GGS questionnaire, a first pilot study was set up in March 2004. Optional modules, precise questions about the religion and some questions about the profession were not included.

This pilot study took place in two areas of France (Lyon and Nancy). Six investigators were in charge of this study, each one having to question 20 people.

Each investigator was to fill out a card (attached) as soon as he located a problematic point, a missing or erroneous filter, a badly formulated question, etc. This document facilitated the assessment of this first test and allowed to bring various corrections.

The aim of this first pilot study was triple:

1. to test the translation quality of the English version of the questionnaire (and thus the comprehension of the questions by respondents);
2. to evaluate the average timing of the interview, even if the questionnaire were not in its definitive form (for the moment, it's a paper and pencil questionnaire)
3. to evaluate acceptance by the respondents 2005 has to answer again in 2008

I – Simple statistics about the Paper and pencil pilot study (March 2004)

A. Respondents

Each investigator had 40 addresses-card to allow the realization of 20 interviews. On the whole, 111 people answered the questionnaire (table 1) and the totality (or almost) of addresses-card was used.

The goal of INSEE to draw 15.000 cards to hope to obtain 10.000 respondents appears thus underestimated. It would be advisable rather to carry out a pulling from at least 18.000 addresses-cards. The two second tests will make it possible to refine this first evaluation.

In this pilot study, there wasn't selection of the person in the household. Thus, we obtain a over-representation of women among the respondents (table 1).

TABLEAU 1 - Sex of respondent

SEX	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
men	32	28.83	32	28.83
women	79	71.17	111	100.00
together	111	100.0	-	-

Among the respondents, 60% live with a partner, having or not children (table 2). The number of people of the household seldom exceeds four people (table 3). The average age of the respondent is 48 years old (table 4)

TABLEAU 2 - % of respondents who live with a partner

VIECOUP	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
with a partner	66	59.46	66	59.46
alone	45	40.54	111	100.00

TABLEAU 3 - Number of person in the household

NBPERS	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	32	28.83	32	28.83
2	31	27.93	63	56.76
3	19	17.12	82	73.87
4	19	17.12	101	90.99
5	8	7.21	109	98.20
6	1	0.90	110	99.10
7	1	0.90	111	100.00

TABLEAU 4 - Overage age of the respondents / by sex

SEXE	N		Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
	Obs	N				
hommes	32	32	49.0312500	17.1322830	21.0000000	79.0000000
femmes	79	79	47.8987342	16.2343376	19.0000000	81.0000000
ensemble		111	48.2252252	16.4276290	19.0000000	81.0000000

B. Timing of the interview

One of the main goal of this pilot study was to give a first estimate of the duration of the interview, one hour not having to be exceeded.

Concerns of a relatively important going beyond of the time of making seem to be checked (table 5) since the average duration of the talks is one hour and quarter (77 minutes). Nevertheless, the durations are very variable. Without surprise, the duration of the questionnaire is all the more important as there are people in the household (table 6). Indeed, many questions take part in the description as precise as possible of the home environment of the respondent (children, date of birth, stepchildren, etc.). Moreover, some sets of questions are about the spouse/partner of the respondent, this explains that the interview is shorter when the respondent lives alone (table 7).

TABLEAU 5 - **Overage timing of the interview (in minutes)**

N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
111	76.6396396	26.4838863	30.0000000	180.0000000

TABLEAU 6 - **Overage timing of the interview (in minutes) by the number of people in the household**

NBPERS	N		Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
	Obs	N				
1	32	32	68.6250000	24.8657687	30.0000000	135.0000000
2	31	31	76.3225806	29.5233095	35.0000000	150.0000000
3	19	19	78.8421053	20.0118386	50.0000000	120.0000000
4 et plus	29	29	84.3793103	27.2166097	30.0000000	180.0000000

TABLEAU 7 - **Overage timing of the interview (in minutes) by the way of life (alone/with partner)**

VIECOUP	N		Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
	Obs	N				
w. partner	66	66	80.5000000	27.0152379	35.0000000	180.0000000
alone	45	45	70.9777778	24.9038961	30.0000000	135.0000000

It is noted that the men are of a few minutes less talkative than the women (table 8), information to be relativized because we don't know if they belonged to households with more or less members.

TABLEAU 8 - **Overage timing of the interview (in minutes) by sex**

SEXE	N Obs	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
men	32	32	74.6562500	28.3146028	30.0000000	180.0000000
women	79	79	78.3730380	25.8505303	30.0000000	150.0000000

Nevertheless, if the average timing of interview exceeds the 60 minutes, we can relativize it. In particular, if it is true that the questionnaire is very long, it is also necessary to underline its complexity. Indeed, the designers of the questionnaire had taken all the diversity of the situations in order to obtain a fine description of it. This required a lot off complex filters sometimes difficult to identify by the interviewer. We can hope for a saving of important time with the transposition of the questionnaire in his Capi version. We observe that the interviewers were more effective as they knew better the questionnaire and the filters. Thus, the overage timing for the five first interview of a same interviewer is approximately '85 minutes but only one hour (65 minutes) for the 16th to 20th interviews (table 9). The Capi system will probably allow to standardize the duration about one hour, filtering being automatic.

TABLEAU 9 - **Durée moyenne du questionnaire selon l'ordre de passation par enquêteur (en minutes)**

ORDRE	N Obs	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
1 à 5	30	30	85.1000000	31.9129743	43.0000000	180.0000000
6 à 10	30	30	82.7666667	26.3526264	43.0000000	150.0000000
11 à 15	27	27	72.5185185	20.6832715	30.0000000	135.0000000
16 à 20	24	24	65.0416667	18.8667620	30.0000000	88.0000000

Nevertheless, this assessment is only provisional because we used for this first pilot study a version of the questionnaire who didn't include – or partially – professional questions, religion question and none optional module. The next pilot survey, with Capi system and the whole version of questionnaire, will give a best estimation of the timing.

C. Longitudinal aspect. Which percentage of acceptance to take part in the second wave?

One of the ambitions of GGS is to be a longitudinal survey. The question of acceptance to participate at the seconde wave is thus important.

Three people out of four (76%) are not hostile with the idea to be recontacted three years after the first visit of the investigator (table 10). Nevertheless, this rate of acceptance differs according to various criteria. Among the people who had to answer this question of acceptance (people in the field of the follow-up, therefore old of less than 76 years), it is noted that young people (less than 25 years old) and oldest (more than 65 years old) accept less to be recontacted in 2008 (table 11). On the other hand, no difference appears according to the sex of the respondent (table 12).

We also observe a rate of acceptance stronger on behalf of respondents for which interview was long (86% when the interview lasted between 1H15 and 1H29 and 85% when the interview lasted 1H30 or more against 77% when the duration was less than one hour) (table 13). Indeed, the most complex situations (several people in the households, etc.) involve one longer duration of interview but also arouse more interest on behalf of the respondent. Thus, the rate of acceptance is more important.

But, behind these reassuring statistics, we are likely to lose many people lasting the three years which separate the two waves (people become out-field (>76 years old in 2005), change of residence, death, change of opinion about the acceptance of the seconde wave, etc.). It will be thus very important to maximize ours chances to keep the contact with the people who will accepte to be respondent in 2008, for example by asking adress and phone number of at least two relay-people (family) and to send them synthetic results of the first wave survey.

TABLEAU 10 - **General** acceptance

ACCEPT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
non réponse	9	8.18	9	8.18
non	17	15.45	26	23.64
oui	84	76.36	110	100.00

Frequency Missing = 1

TABLEAU 11 - Acceptation by the age of respondent

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	<i>acceptation ?</i>		Total
	non	oui	
18-24	2 1.98 33.33 11.76	4 3.96 66.67 4.76	6 5.94
25-34	2 1.98 11.76 11.76	15 14.85 88.24 17.86	17 16.83
35-44	3 2.97 15.00 17.65	17 16.83 85.00 20.24	20 19.80
45-54	4 3.96 18.18 23.53	18 17.82 81.82 21.43	22 21.78
55-64	1 0.99 6.67 5.88	14 13.86 93.33 16.67	15 14.85
65 et +	5 4.95 23.81 29.41	16 15.84 76.19 19.05	21 20.79
Total	17 16.83	84 83.17	101 100.00

TABLEAU 12 - Acceptation by the sex

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	<i>acceptation ?</i>		Total
	non	oui	
men	5 4.95 17.86 29.41	23 22.77 82.14 27.38	28 27.72
women	12 11.88 16.44 70.59	61 60.40 83.56 72.62	73 72.28
Total	17 16.83	84 83.17	101 100.00

TABLEAU 13 - Acceptation by the duration of the 2005'interview

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	<i>acceptation ?</i>		Total
	non	oui	
< 1H00	4 3.96 22.22 23.53	14 13.86 77.78 16.67	18 17.82
1H00 - 1H15	5 4.95 18.52 29.41	22 21.78 81.48 26.19	27 26.73
1H15 - 1H30	4 3.96 13.79 23.53	25 24.75 86.21 29.76	29 28.71
> 1H30	4 3.96 14.81 23.53	23 22.77 85.19 27.38	27 26.73
Total	17 16.83	84 83.17	101 100.00

II – Modifications made to the questionnaire following the first test "paper" (march 2004)

In addition to these two goals of the first pilot survey (timing of the interview and longitudinal aspect) of the paper and pencil test of March 2004, the aim of this investigation was also to locate the disfonctionnements form. Which are the filters erroneous or missing ? Which are the badly formulated questions or not understood questions? Which interviewer use the Cards?

About this last point, no specific instructions was given to the interviewer. Some of them used systematically the cards, others never. Each one has its manner of proceding and the interveiwier adapts it to the particular situations. The use or not of these cards didn't seems to have a particular incidence on the course of interview.

Hereafter, some of the principal remarks given by the interviewers following the first pilot study. The reference of the questions (numero) corresponds to the English version of questionnaire.

QUESTION <i>(english questionnaire)</i>	PROBLEM
2.09	- We precise that we have not to include current pregnancies?
3.24	- We have to precise "by the usual means of transport" - If there is two usual means of transport (50 – 50), we have to precise "by that witch is fastest"
3.12d	- missing item : "health of the spouse/partner"
3.49a, b	- missing filter when the union ended because of the death of the partner (answer "partner died" in 3.43)
3.49 / 3.50	- What instruction when the couple is waiting for a divorce (when their divorce proceedings are under way)? => We propose to add an item "divorce proceedings under way"
3.49 3.50	=> We propose to ask the date of beginning of the procedure of divorce
4.01	- About "who does what": there is no question about "who does the washing" ; "who does some ironing". It's an important activity to estimate the allocation of the tasks in the household => We add two questions
4.01	- What instruction when there is a dishwasher in the household ? => Instruction : In this case, who puts the crockery in the dishwasher?
4.05c, d	- item "the time you / your partner spend in paid work" => Instruction: when it is the employer who decides, code 7
6. fertility	- Why not be interested in the preference of sex among pregnant women? => We add a question in the "current pregnancy" module

6.11	- question badly understood by the respondents : the problem is “now”. What does it mean exactly? The question is sometimes understood like this : “are you currently trying to have a baby” => Could you precise the aim of this question ?
6.12 / 6.16	- some people say that they can physically have a child but avoid having one because of their health or that of the child to be born (hereditary disease) => We add a specific item
6. intentions	- “intentions to have children” : why do not ask this module when there is a current pregnancy? => We ask this questions/module at everyone
3.33	- I think it will be better to precise <u>in the question</u> the definition of “live with someone as a couple” => (to live at least three months)
6.07 6.08	- according to our estimates, there will be not enough concerned people to provide to exploit this question (approximately 5-10) => We propose to change this question in “Did you have already do something to help you to get pregnant?” => We propose to change 6.08 in “when did you for the first time doing something to help you...”
8.37 / 9.25	- Non exclusive items => We have to change them
8.45	- In the question, we have the word “contract” and the fourth item is “no written contract”, that it means from the legal point of view “no contract”

Conclusion and principal following stages

The first pilot study shows that there is a relatively good perception of the questionnaire, according to the return of each interviewer. Principal remarks of the interviewer were due to the multitude of filters and the complexity of the paper and pencil questionnaire, mainly on behalf of those who had never used a paper and pencil way of investigation.

Worries about the interview time (77 minutes) can be relativized, in particular because of the form "paper" of this first pilot study. The filters will automate and simplify the interview. We can thus attend significant fall of the duration with the Capi system, which could make pass the questionnaire under one hour average timing, in spite of the introduction of some new questions. But it's necessary to await first CAPI test to have a more precise idea of this question.

The longitudinal ambition of GGS could be satisfied, the rate of acceptance of one second interrogation three years after the first one being relatively good. But it will be important to maximize our chances to keep the contact until 2008 with the respondents at the first wave (2005) by asking address and phone number of at least two relay-people (family) and to send them synthetic results of the first wave survey.

This test also allow to update some of persistent problems in the current version of the questionnaire (missing filters, questions badly understood or items not very satisfactory).

Currently, we are transposing the paper version in a Capi Version. The next pilot survey, this time in data-processing form, will take place in 3 areas of the country. It will take place with the autumn (at the beginning of November 2004). 150 people will be interrogated. This second test has two principal goals:

1. to validate the corrections brought to the questionnaire (formulation, filter) at the following of the first test; to locate the filters and formulations which remain problematic in particular because of the "capisation";
2. to evaluate the average duration of the interview after the modification of the questionnaire (addition of some complementary questions) in its data-processing form.

A third pilot study will take place after.

*For the Ined team (France)
Arnaud Régnier-Loilier, 2004, may.*

APPENDIX

QUESTION <i>(english questionnaire)</i>	PROBLEM
2.09	We precise that we have not to include current pregnancies?
3.24	- We have to precise “by the usual means of transport” - If there is two usual means of transport (50 – 50), we have to precise “by that witch is fastest”
3.12d	- missing item : “health of the spouse/partner”
3.49a, b	- missing filter when the union ended because of the death of the partner (answer “partner died” in 3.43)
3.49 / 3.50	- What instruction when the couple is waiting for a divorce (when their divorce proceedings are under way)? => We propose to add an item “divorce proceedings under way”
3.49 3.50	=> We propose to ask the date of beginning of the procedure of divorce
4.01 4.01	- About “who does what”: there is no question about “who does the washing” ; “who does some ironing”. It’s an important activity to estimate the allocation of the tasks in the household => We add two questions
4.01	- What instruction when there is a dishwasher in the household ? => Instruction : In this case, who puts the crockery in the dishwasher?
4.05c, d	- item “the time you / your partner spend in paid work” => Instruction: when it is the employer who decides, code 7
6. fertility	- Why not be interested in the preference of sex among pregnant women? => We add a question in the “current pregnancy” module
6.11	- question badly understood by the respondents : the problem is “now”. What does it means exactly? The question is sometime understood like this : “are you currently trying to have a baby” => Could you precise the aim of this question ?
6.12 / 6.16	- some people say that they can physically have a child but avoid having one because of their health or that of the child to be born (hereditary disease) => We add a specific item
6. intentions	- “intentions to have children” : why do not ask this module when there is a current pregnancy? => We ask this questions/module at everyone
3.33	- I think it will be better to precise <u>in the question</u> the definition of “live with someone as a couple” => (to live at least three months)
6.07 6.08	- according to our estimates, there will be not enough concerned people to provide to exploit this question (approximately 5-10) => We propose to change this question in “Did you have already do something to help you to get pregnant?” => We propose to change 6.08 in “when did you for the first time doing something to help you...”
8.37 / 9.25	- Non excusive items => We have to change them
8.45	- In the question, we have the word “contract” and the fourth item is “no written contract”, that it means from the legal point of view “no contract”