



MAFE Methodological Note 2

Migrations between Africa and Europe: Data Collection Report

SCHOUMAKER Bruno, UCL

DIAGNE Alioune, UCL

May 2010



*Funded under the
Socio-economic
Sciences & Humanities
Theme*



Data Collection Report

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
FOREWORD	4
A. DATA COLLECTION IN AFRICA	5
A.1. INTRODUCTION	6
A.2. DATA COLLECTION SCHEDULE	6
A.3. SAMPLING.....	7
A.4. SURVEY STAFF	9
A.5. TRAINING SESSIONS	11
A.6. DATA COLLECTION AND PROCESSING OF QUESTIONNAIRES	12
B. DATA COLLECTION IN EUROPE	16
B.1. INTRODUCTION	17
B.2. DATA COLLECTION SCHEDULE	17
B.3. SAMPLING.....	18
B.4. SURVEY STAFF	19
B.5. TRAINING.....	22
B.6. DATA COLLECTION AND PROCESSING OF QUESTIONNAIRES	23

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Six European countries and three African countries participated in the MAFE surveys. Data collection was carried out in both sending countries in Africa and destination countries in Europe, in order to constitute transnational samples. At the end of data collection, each team provided a synthetic data collection report. This report is a synthesis of the country reports in Africa and Europe. The first part of the report is on data collection in Africa, and the second part on Europe.

Data collection in the three African countries was coordinated by the African partners of the project: IPDSR in Senegal, the Department of population and development of the University of Kinshasa in DR Congo and the Centre for Migration Studies of University of Ghana. The surveys were conducted in 2008 in Dakar (Senegal), and in 2009 in Kinshasa (DR Congo) and in Accra and Kumasi (Ghana). Two questionnaires were used: A household questionnaire, and a biographic questionnaire. The number of households successfully interviewed varied between 1143 in Senegal and 1616 in DR Congo. The number of biographic questionnaires varied between 1067 in Senegal and 1666 in DR Congo.

Data collection in the six European countries was organized by the European partners of the project: INED in France, FIERI in Italy, University Pompeu Fabra in Spain, University of Sussex in the United Kingdom, University of Maastricht in the Netherlands, and the Catholic University of Louvain (UCL) in Belgium. Surveys were conducted in 2008 (France, Spain, Italy) and 2009-2010 (Belgium, the Netherlands, United Kingdom). In France, Spain and Italy, survey firms were hired to conduct the survey (CSA in France, DOXA in Italy and Metroscopia in Spain), in close collaboration with the researchers in charge of the project. In Belgium, UK and the Netherlands, the surveys were organized and supervised by the universities. Only biographic data were collected in Europe, using the same biographic questionnaire as the one used in Africa. Overall, approximately 1450 migrants were successfully interviewed (200 Senegalese in France, 198 Senegalese in Spain, and 202 Senegalese in Italy; 138 Ghanaians in the United Kingdom and 279 Ghanaians in the Netherlands; 278 Congolese in Belgium and 150 Congolese in the United Kingdom).

The main activities related to data collection consisted in organizing a pilot survey (only in Africa), implementing the sampling strategy, recruiting and training the survey staff (interviewers, supervisors, editors, coders, data entry staff), carrying out the survey (interviews, editing) and data entry and cleaning. In total, more than 200 people were recruited and trained for data collection and data entry (approximate 120 in Africa and 110 in Europe). Approximately 5500 biographies were collected (around 4000 in Africa and 1500 in Europe), and around 4000 household questionnaires were successfully completed in Africa. Thanks to the dedication and hard work of the research teams and survey staff, no major difficulty was encountered, although data collection and data entry experienced some delays in several countries.

FOREWORD

Data collection was carried out in both sending countries in Africa and destination countries in Europe, in order to constitute transnational samples. Six European countries and three African countries participated in the MAFE surveys.

At the end of data collection, each team provided a synthetic data collection report. The reports detail all the activities that were carried out as part of the survey, as well as the difficulties that the team encountered during the preparation of the survey, data collection and data entry. These reports thus provide valuable information on the whole process, from the sampling phase to the cleaning of data files, as well as on the training of interviewers and fieldwork.

This report is a synthesis of the country reports in Africa and Europe, and was prepared by the UCL team, in charge of the coordination of data collection in the countries participating in the MAFE project. The first part of the report is on data collection in Africa, and the second part on Europe. Although data collection in Senegal, France, Spain and Italy was carried out before the EU-funded FP7 project, these countries are also included in this document to get a complete picture of data collection in the MAFE countries.

A. DATA COLLECTION IN AFRICA

A.1. INTRODUCTION

Data collection in the three African countries was coordinated by the African partners of the project: IPDSR in Senegal, the Department of population and development of the University of Kinshasa in DR Congo and the Centre for Migration Studies of University of Ghana. Technical assistance was provided by the other MAFE partners - mainly by INED and UCL - at various stages of the study (sampling, organisation of editing, data entry,...). Each team was headed by one researcher in charge of the coordination and of the follow-up of the activities. The local coordinators were also in regular contact with the INED and UCL teams, in charge respectively of the overall coordination of the MAFE project and of the coordination of data collection (UCL).

A.2. DATA COLLECTION SCHEDULE

The project started in Senegal in 2007 and was extended to Ghana and DR Congo in 2009. MAFE surveys were conducted in Africa in 2008 and in 2009. The experience gained from the Senegalese survey as well as the meetings between the various teams helped improve the data collection tools and process for DR Congo and Ghana.

Table A-1. Dates of activities related to data collection in the 3 African MAFE countries

Activities	Senegal	Ghana	DR Congo
Sampling			
Sampling of survey sites (PSU)	November 2007	May 2009	June 2009
Listing of households in selected survey sites	December 2007	May 2009	June 2009
Sampling of households	January 2008	July 2009	July 2009
Pilot survey			
Training for household survey	July 2007	April - May 2009	May 2009
Training for biographic survey	August 2007	May 2009	May 2009
Data collection (household)	July-August 2007	May 2009	May -June 2009
Data collection (biographic)	August 2007	May 2009	May -June 2009
Training of interviewers			
Training for household survey	January 2008	June 2009	July 2009
Training for biographic survey	March 2008	June -July 2009	July - August 2009
Fieldwork			
Data collection of household questionnaires	January - February 2008	July 2009 - January 2010	August - November 2009
Data collection of biographic questionnaires	March - June 2008	July 2009 - January 2010	August -November 2009
Editing and data coding			
Editing and coding of household questionnaires	January - February 2008	July 2009 - January 2010	August - November 2009
Editing and coding of biographic questionnaires	April - June 2008	July 2009 - January 2010	August - November 2009
Data entry			
Quick data entry (sampling frame for biographic surveys and contacts in Europe)	February - March 2008	-	-
Data entry of household questionnaires	April - May 2008	February-March 2010	Not started as of April 23, 2010
Data entry of biographic questionnaires	July - August 2008	February-March 2010	Not started as of April 23, 2010
Data cleaning	August-September 2008	February-March 2010	Not started as of April 23, 2010

In Senegal, data collection activities started in November 2007 (selection of survey sites in Dakar and listing of households in the selected sites). They ended in September 2008 (data entry and data cleaning). Overall, 11 months were necessary to carry out all the activities related to data collection, and fieldwork lasted a little less than 6 months. In Senegal, data collection was organized in two separate stages: the household survey was first conducted, and the biographic survey started after the household survey had been completed. The data collected in the household survey was used to prepare a sampling frame of individuals for the biographic survey; quick data

entry of part of the questionnaires of the household survey was thus necessary before starting data collection for the biographic survey. Although this approach had advantages, it also lengthened the data collection process. This approach was not used for surveys in Ghana and DR Congo, where both surveys were conducted simultaneously.

In Ghana, the preparation of data collection started in February 2009, and a pilot survey was organized in May 2009. The selection of survey sites and the listing of households in the sites were carried out in May 2009. Fieldwork started in July 2009 and lasted approximately 6 months (from July 2009 to January 2010). Several interviewers dropped out during data collection and could not be replaced, which contributed to lengthening the fieldwork. Editing and data coding were done in parallel with data collection, and were over by the end of January 2010. Data entry and data cleaning started in February 2010, and ended in March 2010. As of end of April, data cleaning was still in progress.

In DR Congo, the survey preparation started in March 2009. A pilot survey was organized in May-June 2009. The selection of the survey sites was done in June 2009, and the listing of the households in the selected sites started in June and ended in July 2009. Data collection started in early August, soon after the training of interviewers and the sampling of households. It lasted for about 4 months, until mid November. Like in Ghana, both the household and biographic surveys were conducted at the same time. Editing and coding was also done during the fieldwork and ended a few weeks after the fieldwork. Because of administrative problems with money transfer, data entry had not started yet as of end of April 2010. It is expected to start in May 2010.

A.3. SAMPLING

In the three African countries, stratified random samples of households and individuals in the target areas were selected. The target areas were the city of Kinshasa in DR Congo, the city of Dakar in Senegal, and two cities (Accra and Kumasi) in Ghana. In each of the cities, a sampling frame of primary sampling units was prepared. In Senegal and Ghana, recent censuses were available and served as sampling frames at the first stage. In DR Congo, no recent census was available. The sampling frame of the 2007 DHS was used to selected neighbourhoods, and in each selected neighbourhoods, a sampling frame of streets was prepared.

At the first stage, census enumeration areas were randomly selected in Ghana and Senegal. In Ghana, 80 enumeration areas were selected with a probability proportional to size; in Dakar, 60 enumeration areas were selected with a probability proportional to the number of households with migrants. In DR Congo, a sample of 29 neighbourhoods (out of 324) was selected randomly with a probability proportional to size, and 3 streets were selected randomly with a probability proportional to size in each neighbourhood. The sample was stratified at the first stage in Senegal (10 strata) and in DR Congo (3 strata), but not in Ghana where no information was available for stratifying.

A listing operation was carried out in each of the selected survey sites (enumeration areas or streets) to prepare the sampling frame of households. The listing consisted in enumerating all the households in the selected sites, and in identifying whether these households included migrants or not. In Senegal, two strata were constituted at the second stage (households with migrants or without migrants). In Ghana and DR Congo, the stratification was further refined, and three categories of households were distinguished (households with return migrants, with migrants abroad, and without migrants). The sampling rate was higher in strata of households with migrants, in order to get a sufficient sample of such households. The selected number of households was 1320 in Senegal, 1920 in Ghana and 1773 in DR Congo. The number of households successfully interviewed was 1143 in Senegal, 1248 in Ghana and 1616 in DR Congo.

Table A-2. Sampling characteristics in African countries

	Senegal	Ghana	DR Congo
Target areas	Dakar	Accra and Kumasi	Kinshasa
Sampling frames	2002 Population and Housing Census	2000 Population and Housing Census	Sampling frame of 2007 DHS
Sampling stages	Selection of 60 census enumeration areas	Selection of 60 census enumeration areas in Accra and 20 in Kumasi	Selection of 29 neighbourhoods and 3 streets per neighbourhood (87 sampling units)
Stratification	Stratification at first stage into 10 strata based on the proportion of international migrants. Oversampling of enumeration areas with high proportion of migrants. Two strata at the second stage: households with migrants, households without migrants	Stratification at first stage into two cities (Accra and Kumasi) Three strata at the second stage: households with migrants abroad, with return migrants, without migrants	Stratification at first stage into three strata based on prevalence of migration Three strata at the second stage: households with migrants abroad, with return migrants, without migrants
Selection of households	Random selection of 22 households per enumeration areas. 11 households selected in each of the two strata. If less than 11 households available in one or several strata, the remaining households are selected in the other stratum.	Random selection of 24 households per enumeration areas. 8 households selected in each of the 3 strata. If less than 8 households available in one or several strata, the remaining households are selected in the other stratum.	Random selection of 21 households per enumeration areas. 8 households selected in each of the 3 strata. If less than 7 households available in one or several strata, the remaining households are selected in the other stratum. In a few streets, there were less than 21 households; all of them were selected.
Selection of individuals	People aged 25-75, born in Senegal and who have/had Senegalese citizenship. Up to two return migrants and partners of migrants, and one randomly selected other eligible person. Return migrants are eligible if their first departure was above at 18 or over.	People aged 25-75, born in Ghana. All the return migrants and partners of migrants, and one randomly selected other eligible person. Return migrants are eligible if their first departure was above at 18 or over.	People aged 25-75, born in DR Congo. All the return migrants and partners of migrants, and one randomly selected other eligible person. Return migrants are eligible if their first departure was above at 18 or over.
Sample size (selected households)	1320 households	1920 households (1440 in Accra and 480 in Kumasi)	1773 households
Completed household questionnaires	1143 households	1248 households	1616 households
Completed biographic questionnaires	1067 individuals	1316 individuals	1666 individuals

In each of the selected households, one or several respondents were selected among the eligible people (people aged between 25 and 75, and born in the origin country¹). In Ghana and DR Congo, all the return migrants² and partners of migrants currently abroad were selected. In addition, one other eligible member was randomly selected. A special tool had been designed so that the interviewers could randomly select the people during the fieldwork. In Senegal, up to two return migrants and partner of migrants were randomly selected, and another individual was randomly selected. The selection of the individuals for the biographic survey was done in a different way in Senegal. The household survey was first conducted, and a quick data entry of eligible individuals was done to build the sampling frame. The sample was then selected from that frame. The number of individuals could not be determined precisely before the survey, because it depended on the number of migrants and partners found in the households. In the end, the number of individuals

¹ In Senegal, an additional condition was that people had the Senegalese citizenship at birth. This condition was dropped in Ghana and DR Congo, because it complicated the sampling of individuals, and very few people born and living in these countries did not have the citizenship of the country at birth.

² Return migrants were considered as such if they had left their country for the first time at age 18 or over.

successfully interviewed is a little higher than the number of households (1067 in Senegal, 1316 in Ghana and 1666 in DR Congo).

A.4. SURVEY STAFF

In addition to the coordinators, four categories of staff have participated in the MAFE surveys: (1) interviewers (2) fieldwork supervisors, (3) editors and coders, and (4) data entry agents.

A.4.1. Interviewers

The main role of the interviewers was to collect information using face-to-face interviews with randomly selected respondents. In the three countries, the interviewers were trained to use both the household questionnaire and the biographic questionnaires. In addition to interviewing the respondents, interviewers also had to convince people to participate in the surveys.

Table A-3. Survey staff: composition and recruitment

	Senegal	Ghana	DR Congo
Number of teams	4	4	4
Number of interviewers and gender composition	20 (10 males & 10 females)	16 (9 males & 7 females)	19 (14 males & 5 females)
Number of supervisors	4	4	4
Team compositions	5 interviewers and 1 supervisor per team (total 24)	4 interviewers and 1 supervisor per team (total 20)	5 interviewers in 3 teams, and 4 interviewers in one team. One supervisor per team (total 23)
Editors	9	4	5
Coding staff		2	1 (also editor)
Data entry staff	6	7	20
Recruitment issues	No specific issue	No specific issue. More than 100 applications out of which 35 were interviewed and 26 were selected and trained. Recalcitrant interviewers were dropped.	No specific difficulties for initial recruitment. Four interviewers were dropped because they did not match to expectations.
Evolution of the team of interviewers during fieldwork	No change during the survey.	Some interviewers left before the end of the survey. Two depleted teams were merged to work in selected enumeration areas.	Some interviewers left before the end of the survey.
Specialisation of interviewers for specific questionnaires	The survey was organized in two stages; the interviewers were first trained for the household questionnaire, and later for the biographic questionnaire. The same interviewers participated in both surveys.	No, all the interviewers used household and biographic questionnaires	No, all the interviewers used household and biographic questionnaires

20 interviewers were recruited in Senegal (10 males and 10 females), 16 in Ghana (9 males, 7 females) and 19 in DR Congo (14 males and 5 females). The interviewers were recruited based on their skills and their professional experience. All of them had already participated in at least one socio-economic survey before. Most of them (except in DR Congo), however, had not participated in biographic surveys. As a result, the training stage was all the more important to master the tools of the biographic survey.

In Senegal, all the interviewers selected for the training were retained to be part of the data collection team. In contrast, in Ghana and DR Congo, some interviewers were dropped after the training, because they did not meet up with the expectation of the coordinators. In Ghana, 100 applications were received. 35 people were shortlisted, 26 of them were selected for the training of interviewers, and only 16 interviewers were retained to be part of the data collection teams. The supervisors all had participated in the pilot survey. In DR Congo, out of the 23 interviewers who

participated in the training, 19 were selected for the fieldwork. In this country, approximately half of the interviewers had already participated in a similar survey in 2007 and had a strong experience with the biographic questionnaire.

A.4.2. Supervisors

Interviewers worked in teams under the supervision of a supervisor. In each country, interviewers were organized into four teams of 4 to 5 interviewers, and one supervisor. Overall, around 20 to 25 interviewers and supervisors were involved in data collection in each country. In the three countries, the supervisors were selected among the most experienced or gifted interviewers. They also had participated in the pilot survey in the three countries, and as a result had a very good knowledge of the questionnaires and of potential problems. They also proved to be valuable assistants during the training of interviewers.

The role of supervisors was to coordinate and control the work of the interviewers in the team during fieldwork. Their work included identifying the survey sites and the selected households, allocating work to interviewers, helping interviewers with possible problems, helping convince households and individuals to participate in the survey, do a quick checking of the questionnaires, and have contacts with the survey coordinators and editors. Supervisors were also responsible for the awareness-raising activities in the selected sites.

A.4.3. Editors and coding staff

Directly after being filled, questionnaires were checked by the interviewers and supervisors. They were then sent to a small team of editors for an in-depth reading. The editors consisted of 9 people in Senegal, 6 in Ghana and 5 in DR Congo. Almost all of them had higher education (master students) and a strong experience in survey data collection. The team had followed the same training as the interviewers, and also received a specific training for editing the questionnaires.

Editors worked in an office dedicated to this task, and were not on the field with interviewers. Their role consisted of detecting missing data and/or inconsistencies in questionnaires, which were recorded on a specific grid for each questionnaire. After editing, the grid and the questionnaires were transmitted to the interviewers for corrections (who sometimes needed to go back to the household where the survey was carried out). Editors worked in close collaboration with the supervisors, who acted as intermediates between them and the interviewers. Questionnaires without errors and corrected questionnaires were ready for data entry.

In Senegal, editors were also in charge of coding the questions on localities and on professions. In Ghana and DR Congo, coding of localities was also done by the editors, while the coding of professions was done in a separate step (after the end of data collection) by a different team. The coding of professions was done using the same list of codes for all the surveys (including the surveys in Europe). The coding of some open questions (migration motives, choice of destination...) was not done before data entry. It was decided to do the coding after data entry, using the information collected in all the countries.

A.4.4. Data entry staff

Data entry was performed using MS Access programs prepared by INED. In Senegal, data entry of household and biographic questionnaires was contracted to an external team (IRD), and was carried out in their premises. The data entry staff was composed of 6 persons (4 males and 2 females), trained for data entry of the MAFE questionnaires. In Ghana, 7 people were recruited by the coordinating team (CMS) for data entry and trained by the local team with technical assistance from INED. All of them had a good experience in data entry. In DR Congo, the data entry staff was also recruited by the University of Kinshasa and trained by the coordinating team, INED and UCL. As of

end of April 2010, data entry had not yet begun in Kinshasa and refresher training for the data entry staff was being planned.

A.5. Training sessions

The training of the interviewers was done in two stages. Interviewers were first trained for the household questionnaire, and next for the biographic questionnaire. In DR Congo and in Ghana, the second training session was organized just after the first session. In Senegal, the training for the biographic questionnaires took place several weeks later, after the data collection of household questionnaires.

A.5.1. Trainers and participants

In each country, all the interviewers, supervisors and editors participated in the training. In Ghana, data entry staff also participated in the training sessions. The training was organized by the local teams, but benefitted from the assistance of European partners (INED, UCL, and the University of Maastricht). The trainers in Ghana and DR Congo all had participated in the “training of trainers” session organized in March 2009 in Paris, or had themselves already trained the trainers.

A.5.2. Organisation and content of the training

In the three African MAFE countries, the training of interviewers was organized in the premises of the partner universities (IPDSR at University Cheikh Anta Diop in Dakar, CMS at the University of Ghana, and DSPD at the University of Kinshasa). In the three countries, similar training tools were used. Powerpoint slides were used throughout the training and also served as interviewers manuals. Overall, no major difficulties were encountered during the training of interviewers. Trainers had a large experience in training of interviewers.

Household questionnaire

The organization of the training sessions varied across countries. In DR Congo and in Ghana, one training session was organized for all the interviewers, while in Senegal, the team was divided into two groups and the training was organized in two successive waves.

Table A-4. Training of survey staff

	Senegal	Ghana	DR Congo
Household questionnaire			
Duration	5 days	6 days	6 days
Trainers	Martine Quaglia (INED) Alioune Diagne (IPDSR)	Cynthia Adoquaye Tagoe (CMS) Peter Quartey (CMS) Faustina Frempong (CMS) Alioune Diagne (UCL, pilot survey)	José Mangalu (UNIKIN) Jocelyn Nappa (UNIKIN) Bruno Schoumaker (UCL) Lama Kabbanji (INED) Alioune Diagne (UCL, pilot survey)
Participants	2 groups of 15 persons each (10 interviewers, 2 supervisors, 3 editors)	All interviewers (16), supervisors (4), editors (4), coders (2) and data entry staff (7)	All the interviewers (19), supervisors (4) and editors/coders (5).
Biographic questionnaire			
Duration	8 days	6 days	10 days
Trainers	Alioune Diagne (IPDSR) David Lessault (INED) Géraldine vivier (INED)	Coordinating Team Valentina Mazzucato (U. Maastricht, pilot survey), Alioune Diagne (UCL, pilot survey)	Bruno Schoumaker (UCL) José Mangalu (UNIKIN) Lama Kabbanji (INED) Jocelyn Nappa (UNIKIN)
Participants	2 groups of 15 persons each (10 interviewers, 2 supervisors, 3 editors)	All interviewers (16), supervisors (4), editors (4), coders (2) and data entry staff (7)	All the interviewers (19), supervisors (4) and editors/coders (5).

In Senegal, the first part of the training was organized for all the people involved in data collection and editing³. The objective was to train all the interviewers, supervisors and editors to the content and the use of the questionnaires. The training combined theory and practice. It included a presentation of the MAFE project, an in-depth presentation of the questionnaire, exercises and role plays, and 'real world' practice), so that participants could be operational after the training. An additional session was organized for supervisors and editors/coding agents, and focused on the specific tasks of these persons and the tools used for the quick reading and editing of the questionnaires (see tools). The training for the household questionnaire lasted 5 days for the interviewers (10 days for the two teams), and two additional days for the supervisors and editors.

The training in Ghana and DR Congo benefited from the Senegalese experience, but was organized in a slightly different way. In Ghana, the first training session was organized for all the people involved in data collection and editing (6 days). A second session was organized for editors and coding staff (1/2 day), and a third session involved data entry staff only (3 days). Supervisors and editors were trained for their specific tasks (half a day). In DR Congo the first training session on the household questionnaire was organized for the whole team (6 days). A two-day specific session was organized for the supervisors, and another session (one day) was organized for editors and coding staff. The data entry agents were trained later for 5 days. Like in Senegal, the training in Ghana and DR Congo combined theory and practice.

Biographic questionnaire

In DR Congo and in Ghana, both surveys (household and biographic) were conducted simultaneously. As a result, the training of interviewers for the biographic questionnaire was done just after the training for the household questionnaire. In Senegal, the biographic survey started after the end of the household survey. For this reason, the training of interviewers for the biographic questionnaire was done just before the biographic survey. The duration of the training for the biographic questionnaire varied from one country to the other. It lasted 10 days in DR Congo, 8 days in Senegal and 6 days in Ghana. The difference is essentially explained by the number of fieldwork tests before starting the survey.

The organization of the training also differed a little across countries. In Senegal, the participants were divided into two groups of 15 persons (10 interviewers, 2 supervisors and 3 editors), and were trained by two different trainers at the same time. This was decided to keep the number of participants reasonably small, to allow more exercises and role plays than in a large group. In DR Congo and in Ghana, it was decided not to train two groups separately. However, several interviewers and supervisors had participated in the pilot survey and knew the questionnaire very well, and helped the trainers during the training.

Like for the household questionnaire the training combined theory and practice. Interviewers also had to interview at least one person from outside the group (a neighbour, a friend..) during the training.

A.6. DATA COLLECTION AND PROCESSING OF QUESTIONNAIRES

A.6.1. General organisation

The general organization of the surveys has been very similar in the three countries. The major difference lied in the fact that - in Senegal - the household and biographic surveys were conducted consecutively, while both surveys were conducted simultaneously in Ghana and DR Congo.

³ Ces derniers étaient divisés en deux groupes formés en deux vagues

In the three countries, interviewers worked in teams under the supervision of a supervisor. Each team of interviewers was in charge of specific survey sites that had been sampled by the coordinating team [see sampling section]. The survey sites allocated to a team were close to each other, in order to facilitate transportation and limit the dispersion of interviewers⁴. As a general rule, each team was working in one place (census district or street depending on the country) at a time, and went on to the next place after all the interviews had been carried out. In some instances however, interviewers needed to go back to a previous place because a respondent could not participate before. In all three countries, early morning, evenings and week ends were the best times for meeting respondents, as most of them were working during weekdays. Some respondents also asked to be interviewed on their workplace. The teams usually worked 6 days a week, although the schedules were adapted to specific situations. For instance, interviewers usually worked on Sundays, but some interviewers attended Church in the morning and worked only on Sunday afternoon.

In *Senegal*, each of the four teams was in charge of 15 census districts (60 districts). The teams had been formed according to the place of residence of the interviewers, and the districts were allocated so that the displacements of the interviewers could be minimized. The editors and coders were working in the IRD office in Dakar (Hann). This place was offering good working conditions (workspace, stocking space) and was also close to the data entry office. A coordination meeting between supervisors and editors was organized weekly, in order to facilitate communication between data collection teams and editors. During these meetings, specific issues encountered during data collection and editing were discussed, and contributed to improve the quality of the work and reduce misunderstandings between interviewers and editors. Regular fieldwork visits were also organized for editors, so that they could discuss with interviewers.

Ghana was the only country where data collection was organized in two different cities. While in Senegal and DR Congo, data collection was limited to the capital city (Dakar and Kinshasa), both Accra and Kumasi were covered by the MAFE survey in Ghana. Three of the four teams of interviewers worked in Accra, and one team worked in Kumasi. Like in Senegal, the teams had been allocated a limited number of census districts. As said before, the household survey and the biographic surveys were conducted at the same time. This meant that interviewers and supervisors were in charge of the selection of individual respondents for the biographic survey from the list of household members. Regular meetings with supervisors and editors were also organized in order to improve data quality.

In *DR Congo*, the survey was organized in a similar way as in Ghana. Four teams of interviewers were allocated to four areas in Kinshasa, and each team was headed by a supervisor. The interviewers were also responsible for selecting the individual respondents from the household. Editing and coding were organized in the premises of the University of Kinshasa and was carried out by a team of five persons. One of the team members was in charge of coding the professions, while the four other persons were in charge of editing. A coordination meeting with supervisors and editors was organized weekly.

A.6.2. Administration of questionnaires

The average duration of interviews for the household questionnaires was about 45 minutes-1 hour in Senegal, and a little shorter in DR Congo and Ghana. This can be explained by the larger household size in Senegal compared to the other two countries. The average duration of the biographic questionnaires were also around 45 minutes, but it varied greatly depending on the age and migration status of the respondents.

⁴ It was sometimes necessary for interviewers to go back to a previous site to complete an interview. This was facilitated by the fact that the various sites were in the same area.

In Ghana and in DR Congo, the respondents for the biographic survey were selected by the interviewers and/or supervisors among the eligible persons in the households. A special grid had been designed so that the selection could be done during the fieldwork. In Senegal, the two surveys were conducted consecutively, and the respondents for the biographic survey had been selected from the list of eligible household members collected in the household survey.

Table A-5. Summary of data collection and issues in Africa

Country	Household questionnaire		Biographic questionnaire		Major difficulties
	Completed questionnaires	Average duration	Completed questionnaires	Average duration	
Senegal	1144	45 minutes to 1 hour	1067	Between 1 hour and 2 hours	No major difficulties
DR Congo	1616	Around 45 minutes	1666	Between 1 hour and 2 hours	Some selected households could not be found
Ghana	1248	Around 45 minutes	1306	Between 1 hour and 2 hours	Some selected households could not be found

The number of completed household questionnaires varies between 1144 in Senegal and 1616 in DR Congo, and the number of biographic questionnaires between 1397 in Senegal and 1666 in DR Congo.

A.6.3.Editing of questionnaires

Given the load of work of the supervisors and the length of the questionnaires, it was not possible for the supervisors to do an in-depth reading of all the questionnaires. Supervisors were asked to do a fast reading of the questionnaires, using a check list with the most common problems. If the supervisor considered the questionnaire was correctly filled in, it was sent to the editors. Otherwise, the interviewers had to correct the questionnaire.

The editing involved a much more detailed reading and a much longer work. Most missing values and inconsistencies were detected at this stage, before data entry. As said before, editors were working in an office. The fact that they were working together allowed them to share experience and discuss specific issues. In all the countries, they had regular contacts with the supervisors, allowing them to give feedback to supervisors and interviewers.

In Senegal, 9 people were in charge of the editing of questionnaires and one of them was in charge of coding. In Ghana, 4 people were in charge of this work, and 5 people did the editing in Kinshasa - one of them also doing the coding of professions.

A.6.4.Coding

Questions on professions were coded before data entry, using a list of codes prepared by INED and used in the same way in all the MAFE countries. All the localities mentioned in the biographic questionnaires were also coded using a gazetteer. In Senegal and in DR Congo, one person was in charge of coding all the questionnaires, while in Ghana 2 people were in charge of this work. The persons in charge of the coding had received a short training.

A.6.5.Data entry and data cleaning

In the three countries, data entry started only after the end of data collection. In Senegal, data entry staff was trained for two days just before the start of data entry. The training combined a formal presentation of the questionnaire as well as exercises. Data entry was supervised by a member of the staff of IRD with a strong experience in data entry. That person worked in close collaboration with the local coordinator of the survey and with the INED survey service, in charge of

the data entry program. His role was to manage the questionnaires, to ensure troubleshooting with the data entry programs, and to run a consistency tests program. The program was run every night, and the data entry agents started the next day by correcting inconsistencies found by the program. When the errors were due to data collection (and not to data entry), the data collection coordinator was in charge of correcting it. On average, 7 questionnaires were entered per day per person.

In Ghana, data entry staff was trained at the same time as interviewers, and received an additional training for data entry (3 days). Data entry was done in an office in the University of Accra, and supervised by a computer scientist recruited by the local coordinating team. His role was similar as in Senegal. Contrary to what was done in Senegal, consistency tests were not run every day. They were run at the end of data entry, using the program prepared by INED. On average, around 8 questionnaires were entered per day per interviewer.

As of mid April, data entry had not started yet in DR Congo for administrative reasons.

B. DATA COLLECTION IN EUROPE

B.1. INTRODUCTION

Data collection in the six European countries was organized by the European partners of the project: INED in France, FIERI in Italy, University Pompeu Fabra in Spain, University of Sussex in the United Kingdom, University of Maastricht in the Netherlands, and the Catholic University of Louvain (UCL) in Belgium. INED and UCL provided support at various stages of the study (sampling, training of trainers, data entry,...). In France, Spain and Italy, survey firms were hired to conduct the survey (CSA in France, DOXA in Italy and Metroscopia in Spain), in close collaboration with the researchers in charge of the project. In Belgium, UK and the Netherlands, the surveys were organized and supervised by the universities. Postdoctoral researchers were in charge of the coordination and follow-up of the surveys.

B.2. Data collection schedule

In Europe, six countries participated in the MAFE surveys. In three of them (France, Italy, Spain), the surveys were conducted in 2008, before the start of the EU funded project. In the three other countries (Belgium, the Netherlands, UK), data collection was conducted in 2009-2010. The questionnaires used in the six countries are very similar. Even though a few changes were made between the 2008 and 2009 surveys, but they are largely comparable.

In all the European countries, the surveys were conducted among males and females who were aged 25 and over at the time of the surveys, and who were 18 or over when they had left Africa for the first time for at least one year. In five of the six European countries, migrants from only one origin countries were interviewed; in the UK, migrants from two origin countries were interviewed (DR Congo and Ghana). In France, Italy and Spain, most of the data collection activities were carried out in 2008, and lasted approximately 6 months. The training of interviewers was done in March and April 2008, and fieldwork started soon after the training. Data collection lasted between one and a half months in Spain, and four months in France. In these three countries, editing and data entry was over by the end of September 2008.

Table B-1. List of MAFE survey countries in Europe and origin countries of migrants

Destination country	Origin country/ies
France	Senegal
Italy	Senegal
Spain	Senegal
Belgium	DR Congo
The Netherlands	Ghana
United Kingdom	Ghana and DR Congo

In the Netherlands and the UK, the training of interviewers was organized late April 2010, while in Belgium it was done late June 2010. Data collection started soon after the training in the Netherlands (April), and in Belgium (July), and a few weeks after the training in the UK because of administrative reasons. It lasted about three months in the Netherlands (150 questionnaires), five months in the UK (2*150 questionnaires), and seven months in Belgium (280 questionnaires). Editing was done along data collection. Data entry was done between June and September 2009 in the Netherlands, between October and December 2009 in the UK, and between December 2009 and

March 2010 in Belgium. The Netherlands started a second phase of data collection in November 2009, which was going to end in April 2010⁵.

Table B-2. Dates of activities related to data collection in the 6 European MAFE countries

Country	Training of Interviewers	Data collection	Editing and Coding	Data entry
France	March 2008	March - July 2008	March - June 2008	August 2008
Italy	March 2008	March - June 2008	March - August 2008	September 2008
Spain	April 2008	May - June 2008	September 2008	September 2008
Belgium	June - July 2009	July 2009 - February 2010	July 2009 - February 2010	December 2009 - March 2010
The Netherlands	April 2009	April - July 2009 November 2009 - April 2010	April - July 2009 November 2009 - April 2010	June - September 2009 May 2010
United Kingdom	April-May 2009	June - November 2009	September - November 2009	October - December 2009

B.3. SAMPLING

In five of the six European countries (Spain being the exception⁶), no suitable sampling frame was available to select randomly individual respondents. As a result, it was decided to use quota sampling. Even though this approach is not as rigorous as a random sample selected from a suitable sampling frame, it is often recommended for constituting small samples, especially when no sampling frame is available. This method requires having auxiliary data that can be used to set quotas of respondents by different types of characteristics (gender, age, region of residence...). It allows matching the distribution of the sample according to certain characteristics to the distribution of the population. In this sense, the quota samples are representative of the target population. In all the countries (except Spain), the quotas were set by age and gender at least. In France, the socio-professional category was also included as criteria in the quotas, while in Belgium and the UK, the place of residence was used in the quotas. In France, Italy, Spain and the Netherlands, sub-regions concentrating the majority of migrants were selected. In Belgium, the whole country was covered, and quotas were set by provinces (11 provinces in Belgium)⁷. In the United Kingdom, the surveys were concentrated in the London area and in the places where Congolese and Ghanaian migrants were living.

Randomness was also included in the samples in different ways. For instance, in Belgium, a random sample of places was selected according to the number of people of Congolese origin living in these places. Respondents were selected in these places. The combination of different recruitment methods also ensured that different types of persons had a non zero probability of being included in the sample. For instance, some respondents were recruited in public spaces (street, metro station, hairdresser...), others were randomly selected from list of volunteers identified in churches... In France, Italy and Spain, some of the respondents were also selected using the contacts obtained in the household survey in Senegal.

⁵ The Netherlands had some funds left which allowed them to increase the sample size.

⁶ In Spain, the population register (Padron) includes all migrants, including undocumented migrants.

⁷ Within each province the sample was allocated to communes or groups of communes according to the number of Congolese migrants in these communes

Table B-3. Sampling characteristics in European countries

Country	Target areas	Sample size	Quotas	Recruitment methods
France	3 regions comprising 64% of Senegalese people in France (Ile de France, Rhône-Alpes and Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur)	200	By age, gender and socio-economic status	Selection from contacts obtained in Senegal, Public spaces, migrant associations, snowballing, interviewers' contacts
Italy	Lombardia, Emilia Romagna, Toscana, Campania	202	By age and gender	Selection from contacts obtained in Senegal, Public spaces, migrant associations, snowballing, interviewers' contacts
Spain	12 provinces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almería (Andalucía) • Alicante & Valencia (Comunidad Valenciana) • Barcelona, Lérida, Tarragona & Gerona (Cataluña) • Madrid (Comunidad de Madrid) • Zaragoza (Aragón) • Las Palmas (Islas Canarias) • Murcia (Comunidad Autónoma de Murcia) • Baleares (Islas Baleares) 	198 (+ an additional sample of 400 people expected in 2010)	Random sample from Padron	Population register (Padron), contacts obtained in Senegal, interviewers' contacts
Belgium	Whole country	278	By age, gender and place of residence	Public spaces, migrant associations, churches, snowballing, phonebook, centre for asylum seekers, interviewers' contacts
The Netherlands	3 cities (in 3 different provinces): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amsterdam(North Holland) • The Hague (South Holland) • Almere (Flevoland) 	279 (167 + 112)	By age and gender	Public spaces, churches, snowballing, interviewers' contacts
United Kingdom (Ghanaians)	Whole country	138	By age, gender and place of residence	Public spaces, churches, snowballing, interviewers' contacts
United Kingdom (Congolese)	Whole country	150	By age, gender and place of residence	Public spaces, churches, snowballing, interviewers' contacts

Overall, the sample sizes are relatively small, which can be explained by the high costs of the surveys in Europe. Around 200 migrants were interviewed per origin country in a destination country. It is a little lower in the UK (around 150 per origin country) and higher in the Netherlands and Belgium (around 280). Spain is expected to interview 400 additional Senegalese migrants, starting in September 2010. Currently, about 1450 migrants have been interviewed (1850 migrants expected after the second round of data collection in Spain).

B.4. SURVEY STAFF

Four categories of staff have participated in the MAFE surveys: (1) interviewers (2) supervisors, (3) editors and encoders, and (4) data entry agents.

B.4.1. Interviewers

The main role of the interviewers was to collect information using face-to-face interviews with selected respondents. In addition to interviewing the respondents, in most countries interviewers also had to find respondents for the survey. Given that no suitable sampling frame was available in most countries (all except Spain), the samples were constituted using a variety of ways. This included recruiting people through associations, in public spaces, in churches. This means interviewers' role was crucial not only in collecting data, but also in recruiting respondents.

Table B-4. Surveys staff composition in Europe

Country	Interviewers				Editors and coding staff	Data entry staff
	Number	Gender	Origins	Experience	Number	Number
France	10	8 males 2 females	3 from African origin	8 with survey experience	2	3
Italy	10	1 male 9 females	No interviewer from African origin	All had survey experience	2	2
Spain	14 at the beginning, 10 for most of the fieldwork	7 males 3 females	African origin (1), Latin American origin (3), Spanish (6)	Most had survey experience	1 coder and 2 controllers (Metroscopia) and 3 researchers from UPF	3
Belgium	12	5 males 7 females	Congolese origin (5), Belgian origin (5), Moroccan origin (2)	Most had some experience in data collection	5 researchers	4
The Netherlands	17 (first round) 8 (second round)	9 males and 8 females (first round) 6 males and 2 females (second round)	First round : Ghanaian origin (15) and Dutch origin (2) Second round : All Ghanaians	Most had survey experience	2	5
United Kingdom (Ghanaians)	Recruited 10 lost 2 before commencement of data collection	3 males 5 females	Nigerian origin (2), Ghanaian origin (4), Caribbean origin (1), German/Irish origin (1)	Most had survey experience	1	1
United Kingdom (Congolese)	10	7 males and 3 females	All of Congolese origin	Most had survey experience	1	1

The selection of the interviewers was done either by the private firms (France, Italy, Spain), or by the university teams (Belgium, Netherlands, UK). In several countries (Spain, UK, Netherlands), some of the interviewers who had participated in the training did not do the fieldwork, either because they were not though suitable for the work, or because they dropped out. The recruitment of interviewers was fairly easy in some countries, and more complicated in a few others. For instance, the Dutch team could easily hire interviewers of Ghanaian origin who had been involved in previous project with the coordinator. In Belgium, most interviewers were PhD students or Master students in social sciences⁸. In these two countries (Belgium and the Netherlands), the recruitment

⁸ The training and the start of the survey were planned during the summer holidays, so that students could participate in the survey.

was facilitated by the small size of the countries, where distances allow interviewers to work in various areas. In France, the recruitment of interviewers was more difficult (notably because of the geographic dispersion, and the political context), but in the end, 10 qualified interviewers were selected and carried out the survey successfully.

The number of the interviewers per survey varied between 8 (survey among Ghanaians in the UK) and 17 (Netherlands). In all the countries, both male and females interviewers were hired; most of them had higher education and some experience with data collection. In some countries (e.g. France), some of them were professional interviewers. The selected interviewers were not necessarily from the same country as the respondents, but most of them also had foreign origins. For instance, 7 of the 12 interviewers in Belgium were of foreign origin, 5 of them from DR Congo. In the Netherlands, most interviewers were from Ghanaian origin. The fact that many of the interviewers were themselves of foreign origin seems to have positively influenced the willingness of interviewees to participate in the survey.

In all the countries, interviewers were paid per completed questionnaire, and travel expenses were reimbursed. The rate per questionnaire varied from one country to the other, with an average of about 50 € per completed questionnaire (excluding travel expenses).

B.4.2. Supervisors

In contrast to what was done in the African countries, supervisors in Europe were not on the field with interviewers. In Belgium, the Netherlands and United Kingdom, the coordination and supervision of the surveys were done by the university teams (postdoctoral researchers and coordinators of the project). In France, Spain and Italy, the coordination and supervision of the surveys were done jointly by the private firms and the research teams.

The work of the supervisors mainly consisted in meeting interviewers regularly during fieldwork to discuss problems in the questionnaires, in allocating the questionnaires and maintaining tracking systems for quota requirements, and in meeting community leaders, association, churches in order to collect contacts and facilitate the work of the interviewers. In some countries, the supervisors also did a large part of the editing of the questionnaires.

B.4.3. Editors and coding staff

After being filled, questionnaires were checked by the interviewers. They were then sent to the coordination team. Editors were in charge of an in-depth reading of the questionnaire, in order to identify inconsistencies or missing data. In five of the 6 European teams (France, Spain, Italy, UK and the Netherlands), editing workshops were set up in similar ways. Two editors were recruited in each country to do this work, and received a special training for this task. In Belgium, the editing work was shared among the researchers involved in the project. All of them knew the questionnaire very well, as they had either participated in the conception of the questionnaire, the training of trainers, or had worked as interviewers.

After a questionnaire had been edited, it was either ready for coding and data entry, or needed some corrections. The interviewers were asked to correct the questionnaires; this sometimes necessitated calling back the respondents. Although this usually went well, callbacks were not always well accepted by respondents. Open-ended questions on professions were also coded before data entry. This was done by one or several people, depending on the countries.

B.4.4. Data entry agents

Data entry of the biographic questionnaire was performed using an MS Access program prepared by INED. In France, Spain and Italy, the private firms were in charge of data entry, and recruited and

trained the data entry staff. In the three other countries, data entry was organized by the universities. Data entry agents were recruited and trained (a few hours), and worked in the university premises. The number of agents varied from 1 per survey (UK) to 5 (Netherlands), with an average of 3 data entry agents per survey.

B.5. Training

Training sessions were organized for the interviewers and editors in each country⁹. The duration of the training sessions varied from one country to the other. It lasted about one week in France and Spain, and was a little shorter in the other countries (3 to 4 days). The training of the interviewers was also a little different in France, which was the first country to do the training. Several interviewers had participated in the pilot survey, and received only refresher training, while the new interviewers were given the full training. In the other countries, one single training session was organized for all the interviewers.

Table B-5. Training of survey staff in Europe

Country	Trainers	Participants	Duration
France	G. Vivier (INED) F. Rougier (CSA)	Full training for 8 interviewers, 1 editor, and 1 researcher Refresher training for 2 interviewers and 1 editor (participated in the pilot survey)	5 days
Italy	E. Castagnone (FIERI) F. Gasparetti (FIERI) V. Reda (DOXA) A. Moro (DOXA)	All the interviewers, the supervisor and editors/encoders.	3 days
Spain	P. Baizán (UPF) A. González (UPF) M. Liu (UPF) G. Vivier (INED)	All the interviewers, one field supervisor and office supervisor. The data entry staff and editors received separate trainings.	6 days
Belgium	B. Schoumaker (UCL) A. Rakotonarivo (UCL) Support from A. Diagne (UCL)	All the interviewers. Separate training for the data entry staff.	4 days
The Netherlands	V. Mazzucato (U. Maastricht) D. Schans (U. Maastricht)	All interviewers and both editors. Separate training for the data entry staff.	3 days
United Kingdom (Ghanaians)	R. Black (U. Sussex) D. Garbin (U. Sussex) N. Binaisa (U. Sussex)	All the Interviewers. Separate training for the editors and data entry staff.	4 days
United Kingdom (Congolese)	A. Castaldo (U. Sussex) Support from C. Mezger (INED)		

The training sessions were given by the members of the research teams. The trainers had themselves followed a training session at INED. In France, Spain and Italy, the sessions were organized jointly by the researchers and private firms in charge of data collection, while in the other countries they were animated by the researchers. Overall, although the questionnaire was complex, no major difficulties were encountered during the training.

The organization differed a little across countries, but the overall structure was the same. In all the countries, the training combined theory and practice. It included a presentation of the MAFE project, an in-depth presentation of the questionnaire, exercises and role plays, so that participants

⁹ Data entry agents were trained later, just before data entry.

could be operational after the training. In most countries, interviewers were also asked to do an interview on their own after the first part of the training (2 days in the Netherlands and France, 3 days in Belgium). This made the interviewers familiar with the questionnaire and the theory behind the questionnaire. In this first interview, most interviewers experienced some difficulties that had not been discussed in the training. An additional training day was devoted to discuss again the whole questionnaire based on the interviewers' first experience. This allowed resolving doubts, reinforcing training points and evaluating mistakes. However, the complete mastering of the questionnaire was only achieved after a few surveys. In all the countries, a close supervision of the interviewers and an individual meeting with each interviewer after a few survey allowed identifying recurrent mistakes, and providing additional training.

Example of training program in France	
Monday 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of the MAFE project
Tuesday 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principles of a biographic approach • Detailed presentation of the questionnaire, following "Souleyname's life" • Transcription of information from Ageven grid
Wednesday 19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exercises with ageven grid • Role plays in French with « Mamadou's life » • Transcription of information from Ageven grid
Thursday 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fieldwork test for the new interviewers • Discussion after first experience with questionnaire
Friday 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checking of questionnaires • Fieldwork instructions for selection of respondents, contact sheets, informed consent,... • Distribution of material

B.6. DATA COLLECTION AND PROCESSING OF QUESTIONNAIRES

B.6.1. General organisation

The general organization of fieldwork varied across countries. In countries where the surveys were conducted by private firms, the questionnaires were sent directly to the firm, which was in charge of editing and data entry. Weekly reports were sent to the research teams, which were notably in charge of tracking the sampling quotas. In the other countries (Belgium, the Netherlands, UK), the questionnaires were sent or handed out to the supervisors in the research team. After editing, questionnaires with inconsistencies were given back to the interviewers who were in charge of correcting them. Corrected questionnaires were ready for codification and data entry.

In contrast to the organization of the surveys in Africa, interviewers in Europe worked individually. This is linked to differences in the sampling approaches in Europe and Africa. In Europe, respondents were selected according to predefined criteria, using quota sampling (except in Spain). Interviewers were then asked to recruit respondent themselves in public spaces, or to contact respondents whose contacts had been obtained in another way (snowballing, associations, churches, phonebook).

In large countries, interviewers were much more dispersed than in small countries like Belgium and the Netherlands. As a result, the supervision of interviewers was easier in small countries, notably because it was easier to meet interviewers regularly.

B.6.2. Population awareness raising and selection of respondents

In Europe, several methods were used to recruit respondents. The general philosophy was to use quota sampling, and to select respondents in various ways. In the three 'MAFE Senegal' countries (France, Italy, Spain), the samples were initially planned to be constituted from contacts obtained in the households in Senegal. However, given the small number of contacts that could be obtained in Senegal, it was decided to diversify the ways of recruitment. In France and in Italy, contacts from migrant associations, snowballing, and recruitment in public spaces were used to find recruit respondents. In Spain, most respondents could be selected randomly from the population register. In the other countries (Belgium, Netherlands, United Kingdom), the idea of collecting contacts from the households in the origin countries had been abandoned. As a result, the recruitment of respondents was done using several approaches (contacts of interviewers, churches, snowballing, phonebooks, and recruitment in public spaces). Quotas by gender, age and place of residence were also used.

In all the countries, a MAFE leaflet had been prepared. Interviewers could give them to the respondents to inform them about the objectives of the survey, and give them contacts in case the respondents had any question. As a rule, the leaflets were very useful and contributed to reassuring some respondents. Contacts with migrant associations and churches also proved very useful to get in touch with migrant populations and convince people to participate in the survey.

B.6.3. Administration of questionnaires

Before doing the interview, interviewers had to set an appointment (except in cases persons were directly available). The choice of the place and time of the interview were left to the respondents. In most cases, interviews were carried out at the house of the respondents, but it also took places in various places (pubs, street, office...). In some cases, interviews carried out at the homes of respondents were interrupted many times (children, visits of friends, phone calls...), but overall it took place smoothly. The interviews were done during weekdays or week-ends, at various times.

Interviewers were asked to read quickly the completed questionnaire as soon as possible after the interview, in order to detect any missing parts or inconsistencies, and correct them on the spot. In Belgium, the Netherlands and the UK, interviewers also had to transcribe the information from the ageven grid to the questionnaire directly after the interview (this was done by the editors in the other countries).

The average duration of interviews was between 1 and 1.5 hours. In some cases, interviews lasted as long as 4 hours, but these were exceptional cases, and most interviews were completed within 1 or 2 hours. The length of the interviews was one of the most common 'complaints' from the respondents (especially when the respondents had a long history), but very few surveys had to be interrupted because of lack of time.

In all the countries, the respondents were offered a small gift at the end of the interview. In most countries, this was a calling card; in the UK, money was given to the respondents and in Belgium, respondents were given the choice between a calling card and a voucher in a supermarket. The value of the gift varied between 5 € (Italy) and £15 (UK). In all the countries, the gift was very much appreciated. Although the gift was offered after the interview, some participants knew in advance they would receive it. For instance, a few surveys were conducted in a centre for asylum seekers in Belgium, and the information about the gift quickly spread among the Congolese migrants. Recruitment by snowballing also meant that respondents were sometimes aware they would receive

a gift. Although this may have facilitated the recruitments of some persons, we think it does affect negatively the composition of the sample¹⁰.

Table B-6. Summary of fieldwork organization and issues in Europe

Country	Average duration	Major difficulties	Gift	Number of questionnaires
France	1h 35 min	A few surveys took place in 'extreme conditions' (whole afternoon at someone's place with many interruptions, interviews in 3 visits, 'intrusion' of husband during interview), but no major problems.	10€ calling card	200
Italy	1h 30 min	No major issues	5€ calling card	202
Spain	1h 20 min	A few interviews were particularly long and difficult to complete	10€ calling card	198
Belgium	Approximately 1h 30 min	Interviewers were often suspected to be sent by the "Office des étrangers", in charge of foreign people in Belgium. Some difficulties in convincing people to participate (especially undocumented migrants) Last minute cancellations of interviews were quite frequent	Choice between a 10€ calling card or a 10€ voucher in a supermarket	278
The Netherlands	Approximately 1h 30 min	Some respondents were suspicious about questions regarding their assets and legal status Respondents often complained the interview was too long	15€ calling card	279 (167+112)
United Kingdom (Ghanaians)	Approximately 2h	Length of questionnaire was the most common problem, especially in the London area Last minute cancellations of interviews were quite frequent Sample quota challenges (age, gender plus location)	£15 (cash) at the end of the interview.	138
United Kingdom (Congolese)				150

The overall rhythm of data collection varied across countries and, in each country, over time. For instance, in Spain, about 75 questionnaires were completed in the first ten days, but the pace decreased a little later. On average, 10 questionnaires were completed per week in the UK and 12 in Belgium. In Belgium, it varied from 3 to 30 in a week. The length of the fieldwork varied from 1.5 months to more than 6 months. The number of completed questionnaires varied from one country to another. It was around 200 in France, Italy and Spain. A little less than 300 interviews were conducted in the United Kingdom (150 among the Congolese and 138 among the Ghanaians). In Belgium and the Netherlands, it was initially planned to interview 150 migrants. In the end, it was possible to increase the sample size to 278 in Belgium and to 279 in the Netherlands.

B.6.4.Editing of questionnaires

To guarantee high quality data, all the completed questionnaires were read carefully by editors who had been specially trained for this task¹¹. The objective was to detect any missing values and inconsistencies in the questionnaires, quickly after they had been sent back by the interviewers, and before sending the questionnaire to data entry. All the questionnaires with problems were given back to the interviewers who had to correct them. This often required calling back respondents. Questionnaires without mistakes were coded and ready for data entry.

¹⁰ The proportion of people who knew in advance they would receive a gift is relatively small, and this may have in fact contributed to including people in the sample that would have been less likely to be interviewed otherwise.

¹¹ In some countries (France, Spain), questionnaires were edited by two persons, but only one person did it in most cases.

As said before, the editing was done by the private firms in France, Italy and Spain. In the UK and the Netherlands, two persons had been recruited and trained for this task. In Belgium, the work was shared among the researchers involved in the MAFE project. In all the countries, the survey supervisor acted as the link between the editors and the interviewers.

This stage represented a relatively heavy burden in all the countries, but was also an essential part of the quality control. At the beginning of the survey, problems (often minor) were detected in the majority of the questionnaires. Thanks to the editing stage, these could be corrected early, and interviewers were informed of common mistakes. As the surveys went on, the number of problems in questionnaires decreased, but the editing phase still proved essential.

B.6.5. Coding

Like for editing, coding of professions was done either by the private firms or the university teams. This was done after the editing phase and before data entry (except in the Netherlands, where it was done after data entry). Coding of professions was done using the same list, prepared by INED, in all the countries. Some variables were not coded before data entry (reasons for leaving a country, reasons for choice of destination...). It was decided first to enter the full answers, and prepare the list of codes using the answers found in all the countries. The coding will be done after data entry and data cleaning has been carried out in all the countries.

B.6.6. Data entry

Data entry was done after the questionnaires had been corrected and coded. In some countries it started during data collection, while in others it started after the end of data collection. Two different data entry programs were used. The 'MAFE Senegal' countries (France, Italy, Spain) used a first version of the program developed at INED in 2008. While several problems were encountered at the beginning of data entry, they were quickly fixed. Most of the problems with the program were experienced by the French team, but Spain and Italy did not have major troubles. Another version of the program was developed for the second series of country. The Netherlands used an early version of the second program and experienced many problems. Data entry agents were asked to write comments when they felt there was a mistake in the program and they could not enter the correct data. Belgium and the UK used an improved version of the program, but problems with the programs were still encountered and the same strategy as in the Netherlands was used in these countries.

Table B-6. Summary of data entry organization and issues in Europe

Country	Number of agents	Place	Major issues
France	3	INED	- Missing data fields (e.g. profession) - Multiple responses not possible for some questions - Problems with filters in the program - Not possible to select answers 8888 or 9999 for some questions (income, number of unions...)
Italy	3	Doxa	A few problems at the beginning which were rapidly fixed by INED.
Spain	3	Metroscopia	A few problems at the beginning which were rapidly fixed by INED.
Belgium	4	University of Louvain	Several problems remaining in the program. Sometimes the program would not accept (correct) answers, would give incomprehensible error messages. Data entry agents were asked to write comments when they felt there was a mistake in the program and they could not enter the correct data.
The Netherlands	5	University of Maastricht, and 1 person worked from home	
United Kingdom (Ghanaians)	1	University of Sussex	
United Kingdom (Congolese)	1	University of Sussex	

In spite of the problems encountered during data collection, the data entry programs were overall very good and allowed the research teams to produce data files that are directly comparable.

In all the countries, consistency tests were performed at the end of data entry, using the program prepared by INED. These programs allowed detecting inconsistencies due to errors during data entry, or that had gone unnoticed during the editing phase. These inconsistencies were corrected in the data base, and programs run again until no inconsistencies were left. Some difficulties were encountered with early versions of the program (some 'false errors' were identified), but most were quickly fixed by INED.

Team members (at the time of survey design and data collection)

BELGIUM	<p><u>Project coordinator:</u> Bruno Schoumaker (UCL)</p> <p><u>Team members:</u> Andonirina Rakotonarivo (UCL) Sophie Vause (UCL) Marie Laurence Flahaux (UCL) Alioune Diagne(UCL) Eugénie Kabali (UCL)</p>
CONGO	<p><u>Project coordinator:</u> José Mangalu (UNIKIN)</p> <p><u>Team members:</u> Pascal Kapagama (UNIKIN) Jocelyn Nappa (UNIKIN) Barthelemy Kalambayi (UNIKIN)</p>
FRANCE	<p><u>Project coordinators:</u> Cris Beauchemin (INED)</p> <p><u>Team members:</u> Lama Kabbanji (INED) David Lessault (INED) Cora Mezger (INED) Géraldine Vivier (INED) Raphaël Laurent (INED) Martine Quaglia (INED) Nicolas Razafindratsima (INED) Private firm: CSA</p>
GHANA	<p><u>Project coordinator:</u> Peter Quartey (CMS)</p> <p><u>Team members:</u> Faustina Frempong (CMS) Cynthia Addoquaye Tagoe (CMS)</p>
ITALY	<p><u>Project coordinator:</u> Eleonora Castagnone (FIERI)</p> <p><u>Team members:</u> Sorana Toma Private firm: Doxa</p>
SENEGAL	<p><u>Project coordinators:</u> Papa Sakho (IPDSR)</p> <p><u>Team members:</u> Alioune Diagne (IPDSR) With the support of the INED team</p>
SPAIN	<p><u>Project coordinator:</u> Amparo Gonzalez (CSIC) and Pau Baizan (UPF)</p> <p><u>Team members:</u> Mao-Mei Liu (UPF) Private firm: Metroscopia</p>
THE NETHERLANDS	<p><u>Project coordinator:</u> Valentina Mazzucato (U. Maastricht)</p> <p><u>Team members:</u> Djamila Schans (U. Maastricht) Kim Caarls (U. Maastricht)</p>
UNITED KINGDOM	<p><u>Project coordinator:</u> Richard Black (U. Sussex)</p> <p><u>Team members:</u> Nalu Binaisa (U. Sussex) David Garbin (U. Sussex) Adriana Castaldo (U. Sussex)</p>