
EuroModule... Towards a European Welfare Survey

CODEBOOK

PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES

Slovenia
Germany
Hungary
Spain
Switzerland
Sweden

Please note:

All marginals in this documentation are calculated from **unweighted data** and based on **original age cuts**. Only the Swiss data are weighted by a regional weight, because of the overrepresentation of the Zurich area. Please refer to the study descriptions for further information

TABLE OF CONTENTS

An Introduction to the Euromodule ^o	IV
Description of common Data File	XVI
Study Descriptions	XXV
Slovenia	XXVI
Germany	XXVIII
Hungary	XXX
Spain	XXXII
Switzerland	XXXIII
Sweden	XXXV
Codebook Information and Explanations	XXXVI
Codebook	1
Part 1: Core Questions for the Dimensions Objective Living Conditions, Subjective Well-Being, Quality of Society	2
Part 2: Optional Questions	98
Non comparable Items	144
Variable List	145

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE EUROMODULE

As Europe is growing together politically and economically, the international perspective is becoming more and more important in social reporting and welfare research. Research teams from 19 nations have set up a research initiative; as a result of this cooperation, the *Euromodule* came into being, a survey instrument for a European welfare comparison. In this overview the development and conception of the *Euromodule* are described.

1. How the *Euromodule* Came into Being

The *Euromodule* is a research initiative of European researchers engaged in the field of social reporting and quality of life. The aim of this initiative is to strengthen efforts to monitor and systematically analyse the current state and changes in living conditions and quality of life in Europe in a comparative perspective. Due to several developments, these issues gained importance in recent years. First of all, in many European countries, due to the "crisis of the welfare state" we are again in the middle of controversies about the "state of the nation" and citizens' welfare. There is growing public interest in how well people are doing in a period of ongoing modernization and globalization, and how extensive disparities and social exclusion can be avoided. This renewed public interest is also stimulated on the European level. As a result of European integration, comparable information about living conditions in single member states is of great interest. In the Maastricht treaty, several objectives related to individual welfare, quality of social relations, the combat against poverty and exclusion as well as the convergence of living conditions within Europe is given high priority by the European Union (EU). Another development is the transformation of the formerly socialist countries. For obvious political reasons, monitoring their progress on the road from state socialism to democratic capitalism is an important topic for years to come, especially for those countries heading to access the EU within the next years. These developments highlight the increasing demand for a comparative European welfare research.

In 1996, the Research Unit "Social Structure and Social Reporting" at the Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB) and the Social indicators group at the Survey Research Center Mannheim (ZUMA) had started an initiative to develop a European Welfare Survey. In summer 1996, the WZB and ZUMA groups invited a number of colleagues from the social indicators and quality-of-life communities, but also from official social statistics, to discuss the feasibility of such a project. The response was far better than expected. Research teams

from 19 countries – West European as well as East European countries – participated in three meetings in Berlin.

In 1998, the concept of a European Welfare Survey as one of several projects which were part of a TSER application (,Targeting Socio-Economic Research Programme') titled "*Towards a European System of Social Reporting and Welfare Measurement*" was submitted. The addressee of this application was the European Commission. The expert advice given by the European Commission about the TSER application was positive in large parts. During further negotiations, however, it became clear that Brussels would recommend to concentrate on those parts of the TSER project which aimed at taking stock of already existing statistics from state institutions or other sources - official and nonofficial. Thus, money was raised to carry out three subprojects under the title "EuReporting. Towards a European System of Social Reporting and Welfare Measurement": (1) European System of Social Indicators (EUSI), (2) Access to Comparative Official Microdata, and (3) Stocktaking of Comparative Databases in Survey Research. The project is coordinated by the Social Indicators Department at ZUMA, Mannheim, and carried through in collaboration with researchers from several European countries.¹

Under these circumstances, the initiative quickly agreed not to follow the most ambitious idea of establishing full-fledged welfare surveys in many countries, which would have demanded a huge amount of central funding. Instead, at another meeting in 1998 they agreed to follow a stepwise, bottom-up strategy by establishing a smaller version of the originally planned European Welfare Survey. The revised idea was to develop a set of basic questions which could be implemented in different types of ongoing surveys in the participating countries. This set of basic questions - called **Euromodule** - was composed in intensive discussions considering a variety of interests. In its prototype version it consists of core questions plus core standard demography consuming approximately 25 minutes of interviewing time; and of optional questions of approximately 20 minutes. The idea was to run the *Euromodule* in as many countries as possible. So far, it has been carried out in six countries: in Sweden, Slovenia, Germany, Hungary, Switzerland, and Spain. The decentralized way the initiative is organized is very similar to the way the International Social Survey Programme or other international co-operations are organized. The initiative is coordinated by the Research Unit "Social Structure and Social Reporting" at the WZB under the heads of Wolfgang Zapf and Roland Habich. But there is no central funding - each country team which is interested in running the *Euromodule* has to raise funding by themselves.

¹ The description of the projects and bibliographies are available on the following website:
<http://www.zuma-mannheim.de/data/social-indicators/eureporting>.

2. Goals and Objectives

The common interest of the participants of the *Euromodule* network is to gain comparative data about welfare and quality of life. The initiative stands in the tradition of the social indicators movement, which enjoyed its take off in the late 1960s and during the 1970s. The most practical and visible output of this movement has been and still is social reporting. "Social reports are social policy analyses with the clear-cut question if objective living conditions and subjective well-being, and beyond individual dimensions if the quality of society has improved" (Zapf 2000: 8). Examples for such comprehensive social reports in Western Europe are *Social Trends* in Great Britain (since 1970), the French *Données sociales* (since 1973), the *Social and Cultural Reports of the Netherlands* (since 1974), and the German *Datenreport* (since 1983). In Eastern Europe, Hungary recently started its series of *Social Reports* on Hungary (for an overview of social reporting activities and the social indicator movement in Europe, see Habich/Noll 1994, Berger-Schmitt/Jankowitsch 1999). Many of these social reporting activities have been and still are joint activities from national offices of statistics and social scientists. Another line of activities can be found at the supra-national level of international organizations (cf. Vogel 1994, Zapf 2000). The OECD, the United Nations, Eurostat and others gave rise to a multitude of social reports and many continuing periodic publications. Moreover, these organizations themselves produced huge compendia of social indicators for world regions or the world as a whole, mainly consisting of aggregated data at the level of nation states.

During its take off, the social indicators movement had a strong inclination to compare nations. The Social Indicator Development Programme of the OECD, for example, was launched with the objective of generating a comprehensive body of data for social indicators common to all OECD countries (OECD 1982, 1986). The cross-national perspective was also followed by the 1972 pioneering survey directed by Erik Allardt, the Comparative Scandinavian Welfare Survey. This survey described various dimensions of welfare in Finland, Sweden, Norway and Denmark (see Allard et al. 1972, Allardt 1981). The *Euromodule* ties on to this cross-national research tradition. The use of social surveys is seen as the preferred method for studying living conditions and subjective well-being. As aggregated figures often used in social reporting (most of all in reports published by supra-national organizations) can not be related to individuals, microdata stemming from surveys are the best opportunity to understand the distribution of welfare within a society, the relationship between different life domains, and the way quality of life is connected to socio-demographic characteristics. Survey research offers the possibility to combine individual living conditions and subjective characteristics - and it also proved to be a flexible tool for comparative welfare research across nations.

The *Euromodule* can fill a gap in European comparative social reporting and social structure analysis. International surveys that already exist are either primarily dedicated to political opinions, or they cover only indicators for few selected life domains, or they are hardly accessible to scientific analysis. Though concepts such as life satisfaction or happiness are included in surveys like the Eurobarometer and the World Value Survey, they appear only as single indicators. With regard to the European Community Household Panel (ECHP), Eurostat has initiated and harmonized national household surveys. The main focus of the ECHP, however, is on the labour market and the financial situation and therefore covers only some areas of life. Moreover, the data are rather expensive for secondary analysis, they are no longer sufficiently up to date for many research questions and limited to the member states of the EU. In the *Euromodule* project also non-EU-countries such as Switzerland, Turkey and a couple of Central and Eastern European countries do participate. Thus a number of additional cross-national comparisons have become possible.

The aims of the *Euromodule* research initiative can be described as follows:

- strengthening efforts to monitor and systematically analyze the current state of and changes in living conditions and quality of life in – as many as possible - European countries.
- providing comparative representative survey data dealing with several aspects of quality of life and individual welfare.
- bringing together different national traditions of welfare research, which we regard as complementary rather than conflicting.
- using the competence and knowledge of the national teams to provide thorough and meaningful interpretation of the data.
- providing accurate assessments of the quality of life for policy makers.
- improving the public's understanding of welfare development.

3. Welfare Concepts and Conceptualizations

The *Euromodule* initiative considers the development of welfare to be part of the processes of social change which are judged according to socially highly valued aims. The underlying premise is that welfare is a concept which applies not only to the rich West European countries, but also to less modernized countries. Although there are different opinions of what the right notion and conceptualization of welfare is – even within Western Europe – *quality of*

life is "the most widely recognised and the most frequently used framework for analysing the welfare development of a society" (Berger-Schmitt/Noll 2000: 8). It is a multidimensional concept which encompasses both material and immaterial, objective and subjective, individual and collective aspects of welfare. In principle, the *Euromodule* combines three kinds of welfare concepts: objective living conditions, subjective well-being, and (perceived) quality of society.

During the 1970s and 1980s, the understanding of welfare was an "individualistic" one. Quality of life was conceptualized mainly as individual welfare or welfare of households (cf. Noll 2000). Components of this individual welfare are not only good objective living conditions, but also subjective well-being. *Objective living conditions* have been and still are prominent in the Scandinavian approach as well as in the above-mentioned Social Indicator Development Programme of the OECD (under the term "social concerns"). In the tradition of level-of-living research, welfare is defined as "the individual's command over resources through which the individual can control and consciously direct his living conditions" (Erikson 1993: 72/73). Living conditions are measured in a variety of life domains: income, housing, education, family, work, and so on, some of them representing resources or capabilities, some of them representing outcomes or ends, and some of them both (e.g. income). The theoretical assumption of this objectivist approach is that there are so-called basic needs and that satisfying these basic needs determines people's well-being (see Zapf et al. 1987). This approach was very influential for comparative social reporting, especially the Social Indicator Programme of the OECD, started in 1970 and closed in 1986 (cf. OECD 1973, 1977, 1982).

Subjective well-being emphasizes another perspective, closely related to the socio-psychological approach. It is often associated with the Anglo-Saxon – mainly American – research tradition of mental health. Although American researchers also use objective indicators when assessing quality of life, there is a long-standing tradition to analyse subjective well-being, which "is concerned with individual's subjective experience of their lives. The underlying assumption is that well-being can be defined by people's conscious experiences – in terms of hedonic feelings or cognitive satisfactions" (Diener/Suh 1997). Or, as Campbell (1972: 422) had stated it: "Quality of life must be in the eye of the beholder". Life satisfaction, pleasant affect and unpleasant affect are interrelated, but separable components of subjective well-being. That is, it includes not only positive feelings and experiences, but also negative affective experiences like anxieties and worries.

During the 1970s there was an intensive discussion within the scientific community which concept is more appropriate. Nowadays, there is a mainstream consensus that objective living

conditions and subjective evaluations are actually just two sides of one coin. Subjective evaluations of personal life circumstances can relate to life as a whole as well as to different life domains, like work or income. This underlines the complementary nature of the two approaches, objective welfare measurement, and subjective well-being. In the *Euromodule* survey, both approaches have "equal rights". The main idea is to collect both objective and subjective indicators in order to focus on the constellation of these two. This combined approach is used in several survey projects, e.g. in the above-mentioned Scandinavian Welfare Survey, or the German welfare research. The German Welfare Survey, which was initiated in 1978 and has been replicated several times since then (recently in 1998), is one of the central surveys for continuous observation of the German society (Habich 1996, Habich/Noll/Zapf 1999). This branch of welfare research combines the Swedish approach with its socio-political focus and the socio-psychological approach of the American tradition. Welfare and quality of life are thus influenced by the constellation of objective living conditions and subjective well-being. "By quality of life we mean ... good living conditions that go along with positive subjective well-being" (Zapf 1984: 23, own translation).

Another aspect of welfare which is included in the *Euromodule* is "quality of society". As human beings, our personal development and opportunities depend to a large extent on the "liveability" (Veenhoven 1996, 1997) of the society we live in. In recent years, new concepts of welfare emerged, highlighting specific aspects of the *societal* components of welfare, namely social cohesion, social exclusion, and social capital (cf. Noll 2000, Berger-Schmitt/Noll 2000). These concepts refer to the quality of a given society, i.e. the quality of relations among members of the society and the binding effects of these relations, the rupture of the relationship between the individual and the society due to new forms of poverty, and the mutual feelings of commitment and trust created by common values and norms. The *Euromodule* also included some of these concepts in its programme, although it was not possible to cover all these dimensions with a broad range of questions. Those characteristics of society and its central institutions which may have a positive or negative influence on individual welfare are subsumed under the term of "quality of society". When these characteristics are evaluated by the population, we speak of *perceived* quality of society. The different aspects of welfare, which form the basis of the *Euromodule*, are illustrated in table 1.

Table 1: Taxonomy of welfare concepts

	Objective	Subjective
Individual level	Objective living conditions (e.g. income)	Subjective well-being (e.g. income satisfaction)
Societal level	Quality of society (e.g. income distribution)	Perceived quality of society (e.g. perceived strength of conflicts between rich and poor)

4. The *Euromodule* questionnaire

In June 1998 and January 1999 two meetings were arranged at the WZB, where the participants agreed on a common core questionnaire ("Master Questionnaire") and methodological standards for carrying out the project. The result of this international cooperation is the "*Euromodule*". Its conceptualization is closely related to the German Welfare Survey. Beyond the "classic" concept of welfare research, more recent concepts regarding the societal quality have influenced the choice of indicators.

The questionnaire consists of a core part and an optional part. The core part, which is obligatory for all participating countries, focuses on central life domains and their subjective evaluation: housing, composition of the household, social relations, participation, standard of living, income, health, work, education, personal environment and safety. Both, private and public social concerns are thus covered. Moreover, well-established global measures of subjective well-being (life satisfaction, happiness, anomia, anxiety) as well as some aspects of the quality of society are included. A set of socio-demographic background variables is obligatory for all countries and should be asked in a uniform fashion, as far as possible. In the optional part, more detailed questions are available, which can be additionally asked if sufficient financial resources are at hand. This optional part offers supplementary questions, in particular regarding the quality of society, for instance the subject of social integration. But there are also additional questions regarding the individual level, e.g. the importance of various life domains for well-being or the evaluation of personal living conditions. The main indicators are listed in table 2.

Table 2: Indicators used in the *Euromodule*

<p>Objective living conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • housing • household composition • social relations (also *) • participation • standard of living • income • health • education and work • personal environment and safety 	<p>Subjective well-being</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • domain satisfactions (see left column) • general life satisfaction • happiness • anxieties and anomia • subjective class position • importance of various life domains* • optimism/pessimism for various social concerns* • evaluation of the own living conditions*
<p>(Perceived) quality of society</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • social conflicts • trust in other people • degree of achievement of public goods (freedom, security, social justice)* • living conditions in various European countries in comparison to the own country* • preconditions for social integration* 	
<p>Background variables (so far as not included in objective living conditions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • age • gender • type of community • marital status • employment status • occupation (current / former) 	

* = optional part

As the *Euromodule* is planned as a "small" survey ready to be attached to an omnibus survey, each life domain could be covered only by a few indicators. The intention was to cover many social concerns, rather than ascertain in-depth data for few concerns. With regard to the measurement of the standard of living, however, a more detailed and time-consuming unit was developed. Following earlier British and German studies (Townsend 1979, Gordon/Pantazis 1997, Andress 1999), a list of 19 commodities and activities was drawn up, which serve as indicators for the achieved living standard of the respondents. Additionally, information is gathered about the respondents' notion of a decent standard of living. This gives the researcher the opportunity to explore not only cross-national differences in material well-being, but also differences in the definitions of "acceptable" and "unacceptable" living conditions. Emphasizing material living conditions is justified by the wide range of economic power the participating countries command, from "rich" Switzerland to "poor" Turkey, and by the vital political and public interest in processes of social exclusion and poverty.

The *Euromodule* may be carried out as a stand-alone survey as well as part of a multi-purpose survey. Till now it has been carried out in six countries: in Germany, Hungary, Slovenia (all in 1999), Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland (all in 2000). In 2001 Italy and Turkey will follow. A section of the *Euromodule* has been carried out in Poland in 2000.

Other countries participating in the research network are Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Norway, Austria and the Czech Republic; at least some of them are still looking for an opportunity to run the *Euromodule*. Although the initiative is a European enterprise, the idea of comparative welfare research has also attracted interest from outside Europe: in 2000, South Korea has joined the network and will probably carry out the survey in 2001. The South Asian "tiger state" will be an interesting extra-European case of comparison. In addition, the *Euromodule* project cooperates with the NORBALT project, a "level of living" survey in the Baltic countries directed by the Norwegian FaFo Institute. Another interesting opportunity for comparative research could turn out from the project "Living conditions, lifestyles and health" in eight former Soviet countries, coordinated at the Institute for Advanced Studies, Austria. This survey dealing with the changing (and often declining) quality of life in the successor states of the Soviet Union has adapted some parts of the *Euromodule* questionnaire. Thus, the data of the *Euromodule* facilitates international comparisons as to the level of welfare, the relationship between different dimensions of welfare and the social situation of certain groups of people in various European societies, which are characterized by a wide range of economic power and different types of welfare states and political traditions.

5. Outlook

In April 2000, another conference took place where the first comparative results were presented. The participants agreed that for the time being the documentation of the data as well as their harmonization and management should be coordinated and carried out by the Social Structure and Social Reporting Department at the WZB. The harmonization of the data and the integration into a common database is an important step to enable comparative research. Part of this package is the *Euromodule* codebook. This technical documentation gives an overview on the wording of the questions and the coding of the answers and offers unweighted marginals and means for all variables, broken down by countries. Furthermore, the national studies are described by giving information on fieldwork dates, the principal investigator, sample type, fieldwork method and institute, the context of the *Euromodule* questionnaire, sample size, response rates, weighting and national population characteristics. The participants of the network have agreed to exchange the *Euromodule* data within the network for the next two years. From 2003 on, the data base will be shared with the broader scientific community.

With data from eight countries by mid 2001, the *Euromodule* project will effectively be started. With this enterprise, the research initiative hopes to contribute to social reporting in Europe and to a deeper understanding of the state of the nations and the mood of their populations. However, some larger European countries are still missing, namely France and Great Britain. We cordially invite our European colleagues to join the project and fill the white spots on the *Euromodule* map. Besides a broader geographical coverage, another vision is to repeat the surveys within the next years. This might add another perspective, the perspective of comparisons over time. And it might provide a good opportunity for newcomers to join. A repetition would be another milestone for establishing the *Euromodule* as a continuous enterprise in the long run.

(taken from: Jan Delhey, Petra Böhnke, Roland Habich & Wolfgang Zapf:
 “Quality of Life in a European Perspective. The Euromodule as a new Instrument for
 Comparative Welfare Research”, will be published in: Social Indicators Research, 2001

References

- Allardt, Erik (1981): Experiences from the Comparative Scandinavian Welfare Study, with a Bibliography of the Project. In: European Journal of Political Research 9 (1981), p. 101-111.
- Allardt, Erik and the Research Group for Comparative Sociology (1972): The Scandinavian Welfare Survey 1972. Data Material. (Available at the Finnish Social Science Data Archive, Tampere).

- Andreß, Hans-Jürgen (1999): Leben in Armut. Analysen der Verhaltensweisen armer Haushalte mit Umfragedaten. Opladen.
- Berger-Schmitt, Regine / Beate Jankowitsch (1999): Systems of Social Indicators and Social Reporting: The State of the Art. EuReporting Working Paper No. 1. Mannheim: Centre for Survey Research and Methodology (ZUMA).
- Berger-Schmitt, Regina / Heinz-Herbert Noll (2000): Conceptual Framework and Structure of a European System of Social Indicators. EuReporting Working Paper No. 9, Centre for Survey Research and Methodology (ZUMA), Mannheim.
- Boehnke, Petra / Jan Delhey / Roland Habich (2000): Das Euromodul – ein neues Instrument für die europäische Wohlfahrtsforschung. In: Informationsdienst Soziale Indikatoren, Ausgabe 24, Juli 2000, S. 12-15.
- Campbell, Angus (1972): Aspiration, Satisfaction, and Fulfillment. In: Campbell, Angus / Philip E. Converse (eds.): The Human Meaning of Social Change. New York, 441-446.
- Delhey/Boehnke/Habich/Zapf (2001): The Euromodule. A new Instrument for Comparative Welfare Research. Euromodule working paper series, Social Science Research Center Berlin.
- Diener, Ed / Eunkook Suh (1997): Measuring Quality of Life: Economic, Social and Subjective Indicators. In: Social Indicators Research 40: 189-216, 1997.
- Erikson, R. (1993): Descriptions of Inequality: The Swedish Approach to Welfare Research. In: Nussbaum, M. / A. Sen (eds.): The Quality of Life. Oxford.
- Euromodule (2000): Codebook. Social Science Research Center Berlin, WZB.
- Gordon, David / Christina Pantazis (eds.) (1997): Breadline Britain in the 1990s. Aldershot.
- Habich, Roland (1996): Die Wohlfahrtssurveys - ein Instrument zur Messung der individuellen Wohlfahrt. In: Statistisches Bundesamt (Hg.), Wohlfahrtsmessung. Aufgaben der Statistik im gesellschaftlichen Wandel, Band 29 der Schriftenreihe Forum der Bundesstatistik, Stuttgart: Metzler-Poeschel, S. 121-147.
- Habich, Roland / Heinz-Herbert Noll (1994): Soziale Indikatoren in der Sozialberichterstattung. Internationale Erfahrungen und gegenwärtiger Forschungsstand. Bundesamt für Statistik, Bern.
- Habich, Roland / Heinz-Herbert Noll, Wolfgang Zapf (1999): Subjektives Wohlbefinden in Ostdeutschland nähert sich westdeutschem Niveau. Ergebnisse des Wohlfahrtssurveys 1998. In: Informationsdienst Soziale Indikatoren, Ausgabe 22, Juli 1999, S. 1-6.
- Noll, Heinz-Herbert (2000): Konzepte der Wohlfahrtsentwicklung: Lebensqualität und "neue" Wohlfahrtskonzepte. WZB Discussion paper P00-505, Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB).
- OECD (1973): List of Social Concerns Common to most OECD Countries. The OECD Social Indicator Development Programme, 1, Paris.
- OECD (1982): The OECD List of Social Indicators. The OECD Social Indicator Development Programme, 5, Paris.
- OECD (1986): Living Conditions in OECD Countries. A Compendium of Social Indicators. OECD Social Policy Studies No. 3, Paris.
- OECD (1977): 1976 Progress Report on Phase II. Plan for Future Activities. The OECD Social Indicator Development Programme, 4, Paris.

- Statistisches Bundesamt (Hg.) in Zusammenarbeit mit WZB und ZUMA: Datenreport 1999. Zahlen und Fakten über die Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Schriftenreihe der Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, Band 365, Bonn.
- Townsend, Peter (1979): Poverty in the United Kingdom. Harmondsworth/Middlesex/Berkeley.
- Veenhoven, Ruut (1996): Happy Life-Expectance: A Comprehensive Measure of Quality-of-life in Nations. In: Social Indicators Research, 39, 1996, p. 1-58.
- Veenhoven, Ruut (1997): Lebenszufriedenheit der Bürger: Ein Indikator für die Lebbarkeit von Gesellschaften? In: Noll, Heinz-Herbert (Hg.): Sozialberichterstattung in Deutschland. Konzepte, Methoden und Ergebnisse für Lebensbereiche und Bevölkerungsgruppen. Weinheim/München, S. 267-293.
- Vogel, Joachim (1994): Social indicators and social reporting. In: Statistical Journal of the United Nations ECE 11 (1994), p. 241-260.
- Zapf, Wolfgang (1984): Individuelle Wohlfahrt: Lebensbedingungen und wahrgenommene Lebensqualität. In: Glatzer, Wolfgang / Wolfgang Zapf (Hg.): Lebensqualität in der Bundesrepublik. Objektive Lebensbedingungen und subjektives Wohlbefinden. Frankfurt/Main, New York, S. 13-26..
- Zapf, Wolfgang et al. (1987): Individualisierung und Sicherheit. Untersuchungen zur Lebensqualität in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. München.
- Zapf, Wolfgang (2000): Social Reporting in the 1970s and the 1990s. In: Social Indicators Research 51, 2000, p. 1-15.

Address:
Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB)
Research Unit "Social Structure and Social Reporting"
Reichpietschufer 50
10785 Berlin
Germany
Internet: <http://www.wz-berlin.de/sb/>

DESCRIPTION OF COMMON DATA FILE

In order to ensure data quality and to facilitate comparative research a common Euromodule data file was made containing all national data sets available by now. In the following you will find details on data processing and on characteristic features of the new common data file.

1. Recoding of Variables

Although the Euromodule national questionnaires had been identical when running the field work, most of them have been part of other national surveys. Therefore the information on the respondents' socio-demographic facts were coded in a national specific form, which you neither can compare nor join together.

At the WZB the socio-demographic variables had to be recoded and adapted to the original common guidelines. This has not always been possible as it is described later. At the end, some new common socio-demographic variables were created for the common data file. The original variables of each country have been kept in the common data file. They were marked with a country specific suffix, whereas the new common variable received the original name. The suffixes are:

D	for Germany,
SLO	for Slovenia,
H	for Hungary
E	for Spain and
CH	for Switzerland and
S	for Sweden.

For example, the "household income" was surveyed in national currencies and stored in the variable v24. We renamed v24 in each national data using the suffixes. In a next step the national currencies were recoded into Euro and into Purchasing Power Parities (PPP), respectively. As a result, you have comparable income variables. Later on you will find more information on income variables.

Unfortunately there were national specific variables, which could not be adapted in a meaningful sense. An example is "size of community" (*v11_country*). In this case, we added country suffixes to each existing variable without creating a common one. There are other variables each surveyed only in one country. They kept their original names.

Country names in some variables or value labels were replaced by a common term. Doubled variables were dropped, as well as variables without variation. And, of course, data were corrected for mistakes.

Our main principle when doing the recodes was to change as little as possible. Table 1 gives an overview of the most important changes in the data. Table 2 contains the code for national educational degrees into the ISCED 1997. Table 3 shows the recoding of national occupational status into a common five-categories scheme.

For more details contact the WZB team, they will provide you with the SPSS-syntax-files.

2. Weighting Procedure

You will find two weighting variables in the common data file. The variable *weight1* was created from the individual weighting variables in the national data sets. But the Slovenian and Spanish data sets are lacking weighting variables. Here we have to assume that the selection of respondents was representative. We gave the weighting variable a value of one. Tables 4 and 5 illustrate the representativeness of the Slovenian and Spanish data. Furthermore, we created a new weighting variable to cover disproportions of the number of respondents and the number of each country's inhabitants in the age limits of the respondents. For example, the number of respondents in Germany is about the same as in Spain. But the number of inhabitants is not. Therefore we need a weight to correct this. This second common weight variable is a product of the individual weight and a factor, which contains the number of inhabitants in each country. The Swedish data required special measures due to the structure of the data. There have been two Swedish data sets, surveyed in 1998 and 1999 with different respondents. Due to the fact that either the first or the second Swedish data set is used for comparison with other countries, we weighted the two data sets to have the same number of respondents. Then *weight2* is the Swedish proportionality factor of the number of Swedish inhabitants from the age of 18 to 84 years for each of the two data sets. If you wish to analyse both of the Swedish data sets pooled with other countries, it becomes necessary to divide the Swedish *weight2* by 2.

3. Merging the national data sets

We have chosen the German data set to be the master data set. Negligible differences between variable labels and value labels of different data sets were eliminated and adapted to the German data set during the SPSS merging procedure.

Table 1: Overview of important changes in variables

Variable label and variable name	Change	Country specific comments
Case identity number <i>id</i>	The value of variable <i>country</i> * 100000 was added to make <i>id</i> unambiguous in the common data file	Slovenia, Sweden: <i>id</i> created from casenumber
Parents' citizenship: <i>v9</i>	Value labels standardized: country name eliminated	Switzerland: <i>v9_CH</i> means 'respondents citizenship', may not be joined with <i>v9</i>
Type of Community: <i>v11_country</i>	Meaningful merging not possible	Germany: <i>V11_D1</i> : Type of community - categories of settlement structure <i>V11_D2</i> : Size of community – political size of community
Contact friends: <i>v15</i>	Adapting of value labels	Slovenia, Hungary: With process of joining adaptation of value 1 'infrequently' to 1 'less often' – like Germany, Switzerland, Spain
Marital status: <i>v18</i>	Adaptation of German value labels to the commonly used	Germany: original <i>v18</i> kept in <i>v18_D</i> ; category 'married' not separated into 'married and living with spouse' and 'married but separated from spouse'; German category 'married' kept in category 'married and living with spouse' of <i>v18</i>
Actual: phone <i>v21f</i>	Creation of a new variable in the Switzerland data set	Switzerland: not asked, because data were surveyed by telephone interviews; <i>v21f</i> has value 1 'I have or do it' for Switzerland
Household income in Euro: <i>v24</i>	Conversion of all country specific currencies in Euro, original household income variables kept, but partly renamed in a meaningful sense	Germany: renaming of <i>v25a1</i> in <i>v25meanD</i>
Equivalent household income in country <i>v24eq_country</i>	Computed following the Buhmann et al. ² formula: Equivalent income=household income x Size of household ⁰ ($\theta=0.5$)	
Equivalent household income in Euro: <i>v24eq</i>	Conversion of all national specific household equivalent incomes in Euro, original household income variables kept	
Quintiles of equivalent household income in country: <i>v24eqcol</i>	Quintile computed for countries, not for common data file	

² Buhmann, B. et al. (1988): Equivalence Scales, Well-Being, Inequality, and Poverty: Sensitivity Estimates Across Ten Countries Using the Luxemburg Study (LIS) Database. In: The Review of Income and Wealth, Vol. 34, S. 115-142

Table 1, continued: Overview of important changes in variables

Variable label and variable name	Change	Country specific comments
Household income in PPP (international \$) <i>v24_PPP</i>	Conversion of all country specific currencies in Purchasing Power Parities at U.S. Dollar Source: World Bank	
Equivalent household income in PPP (international \$) <i>v24eqPPP</i>	Conversion of all country specific household equivalent incomes in Purchasing Power Parities at U.S. Dollar Source: World bank	
Educational degree: <i>v33</i>	Educational degree following ISCED 1997, Codes shown at Table 2	Germany: Adding of <i>v33a_D</i> and <i>v33b_D</i> to ISCED 1997
Employment Status: <i>v35</i>		Sweden: Code 4 means „all other“, it differs from the common original Code „not employed at all“
Present occupational status/former occupational status: <i>v36 / v44</i>	Collapsed in five categories: unskilled or semiskilled worker, skilled worker and foreman, employee or civil servant lower level, employee or civil servant higher level and self-employed, Codes shown at Table 3	Switzerland: employee no managerial position/managerial position, low level + tertiary educational degree → 'employee/civil servant, higher level'; no separation of workers and employees in Swiss data set → Reconstruction of „worker“ from present/last job (<i>v37/v45</i>); Spain: not asked Sweden: coded following country specific occupational classification (Socioedonomisk indelning, SEI)
Present job/last job: <i>v37 / v45</i>	No changes, no merging	Germany: not asked; Slovenia: two-digit-code of ISCO-88-Subgroups; Spain: coded following country specific occupational classification (CNO) Sweden: coded following country specific occupational classification (Socioedonomisk indelning, SEI)
Working hours per week: <i>v39</i>		Sweden: valid values for both employed and other economically active people (farmers and others)
Weighting: <i>weight1</i>	Computing <i>weight1</i> from individual weighting variables of country data sets	Germany: Division of individual weighting to keep the original number of respondents; Slovenia/Spain: no weighting variable available → <i>weight1</i> =1 for all cases
<i>weight2</i>	Individual weight * factor containing the number of inhabitants aged 18+ in each country	Germany: number of inhabitants aged 14+ Please remember Swedish specifics, see text above

Table 2: Recoding of national educational degrees into ISCED 1997³ (v33):

ISCED-1997		Slovenia	Hungary	Spain	Switzerland	Sweden
	Original national labels					
0 pre-primary education		Incomplete elementary school		Analfabetos; Sin estudios; Estudios primarios sin finalizar		
1 primary education	School without qualification + no vocational training	Complete elementary school	No educational degree; Less than 8 th class	Estudios primarios; EGB o equivalente	Incomplete compulsory education	Elementary school (compulsory school shorter than 9 years)
2 lower secondary education, general, vocational		Incomplete vocational or secondary school	8 th class			9-year compulsory school'
2A lower secondary education, general	Lower secondary / complete compulsory education, middle school education, Certification from a secondary technical or trade school, other school qualification, still at school: middle school / Abitur + no vocational training, in vocational training				Compulsory education Preparatory course for vocational education	
3C secondary edu., vocational			Vocational Training		Basic vocational education	
3B secondary edu., general, prep. for ISCED 5B	School without qualification, lower secondary / complete compulsory education, middle school education, certification from a secondary technical or trade school, other school qualification, still at school: middle school / Abitur + apprenticeship / vocational college, other job training	Complete 2 or 3 year vocational school		Formaci�n Profesional 1 y ense�anza Tecnico Profes. equival.; Formaci�n profesional 2 y equivalentes ; Otros estudios no reglados	Intermediate diploma school and other general education Apprenticeship Vocational college	Upper secondary school, 2 years or shorter'
3A secondary edu., general, prep. for ISCED 5A	Abitur + no vocational training, in vocational training	Complete 4 year secondary school	Upper secondary school degree	Bachillerato superior, B.U.P. y equivalentes	School preparing for the university entrance certificate Teacher training Vocational matura	Upper secondary school, 3 years'
4 post secondary, non tertiary education	Abitur + apprenticeship / vocational college, other job training; Lower secondary / complete compulsory education, middle school education, Abitur + student at university	Incomplete college or university	Vocational training with upper secondary school degree	Arquitecto e Ingeniero Tecnico; Diplomado de otras Escuelas Universitarias y equivalentes		

³ UNESCO (1997): International Standard Classification of Education ISCED 1997; coding following: Eurostat – Education and Training statistics: Construction of the Variable 'Highest Level of Education and Training Attained' (ISCED) from the European Union Labour Force Survey (LFS). Methodological Note. March 2000

Table 2: Recoding of national educational degrees into ISCED 1997 (v33):

ISCED-1997		Slovenia	Hungary	Spain	Switzerland	Sweden
	Original national labels					
5B first stage of tertiary edu., technical	Technical college / master, craftsman	Complete (2year) college degree		Estudios superiores de 2 o 3 aos; Arquitecto e Ingeniero Superior	Master craftsman Technical college	Tertiary (post secondary) education, shorter than 3 years
5A Tertiary education, university	Advanced technical college (Fachhochschule)		Polytechnical university/college	Licenciado	Advanced technical college	Tertiary (post secondary) education, 3 years or longer
5A/6 Tertiary education, university /doctorate	University completed	Complete university degree or academy	University	Doctorado; Estudios de Postgrado o especializaci�n	University	Postgraduate education

Table 3: Recoding of national occupational status v36 und v44:

Occupational Status	Germany	Slovenia	Hungary	Switzerland	Sweden
	Original national labels				
Unskilled/semi-skilled worker	Unskilled/semi-skilled worker	Unskilled; semi-skilled worker	Unskilled worker; semi-skilled worker; worker in primary sector	Employee /no managerial position) + ISCO 88-Hauptgruppe 6 – 9; employee (managerial position, low level) + ISCO 88-Hauptgruppe 6 – 9	unskilled employee in goods production; unskilled employee in service production
Skilled worker/foreman	Skilled worker; foreman in manual work/ master craftsman	Skilled worker; foreman in manual work	Skilled worker	Employee (managerial position, medium level) + ISCO 88-Hauptgruppe 6 – 9; employee (managerial position, high level) + ISCO 88-Hauptgruppe 6 – 9; Employee /no managerial position) + Tertiärer Bildungsabschluss+ ISCO 88-Hauptgruppe 6 – 9; employee (managerial position, low level) + Tertiärer Bildungsabschluss+ ISCO 88-Hauptgruppe 6 – 9	skilled employee in goods production; skilled employee in service production
Employee/civil servant, lower level	Civil servant/ judge/soldier: lower level; employee: routine non -manual	Employee (also civil servant), low qualification	Managing position, low level; non-manual, other	Employee /no managerial position); employee (managerial position, low level)	assistant non-manual employee, lower level; assistant non-manual employee, higher level, without subordinates; assistant non-manual employee, higher level, with subordinates; assistant non-manual employee, higher level; intermediate non-manual employee, without subordinates; intermediate non-manual employee; employee
Employee/civil servant, higher level	Civil servant/ judge/soldier: medium level/higher level; employee: professionals; employee: upper level executive	Employee (also civil servant), medium qualification; Employee (also civil servant), high qualification	Managing position, medium level; managing position, high level; non-manual worker, master; academics	Employee (managerial position, medium level); employee (managerial position, high level); Employee /no managerial position) + Tertiärer Bildungsabschluss; employee (managerial position, low level) + Tertiärer Bildungsabschluss	intermediate non-manual employee, with subordinates; professional and other higher non-manual employee, without subordinates; professional and other higher non-manual employee, with subordinates; professional and other higher non-manual employee; Upper-level executives
Self-employed	Self-employed-farmer/cooperative farmer (+helping family member); self-employed professional /academic); self-employed in trade, sales, industry	Entrepreneur with employees; self-employed; free profession; farmer /also helping family members)	Self-employed, farmer; Self-employed, industry; Self-employed trade; Self-employed service sector; professionals	Self-employed (no employees); self-employed (with employees); collaborator in family-owned business	Self-employed professional; Self-employed without employee; Small-scale entrepreneurs; Large-scale entrepreneurs ; Entrepreneurs; Small-scale farmers; Medium-scale farmers; farmers, forest farmers
Others	In education/ apprenticeship; military/ alternative service	Other		Trainee/ apprentice; military or community service	Students; military conscripts, former skilled employee in goods production; military conscripts, former assistant non-manual employee, high level; military conscripts, former intermediate non-manual employee; military conscripts

Table 4: Representativeness of Slovenian Data for Age and Gender

	Euromodul	Reference^a
Female, till 64 years	46,7	40,9
Female, 65 years and older	9,8	11,0
Male, till 64 years	38,3	41,8
Male, 64 years and older	5,1	6,3
Sum	100	100

Column Percent

^a Source: Statistical Office of the Republic Slovenia: Statistical Yearbook of the Republic of Slovenia 2000**Table 5:** Representativeness of Spanish Data for Age and Gender

	Euromodul	Reference^a
Female, till 64 years	39,7	39,6
Female, 65 years and older	11,9	12,0
Male, till 64 years	39,5	39,7
Male, 64 years and older	8,9	8,7
Sum	100	100

Column Percent

^a Source: Instituto Nacional de Estadística: Base de datos INEbase 2000; <http://www.ine.es/inebase/cgi/um>, 2001-09-15

STUDY DESCRIPTIONS

To differentiate countries in the crosstabulations within this codebook we have decided to use the international automobile identification codes:

SLO	-	Slovenia
D	-	Germany
H	-	Hungary
E	-	Spain
CH	-	Switzerland
S	-	Sweden

Due to practical reasons, the order of countries in this codebook is not alphabetical, but corresponds to the sequence of data collection.

The following study descriptions contain basic information on the Euromodule surveys. If available, the samples are compared with selected national population characteristics.

Study description:	Slovenia
Study title:	Slovenian Public Opinion 1999/2 – Attitudes on Health (III) and International Survey on the Quality of Life
Fieldwork dates:	May 1999
Principal investigator:	Prof. Dr. Niko Toš (Public Opinion and Mass Communication Researchs Centre, University of Ljubljana)
Sample type:	Systematic multi-stage sample with random start of adults aged 18 years or older living at non-institutional address in Slovenia is based on Central Register of Population. 140 PSU (primary sampling units) and 420 SSU (secondary sampling units) are formed, with names and addresses of persons in final clusters. A replacement procedure is used for non-responses. Halves of sample with every second person selected were used for SJM99/1 (non-Euromodule survey) and SJM 99/2 (Euromodule survey).
Fieldwork methods:	Personal interviews with trained interviewers
Fieldwork institute	Public Opinion and Mass Communication Research Centre, Ljubljana
Context of Euromodule Questionnaire	Euromodule questionnaire follows a survey on health values, behaviour and health system 1999/2
Sample size:	1012
Response rate:	2013 Total SJM99 questionnaires received 1001 SJM99/1 without Euromodule 1012 SJM/99/2 with Euromodule In SJM99/2 338 (33.4%) replacements were used due to non-response or ineligibility.
Language:	Slovenian
Weighted:	No

National Population Characteristics: Slovenia

Source: Census 1991, population 15+ years (Statistical Yearbook of the Republic of Slovenia 1995)

<i>Gender:</i>	Male	47.7%
	Female	52.3%

<i>Age groups:</i>	0-14	20.6%
--------------------	------	-------

Euromodule

15-29	22.5%
30-44	23.5%
45-64	22.5%
65+	10.9%

<i>Education:</i>	0-7 years of elementary school	17.3%
	Elementary school completed	30.3%
	Completed vocational school	19.7%
	Completed secondary school	23.7%
	University degree	9.0%

Source: Labour Force Survey, 1995

Employment Status	
Persons in Employment	882.000
Unemployed persons	70.000
Non-active population	669.000

Study description:	Germany																																	
Study title:	German Welfare Survey Trend 1999 - Euromodule																																	
Fieldwork dates:	October 1999																																	
Principal investigator:	Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Zapf, Dr. Roland Habich (Social Science Research Center Berlin, Research Unit: Social Structure and Social Reporting)																																	
Sample type:	Stratified multi-stage sample technique, random-route sampling. The population universe consisted of all German nationals aged 14 and older living at non-institutional address in Germany. The sample was stratified by the criteria federal state, administrative district, and type of community. The first stage of sampling was constituted by the selection of voting districts, the second stage by the selection of households, the third stage by the selection of individuals.																																	
Fieldwork methods:	Personal interviews with trained interviewers																																	
Fieldwork institute	Infratest Burke Sozialforschung GmbH, Munich																																	
Context of Euromodule Questionnaire	Part of the 'Infratest Omnibus Survey, Autumn 1999'																																	
Sample size:	2493																																	
Response rate:	64,3% (total non-response: n = 1384)																																	
	<table><tr><td></td><td>N</td><td>%</td></tr><tr><td>Sample, point of departure</td><td>4024</td><td>100,0</td></tr><tr><td>Neutral non-response</td><td></td><td>3,7</td></tr><tr><td>Remaining addresses</td><td>3877</td><td>100,0</td></tr><tr><td>Systematic non-response</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Not-at-homes</td><td></td><td>14,8</td></tr><tr><td>Respondent away/in vacation</td><td></td><td>0,6</td></tr><tr><td>Respondent ill</td><td></td><td>1,3</td></tr><tr><td>Refused</td><td></td><td>11,2</td></tr><tr><td>Total non-response</td><td>1384</td><td>35,7</td></tr><tr><td>Interviews realized</td><td>2493</td><td>64,3</td></tr></table>		N	%	Sample, point of departure	4024	100,0	Neutral non-response		3,7	Remaining addresses	3877	100,0	Systematic non-response			Not-at-homes		14,8	Respondent away/in vacation		0,6	Respondent ill		1,3	Refused		11,2	Total non-response	1384	35,7	Interviews realized	2493	64,3
	N	%																																
Sample, point of departure	4024	100,0																																
Neutral non-response		3,7																																
Remaining addresses	3877	100,0																																
Systematic non-response																																		
Not-at-homes		14,8																																
Respondent away/in vacation		0,6																																
Respondent ill		1,3																																
Refused		11,2																																
Total non-response	1384	35,7																																
Interviews realized	2493	64,3																																
Language:	German																																	
Weighted:	Yes																																	
Weighting procedure	The data are weighted according to employment																																	

status, federal state, sex, and age using
parameters from the national office of statistics
(Bevölkerungsfortschreibung vom 31.12.1997)

The German data set contains several weighting variables
 GEWPDEMO weighting of sample of individuals
 GEWPDE_W weighting of sample of individuals (West Germany)
 GEWPDE_O weighting of sample of individuals (East Germany)
 GEWHHW_O weighting of sample of households
 GEWHH_W weighting of sample of households (West Germany)
 GEWHH_O weighting of sample of households (East Germany)

Comparison with National Population Characteristics: Germany

(in %)	German Euromodule 1999	National office of statistics 1997
Gender		
Women	52,3	51,3
Men	47,7	48,7
Country region		
West Germany	79,6	81,2
East Germany	20,4	18,8
Age		
18-24	10,4	9,4
25-44	35,7	39,3
45-59	25,3	24,1
60-64	8,2	7,5
65+	20,4	19,6
Size of community		
< 2000 inhabitants	7,7	8,0
2000 – 4999	9,1	9,7
5000 – 19999	21,8	24,9
20000 – 49999	17,3	17,7
50000 – 99999	9,6	8,8
100.000 – 499999	19,6	16,5
> 500000	14,8	14,5

By means of the variable w_o one can split the sample into West German and East German population:

W_O	'West-German / East German'	
0	West Germany	(N = 2006)
1	East Germany	(N = 487)

Study Description:	Hungary
Study-Title:	EURÓPA
Fieldwork Dates:	November, 1999
Principal Investigator:	Zsolt Spéder, Demographic Research Institute, HCSO, Budapest
Sample Type:	Multi-stages probability sample. First stage: settlements; 9 classes of settlement-type, than probability sample: 73 settlement). Second stages: probability addresses sample concerning the chosen settlements. Supplementary sample with using Leslie Kish – method. In addition to the core and optional part of the joint Euromodule-Questionnaire there were some other topics included. Namely: the quality of the societies, anomie, norm acceptance, children' poverty. We included a demographic part: the household structure too. At first the core and than the optional part of the questionnaire was asked, then the additional topics. In some places we modified the structure of the original questionnaire, but always hold the original blocks of the Euromodule together.
Fieldwork Institute:	TÁRKI, Budapest
Fieldwork Method:	Personal interview
Sample Size:	1510
Response Rate:	In order to reach the ca 1500 sample we used 2383 addresses (62,7%).

The causes of the unsuccessful attempts:

	In proportion of all failed interviews:
R was unable to answer	2,2 %
Refusal	35,0 %
Temporarily far from home	13,8 %
Respondent moved	9,3 %
Individual/address not exist	3,3 %
R died	1,2 %
Cannot be found at home by 3 times visit	23,0 %
Other	11,9 %
Total	100 %

The failure was more typical in Budapest, in the case of men and younger aged (18-29).

Language: Hungarian

Weighted: Yes

Weighting procedure: Weights were counted using the 1996 Microcensus. Four dimension have been included: gender, age group (3 category), level of education (3 category), type of settlement (3 category).

Study description:	Spain
--------------------	-------

Study title:	Objective Living Conditions, Subjective Well-being, and Quality of the Society
Fieldwork dates:	January 2000
Principal investigator:	Prof. Dr. Salustiano del Campo, Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Sociología de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid
Sample type:	Stratified multi-stage sample technique, random route and quota sampling. The population universe consisted of Spanish adults aged 18 years or more in the Spanish mainland and island provinces (excluding the African settlements of Ceuta and Melilla). The sample was stratified by the criteria region (comunidad autónoma) and community size. The first stage of sampling was constituted by the proportional random sampling of communities (municipios), the second stage by the proportional random sampling of districts (secciones), the third stage by the random route and quota (sex and age) sampling of individuals.
Fieldwork methods:	Personal interviews
Fieldwork institute	CIS Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas
Context of Euromodule Questionnaire	Individual survey
Sample size:	2.489
Response rate:	99,56 % (total non-response: n = 11)
Language:	Spanish
Weighted:	No

Study description:	Switzerland
--------------------	-------------

Study title:	Living Conditions and Quality of Life in Switzerland
Fieldwork dates:	May – July 2000 Recontacting of households: August – September 2000
Principal investigator:	Prof. Dr. Christian Suter (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich)
Sample type:	Random-random sample: Random selection of households from updated Swisscom telephone list and random selection of person to be interviewed of each household. The population universe consisted of the language-assimilated Swiss resident population aged 18 and over. Persons living in institutions were excluded.
Fieldwork methods:	Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI)
Fieldwork institute	Institut für Praxisorientierte Sozialforschung (IPSO), Dübendorf
Context of Euromodule Questionnaire	Individual survey
Sample size:	1570 (unweighted), oversampling of canton Zurich and Italian speaking part of Switzerland 1054 (weighted national sample)
Response rate:	52,0%

	N	%
Gross sample I, point of departure	4263	100,0%
Neutral non-response on household level	1198	28,1%
Technical problems	514	
Language problems	299	
Not physically able to be interviewed	385	
Neutral non-response on individual level	43	1,0%
Not language-assimilated	14	
Does not belong to target group	3	
Not physically able to be interviewed	26	
Gross sample II	3022	100,0%
Systematic non-response on household level		
Refusals	1292	42,8%
Systematic non-response on individual level		
Refusals	154	5,1%
Target person away/on vacation	6	0,2%
Σ	1452	48,0%
Interviews realized	1570	52,0%

Languages: French, German, Italian

Weighted: Yes

Weighting procedure: The data are weighted according to region, selection probability of individual, and age using parameters from the national office of statistics (ESPOP, Dec. 1999).

The Swiss data set contains the following weighting variables:

w_reg	regional weighting / weighting of sample of households
w_ind	weighting of sample of individuals
w_age_h	age weighting (households)
w_age_i	age weighting (individuals)

Comparison with National Population Characteristics: Switzerland

(in %)	Swiss Euromodule 2000 ¹	National office of statistics (ESPOP, Dec. 1999 / SAKE 2000)
Gender		
Women	51,7	51,8
Men	48,3	48,2
Age		
18-24	10,7	10,2
25-34	13,4	18,9
35-44	22,0	20,4
45-54	20,5	17,5
55-64	15,9	13,7
65+	17,5	19,3
Educational degree ²		
Compulsory education, basic vocational education	16,2	15,5
Intermediate diploma school and other general education	2,3	1,1
Vocational education	55,1	52,6
School preparing for the university entrance certificate, teacher training	9,9	8,7
Higher vocational education	9,6	12,6
University	7,0	9,6

¹ The data are weighted with w_ind (individual weight)

² Because SAKE gathers data on the Swiss resident population aged 15 and over (Euromodule 18 and over), the category »incomplete compulsory education« is not included

Additional variables:	regions	Swiss regions
	a1	Cantons
	a2	Exact number of inhabitants

Study description:	Sweden																																																					
Study title:	ULF = Swedish Annual Survey of Living Conditions 1999 (3-4 quarter) – attached EUROMODULE, and complementary data from ULF 1998 (quarters 1-4).																																																					
Fieldwork dates:	January-December 1999 Part of the data (see documentation) comes from the 1998 survey																																																					
Principal investigator:	Prof. Dr. Joachim Vogel, Statistics Sweden, Social Welfare Analysis Program, and University of Umeå, dept of Sociology, Sweden																																																					
Sample type:	Simple random sampling of persons 16-84 years, from the current population register																																																					
Fieldwork methods:	Personal interviews with trained interviewers																																																					
Fieldwork institute	Statistics Sweden																																																					
Context of Euromodule Questionnaire	Part of ULF 1999'																																																					
Sample size:	2698 (for 1999) resp. 5003 (for 1998)																																																					
Response rate:	<table> <tr> <th></th><th colspan="2">1999:3-4</th><th colspan="2">1998:1-4</th></tr> <tr> <th></th><th>N</th><th>%</th><th>N</th><th>%</th></tr> <tr> <td>Sample, point of departure</td><td>3542</td><td>100,0</td><td>6622</td><td>100,0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Remaining addresses</td><td>3542</td><td>100,0</td><td>6622</td><td>100,0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Systematic non-response</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Not-at-homes</td><td>207</td><td>5,8</td><td>369</td><td>5,7</td></tr> <tr> <td>Respondent ill</td><td>79</td><td>2,2</td><td>81</td><td>1,2</td></tr> <tr> <td>Refused</td><td>558</td><td>15,8</td><td>1075</td><td>16,5</td></tr> <tr> <td>Total non-response</td><td>844</td><td>23,8</td><td>1525</td><td>23,4</td></tr> <tr> <td>Interviews realized</td><td>2698</td><td>76,2</td><td>5003</td><td>76,6</td></tr> </table>					1999:3-4		1998:1-4			N	%	N	%	Sample, point of departure	3542	100,0	6622	100,0	Remaining addresses	3542	100,0	6622	100,0	Systematic non-response					Not-at-homes	207	5,8	369	5,7	Respondent ill	79	2,2	81	1,2	Refused	558	15,8	1075	16,5	Total non-response	844	23,8	1525	23,4	Interviews realized	2698	76,2	5003	76,6
	1999:3-4		1998:1-4																																																			
	N	%	N	%																																																		
Sample, point of departure	3542	100,0	6622	100,0																																																		
Remaining addresses	3542	100,0	6622	100,0																																																		
Systematic non-response																																																						
Not-at-homes	207	5,8	369	5,7																																																		
Respondent ill	79	2,2	81	1,2																																																		
Refused	558	15,8	1075	16,5																																																		
Total non-response	844	23,8	1525	23,4																																																		
Interviews realized	2698	76,2	5003	76,6																																																		
Language:	Swedish																																																					
Weighted:	yes, standard procedure, see below																																																					
Weighting procedure	poststratification by gender, age and region based on population register statistics (weights are given for persons as well as households)																																																					

CODEBOOK INFORMATION AND EXPLANATION

The example below is a reproduction of information appearing in this codebook. The numbers in angular brackets < > do not appear in the codebook, but are references to the descriptions which follow the example.

< 1 > < 2 >

V23 Satisfaction: standard of living

< 3 >

What is about your standard of living? I mean goods and services which one can buy like housing, cloth, food, cars, vacation, travel. How satisfied are you, overall, with your standard of living?

< 4 >

< 5 >

0: completely dissatisfied

↓

10: completely satisfied

99: no answer

< 6 >

< 7 >

< 8 >

	SLO	D	H	E	CH	S	C7	C8
0 (%)	1	1	4	0	0	n.a.		
1 (%)	1	0	3	0	0	n.a.		
2 (%)	1	1	7	1	0	n.a.		
3 (%)	3	2	12	3	0	n.a.		
4 (%)	4	3	11	4	0	n.a.		
5 (%)	19	10	29	15	6	n.a.		
6 (%)	13	10	11	17	4	n.a.		
7 (%)	17	17	10	25	15	n.a.		
8 (%)	23	26	7	20	27	n.a.		
9 (%)	10	14	2	7	13	n.a.		
10 (%)	9	16	5	7	33	n.a.		
Mean	6,8	7,4	5,0	6,8	8,3	n.a.		
Median	7,0	8,0	5,0	7,0	8,0	n.a.		
valid n	1010	2492	1498	2461	1048	n.a.		
99	2M	1M	12M	28M	6M	n.a.		

Explanations

< 1 > A variable (and reference) number has been assigned to each item in the study. The variable numbers are identical with the question numbers in the Euromodule master questionnaire.

< 2 > Indicates the abbreviated (24 character maximum) variable label used within SPSS system files.

< 3 > Indicates the full question text taken from the Euromodule master questionnaire.

< 4 > Indicates the code value for the single answer category.

< 5 > Indicates the textual definition of the codes.

< 6 > Indicates percentaged frequencies by country (unweighted). This form is used whenever code categories have the same meaning for all countries. Columns percentages are based only on "valid cases". Missing data values were excluded from percentages. Missing cases are indicated by "M". If meaningful, mean and median are printed.

< 7 > n.a. indicates non-availability

< 8 > Place marker for further countries.

The entry "x" indicates that further information of the principal investigators are needed