

# Chapter 7: FIELD OPERATIONS

---

## INTRODUCTION

As with all aspects of PISA-D Strand C, countries were asked to comply with a set of Technical Standards and Guidelines (TSG) for survey operations and data collection. These standards can be found in Chapters 8, 9, 10 and 11 of the TSG. The TSG included a quality assurance (QA) and quality control (QC) programme for survey operations covering the collection of a range of information about the design and implementation of PISA-D Strand C data collection in each country via written reports, telephone conferences and some in-person meetings. Chapter 8 of this Technical Report provides a detailed description of the QA and QC programme that facilitated the collection of this information.

This chapter presents information about the 5 countries that completed the PISA-D Strand C Main Survey data collection: Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, Paraguay and Senegal. While Zambia was an official participant, it did not complete the Main Survey data collection. All the information presented in this chapter is based on data self-reported by countries as of 30 June 2019.

The initial sections of this chapter highlight findings with respect to the data collection timeline, interviewer training, field management practices, staffing and supervision, fieldwork production, nonresponse reduction and fieldwork quality control. Furthermore, at the end of data collection, interviewers were debriefed on their PISA-D Strand C experience. This feedback is summarised in section 7.8. The last section concludes the chapter with recommendations for future PISA-D Strand C cycles.

It is important to note that in most countries there were deviations from the TSG with regard to data collection. Whenever deviations were identified by the Consortium, whether during the planning, training or implementation stages, countries were notified quickly via email or telephone conference, or both. If possible, acceptable alternatives were identified; otherwise both the country and the OECD were notified of the potential problem and consequences of such deviations. However, for the most part, key TSG guidelines or acceptable alternatives were followed.

## DATA COLLECTION TIMELINE

Countries were expected to begin data collection on 1 September 2018 and complete it by 31 January 2019 (5 months or 150 days). Table 7.1 presents detailed information about each country's adherence to the data collection timeline.

Due to various challenges and constraints, countries did not start data collection as expected on 1 September 2018. However, all countries completed the fieldwork by the end of January 2019. The actual length of the field period ranged from 30 days in Senegal to 134 days in Guatemala, for an average of 95 days of data collection per country.

**Table 7.1 Main Survey Data Collection Timeline**

Country	Start Date	End Date	Duration (in days)
Guatemala	10 Sept 2018	21 Jan 2019	134
Honduras	17 Sept 2018	21 Dec 2018	96
Panama	28 Sept 2018	31 Jan 2019	126
Paraguay	24 Sept 2018	20 Dec 2018	88
Senegal	6 Dec 2018	4 Jan 2019	30

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

## FIELDWORK PRODUCTION

This section presents data on each country's production in terms of completed cases and completed assessments. Completed cases include all cases that received a final weight and are included in the analysis file. They consist of youth that completed the Youth Interview (YI), and those who could not respond to the Youth Interview for a literacy-related reason (language barrier or learning/mental disability). Guatemala, Honduras and Panama were required to complete 1 200 probability sample cases that met the definition of a complete case as stated in standard 1.5. Paraguay had to complete 1 460 cases while Senegal had a target of 2 000. The target number of completes was initially 2 700 but was revised following the Field Trial experience. Some countries had different requirements due to having more than one national language. The number of actual completed assessments reported in Table 7.2a are assessments finalised with a disposition code of 1 (complete).

**Table 7.2a Target and actual number of completed cases and actual number of assessments for the Main Survey - Representative Sample**

Country	Target Completed Cases	Actual Completed Cases	Actual Completed Assessments
Guatemala	1 200	1 250	1 041
Honduras	1 200	1 161	1 070
Panama	1 200	1 983	1 983
Paraguay	1 460	814	669
Senegal	2 000	2 103	2 023

Source: Survey Design International File.

Only Guatemala, Panama and Senegal met the PISA-D Strand C target number of completes required for the representative sample (Table 7.2a).

Countries also had targets for the limited representative sample. Guatemala, Honduras and Panama were required to complete 400 cases, Paraguay 140 while Senegal chose not to use the limited representative sample in their sampling design. Table 7.2b displays the assessments finalised with a disposition code of 1 (complete) for the limited representative sample.

**Table 7.2b Target and actual number of completed cases and actual number of assessments for the Main Survey - Limited Representative Sample**

Country	Target Completed Cases	Actual Completed Cases	Actual Completed Assessments
Guatemala	400	499	482
Honduras	400	120	117
Panama	400	72	66
Paraguay	140	188	156
Senegal	0	0	0

Source: Survey Design International File.

Only Guatemala and Paraguay met the PISA-D Strand C target number of completes required for the limited representative sample (Table 7.2b).

### INTERVIEWER TRAINING

Providing timely, adequate, standardised training to interviewers is an important tool in promoting the collection of quality data. Interviewers need to be very familiar with the survey procedures to administer them consistently across respondents and to produce data as error-free and as standardised as possible.

Section 9 of the Data Standards in the TSG covers all aspects of requirements related to the training of PISA-D Strand C field staff that constitutes a successful training approach. Countries were, at a minimum, expected to:

- Develop training materials from international versions provided by the contractors.
- Conduct interviewer trainings in person, no more than two weeks prior to the start of data collection.
- Train interviewers in small groups of 15-20.
- Assemble training staff to include a knowledgeable lead trainer, assistant(s) and technical support staff.
- Conduct in-person interviewer trainings which must include General Interviewing Techniques as well as the project specific training on the concepts, instruments and procedures related to PISA-D.
- Provide opportunity for supervisory staff to observe and evaluate trainee performance.
- Train interviewers in each language in which they will be conducting the interview and assessment, if there are multiple languages.

### Training logistics

The Consortium's recommendation was to conduct interviewer training no earlier than two weeks before the start of data collection so that interviewers could quickly apply the techniques learned and minimise learning loss.

As shown in Table 7.3, all but one country conducted interviewer training approximately one or two weeks prior to the beginning of data collection. Panama held interviewer training sessions as originally planned, but unforeseen circumstances delayed the beginning of data collection, effectively increasing the time between training and the field period.

A total of 13 interviewer training sessions were held in participating countries, with some countries holding as many as 4 sessions. The duration of training sessions varied significantly within and across countries. For example, Paraguay held training that lasted two days, while sessions held by Senegal lasted six days.

**Table 7.3 Summary of Main Survey interviewer training logistics**

Country	Date Training Began	Date Training Ended	Data Collection Start Date	Number of Sessions Held	Number of Days Per Event <sup>1</sup>
Guatemala	4 Sept 2018	28 Sept 2018	10 Sept 2018	4	4
Honduras	11 Sept 2018	14 Sept 2018	17 Sept 2018	4	4
Panama	7 Aug 2018	10 Aug 2018	28 Sept 2018	1	3-4
Paraguay	17 Sept 2018	21 Sept 2018	24 Sept 2018	2	2
Senegal	24 Nov 2018	29 Nov 2018	6 Dec 2018	3	6

Note: <sup>1</sup>A range indicates that a country conducted multiple training sessions lasting varying number of days. Only the minimum and maximum are reported here.

Source: Interviewer Training Forms

At each training session, countries were required to have at least one lead trainer, one assistant trainer and one person responsible for technical support. The lead trainer requirement was met by all countries. However, as shown in Table 7.4, half of the countries conducted some training sessions without technical support staff. In addition, all countries exceeded the recommended maximum number of 20 trainees per training room.

**Table 7.4 Interviewer training staffing and class sizes for the Main Survey**

Country	Lead Staff per Session/Room	Assist Staff per Session/Room	Tech Staff per Session/Room	Number of Trainees Per Session/Room <sup>1</sup>
Guatemala <sup>2</sup>	4	1-2	0-	About 27
Honduras	2	0	0	113
Panama	2-5	2-4	0	80-120
Paraguay <sup>2</sup>	1	2	3	About 53
Senegal <sup>2</sup>	3	7	9	About 33

Note: <sup>1</sup> A range indicates that a country conducted multiple training sessions with varying numbers of training staff and trainees. Only the minimum and maximum are reported here.

<sup>2</sup> Breakout rooms were used to conduct part of the training.

Source: Interviewer Training Forms.

## Content covered

The Consortium provided training materials that countries were required to use in training their interviewers. As countries were allowed to tailor their training programme to their interviewers'

particular needs, it is somewhat challenging to evaluate the adequacy of training offered. However, there were some topics for which virtually no tailoring was allowed, including the Youth Interview, assessment administration and gaining cooperation. Table 7.5 shows the topics covered in the Consortium-provided training package and topics that countries developed and tailored to their national context.

**Table 7.5 Required and optional components of interviewer training**

<b>Interviewer Training Topic</b>	<b>Estimated hours</b>
General Interviewing Techniques	3.5
Introduction	0.3
Preparing for the field	0.3
Introduction to the Tablet and the Case Management System	0.5
Locating households/respondents	1.0
Screeners interactive, if applicable	2.5
Referral cases	0.5
Youth Interview administration	3.0
Disposition codes	0.75
Exercise Administration	0.75
Administrative procedures	0.5
Quality Control	0.25
Gaining respondent cooperation	1.5
Putting it all together	1.0
Scripted practice interview (role play)	2.25
Live respondent practice	2.0
<b>Total hours for countries with list samples</b>	<b>20.6</b>

Source: Estimated timing of scripts provided by Consortium.

As shown in Table 7.6, only one country, Paraguay, met or exceeded the 5 hours recommended for gaining cooperation training. One country offered as little as two hours of gaining cooperation training.

All five countries spent the recommended amount of time on YI administration (four hours or more, regardless of level of experience). None of the countries met the recommended number of hours required for assessment administration (about four hours or more).

**Table 7.6 Actual training time spent on gaining cooperation, Youth Interview administration and assessment administration (Main Survey)**

Country	Number of Sessions or Groups	Hours In Person	Gaining Respondent Coop Total	YI Total <sup>1</sup>	EX Total <sup>2</sup>
Guatemala	4	25.0-27.0	3.5	4.5	0.8-3.5
Honduras	4	32.0	4.0	5.0	1.0
Panama	1	32.2	2.0	7.0	3.0
Paraguay	2	28.4	6.0	4.5	1.0
Senegal	3	42.0	4.0	5.0	2.0

Note: <sup>1</sup> Includes time spent at in-person training on Introduction to YI, YI interactives, and YI exercises.

<sup>2</sup> Includes time spent at in-person training on the Introduction to the Exercise and its administration.

Source: Interviewer Training Form.

The data in Table 7.6 suggest that countries made significant adaptations to interviewer training scripts provided by the Consortium. Countries were permitted to make adaptations to Consortium training materials to fit their specific situation (mostly YI adaptations), but these adaptations were not expected to dramatically affect the time spent on training.

## STAFFING AND FIELD MANAGEMENT

Hiring a sufficient number of field staff (supervisors and interviewers), close supervision of field staff, and monitoring of production goals and response rates are the fundamentals of successful fieldwork.

### Interviewer hiring and attrition

Each country was required to hire a sufficient number of interviewers to achieve that country's production goals within the data collection field period (see Table 7.2 for production targets). National teams were advised to use the best information available from similar national surveys conducted in their country as well as their PISA-D Strand C Field Trial experience to help determine the optimal number of interviewers needed. Countries with compressed data collection schedules due to delays were advised to adjust their staffing needs accordingly.

Table 7.7 provides detailed information about staffing levels and attrition. All countries hired more than 70 interviewers (between 70 to 220 interviewers; cf. column "Received Assignment"). The unusually large number (relative to other countries) of interviewers hired in Honduras was due to travel constraints that required all interviewers to be local. Most countries experienced some level of attrition in their interviewing staff.

**Table 7.7 Main Survey data collection staffing and reasons for attrition**

Country	Staff Attended Training	Staff Received Assignment	Staff Working at the End of Study	Typical Hours Worked Per Week	Quit	Laid off	Dismissed-Productivity	Dismissed-Quality Control	Other
Guatemala	84	84	84	40-50					
Honduras	220	220	105	40		X			
Panama	80	80	80	48			X		
Paraguay	71	70	68	42-48			X	X	
Senegal	99	85	84	35					

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

### Field management

Two key indicators of adequate field management are: i) the supervisor-interviewer ratio and ii) the frequency/regularity of supervisor-interviewer meetings.

In terms of the interviewer-supervisor ratio, countries were advised to assign one supervisor for every 15-20 interviewers to support the close supervision and monitoring of data collection.

Table 7.8 indicates that 3 out of 5 countries adhered to the recommended ratio of 20:1 or less. The other two countries had a ratio of about 30 to 1.

**Table 7.8 Number of interviewers per supervisor during Main Survey data collection**

Country	Number of Interviewers Who Received Assignments	Number of Supervisors	Size of Supervisor Assignment
Guatemala	84	20	4.2
Honduras	220	7	31.4
Panama	80	20	4
Paraguay	70	23	30.4
Senegal	85	7	12.1

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

With regard to adequate communication between field staff, the Technical Standards call for regular phone or in-person communication among the various levels of field staff, and email communication as necessary. In particular, field supervisors should have weekly calls with their interviewers to ensure steady and adequate progress in data collection by keeping all staff on task, and making them accountable for their progress or lack thereof. Discussion during the meetings should focus on progress through caseload, response rates, problems encountered and strategies/solutions for the completion of their remaining cases. Meeting sporadically can result in failure to meet data quality and production goals.

Three out of five countries followed communication recommendations. The other two countries, Panama and Senegal, did not conduct scheduled meetings and opted to have meetings only as needed.

Countries used a variety of modes to communicate with their field staff. All countries used telephone and all but Honduras and Senegal used email. Three countries (Guatemala, Paraguay and Senegal) held in-person meetings.

Details regarding the modes and frequency of communication are presented in Table 7.9.

**Table 7.9 Modes of communication used between field staff during Main Survey data collection**

Country	In Person	Phone	Email	Other	Frequency
Guatemala	X	X	X		Daily (phone), weekly (in-person)
Honduras		X		SMS	Every other day
Panama		X	X	WhatsApp	As needed
Paraguay	X	X	X	WhatsApp, App sending interviewer location and case status	Daily (phone, WhatsApp), weekly (in-person)
Senegal	X	X			As needed

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

## NONRESPONSE REDUCTION

Implementation of a comprehensive strategy to promote survey participation is a key element in obtaining acceptable and/or high response rates. Doing so requires the use of a variety of outreach materials and tools, including examining information on contact attempts and nonresponse, and strategies specifically aimed at minimising nonresponse. In addition, countries were strongly advised, but not required, to offer a respondent incentive as a means to increase participation.

### Use of introductory materials and outreach tools

Countries were required to send an introductory letter to households/respondents in advance of the interviewer visit and were advised to use a variety of tools to increase the visibility and legitimacy of the study. Table 7.10 shows that all countries used an introductory letter and virtually all countries used a respondent help line. The help line is a telephone line available to potential respondents to receive additional information about the survey. The number for this line is typically provided in the introductory letter or the study brochure. Study brochures, endorsement letters, informational leaflets or flyers, newspaper articles and study website were used by a few countries.

With regard to the use of respondent help lines by potential respondents, Table 7.10 shows that countries received very few calls, from 0 in Panama to 118 in Senegal.



**Table 7.10** Introductory materials used in presenting the study to respondents/households

Country	Intro. Letter	Study Brochure	Endorsement Letter	Informational leaflet or flyer	Newspaper Article	Study-Specific Website	Respondent Helpline (# calls)
Guatemala	X	X		X	X	X	
Honduras	X						X (3)
Panama	X					X	X (0)
Paraguay	X			X			X (1)
Senegal	X	X	X		X	X	X (118)

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

### Documenting contact attempts

Countries were advised to require interviewers to thoroughly document each contact attempt with sample persons/households and to record as much information as possible on nonresponse cases. The purpose of the documentation was to provide supervisors with the information necessary to manage the work of interviewers effectively and facilitate productivity.

The information recorded for each contact attempt included time and outcome of each visit and relevant comments that could be helpful in obtaining respondent cooperation during future contacts. The ability to document contacts was included as a feature in the CMS provided to countries and included as a requirement per Standard 8.10 (TSGs).

### Monitoring contact attempts

Countries were required to ensure that a minimum number of contact attempts were made to each respondent/household. Countries were strongly advised to attempt initial contacts in person and to make at least three subsequent contact attempts.

Table 7.11 presents details of the contact procedures used by participating countries. All countries met or exceeded the minimum number of contacts required with respect to their mode choice.

**Table 7.11** Strategy for contacting potential respondents/households

Country	Mode of Initial Contact		Minimum Number of Subsequent Contacts	
	In Person	Telephone	In Person	Telephone
Guatemala	X		3	3
Honduras	X		4	4
Panama	X		3	0
Paraguay	X		7	0
Senegal	X		3	4

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

## Documenting nonresponse

In addition to recording information about each contact attempt, countries were also required to record details about each case that was finalised as nonresponse. These details included basic demographics about the person who refused, the strength of the refusal, the likelihood of conversion, any problems encountered and any additional relevant information that might facilitate future contact with a potential respondent. Documentation of nonresponse was also included as a standard (Standard 8.11, TSGs)

In addition, countries were required to report on some of the most common reasons for refusal to complete the Youth Interview (Table 7.12) and the assessment (Table 7.13). For nonresponse to the Youth Interview, lack of interest was the most often cited reason across all countries, followed by excessive length (“too long”). For nonresponse to the assessment, excessive length of the assessment (“too long”) was the most often cited reason.

**Table 7.12 Most common reasons for refusal to Youth Interview (Main Survey)**

Country	Not Interested	Too Long	Don't Want To Be Bothered	Waste of Time/ Money	Dislike government	Don't Trust Surveys	Too Busy	Other
Guatemala	X	X			X		X	Safety concern <sup>1</sup>
Honduras	X		X			X		
Panama	X	X						
Paraguay	X	X					X	
Senegal								Temporarily absent

Note: <sup>1</sup> Legal guardian refused permission for respondents' participation due to safety concerns.

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

**Table 7.13 Most common reasons for refusal to assessment (Main Survey)**

Country	Not Interested	Too Long	Don't Want To Be Bothered	Waste of Time and Money	Too Busy	Don't Want To Do Exercise	Too Complicated	Other
Guatemala		X			X		X	Concern about tablet use
Honduras		X				X		Lack of incentive
Panama	X	X				X		
Paraguay		X					X	Language barrier, reading and writing difficulty
Senegal								Temporarily absent

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

## Nonresponse strategy

Countries were strongly advised to implement a comprehensive strategy to deal with nonresponse cases. Table 7.14 presents the nonresponse strategies used by countries. Two countries implemented a strategy involving a combination of techniques such as case reassignment and supervisor follow-up (Guatemala and Senegal). Three countries had minimal strategies involving only the use of supervisor follow-up (Honduras, Panama and Paraguay).

**Table 7.14 Strategies to deal with difficult/nonresponse cases during Main Survey data collection**

Countries	Case Re-Assign.	Follow-Up Senior FIs	Follow-Up Supervisors	Traveling Reassignment	Tailored Letters	Refusal Conversion Letters	Other
Guatemala	X	X	X				X <sup>1</sup>
Honduras			X				
Panama			X				
Paraguay			X				
Senegal	X		X				X <sup>1</sup>

Note: <sup>1</sup> Contact leaders of local communities

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

## Use of incentives

Three countries offered some form of incentive for participating. Details regarding the nature of each country's incentives are provided in Table 7.15.

**Table 7.15 Respondent incentives used during Main Survey data collection**

Country	Incentive type		Description
	Monetary	Non-Monetary	
Guatemala		X	Thank you letter
Honduras			None
Panama		X	Souvenir thermos and CD holder
Paraguay		X	PROB cases: refillable bottles; SCAD cases: pencil case
Senegal			None

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

## FIELDWORK QUALITY CONTROL

Each country was required to implement a comprehensive fieldwork quality control plan. This plan had to include:

- an evaluation of interviewing skills at the end of training and during data collection
- the implementation of a validation (callback) effort to detect falsification
- the review of survey and process data.

## Audio recording/observation of interviews

Countries were strongly advised to monitor at least two interviews per interviewer during the early stages of data collection and provide feedback. Monitoring could either be done by audio recording interviews, observing the interviews in person or a combination of both.

All countries except Senegal conducted some form of monitoring, as in-person observations. Only three countries monitored at least one interview per interviewer on average. Panama far exceeded the recommended level of two interviews per interviewer (see ratio of interviews monitored to number of interviewers assigned in Table 7.16).

The Consortium's recommendation was to monitor the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> completed interview, per Standard 11.1. However, some interviewers may not have been productive enough to allow for a country to monitor a second interview. Therefore, countries are considered to have met the requirements if they have monitored at least one interview per interviewer on average.

Table 7.16 shows the number of interviewers assigned to PISA-D Strand C, the number of interviews that were audio recorded or observed in each country, and the ratio of interviews monitored to the number of interviewers assigned to PISA-D Strand C work.

**Table 7.16** Number of interviews monitored by mode during the Main Survey data collection

Countries	Number of Interviewers Assigned	Number of Interviews Monitored				Ratio of Interviews Monitored to Number of Interviewers Assigned
		Taping Full Interview	Taping Snippets	Observation	Total	
Guatemala	84	0	0	138	138	1.66
Honduras	220	0	0	30	30	0.13
Panama	80	0	0	420	420	5.25
Paraguay	70	0	0	97	97	1.38
Senegal	85	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

## Validation

Validation (back-checks) is critical to data validity, it is the most important quality control feature of household data collection. As stated in the TSGs, the validation procedure required the verification of 10% of an interviewer's finalised work, including cases finalised as nonresponse. The validation plan had to ensure that:

- validation cases were selected randomly
- at least 10 percent of each interviewer's cases were validated
- all dispositions were validated, including completes and nonresponse.

The requirement to validate *each* interviewer at the 10% level appears to have been the most challenging for countries to meet: only 2 of the 5 countries did so.

Validation was either done mostly by phone (Guatemala and Honduras) or in-person (Panama, Paraguay and Senegal) and included all types of case dispositions, except in Guatemala and Honduras where cases finalised as non-contacts were not validated. All countries selected most or all validation cases randomly and used the form provided by the Consortium to carry out validation.

Details about each country’s validation procedure are presented in Table 7.17. No instances of falsification were reported by any of the countries.

**Table 7.17 Summary of validation procedure for Main Survey**

Country	Percentage of interviewers...		Validation Mode <sup>1</sup>				Dispositions Validated				Random Selection	Consortium Form Used
	Validated at 10%	Validated at 7%	Phone	In Person	Mail	Other	Completes	Non-Contacts	Refusal	Not-eligible		
Guatemala	100	100	664 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	X		X	X	All cases	Adapted
Honduras	39.1	50.5	481 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	X		X	X	Most cases	As-is
Panama	0	29.4	0 (0)	120 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	X	X	X	X	All cases	As-is
Paraguay	84.3	84.3	40 (0)	5 166 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	X	X	X	X	Most cases	Adapted
Senegal	100	100	0 (0)	8 412 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	X	X	X	X	Most cases	Adapted

Note: <sup>1</sup> Count of cases validated. Numbers not in parentheses refer to cases from probability sample that were validated. These include cases that were screened and deemed out of scope of the PISA-D Strand C population as well as those in scope. Numbers in parenthesis refer to referral cases that were validated. A count of 0 means that no cases were validated following the mode specified in the header of the column.

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

## Other quality control checks

Countries were advised to use automated management reports (proposed by the Consortium) dealing with process data as well as any other means of detecting falsification available to them. All countries, except Panama, used some of the reports proposed by the Consortium to monitor administration length, time lapse between interviews and the number of interviews completed per day. Details are provided in Table 7.18.

**Table 7.18: Use of fieldwork quality control reports during the Main Survey data**

Country	Interview Duration	Individual Instrument Duration	Time Between Interviews	Interviews Conducted Very Late/Very Early	Number of Interviews Per Day
Guatemala			X		X
Honduras			X		
Panama					
Paraguay			X	X	
Senegal	X	X			X

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

In addition, countries were advised to monitor the quality of data throughout the Main Survey data collection. All countries reviewed data frequencies. Only two countries reviewed the quality of open-ended responses. Details are presented in Table 7.19.

**Table 7.19 Procedures to monitor quality of data during the Main Survey data collection**

Country	Data Frequencies	Review of 'Other-Specify' Responses	Review of Open-Ended Responses	Missing Data Rates	Other
Guatemala	X		X	X	
Honduras	X				
Panama	X				
Paraguay	X			X	Review of CMS data against paper documentation.
Senegal	X	X	X	X	

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

## Interviewer productivity

Unusually high interviewer productivity (measured as number of completed interviews) can be an indication of falsification. Countries were asked to monitor the minimum, mean and maximum number of completes per interviewer and to increase the validation rate of interviews with high production. Data is provided in Table 7.20.

The mean number of completes per interviewer ranged from 3 in Honduras, Panama and Paraguay, to 23 in Guatemala. The range between the least and most productive interviewer

varied widely among countries from 8 in Paraguay to 74 in Guatemala. Details about interviewer productivity are presented in Table 7.20.

**Table 7.20 Summary statistics of the number of completes achieved by interviewers for the Main Survey data collection**

Country	Mean (rounded to nearest unit)	Minimum	Maximum	Range
Guatemala	23	1	75	74
Honduras	3	0	13	13
Panama	3	0	13	13
Paraguay	3	1	9	8
Senegal	10	0	21	21

Source: Most recent Data Collection Form submitted.

## INTERVIEWER DEBRIEFING

Countries were required to administer a debriefing questionnaire and/or hold debriefing sessions with interviewers to gain insights into their perspective on the training they received, the problems they encountered, the comments made by respondents and to provide suggestions for improving procedures for future cycles of PISA-D Strand C. Countries were required to provide a report to the Consortium summarising the key findings. Only one country, Paraguay, submitted an interviewer debriefing report after the Main Survey.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In general, countries were able to carry out all aspects of the PISA-D Strand C field operations to achieve the target number of completed cases.

In future cycles, we recommend that countries solicit the engagement of the National Statistical Institute early in the planning phase for the conduct of the Field Trial. This will allow countries to know in advance the resources that are available including the number of experienced interviewers to conduct data collection, staff to advise in the selection of the study sample and maps for use in the field. Countries must also strive to assemble a team to work solely on PISA-D Strand C activities – thus eliminating the conflict with resource and time availability when team members are also working on PISA-D Strand A activities.

The Consortium should consider extending the time allotted in the overall planning period for countries to acquire, prepare and test the required instrumentation as well as the functioning of the tablets. A longer period allocated for data collection would be conducive to completing all survey operations activities mandated by the Consortium and specified in the TSGs, as the experience during this pilot study showed that most countries encountered a variety of unforeseen challenges, including inclement weather (torrential rains and flooding), interviewer attrition, security concerns in sampled areas and changes in the project leadership team.