

Make Your Publications Visible.

A Service of



Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft Leibniz Information Centre

Delhey, Jan; Böhnke, Petra; Habich, Roland; Zapf, Wolfgang

Working Paper

The Euromodule: a new instrument for comparative welfare research

WZB Discussion Paper, No. FS III 01-401

Provided in Cooperation with:

WZB Berlin Social Science Center

Suggested Citation: Delhey, Jan; Böhnke, Petra; Habich, Roland; Zapf, Wolfgang (2001): The Euromodule: a new instrument for comparative welfare research, WZB Discussion Paper, No. FS III 01-401, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB), Berlin

This Version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/10419/50210

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



Veröffentlichungen der Abteilung Sozialstruktur und Sozialberichterstattung des

Forschungsschwerpunktes Sozialer Wandel, Institutionen und Vermittlungsprozesse des Wissenschaftszentrums Berlin für Sozialforschung

ISSN 1615-7540

FS III 01 - 401

The Euromodule

A New Instrument for Comparative Welfare Research

Jan Delhey, Petra Böhnke, Roland Habich, Wolfgang Zapf

March 2001

Research Unit "Social Structure and Social Reporting"

Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB)
• Reichpietschufer 50 • D - 10785 Berlin
Telefon 030 - 25 491 - 0

Abstract

As Europe is growing together politically and economically, the international perspective is becoming more and more important in social reporting and welfare research. Are there strong differences in the objective living conditions and the subjective well-being between European nations? Do the Europeans enjoy the same quality of society all over Europe? To answer questions like these empirically, 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. By now, data from Germany, Hungary, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland are available. In this paper the conception and development of the *Euromodule* are described. In an extensive appendix, the *Euromodule* master questionnaire and other central materials are documented.*

Mit dem politischen und wirtschaftlichen Zusammenwachsen Europas ist der Blick über nationale Grenzen hinaus von besonderem Interesse für die Sozialberichterstattung und die Wohlfahrtsforschung. Wie stark unterscheiden sich die objektiven Lebensbedingungen und das subjektive Wohlbefinden der Europäer? Wie steht es um die "soziale Qualität" der europäischen Gesellschaften? Um solche Fragen empirisch beantworten zu können, haben sich Wohlfahrtsforscher aus 19 Nationen zu einem Netzwerk zusammengeschlossen. Ergebnis dieser Kooperation ist das *Euromodul*, ein Umfragebaustein für einen europäischen Wohlfahrtsvergleich. Inzwischen liegen erste Daten aus Deutschland, Schweden, der Schweiz, Slowenien, Spanien und Ungarn vor. In diesem Beitrag werden die Entwicklung und Konzeption des Euromoduls vorgestellt. In einem umfangreichen Anhang werden die Kooperationspartner genannt sowie Fragebogen und technische Standards dokumentiert.

^{*} We are greatful to Uschi Gerlach for doing the language check.

Address:

Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB)
Research Unit "Social Structure and Social Reporting"
Reichpietschufer 50
D 10785 Berlin
Germany

Internet: http://www.wz-berlin.de/sb/

Contents

| 1 | Development and Conception of the Euromodule | | | | |
|---|--|----|--|--|--|
| | How the <i>Euromodule</i> Came into Being | 4 | | | |
| | Goals and Objectives | 6 | | | |
| | Welfare Concepts and Conceptualizations | 8 | | | |
| | The Euromodule Questionnaire | 10 | | | |
| | Outlook | 13 | | | |
| | References | 15 | | | |
| 2 | Appendix: Key Documents | 17 | | | |
| | D1 Cooperating Partners | | | | |
| | D2 Technical Standards | | | | |
| | D3 Questionnaire | | | | |

1 Development and Conception of the *Euromodule*

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 analyze the current state of affairs and the 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" there is a lot of controversy 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 are given high priority by the European Union (EU). Another development is the transformation of the former 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 are highlighting the increasing demand for a comparative European welfare research. In this paper, the development and conceptual approach of the Euromodule research network are described

In 1996, the Research Unit "Social Structure and Social Reporting" at the Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB) and the Social Indicators Department at the Survey Research Centre 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 statistical offices, 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 government 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.*

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 cooperations 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 funds by themselves.

^{*} The description of the projects and bibliographies are available on the following website: http://www.zuma-mannheim.de/data/social-indicators/eureporting.

Goals and Objectives

The common interest of the participants in 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 takeoff 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 supranational level of international organizations (cf. Vogel 1994, Zapf 2000). The OECD, the United Nations, Eurostat and other organizations gave rise to a multitude of social reports and a lot of continued periodic publications. Moreover, these organizations produced huge compendia of social indicators for world regions or the world as a whole themselves, mainly consisting of aggregated data at the level of nation states.

During its takeoff, 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). A 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 Allardt 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 supranational 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 sociodemographic characteristics. Survey research offers the possibility to combine individual living conditions and subjective characteristics - and it also has 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 only appear 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 labour market and 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. Within 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.

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 wellbeing, 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 subjective well-being either. 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, others 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 sociopsychological 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 analyze 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: 199). 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 about which concept might be the more appropriate one. Nowadays, there is a mainstream concensus 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 e.g. 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 objective as well as subjective indicators in order to focus on their constellation. This combined approach has been used in several survey projects, e.g. in the above-mentioned Scandinavian Welfare Survey, and 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. "Quality of life can be understood as ... good living conditions that go along with positive subjective wellbeing" (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 to a large extent depend 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 the members of society and the binding effects of these relations, the rupture of the relationship between individual and society due to new forms of poverty, and the feelings of mutual commitment and trust created by common values and norms. The

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) |

Euromodule also has included some of these concepts in its program, although it has not been 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 "quality of society". When these characteristics are evaluated by the population, we speak of the *perceived* quality of society. The different aspects of welfare covered by the *Euromodule* are illustrated in table 1. The *Euromodule* can be used as a uniform instrument to investigate these aspects in a representative fashion.

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 on 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.

Table 2: Indicators used in the Euromodule

Objective living conditions

- housing
- household composition
- social relations (also *)
- participation
- standard of living
- income
- health
- education and work
- personal environment and safety

Subjective well-being

- 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*

(Perceived) quality of society

- 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*

Background variables (so far as not included in objective living conditions)

- age
- gender
- type of community
- marital status
- employment status
- occupation (current / former)

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. Thus, private social concerns are covered as well as public ones. 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

^{* =} optional part

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 issue of social integration. In addition there are included 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.

As the *Euromodule* is planned as a "slim" survey apt to be attached to omnibus surveys, each life domain could be covered only by a few indicators. The intention was to cover as many social concerns as possible, rather than ascertain in-depth data for a 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. The emphasis on material living conditions is justified by the wide range of economic power which 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 multipurpose 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 it 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 differ in their level of modernization, the type of welfare state, and political traditions.

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 data, the principal investigators, sample type, fieldwork methods 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.

Table 3: Euromodule-timetable

| | 199 | 7 | 199 | 8 | 199 | 9 | 200 | 00 | 200 |)1 | 200 |)2 | 200 |)3 |
|-------------------------------|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|----|-----|----|-----|----|-----|----|
| Conception | Х | Χ | Х | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Development of questionnaire | | | | Х | Х | | | | | | | | | |
| Data collection | | | | | | X | Χ | Х | Х | Х | | | | |
| Data management | | | | | | | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х | | | |
| Codebook and table collection | | | | | | | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х | | | |
| Data analysis | | | | | | | | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х | |
| Publication | | | | | | | | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х | Χ | |
| Conferences | | | Х | | Х | | Х | | | Х | | Х | | Х |

With data from eight countries by mid 2001, the *Euromodule* got off to a good start. With this enterprise, the research initiative hopes to contribute to social reporting in Europe and to a deeper understanding of the state of affairs of the nations and the mood of their population. However, several larger European countries are still missing, e.g. 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, the repetition of the surveys is envisaged 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.

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, Centre for Survey Research and Methodology (ZUMA), Mannheim.
- 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, p. 441-446.
- Diener, Ed / Eunkook Suh (1997): Measuring Quality of Life: Economic, Social and Subjective Indicators. In: Social Indicators Research 40, 1997, p. 189-216.
- Erikson, Robert (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, 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 (1977): 1976 Progress Report on Phase II. Plan for Future Activities. The OECD Social Indicator Development Programme, 4, 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.

- Statistisches Bundesamt (Hg.) in Zusammenarbeit mit WZB und ZUMA (2000): 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 a.M./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.

2 Appendix: Key Documents

- D1 Cooperating Partners
- D2 Technical Standards
- D3 Questionnaire

D1 Cooperating Partners

| No. | Country | Research Group |
|-----|----------------|--|
| 1 | Austria | Dr. C. Haerpfer, Prof. K. Müller IHS Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna |
| 2 | Belgium | Dr. I. Marx Centrum voor Social Beleid, University Antwerpen |
| 3 | Czech Republic | Prof. J. Vecernik Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague |
| 4 | Denmark | Dr. J. Bonke Danish National Institute of Social Research, Copenhagen |
| 5 | Finland | Dr. M. Lindqvist Statistics Finland, Helsinki |
| 6 | France | Dr. L. Chauvel Institut d'Etudes Politiques Observatoire Sociologique du Changement, Paris |
| 7 | Germany | Prof. W. Zapf, Dr. R. Habich Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB) |
| | | Dr. HH. Noll ZUMA, Mannheim |
| 8 | Great Britain | Dr. D. Gordon University of Bristol |
| 9 | Hungary | Prof. Zs. Spéder Demographic Research Institute, Hungarian Statistical Office, Budapest |
| 10 | Italy | Prof. A. Martinelli, Dr. N. Pasini University of Milano |
| 11 | Netherlands | Prof. R. Veenhoven Erasmus University Rotterdam |
| 12 | Norway | Dr. T. Moum Dept. of Behavioural Sciences in Medicine, Oslo |

| 13 | Poland | Prof. W. Adamski Polish Academy of Science, Warsaw |
|----|-------------|--|
| 14 | Slovenia | Prof. N. Tos <i>University of Ljubljana</i> |
| 15 | South Korea | Prof. Doh C. Shin University of Missouri at Columbia, U.S.A. |
| 16 | Spain | Prof. S. del Campo University of Madrid |
| 17 | Sweden | Prof. J. Vogel Statistics Sweden, Stockholm |
| | | Dr. B. Halleröd Umea University, Umea |
| 18 | Switzerland | Prof. Ch. Suter ETH Zürich |
| 19 | Turkey | Prof. Ayata, Dr. Y. Özcan <i>University of Ankara</i> |

D2 Technical Standards

Euromodule Towards a European Welfare Survey

Part I: Some Rules for Methodological and Technical Issues

1. Population Universe

National surveys will have to meet certain standards of comparability in terms of the population universe: In this respect, the national surveys are supposed to be representative surveys for the whole population rather than for specific population groups. The survey shall cover the whole adult population from at least 18 years upwards. There will be no general rule whether non-national residents are to be included or not.

Details about the population universe and deviations from general rules must be documented properly.

2. Sample Design

In terms of sample design the minimum requirement will be to accept only random samples and not to allow quota sampling.

Details of the sample design have to be documented properly for each survey.

3. Sample Size

Concerning sample size it would be preferable to aim at a sample size of about 2000 respondents per country. However an effective sample size of 1000 respondents should be the absolute minimum requirement.

4. Socio-Demographic Variables to be Included

See Questionnaire.

Because of the consequences in terms of comparability, deviations from the agreed upon socio-demographic variables should be avoided as far as possible. If there will be any deviations, they need to be explained and documented in detail. The occupation of respondents should be coded according to ISCO 1988, the educational level according to ISCED after data collection by the national teams (see additional sheets).

5. Other Information to be Collected Within National Surveys

In order to know which kind of information (for example information about the interviewer, interview situation, sample unit etc.) other than the Euromodule itself and the set of socio-demographic variables we can expect to be collected within the national surveys, each participant is kindly requested to provide us with a respective list of variables which are routinely used in his national survey.

6. Ouestionnaire Translation

The comparability of data collected depends to a large degree on the comparability and equivalence of question wordings. Therefore each participant is requested to put special emphasis on the quality of translation of the original English language master questionnaire. Whenever possible, the application of quality assurance procedures like back translation is highly recommended.

Each participant is kindly asked to provide us with the translation of the Euromodule-Questionnaire in his national language in due time before fielding.

7. Question Ordering

To avoid ordering effects questions need to be asked in an identical order across all national surveys (see Euromodule-Master-Questionnaire).

If for particular reasons deviations from the compulsory succession of questions are unavoidable, this needs to be documented in detail.

In addition, the exact placement of the Euromodule questions within the questionnaire shall be documented in case they are part of a larger survey.

8. Field Work - Interviewing

Interviewing: As far as interviewing - techniques are concerned, there is agreement that as a general rule face to face interviews are required, either paper and pencil or CAPI. The agreed upon Euromodule-Questionnaire has been designed for face to face interviews. Telephone or mail surveys are considered to be not appropriate in order to guarantee comparability, since the questionnaire will have to be adapted for respective techniques. Anyhow we do not want to lose any country because of technical reasons.

If there will be any deviations from this general rule, detailed information will be neccesary.

Timing of Surveys: For obvious reasons possibilities to synchronize time periods of data collection are very weak. We ask each participant to let us know about the possibilities and preferences to conduct the survey in his country.

9. Documentation Requirements

In order to be able to check for and evaluate comparability each participant is requested to provide all kinds of relevant information about his national survey carried out. This information shall include - for example - national questionnaires, field reports, information about the field organization etc..

10. Data Management Requirements

Decisions about data management requirements - as for example checking and cleaning of national data sets, integration of national data sets, structure of a common data set - have to be taken in due time.

11. Data Disemination and Rules of Access

As a general rule, all data collected within the Euromodule Network shall be made accessable in due time and shall be shared among those participants, who are running the Euromodule in their national surveys and give access to these data.

Euromodule

| - |
|---|
| _ |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

| 2. Is your sample designed to be representative of the entire <u>adult</u> population of your |
|---|
| country? |
| ☐ Yes |
| □ No |
| 3. Are any groups like non-national residents excluded from, or under-represented in, your |
| sample design? |
| Non-national residents excluded/under-represented |
| ☐ Other (Please write in:) |
| 4. What is the <u>lower</u> age cut-off for your sample? |
| (Please write in) |
| 5. Is there any <u>upper</u> age cut-off for your sample |
| Yes (please write in:) |
| □ No |
| 6. What is the planned achieved sample size? |
| (Please write in) |
| 7. What is the expected response rate? |
| (Please write in) |
| 8. Is your sampling method a probability or random sampling method? |
| Yes (that is, with no 'quota controls' at any stage) |
| □ No, other (please write in): |

Sampling

В.

| C. | Fieldwork |
|--------------|--|
| 9. How wi | Il the Euromodule questions be fielded? |
| | ☐ Face-to-face -> Question 10 |
| | ☐ Self-completion (postal) |
| | □ Phone |
| 10. If Euro | module questions fielded face-to-face. |
| | ☐ Paper and Pencil |
| | ☐ Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) |
| 11. What i | s the most likely timing of your survey? |
| | Fielding will probably start Year Month |
| D. | Questionnaire |
| 12. Are the | ere any parts of the Euromodule-Questionnaire which will not be fielded in your? |
| | □ No |
| | ☐ Yes -> Question 13 |
| 13. lf any լ | parts of the Euromodule-Questionnaire are not fielded, please specify which. |
| | Core Part |
| | Question No.: |
| | Optional Part Question No.: |

| 14. Which kind of information is routinely collected in your survey about interviewers, |
|---|
| interview situation, sample unit etc. |
| (Please attach list of variables) |
| |
| E. Data Management |
| |
| 15. Will your data be deposited in a national Social Science Archive? |
| ☐ Yes |
| □ No |
| |
| |

D3 Questionnaire

| Hous | sing | | | |
|------|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | How many rooms has your apartment/your house? I mea kitchen, bathroom, corridor, storage rooms, and sublet i | - | hout | |
| | Number of rooms: ,, | | | |
| 2 | How is your apartment equipped? Does it have the follo | wing a | menities? | |
| | a) A separate kitchen b) A bath or shower c) An indoor flushing toilet d) Hot running water e) Central heating or electric storage heaters f) A place to sit outside, e.g. balcony, terrace or garden | yes | o | |
| 3 | Please tell me, which item on this list applies to the hous your household? (show list) | ing coi | nditions of | |
| | renter of an apartment, renter of a house, which was a substitute of an apartment, which was a substitute of a house, which was a substi | 0 0 0 | | |
| 4 | Please tell me, by means of this list, how satisfied you are your apartment or house? In case you are completely satisfied, please answer "10". completely dissatisfied, please answer "0". If you are new satisfied nor completely dissatisfied, please choose one of between "1" and "9". (show scale) | If you ther co | are ompletely | |
| | 10 8 8 7 8 9 9 9 9 | + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + | = completely satisfied = completely dissatisfied | |

| Hous | sehold Composition and Demography | | |
|------|--|------------------|--|
| 5 | The next questions refer to your household. How many people live in your household including yourself? We mean everyone who lives here normally even if he/she is absent at the moment, e.g. in the hospital or on vacation. Please also include the children. | | |
| | Number: | | |
| | (excluding paid employees and persons who pay for rent) | | |
| 6 | How many of them are under 18 years? | | |
| | Number: | | |
| 7 | Gender | | |
| | o male | | |
| | o female | 0 | |
| 8 | In which year are you born? | | |
| | year | | |
| 9 | Were both your parents <country> citizens when you</country> | ı were born? | |
| | o both <country> citizens</country> | ٥ | |
| | o one non- <country></country> | _ | |
| | o both non- <country></country> | | |
| 10 | Did you vote in the last general parliamentary election | n? | |
| | o yes | ٥ | |
| | o no | | |
| | o no right to vote | | |
| 11 | Type of Community | | |
| | o large city | | |
| | o suburb of large city | | |
| | o middle-size city | | |
| | o small city | | |
| | o village | | |
| | o rural area | | |
| | (filled up by interviewer, according to the classification of r | ational polling) | |

| Social relations | | | | |
|------------------|---|------------|------------|--|
| 12 | Are you currently a member of an organisation or associate Please look at this list and tell me if you are a member of | | | |
| | a) trade union b) political party c) neighbourhood association d) environmental association e) charity association f) church related association g) cultural group like music or theatre group h) sports club or leisure club i) other j) not a member of any organisation or association? | yes | ° | |
| 13 | Thinking now of close friends – not your husband, or wifamily members – but people you feel fairly close to. Do friend with whom you can discuss intimate and importate O Yes O No | you hav | e a close | |
| 14 | And how many close friends do you have? number of friends | | | |
| 15 | How often do you contact your close friends? O Nearly daily O At least once a week O At least once a month O Infrequently | 0 | | |
| 16 | Generally speaking, would you say that most people car you can't be too careful in dealing with people? Most people can be trusted Can't be too careful | n be trust | ed or that | |

| 17 | In all countries there are differences or even conflicts between different social groups. In your opinion, how much conflict is there between | | | | | |
|----|---|----------------|--------|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | | very strong | strong | only weak | no con- flicts | |
| | a) poor and rich people? b) the unemployed and people with jobs? c) Management and workers? d) young people and older people? e) men and women? f) <germans> and immigrants? very strong conflicts strong conflicts only weak conflicts no conflicts</germans> | | | 00000 | 00000 | |
| 18 | At present, are you single married and living with your spouse married but separated from your spouse widowed or divorced? (only record actual marital status) | use | 0 0 0 | | | 19 20 19 19 |
| 19 | Do you live with a partner? • Yes • No | | 0 | | | |

| Stand | ard of Living | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|--|
| l k v | There are different views/opinions about what iving. What is your opinion: What items on t nousehold in your country be able to afford? what is desirable but not necessarily needed, necessary? | his list shoul What could | ld every I be ren | , ounced, | |
| | desirable | | | | |
| (| show list) | | | | |
| | | could be derenounced | esirable | necessary | |
| k c c f g h i j k | To be able to buy new clothes regularly To be able to replace worn-out furniture To have on average one cooked meal per day To be able to invite friends for dinner once a month To be able to take the family out for dinner once a month Car Television Washing machine Dishwasher To be able to save at least (50 Euro)* | | | | |
| c r s | | 0 0 0 | | 0 | |
| | * give amount in national currency, around 5% of cousehold income) | the national | average | net | |

| do? What don't you have or can't do because don't you have or do out of other reasons? | you canno | ot afford it | ? What |
|--|--------------------|------------------------|--|
| o I have or do it | | | |
| o I can not afford it | | | |
| D I don't have or don't do it out of other | reasons | | |
| (show list) | | | |
| | I have or do it | I can not afford it | I don't have or do it out of other reasons |
| a) An apartment in which every household | | | |
| member has his own room | | | |
| b) WC and bath or shower in the apartment | | | |
| c) Garden, balcony or terrace | | | |
| d) One week vacational travel per year | | | |
| e) Subscription to a newspaper | | | |
| f) Phone | | | |
| g) Buy new clothes regularly | | | |
| h) Replace worn-out furniture | | | |
| i) Have on average one cooked | | | |
| meal per day | | | |
| j) Invite friends for dinner once a month | | | |
| k) Take the family out for dinner | | | |
| once a month | | | |
| l) Car | | | |
| m) Television | | | |
| n) Washing machine | | | |
| o) Dishwasher | | | |
| p) Save at least (50 Euro)* per month | | | |
| q) Private pension plan | | | |
| r) Video-recorder | | | |
| s) Computer | | | |
| | | | |
| (* give amount in national currency, around 5% of | the nationa | l average ne | et |

| 22 | If you were asked to choose one of thes which would you say you belong to? | e five names for your social class, |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|
| | o lower class | <u> </u> |
| | o working class | |
| | o middle class | |
| | o upper middle class | |
| | o upper class | 0 |
| 23 | What is about your standard of living? I one can buy like housing, cloth, food, ca are you, overall, with your standard of I | ars, vacation, travel. How satisfied |
| | | 6 + |
| | | 5 + |
| | | 4 + |
| | | 3 + |
| | | 2 + |
| | | 1 + |
| | | 0 |

| Inco | me | | | | | |
|------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 24 | Would you please tell me, what the monthly net income of your household is. I mean the total income of all household members, after deduction of taxes and contributions. Please do not forget additional incomes, like for instance housing or child allowances. <currency></currency> | | | | | |
| 25 | (If refused, emphasize anonymity, and show list w | ith income categories | | | | |
| 23 | country specific) reference number | iti income categories, | | | | |
| 26 | If you compare your household's present financia year ago, would you say the situation today has | situation to that of one | | | | |
| | Clearly improved Improved somewhat Remained the same Deteriorated somewhat Clearly deteriorated? | 0 0 0 | | | | |
| 27 | Is your household able to make ends meet | | | | | |
| | with great difficulty, with some difficulty, fairly easily, very easily? | 0 0 | | | | |
| 28 | Taking everything into account, how satisfied are income? Please use the scale from 0 to 10. | you with your household 10 = completely satisfied 9 8 7 | | | | |
| | | 6 - 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 - 2 - completely dissatisfied | | | | |

| Heal | th | | | |
|------|--|---|---------------------------|--|
| 29 | Are you hampered in your daily activities by any chroninealth problem, illness or disability? | c physica | l or mental | |
| | Yes, severelyYes, to some extentNo | 0 | | |
| 30 | Do you need to take medicine regularly? I mean real mopills. | edicine, n | ot vitamin | |
| | o Yes o No | 0 | | |
| 31 | Please answer the following questions simply by saying | "yes" or | "no". | |
| | a) Do you often get spells of complete | yes | no | |
| | exhaustion or fatigue? b) Do you usually feel unhappy or depressed? c) Do you often shake or tremble? d) Are you constantly keyed up and jittery? e) Do frightening thoughts again and | | 0 0 0 0 | |
| | again come back in your mind? | _ | _ | |
| 32 | Now I have some questions about your health. All in all you with your health? Please use the scale from 0 to 10 | | | |
| | | 10 T 9 - 8 - 7 - 6 - 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 - | = completely satisfied | |
| | | ο I | = completely | |

| Educ | ation and Work | |
|------|---|----------|
| 33 | What educational degree do you have? Please tell me only the highest general educational degree you have. | |
| | | |
| | (Educational degrees, country specific, to be coded afterwards according to ISCED; see additional sheet) | |
| 34 | How satisfied are you with your education? | |
| | 10 | |
| 35 | Now we have some questions concerning your occupation. Are you currently working for pay either | |
| | o full-time, o part-time, o or are you only occasionally employed, o are you not employed at all, o or are you in military service? | 42 44 |
| 36 | Please classify your present occupational status | |
| | | |
| | list occupational status (see end of core part) | |

| 37 | Please name your present job | | |
|----|--|---------------------------|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | (ISCO classification) | | |
| 38 | What type of professional education or training is us job that you do? | sually necessary for the | |
| | (show list) | | |
| | no vocational education or particular training no vocational education, but fairly lengthy | ٥ | |
| | training at the workplace | | |
| | no vocational education, but certain coursesvocational training, non-university | | |
| | o university education | 0 | |
| 39 | How many hours do you normally work per week? | | |
| | hours per week | | |
| 40 | Taking everything into consideration, how satisfied on with your present job? Please use the scale from 0 to | | |
| | | 10 = completely satisfied | |
| | | 8 + | |
| | | 7 🕇 | |
| | | 6 + | |
| | | 5 🕇 | 1 |
| | | 4 🕇 | |
| | | 3 + | 1 |
| | | 2 + | 1 |
| | | 1 🕇 | İ |
| | | 0 | |
| | | | İ |

| 41 | In case you would lose your present job, how difficult would it be to find an equivalent job? | | | |
|----|--|------------------|----|--|
| | easy difficult practically impossible | _ _ _ | | |
| | | | | |
| 42 | On this list you find several reasons for not being employed. What applies best to your current situation: | | | |
| | o retired o early retirement o permanently disabled, sick o in school, university o retraining o unemployed o homemaker o others | | | |
| 43 | Have you ever been employed? | | | |
| | o yes o no | 0 | 49 | |
| 44 | Please classify your last occupational status | | | |
| | | | | |
| | list occupational status (see end of core part) | | | |
| 45 | Please name your last job? | | | |
| | (ISCO classification) | | | |
| 46 | Have you ever experienced spells of unemployment durir years? | g the last five | | |
| | o yes o no | 0 | 49 | |
| 47 | How often have you been unemployed during the last five | e years? | | |
| | (number of spells) | | | |
| 48 | In the last five years, how often have you been unemploy 6 month? | ed for more than | | |
| | (number of long-term spells) | | | |

| Pers | onal Environment and Personal Safety | | | | | |
|------|--|-----------|---|--|--|--|
| 49 | Overall, how satisfied are you with the neighbourhood in which you live? Please use again this scale (0-10). | | | | | |
| | | 9 | completely satisfied = completely dissatisfied | | | |
| 50 | How safe do you feel if you are walking around in this a you feel | rea at ni | ght? Do | | | |
| | very safe,rather safe,rather unsafe,very unsafe? | 0 | | | | |
| 51 | Have you yourself during the last 12 months been subject following incidents? | cted to a | ny of the | | | |
| | a) get things stolenb) be harassed or threatenedc) get sexual molestedd) be beaten and hurt | yes | no | | | |

| And now generally speaking, how satisfied are you with the public safety? Please tell me again by help of this list (0 to 10). 10 | |
|---|--|
| Please think about the place where you live now. I mean the immediate neighbourhood of your apartment. Do you have o very many, o some, o not so many, | |
| neighbourhood of your apartment. Do you have very many, some, not so many, | |
| o some, o not so many, | |
| | |
| very some not so no many many | |
| a) noise, b) air pollution, c) lack of access to recreation | |
| areas or greensward, e) water quality? | |

| 54 | And how satisfied are you, generally speak situation in our country? Please use the so | | | ironmen | tal | |
|-------|--|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 | - sa | npletely tisfied npletely satisfied | |
| | | | | uis: | satistieu | |
| India | cators of Subjective Well-Being (Glo | bal Me | asures) | | | |
| 55 | Now I want to read to you several statement problems of life. Please tell me, by help of completely agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or not agree at all with the statement | this list, | | general | | |
| | | com- pletely agree | some- what agree | some- what dis- agree | not agree | |
| | a) I cannot influence most of today's problems, b) I often feel lonely, c) I don't really enjoy my work, d) Life has become so complicated today that I almost can't find my way, e) I am very optimistic about the future, f) In order to get ahead nowadays you are forced to do things that are not correct. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| 56 | What do you mean, how satisfied are you at present with your life in general? 10 | |
|----|---|--|
| 57 | Taking all things together, how would you say things are these days – would you say you are | |
| | o Very happy | |
| | o Pretty happy | |
| | □ Not too happy | |
| | o Very unhappy these days? □ | |

List occupational status

Country specific, German example:

- 10 Unskilled worker
- 11 Semi-skilled worker
- 12 Skilled worker
- 13 Foreman in manual work
- 14 Master craftsman
- 21 Non-manual employee, low qualification
- 22 Non-manual employee, medium qualification
- 23 Non-manual employee, high qualification
- 24 Managing position
- 30 Civil servant, lower level
- 31 Civil servant, medium-level
- 32 Civil servant, higher level
- 34 Military service
- 40 Farmer
- 50 Professional
- 53 Self-employed
- 56 Helping family member
- 60 Apprenticeship
- 64 Trainee

List main occupation of respondent (ISCO)

Legislators, senior officials and managers

- 11. Legislators and senior officials
- 12. Corporate managers
- 13. General managers

Professionals

- 21. Physical, mathematical and engineering science professionals
- 22. Life science and health professionals
- 23. Teaching professionals
- 24. Other professionals

Technicians and associated Professionals

- 31. Physical and engineering science associate professionals
- 32. Life Science and health associate professionals
- 33. Teaching associate professionals
- 34. Other associate professionals

Clerks

- 41. Office clerks
- 42. Customer services clerks

Service workers and shop and market sales workers

- 51. Personal and protective service workers
- 52. Models, sales persons and demonstrators

Skilled agricultural and fishery workers

- 61. Market-oriented skilled agricultural and fishery workers
- 62. Subsistence agricultural and fishery workers

Craft and related trade workers

- 71. Extraction and building trade workers
- 72. Metal, machinery and related trade workers
- 73. Precision, handicraft, printing and related trade workers
- 74. Other craft and related trades workers

Plant and machine operators and assemblers

- 81. Stationary-plant and related operators
- 82. Machine operators and assemblers
- 83. Drivers and mobile-plant operators

Elementary occupations

- 91. Sales and services elementary occupations
- 92. Agricultural, fishery and related labourers
- 93. Labourers in mining, construction, manufacturing and transport


Armed forces

- . armed forces
- 97. no occupation 98. don't know
- . Inapplicable

Note: The respondent's main occupation is the job at which the respondent spends most of the time or if the respondent spends an equal amount of time on two jobs, it is the one from which the respondent earns the most money. For a respondent who is currently working, code current occupation. For a respondent who is retired or not currently working, code last occupation.

Coding conventions shall employ the first two-digits of 1988 ISCO / ILO International Standard Classification of Occupations Code from the International Labour Office, CH-1211, Geneva 22, Switzerland.

| Qual | lity of Society | | | | |
|------|--|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 58 | What do you mean? In what degree the chances and securities are realized in <co are="" td="" they<=""><td></td><td>freedoms</td><td>, rights,</td><td>life-</td></co> | | freedoms | , rights, | life- |
| | o fully realized, o rather realized, o rather not realized or o not at all realized? | fully rea- lized | rather rea- lized | rather not rea- lized | not at all rea- lized |
| | a) Freedom of political participation b) Freedom to choose for yourself | | | | |
| | your occupation c) Protection of environment d) Protection of private property e) Just and fair distribution of wealth f) Equality of men and women g) Equality of life chances regardless of origin h) Freedom of free speech always and everywhere i) Freedom of religion/faith j) Protection from crime k) Social security l) Solidarity with the poor and needy m) Chance to get a job | | | | |
| 59 | What do you mean? Will today's young of parents later have a higher, a lower or the higher standard of living, lower standard of living, same standard of living, | | | f living? | heir |



62 The living conditions among European countries differ quite a lot today, and we would like to get your personal evaluation. Please use these ladders, where the highest field represents very good living conditions and the lowest field stands for very bad living conditions. (show ladders) a) First, the <Federal Republic of Germany>. Where on this ladder would you classify the living conditions in <Germany>. b) In comparison to < Germany>, where on the second ladder would you classify the living conditions in Poland? c) Where on the third ladder would you classify the living conditions in France? d) ... in Italy? e) ... in Spain? f) ... in the Netherlands? g) ... in Switzerland? h) ... in Hungary? i) ... in Sweden? <Gernany> Poland France Italy Spain The Nether-Switzerland Hungary lands (c) (h) (i) very good living condtitions very bad living conditions

| 63 | Please show how much you agree or disag | gree with | each st | atement: | | |
|-------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| | o strongly agree o agree o disagree o strongly disagree | strongly | agree | dis- | strongly | |
| | | agree | agree | agree | disagree | |
| | a) Nobody takes care of what happens to the others.b) People are usually selfish | | 0 | | 0 | |
| | and want to misuse the other. c) If I do good to somebody, I can hope | | | | | |
| | he/she will treat me well similarly. | | | | | |
| Exclu | usion and Integration | | | | | |
| 64 | One may have the feeling to be integrated life or to be rather excluded. In your view items for being integrated and included in the very important, important, important, or unimportant, or unimportant? | how imp | ortant a | are the f | | |
| | | very im- por- tant | im- por- tant | not so im- por- tant | un- im- por- tant | |
| | a) To be in a respectable occupation | | | | | |
| | b) Not to be restricted or handicapped in one's working capabilities c) To be able to operate a computer d) To master a foreign language e) To have a driver's license f) To have an occupational training g) To have friends h) Not to have chronic illness or handicaps i) To have one's own family and children j) To engage in voluntary activities k) To engage in political activities l) To have a higher education m) To have one's own personal income | 000000000000 | 00000000000 | 0000000000000 | 0000000000000 | |

| 65 | Considering your contacts with other people – friends, relatives and people | | | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|----|--|--|--|
| | at your workplace – which of these statements fit your situation: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | o I never feel lonely | | | | | |
| | o Sometimes I feel lonely, | _ | | | | |
| | but I don't see that as a problem | | | | | |
| | o Sometimes I feel lonely, and generally | _ | | | | |
| | I would like to associate more with | | | | | |
| | other people than I am doing now | ٥ | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | - | | | | |
| | o I always feel lonely | | | | | |
| 66 | Are your parents or one of your parents still alive? | | | | | |
| 00 | Are your parents or one or your parents still allive: | | | | | |
| | o yes | ٥ | 68 | | | |
| ı | o no | | 67 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 67 | Do you have children? | | | | | |
| | | | 00 | | | |
| | o yes | | 69 | | | |
| | o no | | 70 | | | |
| 68 | a) How often do you see or visit your parents or one of your parents? | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | o They/she/he live in the same household | | | | | |
| | o Daily | | | | | |
| | At least several times a week | | | | | |
| | At least once a week | | | | | |
| | At least once a month | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | o Several times a vear | <u> </u> | | | | |
| | Several times a yearLess often | - | | | | |
| | | 0 | | | | |
| | | ū | | | | |
| | o Less often | ū | | | | |
| | Less oftenb) And how often do you talk on the phone with your parents? | ur parents or one of | | | | |
| | Less often b) And how often do you talk on the phone with your parents? They/she/he live in the same household | ur parents or one of | | | | |
| | b) And how often do you talk on the phone with your parents? They/she/he live in the same household Daily | ur parents or one of | | | | |
| | b) And how often do you talk on the phone with your parents? They/she/he live in the same household Daily At least several times a week | ur parents or one of | | | | |
| | b) And how often do you talk on the phone with your parents? They/she/he live in the same household Daily At least several times a week At least once a week | ur parents or one of | | | | |
| | b) And how often do you talk on the phone with your parents? They/she/he live in the same household Daily At least several times a week At least once a week At least once a month | ur parents or one of | | | | |
| | b) And how often do you talk on the phone with your parents? They/she/he live in the same household Daily At least several times a week At least once a week At least once a month Several times a year | ur parents or one of | | | | |
| | b) And how often do you talk on the phone with your parents? They/she/he live in the same household Daily At least several times a week At least once a week At least once a month | ur parents or one of | 70 | | | |

| 69 | a) How often do you see or visit your child/children? | | | | | | |
|----|--|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | They live in the same household | | | | | | |
| | Daily | _ | | | | | |
| | At least several times a week | _ | | | | | |
| | At least once a week | | | | | | |
| | At least once a month | | | | | | |
| | Several times a year | | | | | | |
| | Less often | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | b) And how often do you talk on the phone with your child/children? | | | | | | |
| | o They live in the same household | | | | | | |
| | o Daily | ٥ | | | | | |
| | At least several times a week | | | | | | |
| | o At least once a week | | | | | | |
| | o At least once a month | | | | | | |
| | o Several times a year | | | | | | |
| | o Less often | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | ctive Living Conditions and Subjective Well-beir | ng: Additional | | | | | |
| | ators | | | | | | |
| 70 | Job and leisure time can be of different importance. How important is your job, what applies best to you? Please use the scale from 0 to 10. In case your job is absolutely important, please answer "10". If it is not important at all, please answer "0". | | | | | | |
| | How important is your leisure time? Please use the scale from 0 to 10. | | | | | | |
| | [only to employed respondents, use filter] | | | | | | |
| | 10 - absolutely | | | | | | |
| | 10 T = absolutely important | | | | | | |
| | 9 🕇 | | | | | | |
| | 8 🕇 | | | | | | |
| | 7 🕂 | | | | | | |
| | 6 + | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 5 🕇 | | | | | | |
| | 4 🕇 | | | | | | |
| | 3 + | | | | | | |
| | 2 🕇 | | | | | | |
| | 1 🕇 | | | | | | |
| | $_0$ \perp = not important at all | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| 71 | And now let us talk about your personal future with respect to the next two to three years. I am going to read you several different aspects and would like you to tell me whether you are o optimistic, o more optimistic than pessimistic, o more pessimistic than optimistic, o pessimistic about them: | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----------------|---|---|------------------|--|--|--|
| | g pess | opti- mistic | more opti- mistic than pessi- mistic | more pessi- mistic than opti- mistic | pessi- mistic | | | |
| | a) further development of your income, | | | | ٥ | | | |
| | b) (if employed) security of your job, c) development of your | | | | ٥ | | | |
| | cost of living (clothing, rent etc.), d) the environmental situation | | | | ٥ | | | |
| | of where you live, e) your opportunities | | | | ٥ | | | |
| | of political influence, f) your opportunities to promote | | | | 0 | | | |
| | in your occupational career? | | | | ٥ | | | |
| 72 | And how do you, in general, evaluate yo | ur perso | nal futu | re? | | | | |
| | o optimistic,o more optimistic than pessimistic, | | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| | more pessimistic than optimistic,pessimistic? | | | 0 | | | | |

| o very important, o important, o not very important, o unimportant for your well-being and satisfaction: very impor- not unimpor- tant very important impor- tant important tant a) work, b) family, | impoi | The areas of life which we have talked about so far might be of different importance for the well-being and satisfaction of people. Please tell me for the following areas if they are | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|-----------|-----------|----------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| impor- tant very important impor- tant impor- tant tant a) work, b) family, | 0 0 | very important, important, not very important, unimportant | | | | | | |
| b) family, | | | impor- | - | very impor- | impor- | | |
| c) income, d) love and affection, e) influence on political decisions, f) successful career, g) leisure time, h) faith, i) health, j) protection of natural environment, k) protection against crime. 74 Considering the course of your personal living conditions since 1990 up to now: What picture on this list would be most appropriate? Please give only the number. | b) fan c) inco d) lov e) infl f) suc g) leis h) fai i) hea j) pro k) pro k) pro | amily, come, ove and affection, fluence on political decisions, ccessful career, isure time, aith, alth, otection of natural environment, rotection against crime. sidering the course of your personal or: What picture on this list would be a | living co | onditions | since 199 | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | |

| 75 | Now we would like you to consider your general living conditions once | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| | more. On the following scheme you see a series of ladders. The highest | | | | | | | | | |
| | field of every ladder represents the best living conditions you can imagine; | | | | | | | | | |
| | the lowest field represents the worst living conditions you can imagine. | | | | | | | | | |
| | the lowest field represents the worst living conditions you can imagine. | | | | | | | | | |
| | (show ladders) | | | | | | | | | |
| | (show ladders) | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) First to your current living conditions. Where, on this ladder, would you | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) First to your current living conditions. Where, on this ladder, would you | | | | | | | | | |
| | locate your current living conditions? b) What are your personal future expectations? What do you expect, | | | | | | | | | |
| | • | • | | • | | • | will lead in | | | |
| | five years f | | | would you | i Classify C | ie ilie you | wiii ieau iii | | | |
| | c) Now please | | | heen five | vears ago | 2 Where w | rould you | ┪ | | |
| | classify you | | | | | : VVIICIE VV | odia you | | | |
| | d) Nearly eve | | | | | sha is anti | tled to | ┪ | | |
| | | | | | | | classify the | | | |
| | living cond | | | | | would you | a classify circ | | | |
| | e) And where | | | | | n of the ne | eople in vou | . | | |
| | neighbour | | ou clussii | y circ iiviii | g contains | ii or the p | copic iii youi | | | |
| | f) And where | | ixth ladd | er would v | ou classif | v the living | condition | 1 | | |
| | of your frie | | | | , | , | , | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | Current | Living | Living | Living | Living | Living | 1 | | |
| | | Living Conditions | Conditions in 5 years | Conditions 5 years ago | Conditions entitled to | Conditions neighbourhood | Conditions friends | | | |
| | | (=today) | iii 5 years | ., | enutied to | magniboumood | menus | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Best Living | | | | | | | | | |
| | Conditions | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 10/ | | | | | | | | | |
| | Worst Living | | | | | | | | | |
| | Conditions | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | Do you work i | n public : | service/pu | ublic secto | r? | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | o Yes | | | | | | | | | |
| | o No | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |