



## **FP7 - Design Study**

### *Deliverable 21: Proposed new questionnaire module on economic well-being*

*Please cite this deliverable as:*

GGP (2011) Proposed new questionnaire module on economic well-being, Deliverable 21 of the EU-DG Research grant entitled '*Design Studies for Research Infrastructures*' funded under the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme (FP7), GGP 212749. Available at: [www.ggp-i.org](http://www.ggp-i.org)



Generations &  
Gender Programme



**GGP 212749**  
*Deliverable 21*

---

**Proposed new questionnaire module on  
economic well-being**

*Arnstein Aassve<sup>1</sup>, Ariane Pailhé<sup>2</sup> and Olivier Thévenon<sup>2</sup>*  
*<sup>1</sup> Dondena Centre, Università Bocconi*  
*<sup>2</sup> Institut National d'Études Démographiques*

---

*Work Package 7*  
*Measuring Economic Well Being*

January 2011



EUROPEAN  
COMMISSION

European  
Research Area



## Contents

1	Introduction .....	3
2	Income and assets .....	3
3	Monetary transfers and Inheritance.....	5
4	Education.....	5
5	Child alimony .....	9
6	Dwelling unit .....	12
7	Activity status .....	13

## 1 Introduction

In this deliverable, recommendations are made with regard to questionnaire items on economic status and wellbeing, to be included in the GGS 2015 questionnaire. More specifically, questions regarding education, dwelling unit, child alimony/maintenance, partner alimony, current activity status, previous employment, current employment, additional jobs and income and assets will be assessed. It should be noted that the majority of these groups of questions include items that refer to intentions. Whereas recommendations on the inclusion and formulation of these items is primarily covered by Work Package 9, we formulate recommendations for these questions as well. Our impression is that many of these questions have been included in prior waves of the GGS by default, without always properly assessing how well they function in applied research.

## 2 Income and assets

The questions concerning income and assets are studied in detail in Deliverable 8, the *Report on existing wellbeing indices in the GGS*, also prepared within the scope of Work Package 7 – Measuring Economic Well Being. That report provided a rather detailed analysis of income and other measures in the GGS and –where relevant– provided comparisons to the EU-SILC, which serves as the yardstick to analyse economic wellbeing and living standards across Europe.

Based on the lessons learned from that report we suggest a simplification of the income questions. Starting with personal income, we suggest to shorten question 864<sup>1</sup> down to four categories (from nine) as follows:

- 1: earnings from main job or business
- 2: earnings from additional jobs or businesses
- 3: income from retirement pensions
- 4: income from maternity leave, parental leave or childcare leave benefits

For each of these four items we keep questions 865, 866 and 867, which all refer to the net payments for these income categories. In addition, we suggest to ask for any other

---

<sup>1</sup> Whenever reference is made to a question number within this document, the reference is to the number of the question as given in the document *GGS Wave 1 Questionnaire – Full*, downloadable from the Generations and Gender Programme website ([www.ggp-i.org](http://www.ggp-i.org)).

additional personal income, followed by questions of the type 865, 866 and 867. In theory, this would provide a measure of the overall personal income for that person. At the same time, we will have a measure of respondents' labour earnings.

There are several considerations to be made here. First, one should bear in mind that constructing a "reliable" income measure means substantial expansion of the already existing income questions. In other words, unless we expand the income questions considerably, we cannot provide incomes that are as precise as they are in EU-SILC or the BHPS, for instance. Descriptive analysis reveals that incomes for the nine existing sources in GGS Wave 1 sometimes had large numbers of missing values. It is highly questionable to what extent information about *widow's or survivor's or war benefits* can sensibly be used for multivariate analysis or to provide representative descriptive analysis. On the other hand, it is important to have income measures that enable scientists to use respondents' wages in their analysis. Similarly, it is important to have an understanding of the economic situations of pensioners and the elderly. We suggest to use this same format for partners' personal income.

A rather nice feature of the GGS is that it asks for the actual net income, and in case the respondent is not able to provide an answer, is asked to point out the relevant income interval to which he or she belongs. This reduces the proportion of missing values and makes imputations more precise. However, the fact that some countries have opted for using the intervals only is highly unfortunate as it makes cross-country comparisons difficult. We recommend to make the use of this complete set of questions obligatory.

Household income (questions 1008 and 1009) should be kept as is. Again, the use of actual household income should be made compulsory. The fact that some countries opted for the discrete interval question only is highly unfortunate for comparative analysis.

As for household possessions and economic deprivation, we suggest to keep in line (as far as possible) with the EU-SILC, which is the key source of information for living standards in Europe. This means to keep question 1001, though items i and j (possession of a second car and a second home respectively) are not provided in the EU-SILC. Our suggestion is to drop these two items, as well as item b (video recorder or DVD player) which also is not offered in the EU-SILC. Keep question 1002. Keep question 1003. Keep question 1004. Drop question 1005 as this is not given in EU-SILC and it is unclear to

what extent this provides any additional information over question 1002, which asks to what extent individuals find it difficult to make ends meet.

Questions 1006 and 1007 ask whether other individuals in the household receive income from other sources. These are simple yes/no dichotomies. These are in principle useful, not least to improve income imputation. But given the aim of shortening the questionnaire, we suggest to drop these two questions.

### **3 Monetary transfers and Inheritance**

These questions (1010 to 1018) are at the core of the Gender and Generation Program in the sense that they record transfers between generations (as well as with non-kin). As a result, we suggest to keep these questions in a new round of GGS.

### **4 Education**

Questions 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 304, 305, 313, 314, 573 and 575 are the key questions that we have identified concerning respondents' education. Question 124 refers to the intention in proceeding educational careers. Our suggestion is to drop question 124 and keep all other questions as they are. The intention question is somewhat strange in the sense that reported intention will depend directly on the stage of education one is enrolled in. For instance, someone who has just started higher education will most likely not end their education within the next three years, whereas someone with one year left of education is highly likely to end their education within three years. Our opinion is that the intention question as part of the TPB is not well suited here. The question regarding subject of study needs to be revised (121). At the moment, this appear as an open ended question and there does not appear to be any harmonization effort on these question. Countries operate with different groupings that currently cannot be easily compared. For question 121 one needs to provide a common card of standard ISCED coded fields of education.

The response rate for field of study is reasonable (see Appendix) also for resident and non-resident partners. One should bear in mind that in many countries respondents do not answer to question 121 if they have achieved a very low level of education – which make sense. It does not make sense to report field of study if one has achieved primary

education only, or even in some cases, if one has achieved a low level of secondary education.

It should be made explicit that all countries should formulate their questions on the level education in such a way that ISCED categories (levels 0-6) can be reconstructed from them. Moreover, individuals who are enrolled in full-time education at the time of the interview should also be classified according to what level of studies they have completed

Questions 573 and 575 refer to the educational level of parents and should clearly be included in future waves of the GGS.

The suggested ISCED codes for field of study (question 121) are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: Fields of education to be distinguished (based on ISCED)**

---

0 General programmes
01 Basic programmes
08 Literacy and numeracy
09 Personal development
1 Education
14 Teacher training and education science
2 Humanities and arts
21 Arts
22 Humanities
3 Social sciences, business and law
31 Social and behavioural science
32 Journalism and information
34 Business and administration
38 Law
4 Science
42 Life sciences
44 Physical sciences
46 Mathematics and statistics
48 Computing
5 Engineering, manufacturing and construction
52 Engineering and engineering trades
54 Manufacturing and processing
58 Architecture and building

6 Agriculture

62 Agriculture, forestry and fishery

64 Veterinary

7 Health and welfare

72 Health

74 Social services

8 Services

81 Personal services

84 Transport services

85 Environmental protection

86 Security services

Not known or unspecified

---



**Table 2: Education (of R, partner and parents) (Qs 120-124, 304-305, 313-314, 573, 575)***Country-specific lists to be compatible with ISCED*

Q. no.	Var. no.	Variable	missing (%)								Notes	
			BG	FR	GEO	DE	HU	RU	RO	NL		
120	a148	highest reached education level	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	5,5	0,0	0,2	varying differentiation of isced codes, still pupil/student as different category in DE very different lists, sometimes not coded	
121	a149	main subject of studies	38,9	13,9	45,7	-	-	21,8	1,7	-		
122	a150y	date of degree (year)	6,5	14,2	45,8	22,4	0,9	25,6	1,8	-		
122	a150m	date of degree (month)	9,9	-	46,4	21,1	-	26,2	1,8	-		
123	a151	current study	1,5	0,0	0,0	-	0,2	0,3	0,0	0,2		
124	a152	resumption of studies	0,4	37,6	0,0	-	-	0,6	0,0	-		
304	a308	highest education level of the current partner	1,2	0,8	0,2	0,3	0,0	21,4	0,1	13,0		
305	a309	main subject of the partner's studies	40,0	14,3	43,8	-	-	19,6	-	-		
313	a321	highest education level of the non-resident partner	17,1	8,0	0,0	2,0	-	25,4	0,0	35,4		not coded in RU
314	a322	main subject of the non-resident partners studies	49,4	16,6	34,5	-	-	-	-	-		
573	a5113	highest education level of the father	4,2	10,6	5,0	0,4	3,2	23,0	2,0	13,1	not coded in RU	
575	a5115	highest education level of the mother	4,0	8,9	4,8	0,3	1,7	18,0	3,3	10,4	not coded in RU	

## 5 Child alimony

Questions that focus on the topic of Child alimony/maintenance are questions 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344 and 345. Whereas these questions theoretically make a great deal of sense, they do not perform well in the survey questionnaire – partly as a result of small sample size and partly because the institutional aspects of child alimony vary a great deal across countries. Our suggestion is to keep question 339, which would encapsulate the current version of question 338. Thus, the question should read as:

*“Have you received maintenance payments for children any time over the last 12 months? (including current maintenance payments)”*

*1 – Yes, on a regular basis*

*2 – Yes, from time to time*

*3 – No*

This would mean dropping questions 338, 340, 341, 342, 344 and 345 compared to the GGS Wave 1 questionnaire. The problem with these questions is that there are very few valid responses and it is questionable to what extent such a variable can be used in multivariate analysis. The variable is not suited for constructing representative descriptive statistics. As can be seen from Table 3, the number of valid responses is extremely low for some countries.

Question 343 on the other hand asks whether the respondent is paying maintenance or alimony for children and we think this is an important question to keep. Our suggestion is to formulate this question as follows:

*“Have you paid maintenance payments for children any time over the last 12 months? (including current maintenance payments)”*

*1 – Yes*

*2 – No*

Questions 346, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, and 353 focus on partner alimony. These questions perform particularly badly (see Table 3). The number of valid responses is very low and for instance asking for how much one has paid in alimony is of little meaning. These variables would probably work better with larger sample sizes, but as long as the sample size is set around 10,000 it remains unlikely that we can derive much valid information from these questions. Our suggestion is to drop questions 346, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, and 353.

**Table 3: Child alimony, maintenance / partner alimony (Qs 338-353). Child alimony/maintenance**

*Asked only if a333=1 (R has ever lived together with someone, either married or not) and a345=1 (R had children together with any previous partner)*

Q. no.	Var. no.	Variable	missing (%)							valid answers (n)								
			D															
			BG	FR	GEO	E	HU	RU	RO	NL	BG	FR	GEO	DE	HU	RU	RO	NL
338	a353	current maintenance payments for the children received past maintenance payments for children (last 12 months)	39,9	-	0,3	0,4	-	-	0,0	0,0	98	-	32	230	-	-	82	164
339	a354	monthly amount of the payments	6,1	0,0	0,0	-	-	1,5	0,0	-	7	267	0	-	-	310	6	-
340	a355, a355u	number of received payments (last 12 months)	3,8	1,1	0,0	-	-	26,1	0,0	-	101	264	32	-	-	229	88	-
341	a356	current paid maintenance payments for children	10,5	0,0	0,0	3,9	-	-	0,0	-	94	267	32	221	-	-	88	-
342	a357	paid past maintenance payments for children (last 12 months)	8,0	-	0,0	0,1	-	-	0,0	0,0	17	-	17	132	-	-	62	87
343	a358	paid amount of maintenance	0,3	0,0	0,0	-	-	0,2	0,0	-	2	243	11	-	-	185	0	-
344	a359, a359u	number of maintenance payments (last 12 months)	0,0	1,2	0,0	-	-	26,0	-	-	19	240	28	-	-	137	-	-
345	a360		0,0	0,0	0,0	-	-	-	0,0	-	19	243	28	-	-	-	62	-

**Partner alimony**

*Not asked if a333=2 (has never lived together with someone, either married or not)*

Q. no.	Var. no.	Variable	missing (%)								valid answers (n)							
			BG	FR	GEO	DE	HU	RU	RO	NL	BG	FR	GEO	DE	HU	RU	RO	NL
346	a361	receive payments from previous partner currently	45,0	-	69,3	26,4	-	-	-	0,0	4	-	4	88	-	-	-	132
347	a362	payments in the last 12 months	0,2	20,3	0,0	-	-	34,0	-	-	1	45	1	-	-	21	-	-
348	a363, a363u	monthly received amount of payments	60,0	11,1	20,0	-	-	100,0	-	-	2	40	4	-	-	0	-	-
349	a364	number of received payments (last 12 months)	60,0	2,2	20,0	-	-	-	-	-	2	37	4	-	-	-	-	-
350	a365	pay payments for previous partner currently	3,1	-	0,0	0,1	-	-	-	0,0	30	-	2	43	-	-	-	69
351	a366	past paid payments (last 12 months)	0,1	0,0	0,0	-	-	0,0	-	-	1	36	3	-	-	25	-	-
352	a367, a367u	monthly paid amount of payments	25,8	2,8	0,0	-	-	56,0	-	-	23	35	5	-	-	9	-	-
353	a368	number of paid payments (last 12 months)	54,8	2,8	0,0	-	-	-	-	-	14	35	5	-	-	-	-	-

## 6 Dwelling unit

Questions 114, D02 (optional), 115, 116, 117, 118 and 119 concern the dwelling in which the respondent lives. As can be observed in Table 4, the percentage of missing values on most of these items is relatively small. When assessing the usefulness of these questions, we should bear in mind that there are several other questions available to measure the quality of the household dwelling (see discussion above). Question 114 is a standard question in the EU-SILC and in many other household surveys. We suggest to keep it. We suggest to drop question D02 which refers to the floor place. This is not standard in the EU-SILC and it is questionable to what extent it provides additional information over question 114 (used in conjunction with Q117 and Q1003 and Q1004). Keep household ownership status (Q116) and dwelling satisfaction (Q117), whereas questions 118 and 119 deal with intentions whose usefulness is questionable. Our recommendation is to drop these questions – though such a decision should be consulted with those responsible for dealing with intention questions. Keep question 115.

We suggest to add a category for question 116 – i.e. household ownership. The categories should read as:

- 1: Owner, without mortgage
- 2: owner, with mortgage
- 3: tenant, paying rent to private landlord
- 4: tenant, paying rent in social/voluntary/municipal housing
- 5: accommodation provided rent free
- 6: Other

This categorization is similar to the one used in the European Community Household Panel (ECHP) 1994-2000, European Quality of Life Survey 2003 and European Quality of Life Survey 2007. Tenure choice can be related to family events such as birth or intergenerational transfers. It is important to distinguish between owners having to pay mortgage debts and the others as the former still have a financial burden to bear. It is likely to be harder for them to transfer money to their children. Also, rents paid to private landlords are usually higher than those paid for living in a public dwelling. This can yield

an important difference in the financial burden for poor families and also influence intergenerational transfers. Households living in a house for free are, of course, far less budget constrained. Depending on the dwelling costs, some households may postpone giving birth until they are financially at ease to support a new child. There are also important country difference in tenure choice, for which this question would be informative.

**Table 4: Dwelling unit (Qs 114-147)**

Q. no.	Var. no.	Variable	missing (%)							
			BG	FR	GEO	DE	HU	RU	RO	NL
114	a119	Number of rooms	1,3	0,0	0,0	0,5	0,6	0,3	0,0	0,2
D02	a120	Living floor space ( <i>optional</i> )	1,7	-	-	-	1,3		0,0	-
		Time of starting living in current dwelling								
115	a121m	(month)	10,7	-	0,6	-	-	2,2	0,0	0,2
		Time of starting living in current dwelling								
115	a121y	(year)	1,4	0,1	0,2	-	-	0,5	0,0	0,2
		Household's ownership status towards the								
116	a122	dwelling	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,2
117	a145	Satisfaction with dwelling	4,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,5	0,2	0,0	-
118	a146	Intention to move (next 3 years)	1,7	1,7	0,0	3,2	0,5	0,1	0,0	-
119	a147	Distance of move	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	-	0,0	0,0	-

## 7 Activity status

The section on activity status and related concepts is particularly long, and includes not only questions on gainful activities by the respondent him- or herself, but also on gainful activities of the partner (if one has a partner). Some of these questions are only relevant for respondents in specific circumstances (e.g. the unemployed, the self-employed, the retired). We will discuss the set of questions mostly in the order in which they appeared in the GGS Wave 1 questionnaire.

Keep questions 801, 802, 803a and 803b. Drop question 804 on satisfaction with maternity leave. It is unclear how respondents interpret this question. The frequency tables suggest that the majority are very satisfied. It is also unclear whether they are satisfied with maternity leave because of its duration or its payment. Given reasonable external

information on maternity leave across countries and in light of the need to reduce the length of the questionnaire, we recommend this question to be cut.

Keep question 805a. Questions 805a and 805b are supposed to capture if a respondent is working part time during the period of maternity leave. In some countries, one can be on part-time leave, and as such it is important to know this. In other countries, individuals are reported to be on maternity leave (but without any part and full-time distinction), but will nevertheless do some part time work. However, many respondents on part-time leave may qualify their main activity status as “being in-work”<sup>2</sup>. For this reason, it is likely preferable to identify part-time leave as one of the reasons to work part-time. Therefore, we propose to drop question 805b but add one question on the reasons for working part-time (see below on question 834a). In such case, the questionnaire routing needs to be amended as follows:

If 805a = 1 – yes, then go to 806; if 805a = 2 then go to 831.

Question 806 is to be amended. At the moment there is no question about whether the person worked or not prior to maternity leave, though in some countries individuals will answer that they are on maternity leave despite not having worked prior to it. As a result, we suggest to include another category. The categories will be:

1 – Yes

2 – No

3 – *Did not work prior to maternity leave*

Keep question 807. This question is about intention to restart work after maternity leave. Each of the responses in question 806 is followed by intentions to resume work. We suggest therefore to add another intention question that follows from response to 3) in Q806 that is similar to Q807b.

Keep questions 808a and 808b. Good response rate and important. Drop question 809 which asks about satisfaction about being unemployed. The vast majority appears to be not very satisfied about being unemployed, and it is unclear to what extent this question is useful in applied research.

Drop question 810, which asks about the intention to take a job. The problem here is that it is not clear whether the question reflects real intentions or rather the perceived likelihood

---

<sup>2</sup> This is why only two respondents declared being on part-time leave in France, where the question was asked to employees having responded to be on leave to the question about their main activity status.

of finding a new job. The question has an enormously high non-response for Russia. If this question is to be kept we suggest a subjective question where individuals are asked about their assessment of the possibility to find employment in the next year.

Keep questions 811 and 812. Question 811 is used to determine social class and occupation based on employment status prior to unemployment. Drop question 813 on satisfaction with being a student. Again, it is difficult for us to grasp the usefulness of this question in applied analysis.

Question 814 asks about the intention to complete education in the next 3 years. As already argued when discussing question 121, which asks about the intentions of proceeding with education, the reported answers will be mainly driven by the stage of education respondents are enrolled in. This question should be either dropped or be rephrased so that it refers to the persons' planning in terms of education. For instance – “at what time (year) do you expect to complete your education”

Keep questions 815, and 816m and 816b. Drop question 817 on the assumption that there will be a general question on satisfaction (e.g. life satisfaction). Keep questions 818 and 819. Drop question 820.

Keep questions 821 and 822. The apparent high level of non-response is driven by those who did not work before becoming a homemaker. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that those not responding to this question were always homemakers. This pattern is confirmed by crossing questions 822 and 825. Drop question 823, again on the assumption that there will be a general question on satisfaction. Keep questions 824 and 825. Drop question 826, as cell size is extremely small for this category. Keep question 827.

Keep question 828, but we need to apply the new ISCO-2008 code as listed below. We doubt there is much point in having more than two digits. In most applied analysis that we are aware of, the ISCO is truncated to one digit. However, recent studies on fertility have focused on the importance of occupation, so it is useful to keep two digits.



**Table 5: ISCO-08 classification**

- 
- 1 Managers
    - 11 Chief executives, senior officials and legislators
    - 12 Administrative and commercial managers
    - 13 Production and specialized services managers
    - 14 Hospitality, retail and other services managers
  - 2 Professionals
    - 21 Science and engineering professionals
    - 22 Health professionals
    - 23 Teaching professionals
    - 24 Business and administration professionals
    - 25 Information and communications technology professionals
    - 26 Legal, social and cultural professionals
  - 3 Technicians and associate professionals
    - 31 Science and engineering associate professionals
    - 32 Health associate professionals
    - 33 Business and administration associate professionals
    - 34 Legal, social, cultural and related associate professionals
    - 35 Information and communications technicians
  - 4 Clerical support workers
    - 41 General and keyboard clerks
    - 42 Customer services clerks
    - 43 Numerical and material recording clerks
    - 44 Other clerical support workers
  - 5 Service and sales workers
    - 51 Personal service workers
    - 52 Sales workers
    - 53 Personal care workers
    - 54 Protective services workers
  - 6 Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers
    - 61 Market-oriented skilled agricultural workers
    - 62 Market-oriented skilled forestry, fishing and hunting workers
    - 63 Subsistence farmers, fishers, hunters and gatherers
  - 7 Craft and related trades workers
    - 71 Building and related trades workers, excluding electricians
    - 72 Metal, machinery and related trades workers
    - 73 Handicraft and printing workers
    - 74 Electrical and electronic trades workers

- 75 Food processing, wood working, garment and other craft and related trades workers
  - 8 Plant and machine operators, and assemblers
    - 81 Stationary plant and machine operators
    - 82 Assemblers
    - 83 Drivers and mobile plant operators
  - 9 Elementary occupations
    - 91 Cleaners and helpers
    - 92 Agricultural, forestry and fishery labourers
    - 93 Labourers in mining, construction, manufacturing and transport
    - 94 Food preparation assistants
    - 95 Street and related sales and service workers
    - 96 Refuse workers and other elementary workers
  - 0 Armed forces occupations
    - 01 Commissioned armed forces officers
    - 02 Non-commissioned armed forces officers
    - 03 Armed forces occupations, other ranks
- 

Drop question 829. Keep questions 830 and 831.

Many of the questions discussed above are also posed about the partner of the respondents. We propose to make the same kind of changes as proposed for the respondent. Keep questions 901, 902, 903, 904 and 905. Drop questions 906 and 907. Keep question 908. Drop question 909. Keep questions 910, 911m and 911y, 914m and 914y, 915, 916 and 917. Drop question 918. Keep question 919, but again use standard ISCO 2 digit codes (see Table 5). Keep question 920.

There is a specific section with question that are only posed to those who are working. We suggest to amend question 832 in the sense that one needs to provide ISCO code with two digits (see Table 5). Keep questions 833, 834 and 835.

Add a question 834a on the reasons for working part-time (“Why do you work part-time?”). Categories would be:

1. on part-time leave
2. did not find a full-time job

3. employer impose to work full-time
4. no part-time leave, but the respondent want to balance work and family life
5. for medical reasons
6. to have more personal time
7. for another reason : give details
9. don't know

Drop question 836. Looking at the distribution of this question we are unsure if this gives much useful information, or at least we are not sure it capture what it is supposed to.

We proposing amendments to question 837 that are consistent with how these types of questions are phrased in surveys on working conditions. In particular, we suggest to replace the current question by the following set of three related questions:

*Do you work at night (for at least 2 hours between 10 00 pm and 05.00 am)?*

Never

Yes, usually

Yes, occasionally

Source: French working condition survey

*Do you work on week-ends?*

Never

Yes, usually

Yes, occasionally

Source: French working condition survey (modified: 2 original questions: on Saturdays, on Sundays)

*Do you work...?*

the same number of hours every day

the same number of hours every week

fixed starting and finishing times

shifts  
yes/no  
DK/no opinion  
Refusal

Source: Questions from the Fourth European Working Conditions Survey +

Keep question 838.

Questions 839 to 849 are to be answered by employees. Keep questions 839 and 840. Drop question 841. The gender composition at the workplace might be important, but is proxied by the occupational code, at least if this is given with ISCO 2 digits. Keep questions 842, 843, 844, 845. Drop question 846, 848 and 849. Question 847 is to be rewritten in order to focus on perceived job security. We suggest the following formulation:

*How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? “I might lose my job in the next 12 months”*

Strongly agree  
Agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Disagree  
Strongly disagree  
DK  
Refusal

Source: European Social Survey

Questions 850 to 854 are posed to the self-employed. Drop question 850. Keep question 851. We have some doubts about question 852. In general, we would like to gauge to what extent the respondent feels secure about his or her current working status, and in this sense make it consistent with the question regarding those being employees. However, we have no specific proposal at this stage. Drop questions 853 and 854.

Questions 855 to 859 are posed to all those who are currently working. We suggest to keep them all.

Questions 860 to 863 are on additional jobs or business activities. Keep question 860. Drop question 861. We are aware that this is a fairly standard question, but we think that this information will not very often be used, especially because we already have ISCO code about the main activity. Keep question 862. Drop question 863. Again, we do not think this provides crucial information for the majority of analyses that tend to be done by applied analysts.