



Field Report
For the Integrated Quality of Life/ Customer Satisfaction Survey in the
Gauteng City Region (GCR)

19 October 2009

By DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH AFRICA Pty Ltd

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Development of primary data collection tools.....	3
3	Piloting of primary data collection tools.....	3
4	Data collection	4
5	Quality control and quality assurance.....	8
6	Conclusion	9

Contact Details

Dyke Mafanyolle
Development Research Africa
2nd Floor, 356 Rivonia Blvd
Rivonia
2123

Tel: 011 807 1194
Fax: 011 807 1197
Alt tel: 072 480 6543

E-mail: dyke@dra.co.za

1 Introduction

The Gauteng City-Region Observatory (GCRO) (based at the University of Johannesburg (UJ)) in partnership with the Gauteng Provincial Government contracted Development Research Africa (DRA) to conduct an integrated Quality of Life/Customer Satisfaction Survey in the Gauteng City-Region (GCR).

The objective of the GCRO is to assist and inform the Gauteng Government to build Gauteng as an integrated and globally competitive region, where the economic activities of different parts of the province complement each other in consolidating Gauteng as an economic hub of Africa and an internationally recognised global city-region.

The this end, the main aim of the survey is to inform the GCRO and the Provincial Government as well as other role-[layers about the perceived state of the municipalities within the GCR footprint especially with regards to the quality of lives of the people. To expand on this aim, the tools designed and implemented will be used to measure any progress longitudinally.

2 Development of primary data collection tools

GCRO in partnership with DRA developed the quantitative evaluation tool. DRA reformatted the pre-pilot questionnaire and provided input into the layout and flow as well as question structure to ensure accurate and efficient data capturing of the instrument.

3 Piloting of primary data collection tools

Piloting allows for the testing of the tools or questionnaires. Some important reasons for testing these tools are to ensure that:

- Response categories are mutually exclusive;
- That the questionnaire is standardised;
- That the respondents all understand the questions the way they were intended by the researchers;
- That questions are appropriate and do not need to be altered or supplemented; and
- That fieldwork errors can be addressed during training

Field managers piloted the questionnaire. The pilot consisted of about 30 interviews with various individuals from different demographic households. After the administration of the pilot, field managers provided feedback on the process and research tools. Below are some of the difficulties encountered by the field managers during the pilot study:

1. There were discrepancies between the overview map and the colour coded map. The boundaries were not clear. However, the suggested solution was to ensure that before going to field all the maps were corresponding and in the same format

2. As could be expected in Gauteng, access was a problem in some areas, especially in areas with a block of flats where security guards did not allow access. Field managers suggested that this be addressed properly during field preparation as is DRA's usual practise.
3. During the pilot, the questionnaire took an average of about 70 minutes to complete. The fastest time recorded was 45 minutes, and the slowest was about 120 minutes. Many respondents reported respondent fatigue. Therefore, DRA suggested that the questionnaire be reduced to a length averaging about 40 minutes.

After consultation with the client, the above issues regarding the questionnaire were resolved and some questions were deleted from the instrument. In addition, suggestions were made concerning the flow of the questionnaire.

4 Data collection

Data collection relies on reliable infrastructure:

- Appropriate research tools and methodology
- Recruitment and selection of suitable staff
- Adequate training
- And strict monitoring of the data collection/fieldwork process

4.1 The Fieldwork Methodology

For the purpose of this study, **multi-stage cluster sampling** was used as no sampling frame containing all members in the universe or population exists. The sample was drawn in stages, with wards being selected at the first stage, dwelling units within the wards being selected in the second stage and respondents selected at the third stage.

Phase 1

The wards formed the primary sampling units (PSUs). A random starting point(s) was used as a method to select the dwelling units to be surveyed. A total number of 602 wards in 4 provinces (Gauteng 448 wards), (Mpumalanga 72 wards), (North-West 70 wards) and (Free State 12 wards) were completed. A total of 6639 interviews were completed in these wards.

Phase 2

During the second phase, the field teams were required to complete a certain number of interviews, depending on the population size of that particular ward. The teams had to complete for an example in ward X 3 interviews and in ward Y they had to complete 33 interviews. This meant that the field teams had different target number of interviews that they needed to complete in all the pre-selected wards.

Ward maps were obtained before fieldwork commenced, and random starting points were identified, marked and numbered on the map. This allowed for the random selection of one (if more than one existed) starting point. The field managers concerned will firstly identify where the starting point(s) is/are on the ground. Once

that has been established he/she will from the starting point count 20 households from the starting point moving to his/her left. The 20th household that he/she has selected was the household where the interviews were supposed to take place. Thereafter, the next 20th household was selected and approached until the target number of interviews was obtained.

The following process of household selection was adhered to:

From the starting point 20 houses were counted in a ward. However, if there were:

- 1-5 target number of interviews to be completed in a ward; 01 starting point was used;
- 6-10 target number of interviews to be completed in a ward; 02 starting points were used;
- 11-15 target number of interviews to be completed in the ward; 03 starting points were used;
- 16-20 target number of interviews to be completed in the ward; 04 starting points were used;
- 21-25 target number of interviews to be completed in the ward; 05 starting points were used; and
- 25 and above target number of interviews to be completed in a ward; 06 starting points were used

In the case of a household refusal or if a selected respondent was mentally disabled, the household was immediately substituted with the household on the left. If still there was no interview completed then another substitution, going to the right of the originally selected household, was done. In case of non-contact whereby there was no-one home after two visits at two different times (afternoon and evenings) on the same day, the same substitution method was followed. Therefore, **at least two-re-visits at different times** were done in cases where selected dwelling units, households or individuals were not at home i.e. non-contact. However, in some cases households visited after 19:00 on the day were substituted as agreed to in order to ensure that all the target number of households would be completed in the allocated time per ward.

Phase 3

For the purpose of this study, one randomly selected household respondent was selected per household. All household members qualified if they met the following criteria:

- Resident(s) of the household irrespective of nationality but excluding non-residents and visitors; and
- 18 years of age or older
- In the event of a child headed household (all household members are under 18 years old), the oldest child was assumed to be the head of household, and should be interviewed

If more than one eligible person was found per dwelling unit, the ideal and most practical and accurate method of random selection of an individual was the use of a KISH grid. One individual per household was selected using the KISH grid after a comprehensive listing exercise was completed of all eligible individuals at the dwelling unit. Once the respondent had been selected the fieldworker will follow up only that person per household. If selected, substitutions could not be made where there were refusals or non-contact over a period of a day after two or more re-visits on the same day. All interviews were face-to-face.

4.2 Recruitment and training of researchers and field workers

4.2.1 Recruitment

Fieldworkers were selected based on the fact that they resided in Gauteng and essentially are familiar with the areas to be surveyed as well as the vernacular of the inhabitants of these areas. A total of 60 field staff worked on the project at any one time together with 10 quality control staff. Each team consisted of one supervisor and four fieldworkers.

4.2.2 Training of Teams

Training took place over a period of three (3) days. The main training took place between 28th and the 30th of July in Johannesburg. An additional training session took place between 31st and 02nd of August in Pretoria for predominantly white teams. The reason why it took so long for the second group of teams to be trained was that they were busy wrapping up another project during the first training session. The client (GCRO) attended the Johannesburg training to observe the process as a quality control measure and to provide clarity relating to the study background content and purpose of the study.

The training was attended by regional managers, research assistants, field teams, field managers, quality control managers and quality assurance personnel all of which were briefed on research intentions, and trained on how to apply the research tools and other measuring instruments designed for the study as well as ethical issues relevant to the study. Training manuals were drafted and training also covered sampling, methodology and access protocols. Therefore, the training consisted of four components namely:

1. Back ground and objectives of the study;
2. Sensitivity and ethics training;
3. Methodology training; and
4. Instrument training.

4.3 Field

Fieldwork commenced on the 31st of July 2009. There were 09 teams altogether from the Johannesburg office. The teams were composed of 1 field manager and 4 fieldworkers (mostly 2 males and 2 females). They all started field at the same time except for the white team which commenced fieldwork on the 03rd September 2009.

4.3.1 Access and other problems

Access in some wards proved difficult since limited community preparation had been conducted prior to the commencement of the study. The wards below proved problematic in this study. The problems encountered were as follows:

- **Ward 42004014** – the response rate in this ward was very low and the team only managed to complete 4 interviews out of 12. The reason for this negative response

rate was based on the fact that this is a high income area with high walls, with no access and there was a lot of household refusals (68 household refusals overall) in this particular area. The team covered the entire ward with very little success.

- **Ward 42004016 & 42004017:** Gaining access into these two wards was not a problem but the main problem was that the community policing forum indicated to the team that they can only work in that area between 9am and 4pm only. This was so despite the fact that the police station commissioner had reassured the team that they will have no problems in that area. The community policing forum informed the team that, it is the community rule and no one else including the police commissioner was in a position to change that rule. Despite all this the team still managed to reach their target number of interviews. They worked according to the rules of that community, which was to only work between 9am and 4pm.

- **Ward 74202008:** This is another predominantly high income area. The team covered the entire ward and only managed to complete 17 interviews out of target of 19 interviews. The team had managed to complete only 4 interviews on a weekday in their first attempt. They went back on a weekend to this ward to try and improve the response rate and on this occasion they managed to get 13 more, which brought up the overall response rate here to 17 interviews completed

- **Ward 79400094** – This ward had 03 starting points of which 02 fell within a prison (Leeuwkop prison) and it was initially very difficult to gain access into this ward. The area commissioner requested that the field manager issue him with a letter in addition to the GCRO introduction letter that the team was issued with, clearly indicating the field teams' ID numbers, their roles, how long they intended working in that ward, the company logo and the name and ID number of the person(s) in charge of them. This letter was drafted and was sent together with the team and they were granted access without any problems.

- **Ward 79400072** – This is a high income area with high walls and it was difficult to gain access to the dwellings. In household where access was granted there was a lot of refusals.

- **Ward 794000103-** This is another high income area with boom gates. The response rate was very low because there were a lot of refusals.

- **Ward 79400048** – This ward is characterised by plots. The stands in this ward are large and in most situations the entire street is occupied by only two plots. This entire area had 20 plots and there were lots of refusals.

- **Ward 79600065** This is another area characterised by high walls with little or no-access. The response rate was very low response rate because of no-access and because wherever they got access to the households they were getting refusals (33 household refusals overall) in this ward.

- **Ward 79300015** The refusal rate in this ward was too high. The team was initially informed that they came at a bad time (over a weekend) since most people were going out with their families or they did not want to be disturbed because they were spending time with their families. Based on this the team went to re-attempt it again on a weekday but the response rate was still too low.

- **Ward 79600075** This ward is under the leadership of tribal authorities. Fieldwork in this ward was delayed by three days because the chief was not available on the first day of field and no-one else was mandated to grant any permission to anyone doing any kind of work in this area, without the chief's permission.
- The team went there on the 31/07/09 and were told to come back on the 01/08/09. When the team returned on the 01/08/09 the very same chief told them to come back the following day because he didn't have time as he was watching a soccer match. They were only granted access on the 02/08/09 and they managed to complete their allotted interviews without any problems.
- **Ward 79400093** – This ward is dominated mostly by complexes. Access proved difficult at the beginning. The first team did not have any success in their attempt to work in these complexes. They managed to get the manager's name and from the office (DRA) managed to contact Mr. Trollip, who was initially reluctant to give the team access but in the end he agreed and the team was able to complete their target number of interviews without any problems.
- **Ward 79400060** – There was one main problem encountered in this ward. This ward consists mostly of flats. In one of the flats the team was told to come back after a week because the owner was away in Mpumalanga. They did go back after a week, the owner was available and he granted the team access. The team managed to complete their target number of interviews without any further problems.

The most challenging part of the fieldwork process was caused by an administrative error where the wrong list of target interviews per ward was disseminated to most of the teams. This mistake was identified halfway through the fieldwork process when the office confirmed the number of interviews completed per ward. This mistake was then rectified immediately and the client informed. It meant that in some wards, teams had to go back to the same wards and proceeded with the same selection strategy to ensure that the target number of interviews was reached. In wards with over samples, it was decided (in consultation with the client) to keep these interviews for inclusion into the data base – with any adjustments to be made during the weighting stage. A total of about 899 interviews were regarded as over samples.

5 Quality control and quality assurance

DRA utilises a range of quality control measures meeting the best of national and international best practice.

- In the field, fieldworkers check completed questionnaire schedules **immediately** after interviews to ensure that all questions are answered and relevant skips are followed.
- The checked questionnaires are then handed to field or office managers who, whilst in field, perform a **second quality check** on each questionnaire. They focus on skip patterns, as well as ensuring that answers correspond with previous responses and follow a logical process.
- On completion of each survey area to the satisfaction of team leaders, questionnaires are submitted to the DRA office.

- Dedicated quality control teams check every questionnaire upon delivery to the regional office.
- At the satisfaction of the Quality Assurance manager the questionnaires will then be transferred to DRA Data Department.

In addition, Quality Assurance personnel performed site visits or “surprise visits” at random intervals to check on fieldwork procedures and that correct interview procedures are being adhered to. Quality Assurance personnel also conducted random call-backs on 15% of the questionnaires – this check process allows the client greater surety of the results and provides an opportunity to collect feedback from a sample of respondents. During this process only minor issues were detected such as field staff not wearing ID tags in some instances. No incidences of fraud were detected.

6 Conclusion

Overall the data collection process was very successful with the exception of a few areas where access proved to a problem. The timelines were put under slight pressure due to an administrative fault that lead to the completion and capturing of an additional 899 interviews. However, it is DRA’s opinion that the fieldwork process was of a high quality and that any challenges were dealt with in a decisive and effective manner. The team is confident that the data collected will yield meaningful and informative results for academics and policy makers alike.