

Standard Quality Report for Adult Education Survey

General information

This Quality Report is used by Eurostat to collect methodological information and results from the implementation of the Adult Education Surveys at national level.

The aim of the quality reports is to establish the current level of knowledge in Eurostat about the quality of the statistical products. The results from the reports will be used for internal summaries of what is known about the quality and where there is lack of quality.

All available information that describes the quality of the product should be reported. If the information is extensive, references should be given for more detailed information. For lack of information on some quality aspects no complementary data has to be collected from the Member States.

The reports should be updated continuously and transmitted to the quality manager once a year.

The structure of the form is according to the quality concept for Eurostat.

I. General information

1.	Country	GREECE
2.	Organisation responsible for the survey <i>Please also indicate the organisation <u>running</u> the survey if different from the organisation responsible (e.g. because of sub-contracting).</i>	HELLENIC STATISTICAL AUTHORITY
3.	Contact person(s) <i>(name, unit, e-mail, phone, fax)</i>	ZACHARIOU STYLIANOS LABOUR FORCE SURVEY SECTION zacharis@statistics.gr Tel: (+30) 213 135 2173 Fax: (+30) 213 135 2948
4.	Name of the collection <i>Please give the name of the survey in its original language(s) and in English (e.g. name used in the statistical office's English website).</i>	ΕΡΕΥΝΑ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ ΕΝΗΛΙΚΩΝ ADULT EDUCATION SURVEY
5.	Last update of this report	28/12/2013
6.	Scope of the survey <i>Please give a brief description of the aim of the survey</i>	Main target of Adult Education Survey was to collect a comprehensive set of data on adult education and learning. The target population of the survey was set to be persons age 18 to 64 years old and the main characteristics under investigation were participation in formal, non formal and informal education, expenditure on formal and non formal education, time spent in formal and non formal education, factors that affect participation in education, knowledge of foreign languages, and competence in computer use.
7.	Survey participation <i>Please indicate whether the survey is mandatory or voluntary.</i>	VOLUNTARY
8.	Survey period <i>The beginning and end date of the data collection period.</i>	June 2012 - December 2012

Complete the abbreviations used in the report

Abbreviation	Explanation
CV	Coefficient of variation (or relative standard error)
Y/N	Yes / No
NA	Not applicable/ Not relevant
UNA	Information unavailable
NR or blank	No response: Member State doesn't answer to Eurostat request for information
AES	Adult Education Survey

NB: if the information is not available or is not applicable/not relevant use the corresponding abbreviations. Blank fields will be considered as non-response.

II. Content

1 Survey variables

Please list the optional variables proposed in the AES Commission Regulation which were included in the survey at national level

Information collected for household and individual

Tick all appropriate boxes

- ☒ Orientation of the highest level of education or training successfully completed
- ☐ Other formal education or training successfully completed
- ☐ Level of the other formal education or training successfully completed
- ☐ Orientation of the other formal education or training successfully completed
- ☐ Field of the other formal education or training successfully completed
- ☐ Recognition of the skills and competences undertaken
- ☐ Recognition of the skills and competences with access to a higher formal education programme
- ☒ Orientation of the formal education programme not completed
- ☒ Main occupation of father
- ☒ Main occupation of mother

Information collected for participation in education and training

- ☒ Satisfaction with formal education activity
- ☒ Reasons for not being satisfied with formal education activity
- ☒ Full payment for the 1st non-formal education activity
- ☒ Satisfaction with 1st non-formal education activity
- ☒ Reasons for not being satisfied with 1st non-formal education activity
- ☐

Information collected for the ICT skills, language skills, cultural and social participation

- ☒ Internet related activities
- ☒ Cultural participation - Live performances
- ☒ Cultural participation - Cinema
- ☒ Cultural participation - Visit to cultural sites
- ☒ Cultural participation - Live sport events
- ☒ Cultural participation - Reading newspapers
- ☒ Cultural participation - Reading books
- ☒ Cultural participation - Number of books
- ☒ Social participation

2 Statistical units, scope and target population

II. Content

a. Please give the definition of the target population of the survey, e.g. permanent residents aged 25 to 64 years, coverage of the optional age group 18 to 24 years old, etc.

Target population of the AES was person age 18 - 64 years old, residing in private households, and staying (or intend to stay) at least 1 year in Greece.

c. Please report any exclusions from the target population (e.g. persons living in collective households)

Individuals who permanently reside in collective houses (i.e. hospitals, hotels, asylums, homes for the elderly, orphanages, etc) are not covered by the survey.

d. The main statistical unit for the AES survey are the individual and the learning activities. Please indicate if there were some deviations

no

3 Territorial coverage

If applicable, indicate the parts of the country that are not included as well as an estimate of the resulting percentage of under coverage (non-covered population compared to total country population).

All NUTS 3 areas of Greece, with the exception of Mount Athos area. Mount Athos area is an autonomous area, home to about 20 monasteries with population less than 3000 persons

Universe

Individuals

4 Target population

The number of individuals in the target population (scope, universe).

Please restrict the numbers to the Eurostat scope (if additional age groups are covered in the national survey, these can be reported separately between brackets).

Please note that in case you have included the optional age group 18-24 in the target population, this can be reported separately.

If not directly available, please provide an estimate (e.g. based on other social surveys).

6049056
age 18 - 24 [736170]

5 Non-target population

The approximate number of individuals outside the scope of the survey (e.g. individuals younger than 25 (or 18) or older than 64), i.e. the difference between the total population in the country and the target population).

If not applicable, please indicate why.

4191967

6 Reference period (s)

What was the reference period of the AES, in case you used different periods for different variables, please specify for which and describe the reasons of your decision.

12 months prior to
survey month

III. Relevance		
1	Classification and description of users	
	Classification of user	Description of user
1.1	Ministry	Of Education and Culture
1.2	Ministry	Of Finance
1.3	NGO	Human Resources Development Authority
1.4	Universities/Institutions	Researchers
1.5	Media	Newspapers, Television, Radio
Institutions	European level	Commission (DGs, Secretariat General), Council, European Parliament, other European Agencies
	National or regional level	Ministries of Economy or Finance, Other Ministries, NSIs, etc.
	Multi-national organisations	OECD, UN, etc.
Social actors	Employers associations, trade unions, lobbies, at the European, national or regional level	
Media	International, national or regional specialised or for general public, interested both in figures and analyses/comments	
Researchers, students		
Enterprises: for own market research activities or for consultancy services in the information sector.		

Table 1.2.1 Relevance of the main AES statistics at national level

	For policy makers (a)		For social actors (b)		For the media (c)	
	high	low	high	low	high	low
Participation in formal, non-formal and informal education (FED, NFE, INF)	x		x		x	
Non-participation and obstacles to participation in training	x		x		x	
Participation in FED, NFE and INF activities by field of education/learning		x		x		x
Share of the job related NFE		x		x		x
Volume of instruction hours in FED and NFE		x		x		x
Employer financing and costs of learning in FED and NFE	x		x			x
Module on language and ICT skills of the population		x		x	x	
Module on social and cultural participation of the population		x		x	x	

	For researchers and students (d)		For enterprises (e)		Comments
	high	low	high	low	
Participation in formal, non-formal and informal education (FED, NFE, INF)	x			x	
Non-participation and obstacles to participation in training	x			x	
Participation in FED, NFE and INF activities by field of education/learning	x			x	
Share of the job related NFE	x		x		
Volume of instruction hours in FED and NFE	x			x	
Employer financing and costs of learning in FED and NFE	x		x		
Module on language and ICT skills of the population	x		x		
Module on social and cultural participation of the population	x			x	

- (a) i.e. if the statistic is used as policy target or if it is used in official studies **influencing policy making**
 (b) i.e. if the statistic is used by employers associations, trade unions, lobbies, at national or regional level, for their **decision making**
 (c) i.e. if the statistic is **mentioned** in national or regional media, specialised or for general public
 (d) i.e. if the statistic is used by academics **for scientific research** (e.g. appears in scientific publications) or by students
 (e) i.e. if the statistic is used by enterprises **for own market research activities or for consultancy services** in the information sec

2.	Users' needs origin <i>Please describe what the user need was, and specify whether there exist any documents where the description of more comprehensive needs was described.</i>
3.	Users needs satisfaction <i>Please evaluate whether users need have been fulfilled in case you have conducted a user satisfaction surveys, please describe more detailed the results.</i>
4.	Future changes being result of growing / not satisfied users needs.

IV. Accuracy

1. Sampling method

Please give a description of the sampling method used (e.g. stratified random sample, quota sampling, cluster sampling; one-stage or two-stage sampling; if not directly selected from the register, what was the Primary sampling unit (PSU), Final sampling unit (FSU), how are individuals selected within the household; one or all individuals within a household; etc.) and the method used for determining the sample size and sample selection. If stratification was used, please specify which variables were used to stratify, the categories of those variables and the final number of strata.

A sub-sample of Labour Force Survey was used for the AES, and consequently, AES follows the same sampling scheme as LFS, which is a two-stage stratified sample survey. Total country is stratified in 182 strata. These strata are formed by allocating municipalities and communes of every NUTS 3 area in three different groups (Agglomerations and Municipalities with 10.000 inhabitants or more, Municipalities and Communes with 2.000 to 9.999 inhabitants, and Communes up to 1.999 inhabitants). The exceptions are Athens and Thessaloniki agglomerations, which are divided into 31 and 9 strata, respectively. At the first sampling stage, 2640 clusters (groups of dwellings) are selected with probability proportional to their "size" (that is, proportional to the number of households residing in these areas at 2001 census). At the second sampling stage a systematic sample of dwellings is selected in every primary sampling unit. All households residing in selected dwellings are asked to

2. Additional measures taken at the time of sampling design to improve representativeness

If any, and if not covered under 6.1.3 E.g. corrections for sampling frame undercoverage, etc.

3.A

Gross sample size

The number of individuals initially selected from the sampling frame (if not applicable, please indicate why).

Number of households

Number of individuals

7761

NA (The sample is a sample of dwellings and the number of persons is not known)

4. Estimation /grossing-up procedures

Please give a description of the extrapolation or weighting procedures used to gross up the results in the net sample to the (target) population, discussing the different steps taken or factors applied to the design weighting to take into account the (post)stratification, adjusting for unit non-response, etc.

Persons in the sample were weighted by the design weights (inverse of the estimated probabilities of selection for each household). Using these weights, estimates for certain combinations of gender and age and NUTS2 areas are computed, and a post-stratification factor is computed to ensure that the estimated - from AES - totals for the particular combinations of gender, age and NUTS2 areas are equal to the estimated "true" values for each combination.

5. Sampling Errors

5.1 Standard Error

Please comment the calculation of the standard error

Table 5.1.a Basic information on the population

	Population		Sample		Response		Non response	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
All	6049056	100		100				
women	3005689	49,7	2788	51,4				
men	3043366	50,3	2632	48,6				
Age(1)								
(18-24) - optional	736170	10,8	620	10,3				
25-34	1463913	21,6	1125	18,6				
35-49	2451690	36,1	2105	34,9				
50-64	2133453	31,4	2190	36,3				
Age(2)								
(18-24) - optional	736170	10,8	620	10,3				
25-34	1463913	21,6	1125	18,6				
35-54	3278446	48,3	2924	48,4				
55-64	1306697	19,3	1371	22,7				
Educational attainment level								
ISCED5+6	1522935	25,2	1230	22,7				
ISCED 3A,B, 3C long programmes (>=2 years), 4	2475779	40,9	2100	38,7				
No formal education or below ISCED 1 + ISCED1+2+3C short programmes (<2 years)	2050342	33,9	2090	38,6				
Labour status								
Employed	3484050	58,1	3131	58,2				
Unemployed	1047679	17,5	827	15,4				
inactive	1463900	24,4	1419	26,4				
Degree of urbanisation								
Densely- populated area	2373342	39,2	1492	27,5				
Intermediate area	735529	12,2	534	9,9				
Thinly- populated area	2940184	48,6	3394	62,6				

5. Sampling Errors

	<i>Indicator or subindicator</i>	<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>Estimated proportion</i>	<i>Standard error (with respect of sampling plan)</i>	<i>95% confidence interval</i>	<i>Deft (if available)</i>
5.1.1	Participation rate in non-formal education					
5.1.1.1	All	398	9,6	0,72	8,2 - 11,08	3,27
5.1.1.2	women	243	11,2	1,08	9,2 - 13,5	3,31
5.1.1.3	men	155	8,0	0,58	6,9 - 9,2	1,24
5.1.2.1	persons 25-34 years old	132	13,7	0,98	11,9 - 15,8	0,9
5.1.2.2	persons 35-49 years old	192	11,6	1,13	9,5 - 13,9	2,6
5.1.2.3	persons 50-64 years old	74	4,4	0,57	3,4 - 5,7	1,7
5.1.2.4	persons 35-54 years old	231	10,3	1,01	8,5 - 12,5	3,3
5.1.2.5	persons 55-64 years old	35	3,1	0,56	2,1 - 4,4	1,5
5.1.2.6	persons 18-24 years old - optional	115	18,7	1,6	15,7 - 22,08	1,1
5.1.3.1	people with the educational attainment level of ISCED 1 or 2 or 3C short programmes (<2years)	51	3,0	0,3	2,4 - 3,7	0,8
5.1.3.2	people with the educational attainment level of ISCED 3A or 3B or 3C long programmes (>=2years) or 4	137	7,6	0,9	6,0 - 9,6	2,4
5.1.3.3	people with the educational attainment level of ISCED 5 or 6	210	21,7	2,4	17,4 - 26,7	4,0
5.1.4.1	employed	303	12,9	1,2	10,7 - 15,6	4,3
5.1.4.2	unemployed	56	7,9	1,1	6,0 - 10,2	1,3
5.1.4.3	inactive	39	3,1	0,5	2,2 - 4,4	1,4
5.1.5	Share of non-formal education and training participants who participated in the training for job related reasons	303	78,3	3,64	70,1 - 84,7	3,1
5.1.6	Share of non-formal education and training participants who participated in the training during paid working hours.	108	31,1	2,43	26,5 - 36,1	1,09

Ratios 1						
Numerator	Denominator	Ratio Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval	Unweighted Count	
				Lower	Upper	
CARNFEJREL	all_non_formal	0,71205716	0,023791115	0,664595	0,75951913	398
				66,45952	75,9519135	

5. Sampling Errors

	Indicator or subindicator	Number of respondents	Estimated proportion	Standard error (with respect of sampling plan)	95% confidence interval
5.2	Share of the job related activities in non-formal education	398	71,2	2,4	66,5- 75,9
5.3	Share of non-formal activities which took place during paid working hours	398	45,0	2,3	40,5 - 49,5
5.4	Share of non-formal activities which took place during paid working hours or were paid at least partially by the employer	398	53,4	3,4	46,7 - 60,1
5,5	Participation in informal learning	467	10,5	0,7	9,2 - 11,9

	Indicator or subindicator	Estimated value	Coefficient of variation
5.6.1	Average amount paid by participant for all the expenses related to the most recent formal education activity	838,7	8,9
5.6.2	Average amount paid by a respondent for all the expenses related to the randomly selected non-formal education activities	295,3	10,4
5.7	Average number of hours spent by a respondent in the most recent education activity	555,77	5,5
5.8	Average number of hours spent by a respondent in randomly selected non-formal education activities		
5.8.1	All	88,6	13,2
5.8.1.1	women	101,2	1,6
5.8.1.2	men	70,8	3,2
5.8.2.1	persons 25-34 years old	113,8	1,9
5.8.2.2	persons 35-49 years old	81,1	2,1
5.8.2.3	persons 50-64 years old	58,7	1,9
5.8.2.4	persons 35-54 years old	77,9	1,8
5.8.2.5	persons 55-64 years old	53,8	1,9
5.8.3.1	people with the educational attainment level of ISCED 1 or 2 or 3C short programmes (<2years)	145,2	1,5
5.8.3.2	people with the educational attainment level of ISCED 3A or 3B or 3C long programmes (≥2years) or 4	87,5	2,8
5.8.3.3	people with the educational attainment level of ISCED 5 or 6	79,3	3,4
5.8.4.1	employed	56	0,7
5.8.4.2	unemployed	208,6	1,7
5.8.4.3	inactive	193,5	3,5

6. Non-sampling errors

6.1 Coverage

6.1.1

Sampling frame

Name and short description of the sampling frame or register used

For AES, a subsample of Labour Force Survey was used-in particular, a full "rotation" sample, which amounts to 1/6th of the total LFS sample.

The sampling frame that is used, is an area frame: that is, building blocks that are enumerated in the previous section. The information that is included in the sampling frame (and used in the sampling procedure) is the geographical area (Municipality, and NUTS 3 area) and the number of households residing in the building block during last census.

LFS (and AES) sample is a stratified sample of dwellings, selected in two stages. In the first stage, total country is stratified in 182 strata that are formed by allocating municipalities and communes of every NUTS 3 in three different groups (Agglomerations and Municipalities with 10.000 inhabitants or more, Municipalities and Communes with 2.000 to 9.999 inhabitants, and Communes up to 1.999 inhabitants). The exceptions are Athens and Thessaloniki agglomerations, which are divided into 31 and 9 strata, respectively. At the first sampling stage, a number of clusters (groups of dwellings) are selected with probability proportional to size. At the second stage, a random (systematic) sample of dwelling is selected.

6.1.2

Known shortcomings of the sampling frame, if any.

Shortcomings in terms of timeliness (e.g. time lag between last update of the sampling frame and the moment of the actual sampling), geographical coverage, coverage of different subpopulations, etc.

The sampling frame is based on the 2001 census results.

The main issues pertaining to the frame quality are:

- a) The more the time interval elapsed since the census, the less accurately the probabilities of selection reflect the "real size" of the selected primary sampling units.*
- b) Sample size can be different, and even significantly different from the expected size, due to considerable changes in the "size" (that is, the number of household dwellings) of a PSU.*
- c) It is difficult to control the way listings are updated. Over-coverage and under-coverage can be both present.*
- d) the sampling frame includes only private households residing in "normal" dwellings. Population living in collective households*

	Coverage of population (ineligible cases)	Number of households	Number of individuals
6.1.3	Ineligible: out-of-scope	951	UNA
	Ineligible: out-of-scope		
	E.g. selected household is not in the target population because all members are under 25 (or 18) or over 64 years old.		
6.1.4	Other ineligible	2031	UNA
	E.g. no dwelling exists at the selected address or selected individual has died between the reference data of the sampling frame (6.1.1) and the moment of the interview.		
6.B	Number of eligible elements	4779	UNA
	I.e. the gross sample size corrected for the ineligible cases.		

6.2 Measurement

6.2.1	Survey vehicle	Y/N?
	stand alone	Y
	embedded in another survey	
	<i>If embedded in another survey, give a short description of the survey the AES was insert in.</i>	

6.2.2	Survey type	Y/N?
	Face-to-face interview	Y
	Telephone onterview	Y
	Combination of techniques	
	Paper-pen	
	CAPI	
	CATI	
	Other	

6.2.3	Allow Proxy answers (Y/N)?
	Y
	(if Yes) An estimate of the percentage of proxy interviews (compared to the total number of interviews)
40.6% (Unweighted)	

6.2.4	Method of random selection of NFE activities
	<i>Please describe the method used for selecting the two random non-formal education activities.</i>
	<i>Interviewers had "selection - sheets" like the one presented here. In case a respondent had participate in more than 2 activities, should go to the column with the corresponding heading and choose the first available combination of activities. When a particular combination was used in a</i>

6.2.5	Existence of pilot test of the 2011 AES questionnaire	Y/N?
	Partial (new questions)	N
	Full	N

NUMBER OF EDUCATINAL ACTIVITIES IN WHICH THE RESPONDEND PARTICIPATED									
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
1 3	3 4	1 2	2 6	1 6	3 8	3 8	9 10		
1 3	2 3	1 3	1 4	2 7	4 5	1 9	2 8		
1 2	1 3	4 5	1 4	3 7	5 6	7 9	5 8		

6.3 Processing

6.3.1	<p>Please describe data entry and coding control process as well as editing systems applied to the data.</p>
	<p>Adult Education Survey in Greece used a paper questionnaire. After data collection, questionnaires were collected in the central office, and after manual check and codifications they were entered in the data base. During data entry controls on the flow and on acceptable values (but not for "open" questions, like occupation) were used.</p>
	<p>What were the main errors detected in the post-data collection process and what was their number?</p>
	<p>Due to the fact that paper questionnaires are used, there is a large number of different kind of errors detected after the data entry. The main categories were: Wrong codes in the open questions Mistakes in the reported languages (e.g. languages reported as mother tongue and as foreign, same language reported twice, etc.) Contradictions between the answers provided in different parts of the questionnaire</p>

6.3.2	What were the questions where category "other" could be reclassified if an appropriate category was defined in a variable?		
	<i>In principle, whenever category "other" is one of the options in the variables/questions, it should be formulated: Other/please specify. Please list questions where quite significant number of answers constitute separate not already existing category, which could be created for the next round of the survey. Please also propose a missing category/ies. You may add rows if necessary.</i>		
	Question/variable	% of answers "other"	Proposal for a category
6.3.2.1	As you mentioned before, you took part in education and training over the last 12 months. What were the reasons?	1.7	No proposal, the "other" categorie was not used frequently
6.3.2.2	Did any of the following reasons explain why you didn't participate in education or training during the last 12 months?	1.5	No proposal, the "other" categorie was not used frequently
6.3.2.3	Where did you get the information about learning possibilities?	0,2	No proposal, the "other" categorie was not used frequently

6.3.3	<p>What were the questions asked as open and post coded afterwards? (Coding of ISCED, NACE, ISCO)</p>
	<p>Please list open questions</p> <p>HATLEVEL HATFIELD JOBISCO LOCNACE ISCOFATHER ISCOMOTHER FEDFIELD NFEFIELD1 NFEFIELD2 INFFIELD1 INFFIELD2 LANGMOTH ER1 LANGMOTH ER2</p>
	<p>Describe the process of post-coding (was it done by the interviewer, in the regional, central office, what were the methods used, etc.)</p>
	<p>Post-coding was done manually in the central office. After data entry, of both codes and verbal descriptions, in a first step, wrong codes were identified. In a second step, cases with same verbal description and different code were identified and corrected In a third step, cases with contradicting codes were identified (for example, a person working as a lawyer with highest educational level ISCED 2) and corrected (if possible)</p>

6.4 Response and non-response /Unit non-response

Table 6.4.a Calculation of unit non-response.

	N		
Is the non response rate weighted? (Y/N)		If weighted, state the definition of the weights	
Is the non-response on household level or person level? (H/P)	H		

Table 6.4.b Rates of unit non response by survey mode.

Survey mode	CAPI	CATI	PAPI	CAWI	POSTAL
Non response rate in %			35,9		

Table 6.4.c Divisions of non-response into categories.

Non response rate (%)	35,9
Non-contacts (%)	15,6
Refusals (%)	17,9
Inability to respond (%)	
Rejected interviews (%)	2,5
Other reasons(%)	

Type of unit non-response (eligible cases)	Number of households	Number of individuals	Examples / guidelines for each type of unit non-response
Non-contact	744	UNA	no one was home or postal survey was never sent back
Refusal	854	UNA	the selected household or individual was contacted but refused to take part in the survey
Inability to respond			the selected household or individual was unable to participate due to language barriers or cognitive or physical incapacity to respond
Rejected interviews	118	UNA	the selected household/individual did take part but the survey form cannot be used (poor quality - e.g. strong inconsistencies; unacceptable item-response – e.g. individual left most of the questions unanswered; survey form got lost and interview cannot be repeated; etc.)
Other non-response			Please specify the other types of non-response encountered

6.4 Response and non-response /Unit non-response

Table 6.4.d Methods used for minimizing unit non-response

Where applicable, give a description of measures taken to reduce the non-response (advance notification in the form of a letter or phone call, system of reminders, number of visits, number of attempts for phone calls, etc)

Advance notification letter. (Due to delay in the starting date of fieldwork, there was no time for systematic use of reminders and multiple phone calls)

Table 6.4.e Patterns of non response. Underestimation and overestimation bias of main characteristics

If the characteristic is not overestimated write "NA"

The was no non-response survey so it is not possible to attest the bias caused by non response in survey estimates. We can have an indication on the bias caused by non-response, by observing differences between the

	Underestimation assessment		Overestimation assessment	
	Quantitative	Descriptive	Quantitative	Descriptive
Participation rate in FED				By comparing the differences in the sample of LFS and AES – and in particular differences in the allocation of the sample by gender, age and employment status- we can notice that the number of inactive persons is slightly “over-represented” and the number of employed is slightly under-represented (for all ages and for both genders). If we take in to account that (according to LFS results) there is a positive correlation between employment and participation in non-formal education, and a positive correlation between inactivity and participation in formal education, we may suppose that non-response in AES may lead to an overestimation of participation in formal education
Participation rate in NFE				For the reasons discribed above, non response may lead to an underestimation of participation in non-formal education
Participation rate in INF				
Participation rate in job related non-formal education and training				
Other characteristic				
Other characteristic				

6.4 Response and non-response /Unit non-response

Table 6.4.f Methods used for adjustments for statistical unit non-response					
Adjustment via weights (Y/N?) e.g. post-stratification by ad hoc auxiliary information for non-response.	Y	Variables used for non-response adjustment	NUTS 2 AREAS, GENDER, AGE	Description of method	Design weights are adjusted using post stratification correction factors that are computed
Substitution of non-responding units (Y/N?)	N	Substitution rate		Criteria for substitution Report which non-responding units are substituted (e.g. non-contacts , refusals, other non-respondents, ineligible units, etc.); at what stage they are substituted; and the criteria for the selection of substitute units (e.g. the household next door or the following unit in the sampling list, etc.).	
Other methods (Y/N?) e.g. results of non-response surveys, copying information from previous waves, etc.	N	Description of method			

6.5 Response and non-response /item non-response

Table 6.5.a Questions or items with item response rates below 90%		
Add rows as necessary.		
Question or item		Item non-response rate (%)
ISCOMOTHER	13,7	
FEDNBHOURS	22,3	
FEDNBWEEKS	14,6	
FEDDURPERWEEK	22,3	
FEDPAIDVAL	54,9	
FEDUSE	11,2	
FEDOUTCOME	5,0	
NFEREASON2	18,8	
nfePAIDVAL2	19,0	
DIFFICULTY	12,3	
OTHERLANG	100,0	
HHINCOME	21,5	

Table 6.5.b Methods used for imputation of statistical item non-response		
Add rows as necessary.		
Question or item	Imputation rate	Describe method used, mentioning which auxiliary information or stratification is used
NA		

Table 6.5.c References to methodological notes and results of non response analysis or other methods to assess the effects of non-response

V. Timelines and punctuality

Table V.1 Dates when each of the phases of the projects started/ended

Please indicate the dates when each of the following phases of the project started and ended.

	Start date	End date
Preparation of survey	15/2/2011	15/5/2012
Fieldwork	1/6/2012	15/9/2012
Reminders and follow-up	na	
Non-response survey	na	
Processing (quality control, editing, imputation, etc.)	15/8/2012	4/1/2013
Transmission of data to Eurostat	12/1/2013	12/1/2013
Dissemination of national results	na	

Table V.2.a Delay of delivery to Eurostat of the full dataset or of the main items and reasons for late delivery

Datasets used for data dissemination are considered, which may not correspond to the first transmission. Late deliveries in blue font. Please provide reason.

Full dataset			Single item(s)		
Deadline	Delivery date	Reason for late delivery	Item(s)	Delay (days)	Reason for late delivery
31/12/2012	04/01/2013	The late delivery was caused mainly by some problems in downloading the validation programs. We should point out that			

Table V.2.b Ways for improving punctuality

--

VI. Accessibility and Clarity

1.	<p>Conditions of access to data, media support, possible restrictions, existing service-level agreement, etc.</p> <p><i>Please describe types of documentation, explanations and quality limitations which were/are going to be to provide to the data users.</i></p> <p>After the publication of a press release for the AES, a series of basic tables will be aploaded in Hellenic Statistical Authority website. Specific tabulations are available to users upon request to the Hellenic Statistical Authority, Statistical Information and Publications Division, 46, Pireos & Eponiton str, P.O. BOX 80847, 18510 Piraeus (tel. (30) 210-4852 311, Fax: (30) 210-4852 022, e-mail: data.dissem@statistics.gr)</p> <p>Micro-data would be available without fee to users upon request to the Hellenic Statistical Authority, Statistical Information and Publications Division, 46, Pireos & Eponiton str, P.O. BOX 80847, 18510 Pireas (tel. (30) 210-4852 311, Fax: (30) 210-4852 022, e-mail: data.dissem@statistics.gr).</p>
2.	<p>Available information accompanying the statistics</p> <p><i>Please describe types of documentation, explanations and quality limitations which were/are going to be to provide to the data users.</i></p> <p>Questionnaire, interviewer instructions, and meta-data in Euro SDMX format are available to users</p>

VII. Comparability/ Deviations from the AES recommendations

1. Methodological deviations

Table 1.1

This part focuses on quantifying and measuring the deviations from the methodological recommendations defined for the AES. So please fill in only if deviations from the methodological guidelines set for the AES took place when the survey was implemented at national level.

Methodological recommendations for the AES	TARGET	DEVIATIONS (Y/N)	COMMENTS ON THE IMPACT OF THE DEVIATIONS
QUESTIONNAIRE			
Deviation from the AES questionnaire		N	
National data collection period	06/2011- 05/2012	Y	The data collection took place between 1/6/2012 - 15/9/2012. As a result, the reference period of AES covered mainly the year 2012. Since, according to LFS estimates, there is no significant difference between participation rates in education during 2011 and 2012, the different data collection period probably had no impact on the main indicators
Survey vehicle	ad hoc of LFS or standalone survey	N	
TARGET POPULATION			
Age	All individuals aged 25-64	N	
	Coverage of the optional age group 18-24	N	
Statistical unit	Individuals learning activities	N	
SURVEY METHODOLOGY			
Sampling frame	Population register or census	N	
Survey method	Simple random, stratified simple random, multistage stratified sampling	N	
Sampling	Three non-formal learning activities are sampled and described in detail for each individual	Y	Only 2 non-formal activities were sampled and described in detail. Since the number of persons that reported more than 2 activities is small, there is probably no significant impact of the deviation.
DATA COLLECTION			
Survey type	Face-to-face interview (CAPI)	Y	A paper questionnaire was used for AES. This probably has an impact on the quality of the survey (since it was not possible to have any checks for implausible answers during the interview) as well as to other aspects of the survey process (time needed for data entry and data validation, etc).
Reference period	The last 12 months preceding the interview	N	
Proxy	Not allowed	Y	Proxy answers were allowed. Since there are significant differences in the participation rates in formal and non formal education (see next table), the use of proxies probably led to an underestimation of participation in educational activities.
PRECISION	95% confidence intervals	N	
NON-RESPONSE	Weighting by age and gender	N	
DATA PROCESSING	Checking is applied during the interviews or at the data editing process and when the data is delivered to Eurostat	N	

		Participation rate in formal education	Participation rate in non formal education
25 - 34 years	Direct interview	10,3	17,1
	Proxie interview	5,6	10,0
35 - 49 years	Direct interview	1,6	13,5
	Proxie interview	0,6	8,2
50 - 64 years	Direct interview	0,5	5,3
	Proxie interview	0,4	2,7

2. Comparability Over Time			
<i>This part compares key variables for aggregated AES2011 data with the pilot AES data.</i>			
Table 2.1			
Definition of relative difference between AES2011 and pilot AES data:			
Key indicators	AES2011	Pilot AES	DIFF = (pilot AES/AES 2011)*100
Participation in formal education and training	2,6	2,3	88,5
Participation in non-formal education and training	9,6	12,7	132,3
Participation in informal learning	10,5	20,7	197,1
Number of non-formal training activities	1,2	1,3	108,3
Number of formal training activities	1,02	1,01	99,0

VIII. Coherence

Comparison of statistics for the same phenomenon or item from other surveys	
<i>Please indicate the most surprising results and important differences (in comparison to other data sources) and analyse their possible reasons.</i>	
Comparison with LFS estimations	
The first 2 tables compare AES and LFS estimates for the educational level (Table 1) and employment status (Table 2) of population 18 - 64 years old. For this comparison, the 4th quarter 2012 results of LFS are used.	

Table 1. Highest completed education

	AES RESULTS		LFS RESULTS		% difference in percentage allocation
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
01	59.722	0,9	74.424	1,1	-22,9
11	1.243.732	18,3	1.197.714	17,4	5,0
21	657.652	9,7	746.005	10,8	-11,9
22	184.582	2,7	191.360	2,8	-2,3
31	49.742	0,7	23.551	0,3	53,3
32	2.329.635	34,3	2.366.838	34,4	-0,2
40	626.620	9,2	615.801	9,0	3,1
51	500.933	7,4	542.018	7,9	-6,7
52	1.091.281	16,1	1.098.249	16,0	0,7
60	41.326	0,6	23.376	0,3	44,2
Total	6.785.226	100,0	6.879.337	100,0	

Table 2. Employment status

	AES RESULTS		LFS RESULTS		% difference in percentage allocation
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
Employed	3.703.617	54,6	3.624.731	52,7	3,5
Unemployed	1.250.668	18,4	1.288.439	18,7	-1,6
Inactive	1.830.941	27,0	1.966.167	28,6	-5,9
Total	6.785.225	100,0	6.879.337	100	

As far as it concerns educational attainment, important differences appear in the estimation of persons with ISCED level 31, ISCED level 60 and ISCED level 01. Differences (but of smaller scale) can be found also in the estimation of persons with ISCED level 11 and 21.

Apart the "simplistic" explanation of sampling variation, one possible reason for the apparent differences in the groups with ISCED 60 and ISCED 01 can be that persons with the highest educational level tend to answer more easily to a survey like AES (while persons of lowest level tend to refuse to answer).

The differences in levels 11, 21, 22 and 31 seem to be "complementary" - that is, the lower estimation by AES of persons with level 21 correspond to a higher estimation of person with level 11 (and, conversely, the lower estimation by AES of persons with level 22 correspond to a higher estimation of person with level 31)

It is not easy to explain these differences. The relevant information is collected in both surveys with an open question and is "post-codified" using the same rules. The only important difference is the "positioning" of the relevant question: in AES it was the very first question in the questionnaire while in LFS is in the end. It is likely that respondents answer differently and perhaps more accurately in a question that is placed at the beginning of the survey

Concerning employment status, the comparison with LFS is not straightforward since a "main status" approach is used in AES, while in LFS the classification in employment, unemployment or inactivity is based on ILO recommendations. Nevertheless, we should point out that the differences are in the opposite of the expected direction (AES estimates a larger number of employed and a smaller number of unemployed), a fact that maybe suggest a different pattern of non-response bias.

Comparison with LFS estimations	
The next table compares AES and LFS estimates of the participation in non-formal activities (Table 3) of population 18 - 64 years old. For this comparison, the 4th quarter 2012 results of LFS are used.	

	Participation Rate in non formal education: AES results	Participation Rate in non formal education: LFS results
18 - 24 years old	18,7	6,0
25 - 34 years old	13,7	2,4
35 - 49 years old	11,6	1,6
50 - 64 years old	4,4	0,8
Total	10,6	2,5

The estimated proportion of persons that participated in non - formal activities is almost 4 times larger in AES than LFS. If we take in to account the longer reference period this result is not too surprising (and if we assume that a person attends 1 non formal activity per year and that these activities usually have short duration and do not cover 2 quarters-an hypothesis which is probably close to the reality in the case of Greece- then the 2 estimations seem plausible.

IX. Overall assessment

Please give your general opinion about the quality of the survey, its weaknesses and strong points.

Strong points:

Information on parental background

Information on non formal education not available from other sources.

Information on participation (or not) in educational activities, in connection with demographic characteristics, labour status and detailed characteristics of employment.

Information on obstacles for participation

Weak points:

Several difficult questions (time spend in education, money spend for education) resulting in high item non response rates.

High non-response rate

Quite lengthy interview in case of persons that participated in many activities

The basic notions/variables (formal – non formal education) are defined mainly as a list of certain activities/programs, that probably are not understood the same way by different respondents (or in different countries).

X. Problems encountered and lessons to be learnt

These comments can relate to methodological issues as well as to the questionnaire itself (item construction, clarity of definitions to interviewers and respondents, routing and filtering, outcome of pre-tests, etc.)

10.1 Problematic modules and variables/questions

Please indicate what were the modules and/or questions which caused problems during preparation of the questionnaire and/or later during the interviews and which were not detected during the tests. Please describe the problems and ways you managed with them. In case you have already ideas for improvements in the next round of the survey.

1. Questions on the use and the outcome of the learning activities provided in many cases contradicting results: for example, persons declaring that they use (or expect to use) very little or not at all the skills they acquired and at the same time report several outcomes from the learning activity.

We believe that the question(s) on the use of the skills could be removed for AES questionnaire (one more reason is the fact that is quite subjective and refers (and) in the future.). It would also be possible to be included as one more answer category in the OUTCOME variable (for example: the program gave me skills that I use (or expect to use) in my work or every day life)

2. The measurement of participation in informal learning is extremely sensitive in the formulation of relevant questions and the way they are understood by the respondent (and probably the interviewer). We believe that only with a completely standardised questionnaire it is possible to make meaningful and valid comparisons between countries or different years of the survey.

10.2 Problems with the definition of different types of learning activities which appeared during the interviews.

Please describe cases where respondents had difficulties in deciding about the type of activity, please discuss possible sources of these problems and propose solutions.

The main problems when reporting learning activities were related with the distinction between:

- a) ISCED 5 and ISCED 4 programs of formal education
- b) seminars and courses
- c) guided on the job training and seminars
- and
- d) guided on the job training and activities that are not learning activities

In case (a) the main problem has to do with privately owned enterprises (education providers) that suppose to provide education at ISCED 5a level but are not recognized as such by the ministry of education (ministry of education consider them as providing education at ISCED 4 level). In such cases, the respondent would probably report that is studying (or have completed) a program of higher level than the level "officially" recognised

In case (b) the main difficulty has to do with the fact that in the Greek language there is no term corresponding clearly to "courses" (it is translated as "lessons" or "programs") and at the same time, in many cases what is described (in the Greek language) as a seminar is (according to AES definition) a course.

In case (c) and (d) it was difficult to distinguish between activities that take place normally in

We believe that the main source of such problems is the fact that we ask the respondents to. Probably one solution would be

- a) Disregard the distinction between courses and seminars or workshops: Both categories
- b) Deal guided on the job training separately (like informal learning)

10.3