

**ASSESSMENT REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF BLES SURVEYS IN THE
REGIONAL OFFICES (except NCR and ARMM)
November 2 to December 3, 2010**

The Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics (BLES) conducted an assessment of the survey implementation of its 2009/2010 BLES Integrated Survey (BITS) and 2010 Occupational Wages Surveys (OWS) in the DOLE Regional Offices (ROs) and Field Offices (FOs). This assessment is part of the technical supervision of BLES to the ROs to identify problems/issues encountered by ROs during survey field enumeration. This is an initial attempt to evaluate the survey implementation at the ROs which is aimed at improving the conduct of the survey.

BLES started the field enumeration of the survey in July with the conduct of trainings for NCR enumerators and a trainers' training for DOLE RO personnel who shall oversee the field enumeration in the regions (except for NCR and ARMM). Prior to this, funds were transferred to the said ROs to cover the supplies, training expenses and wages of enumerators/survey supervisors, and other incidental expenses, including transportation expenses of the RO personnel who attended the trainers' training in Manila.

The assessment primarily covered the following activities: 1) interview with the RO/FO personnel directly involved in overseeing the project in the region; and 2) interview with contact persons in selected survey respondents. The BLES fielded 18 personnel to conduct the assessment in 15 regions for the period November 2 to December 3, 2010.

Results of the assessment are presented below. The report also includes comments made by the RO personnel and contact persons in the establishments; and some observations of BLES personnel who did the interviews.

I. IMPLEMENTATION OF SURVEY PROCESSES

A. Recruitment of Enumerators

Out of 15 Regional Offices visited, 14 regions hired enumerators for the conduct of the 2009/2010 BITS and 2010 OWS. Only Region IV-B did not hire survey enumerators and assigned instead the provincial staff to conduct the enumeration in their respective areas. (*Table 1*)

Several criteria were employed in the recruitment of enumerators. Majority of the ROs required applicants to be college graduates, good communicators, or familiar with the area covered by the surveys. Twelve (12) regions required any or a combination of these criteria in the hiring of field personnel. Only six (6) Regional Offices required only units in any college course.

Other criteria in hiring were kinship with DOLE staff provided that applicants were qualified, possession of motorcycle for easy access, beneficiaries of the NARS program, computer literacy and referral by a DOLE staff. Six (6) regions did not require any of the mentioned documents as enumerators were previously employed by Regional Offices or they are known to RO staff.

B. Conduct of Training

All the regions conducted trainings for 2009/2010 BITS and 2010 OWS and provided training materials to area supervisors and enumerators. The area supervisors and enumerators were trained by the RO staff who attended the training in Manila in July 2010.

All the 14 regions provided field operations manuals, questionnaires, occupational sheets, pens/pencils and training envelopes/bags/kits to field personnel. Regions IV-A, VI, and VII also provided enumerators with calculators.

Ten (10) out of 14 regions conducted mock interviews. These were Regions I, IV-A, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI and XII. CAR and Region III rehired their previous enumerators; Caraga just conducted a briefing session among its survey personnel; whereas Region II cited constraints on time and accessibility due to floods; thus, these regions were not able to conduct mock interviews.

Eleven (11) regions evaluated the trainings conducted and used the BLES training forms.

C. Work Allocation

Familiarity with the area, accessibility and transportation costs were the major factors considered in the distribution of workloads to enumerators in 11 regions. Region III allocated more workload to “previously hired enumerators” due to previous survey experience.

Out of 14 regions, 13 provided control lists to enumerators. It was found out that in Region XII, an enumerator jotted the status of the establishments in a notebook rather than in the control list.

D. Data Collection

Eleven (11) regions implemented their data collection activities within the schedule provided by BLES. Regions III, IV-B and VI started their data collection in September.

Six (6) regions had regional supervisors (RO staff) to primarily oversee data collection while both regional and area supervisors in seven (7) regions. In RO XI and RO IV-B, the area supervisor and field officer, respectively, supervised the data collection.

Only seven (7) regions required their enumerators to report once a week or more. It was in two (2) regions (ROs I and II) where the enumerator/s either did not have a fixed reporting schedule or reported only once a month.

Nine (9) regions had weekly performance form accomplished by enumerators. There were five (5) regions where enumerators did not accomplish the Enumerator’s Weekly Performance Report. Majority of the regions had enumerator’s control list properly filled-out. Note that Region IV-B did not hire enumerators hence, no enumerator control list was used.

Either regional or area supervisors in 13 regions were involved in recording the enumerators’ accomplishments. Note that in Region X, both regional and area supervisors were involved. Region II indicated that recording of accomplishment was the enumerator’s responsibility.

Though provided in the budget provided by BLES, majority of the regions have not purchased tokens for survey respondents. Only Regions VIII and XI provided tokens.

Majority of the regions conducted spot checks on questionnaire delivery/retrieval in establishments while four (4) regions did not.

As agreed during the training, ROs should review questionnaires prior to transmission to BLES however, Regions IV-B, V and VIII admitted not reviewing the questionnaires prior to transmittal. Majority of the regions did not use the verification forms for questionnaires requiring verification. Only four (4) regions used verification forms.

E. Preparation of Payroll

Seven (7) regions paid the enumerators twice a month as provided in the survey manual. In two (2) regions (ROs I and XII), the enumerators were paid monthly while Regions XI and Caraga paid their enumerators on weekly basis. Three (3) regions indicated either paying the enumerator every six (6) retrieved questionnaires (RO III), no payroll has been prepared yet (RO II), or to pay the enumerators upon completion of the survey operation (RO CAR). Meanwhile, Region IV-B was silent about the issue.

F. Fund Utilization

All regions received the interfund transfer/Notice of Transfer Allocation (NTA) either on the 3rd or 4th week of July 2010 except for Region IV-B which received the interfund transfer/NTA on August 13, 2010.

II. SPOTCHECK WITH SELECTED SURVEY RESPONDENTS

There were 116 establishments visited in the 15 regions, ranging from three (3) establishments (Region IV-B) to as much as 12 establishments (Region VII). Selection of establishments spot checked depended on the number of questionnaires that need verification prior to fielding of the assessment team, as well as their proximity to the Regional Office/Field Office visited. Interviewees were the contact persons in the establishments as indicated in the questionnaires.

A. Position of Persons who Accomplished the Questionnaire for Both Surveys (Table 2)

Majority of those who accomplished the questionnaires were HR Manager/Personnel (54.3%) followed by Accountant/Accounting Staff/Bookkeeper/Clerk (26.7%), Finance Officer/Payroll Personnel (12.9%) and Owner/Manager (10.3%). Note that different personnel had to accomplish the BITS and OWS questionnaires due to their varying items of inquiry.

B. Affixing of Signature to the Questionnaire (Table 2)

Of those interviewed, 101 (87.1%) have affixed their signatures to the questionnaire while the rest (15) did not.

C. Time Spent on Accomplishing Questionnaire (Table 3)

More than two days were spent in accomplishing the questionnaire by majority (65 or 56.0%) of the interviewees. Twenty-five (21.6%) of them did so in less than a day while 23 (19.8%) took them one or two days to do it.

D. On the Definition of Terms, Layout and Font/Color of the Questionnaires (Table 3)

Ninety-four (81.0%) of those interviewed found the definition of terms in the questionnaire easy to understand while the rest (22 or 19.0%) said the definitions were vague. Some of the comments/suggestions include: the definitions (in the OWS Occupational Sheet) were not applicable to the electronics industry; some definitions are redundant; there were overlapping questions; not easy to understand; had to request assistance from the regional office on some of the terms; and cite examples applicable to government office.

An equally large number of interviewees (96 or 82.8%) said the layout of the questionnaires were user-friendly while the rest (20) said they were not. Comments/suggestions include: at first glance, they were overwhelming; there were many items of inquiries/computations; it was intimidating and long (technical); totals should be placed after details; and forms should be simplified.

Majority (113 or 97.4%) found the font and colors of the questionnaires appealing.

E. On Ratings for the Enumerators (Table 4)

The interviewees were asked to rate the Enumerators who visited them and “Very Satisfactory” ratings were given by almost half (54 or 46.6%) of the interviewees on ‘**Statement of the objectives of the survey**’ and ‘**Explaining the items of inquiry**’ and by 44.0 percent on the ‘**Courteousness of the enumerators**’.

F. Other Matters

One respondent in Region III denied accomplishing the OWS and BITS questionnaires submitted by the enumerator. Fortunately, she agreed to accomplish another set of questionnaires. The Enumerator assigned to the said establishment has already resigned from DOLE RO III during the time of BLES assessment. Establishments in some regions raised the issues of good grooming and courtesy that should be observed by the enumerators.

III. DOLE ROS COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE 2010 BLES SURVEYS (2009/2010 BITS AND 2010 OWS) (Table 5)

A. Control List of Establishments

The need for an accurate and reliable sampling frame was the utmost concern of DOLE Regional Offices. Seven (7) out of the 15 ROs noted that the list of sample establishments provided by BLES contained duplicates and establishments that have been reported as permanently closed (PCL) and cannot be located (CBL). The number of spoilage is quite significant – an average of 20.0% for BITS and 18.0% for OWS for all regions outside NCR.

To resolve the issue, DOLE ROs VII and VIII offered some assistance in updating/validating the BLES Survey Sampling Frame in their respective regions. Another suggestion is for the BLES to provide ROs with the advance copy of the List of Sample Establishments for their validation prior to the implementation of the survey field operations.

B. Data Collection

Two (2) ROs (III and VI) recommended a longer survey period for the implementation of BLES surveys. The period of data collection from August to November 2010 was considered too short in the light of the numerous workloads of RO staff.

As suggested by RO V, BLES should provide ROs with monthly comparative regional status report as a guide for them to better manage the survey implementation and improve the retrieval rate in the region.

DOLE Central Visayas (RO VII), on the other hand, raised the issue of outsourcing the data collection of BITS and OWS to private entities so as to minimize “respondent bias” associated with DOLE sponsored survey.

C. Survey Budget

High transport cost from establishments located in far flung areas/outside capital regions were reported by DOLE Cagayan Valley (RO II) and Caraga. They suggested that transport allowance be provided to enumerators assigned in these areas.

On the other hand, DOLE Northern Mindanao (RO X) suggested that payments should be provided for PCL and CBL samples since enumerators also incurred costs in validating their status.

DOLE Eastern Visayas (RO VIII) recommended that BLES provide ROs with authorization that will allow them some flexibility in realigning the survey budget to be used as capital outlay.

IV. ESTABLISHMENTS COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF 2010 BLES SURVEYS (2009/2010 BITS and 2010 OWS) (Table 6)

Part of the BLES regional assessment was the visit to selected sample establishments to solicit their views on their participation in BLES surveys as well as their suggestions on how to improve this undertaking. Listed below are some of the useful comments and suggestions that can be considered in improving the conduct of future BLES surveys.

A. Method and Schedule of Data Collection

As stated in the form, the respondents were encouraged to complete and return the survey forms to DOLE ROs within ten (10) days from date of receipt. Respondents in five (5) regions strongly proposed the extension of the “due date”. They noted that due to the large volume of items required in each survey form, respondents need more than 10 days to gather and assemble all the information from their company books and records. This difficulty is particularly true for establishments with large employment size.

B. Survey Questionnaire

In general, respondents of BLES surveys find the BITS/OWS questionnaires too long and time-consuming to accomplish and often require the involvement of several personnel in the establishment. In particular, difficulties were encountered in providing information on the following survey items: total hours actually worked; wage rate by sex; basic pay per worker; and some portion of the occupational safety and health module. Furthermore, some items in the forms were not applicable to the respondents (e.g., number of managers and supervisors in schools)

One suggestion that was cited by respondents in several regions is the need to design industry-specific questionnaire or customized questionnaire (e.g., education, utilities, broadcasting). Other suggestions include: the need for bigger font/change color; change in layout; some definitions/terms and guidelines need further clarification; extra sheets/paper for data on salary.

There was also a suggestion for BLES to develop an “on-line customized” forms for large establishments to reduce the burden of accomplishing long and cumbersome questionnaires.

C. Survey Enumerators

As a good industry practice, it was strongly recommended by several respondents that DOLE ROs make it a policy for enumerators to set appointment with the sample establishments prior to their scheduled visit as unannounced visits often disrupt the operation of the establishment. The wearing of proper attire and being

courteous should be observed at all times in dealing with establishments as negative feedbacks on the behavior of some enumerators were reported in some ROs.

It was also recommended that enumerators should be well-trained and knowledgeable about the questionnaires. Some respondents prefer that enumerators should be “physically” present to assist them in accomplishing the survey forms. There were instances when enumerators failed to brief the staff responsible in accomplishing the forms and made follow-ups only through phone calls.

V. BLES STAFF OBSERVATIONS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DOLE ROS ON 2010 BLES SURVEY OPERATION (*Table 7*)

On the overall, the implementation of 2010 BITS/OWS by DOLE ROs was an improvement of the previous 2008 survey performance in terms of retrieval rate with the exception of ROs IV-B and V. In particular, these regions did not hire area supervisors as provided for in the budget which resorted in the poor coordination and monitoring of field implementation of the survey. Moreover, no editing of questionnaires was done in these two regions which is the function of area supervisors.

The editing of questionnaires still needs further attention and improvement in almost all regions and this should be underscored in the next BLES survey. There is also a need to emphasize the use of verification forms as a tool in verifying data provided by establishments.

**TABLE 1 – Assessment on the Implementation of BLES Surveys by DOLE-ROs by Items of Inquiry and Region, Outside National Capital Region
November – December 2010**

Item of Inquiry		Total	Region														
			I	II	C A R	III	IV-A	IV-B	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	Caraga
Total		15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
With Criteria for Recruitment of Enumerators?	Yes	14	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	No	1						1									
Criteria for Recruitment of Enumerators*	College Graduate	12	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1		1	1
	Units in any college course	6	1			1						1			1	1	
	Good communication skills	12	1	1		1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	Familiar with the area	12	1	1		1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	Relatives of DOLE Staff (if qualified)	1		1													
	Possesses a motorcycle	1				1											
	Beneficiary of NARS program	1								1							
	Computer literate	1									1						
	RO staff referral	1															1
	NA	1						1									
Conducted training?	Yes	14	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Provided training materials?	Yes	14	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Materials Provided*	Field Operations Manual	14	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Questionnaires	14	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Occupational Sheets	14	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Writing Pads	13	1	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Ballpen/Pencil	14	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Training Envelope/Bag/Kit	14	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Calculator	3					1			1	1						
	Umbrella	1									1						
Conducted mock interview?	Yes	10	1				1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	No	4		1	1	1											1
Evaluated conduct of training?	Yes	11	1	1			1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	No	3			1	1											1
Use Evaluation Form (FM-BLES 03-3.23)?	Yes	11	1	1			1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	No	3			1	1											1

* Details may not add to total due to multiple responses.

**TABLE 1 – Assessment on the Implementation of BLES Surveys by DOLE-ROs by Items of Inquiry and Region, Outside National Capital Region
November – December 2010 (Cont'd)**

Item of Inquiry		Total	Region														
			I	II	C A R	III	IV-A	IV-B	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	Caraga
Factors Considered in Allocating Workload*	Accessibility	11	1	1	1	1	1		1		1		1	1	1	1	
	Transportation Cost	11	1	1	1	1	1		1		1		1	1	1	1	
	Familiarity of the area	12	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	
	Others (Old-timer)	1				1											
Provided control list?	Yes	13	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1
	No	1														1	
Person Who Supervised Data Collection*	Regional Supervisor	13	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
	Area Supervisor	8				1	1			1	1	1		1	1		1
	Field Officer	1						1									
Enumerators Reporting Schedule	Daily	1									1						
	Once a week	4			1								1		1		1
	Twice/thrice a week	2								1		1					
	Once a month	1	1														
	Twice/thrice a month	5				1	1		1					1		1	
	No fixed schedule	1		1													
With Weekly Performance Form Accomplished by Enumerator?	Yes	9			1		1		1	1	1	1	1		1		1
	No	5	1	1		1								1		1	
With Enumerator Control List properly filled-out?	Yes	12	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1		1
	No	2							1							1	
Personnel Involved in Recording Enumerator's Accomplishment	Regional Supervisor	6	1		1						1		1	1		1	
	Area Supervisor	7				1	1			1		1		1	1		1
	Enumerator	1		1													
Provided token to establishment?	Yes	2										1			1		
	No	13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1	1

* Details may not add to total due to multiple responses.

**TABLE 1 – Assessment on the Implementation of BLES Surveys by DOLE-ROs by Items of Inquiry and Region, Outside National Capital Region
November – December 2010 (Cont'd)**

Item of Inquiry		Total	Region														
			I	II	C A R	III	IV-A	IV-B	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	Caraga
Conducted spot check?	Yes	10	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	1		1	
	No	4					1		1						1		1
	NA	1						1									
Reviewed questionnaires prior to transmission to BLES?	Yes	12	1	1	1	1	1			1	1		1	1	1	1	1
	NA	3						1	1			1					
Use verification forms for RFV questionnaires?	Yes	4											1	1	1		1
	No	11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				1	
Schedule of Enumerators' Payment	Weekly	2													1		1
	Twice a Month	7					1		1	1	1	1	1	1			
	Monthly	2	1													1	
	Others	3															
	NA	1		1	1	1		1									

NA - Not applicable.

TABLE 2 - Number of Sample Establishments Spot Checked by Items of Inquiry and Region, Outside National Capital Region: November-December, 2010

Region	Total Establishments	Person who accomplished the survey questionnaires							Contact Person affixed signature?	
		Owner/ Manager	HR Manager/ Personnel	Admin Manager/ Personnel	Finance Officer/ Payroll Personnel	Operations Manager/ Supervisor	Accountant/ Acctg Staff/ Bookkeeper/ Clerk	Other Personnel	Yes	No
Total	116	12	63	8	15	3	31	12	101	15
I	9	1	6		1			1	9	
II	8	2	2	1	2		1	2	7	1
C A R	10	1	5	1	2		2		10	
III	6		3	1			1	1	6	
IV-A	7	1	7					1	5	2
IV-B	3		3		1		3	1	3	
V	8	2	5	1					7	1
VI	11		5				5	1	8	3
VII	12	1	6				4	1	8	4
VIII	8	1	2		3	1	3		7	1
IX	6		1		2	2	3		6	
X	7	3	2				2		6	1
XI	10		7	1	1		3	3	10	
XII	4		4						3	1
Caraga	7		5	3	3		4	1	6	1

**TABLE 3 - Number of Sample Establishments by Items of Inquiry and Region, Outside National Capital Region:
November-December, 2010**

Item of Inquiry		Total	Region														Caraga
			I	II	C A R	III	IV-A	IV-B	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	
Total		116	9	8	10	6	7	3	8	11	12	8	6	7	10	4	7
Time Spent in Accomplishing the questionnaire	Less than a day	25	2	2	4	3	1		3	2	1	1	3	1	2		
	One or two days	23	1	2	2		1		4	6		1	2	1	1		2
	More than 2 days	65	6	4	4	3	5	3	1	3	11	6	1	4	7	4	3
	NS	3												1			2
Comments on Definition of Terms	Easy to understand	94	9	6	8	5	4	3	7	11	8	5	6	3	9	4	6
	Vague	22		2	2	1	3		1		4	3		4	1		1
	- Cite examples applicable to government office	1		1													
	- Definition not applicable to electronics industry	1					1										
	- Some are redundant	1					1										
	- Overlapping questions	1									1						
	- Not easy to understand	1									1						
	- Requested assistance from ROs on some terms	1												1			
Comments on Layout	User-friendly	96	8	5	8	4	7	3	7	10	8	7	5	6	9	4	5
	Not user-friendly	20	1	3	2	2			1	1	4	1	1	1	1		2
	- Totals should be after details	2		1					1								
	- Simplify forms	1			1												
	- At first glance, overwhelming	1										1					
	- Many items of inquiries, computation	2									1						1
	- Intimidating, long (technical)	1															1
Comments on Font/Color	Appealing	113	9	8	9	6	7	3	8	11	11	8	6	6	10	4	7
	Not appealing	3			1						1			1			

**TABLE 4 - Number of Sample Establishments by Rating on Enumerators Performance and Region, Outside National Capital Region:
November-December, 2010**

Item of Inquiry		Total	Region														
			I	II	C A R	III	IV-A	IV-B	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	Caraga
Total		116	9	8	10	6	7	3	8	11	12	8	6	7	10	4	7
Enumerator clearly stated the objectives of the survey	Unsatisfactory	1				1											
	Needs Improvement	2									1				1		
	Satisfactory	24	3	2	4	1			1	1	3	2	1		2	3	1
	Very Satisfactory	54	5	5	4	3	2		5	6	8	3	1	3	5	1	3
	Excellent	15	1	1		1				1		1	4	3	2		1
	Not Stated	20			2		5	3	2	3		2		1			2
Total		116	9	8	10	6	7	3	8	11	12	8	6	7	10	4	7
Enumerator explained items of inquiry	Unsatisfactory	3				1									1		1
	Needs Improvement	1			1												
	Satisfactory	22	3	2	3	2			1	2	5			1	2		1
	Very Satisfactory	54	5	5	4	2	4		5	7	3	5	1	2	3	4	4
	Excellent	23	1	1		1	1				4	1	5	4	4		1
	Not Stated	13			2		2	3	2	2		2					
Total		116	9	8	10	6	7	3	8	11	12	8	6	7	10	4	7
Enumerator was courteous	Unsatisfactory	1				1											
	Needs Improvement	2			1										1		
	Satisfactory	4	1		1												2
	Very Satisfactory	51	6	6	6	3	3		3	3	5	3	1	1	5	3	3
	Excellent	49	2	2	1	1	3		3	7	7	5	5	6	4	1	2
	Not Stated	9			1	1	1	3	2	1							

**TABLE 5 - DOLE ROs Comments and Suggestions for the Improvement of the
2010 BLES Surveys (2009/2010 BITS and 2010 OWS)**

Region	COMMENT	SUGGESTION
I	Duplicates and establishments previously reported as PCL (permanently closed) and CBL (cannot be located) still part of 2010 Control List of Sample Establishments	Spoilage reported by RO should no longer be included in the new list of establishments
CAR	None	
II	High transport cost of samples in far flung areas	
III	Duration of survey operation too short	Extension of survey operation
IV-A	Conduct of BLES survey coincides with NSO data collection Spoilage from previous survey rounds still included in the 2010 Control List of Sample Establishments	BITS/OWS survey should not be in time with NSO surveys Allow RO to re-align budget
IV-B	None	
V	No feedback from BLES on status of implementation during the early months of the survey operation Spoilage from previous survey rounds still included in the 2010 List of Establishments	Provide ROs with status of survey implementation 30 days after start of survey operations and monthly thereafter Same as in DOLE RO 1
VI	Duration of data collection too short	Extension of survey operation deadline
	No transport allowance for samples located outside the capital region	Provide transportation allowance for samples outside capital region
VII	Control List of Establishments not updated i.e. includes spoilage previously reported	Provide RO with Lists of Establishments for validation before survey operation
	With DOLE as data collector, establishments may give bias information.	Outsourcing of data collection for BLES surveys
VIII	Survey budget not flexible to allow RO to provide food allowance to enumerators; to be used for capital outlay	Provide authorization to realign budget.
	Control List of Establishments not updated i.e. includes spoilage previously reported	Provide RO with Control List of Sample Establishments for validation before survey operation
IX	Need for additional area supervisor in Zamboanga City	Provide funding for additional area supervisor
X	No payment for permanently closed (PCL) and cannot be located (CBL) questionnaires. Control List of Sample Establishments not updated i.e. includes spoilage previously reported	Provide additional funds for payment of PCL and CBL questionnaires Allow some flexibility in budget List of samples should be validated for spoilage
XI	Control List of Sample Establishments not updated i.e. includes spoilage previously reported	Same as in DOLE RO 1
XII	None	
Caraga	Low budget/no transport allowance for samples located outside capital region	Increase budget/provide transport allowance for samples outside capital region

**TABLE 6 - Establishments Comments/Suggestions for the Improvement of 2010 BLES Surveys
(2009/2010 BITS and 2010 OWS)**

Region	COMMENT/SUGGESTION		
	Method and Schedule of Data Collection	Survey Questionnaire	Field Enumerator
CAR	None	Survey items in OWS questionnaire should be applicable to category of worker in the establishment e.g., specific occupations for broadcasting industry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Visit/s to the establishment should be by appointment. 2. Enumerator should assist the respondent in accomplishing the survey forms /collection of data should be thru "face-to-face interview". <i>Note: Some enumerators just leave the survey forms to the respondent without proper briefing with follow-up done usually by phone.</i> 3. Enumerators should have a clear knowledge of all the items in the questionnaires. <i>Note: Some enumerators had difficulties in "explaining the items in the survey forms"</i>
I	None	None	None
II	None	Shorten the survey questionnaire	Enumerator must be knowledgeable about the survey
III	Due date to accomplish the questionnaire should be extended to more than 10 days upon receipt	Accomplishing the questionnaire involved several personnel in the establishment	Same as item # 1 in CAR Enumerator needs proper grooming
IV-A	BLES surveys should not coincide with NSO surveys	<p>Need to reduce the items of inquiry in BITS/OWS, survey forms are too long and burdensome to accomplish.</p> <p>OWS difficult to fill-out (basic pay per worker especially for establishment with large employment)</p> <p>Items in BITS Part IV-B are redundant</p> <p>Computation on hours of work burdensome</p>	Same as item # 1 in CAR
IV-B	None	Difficulty in providing data on hours of work (BITS) and male and female wage rates (OWS).	None
V	None	<p>Need to develop on-line data collection system for large-sized establishments.</p> <p>Need to design short and user-friendly survey forms</p>	Should always be courteous

Region	COMMENT/SUGGESTION		
	Method and Schedule of Data Collection	Survey Questionnaire	Field Enumerator
VI	Establishments should be given enough time to accomplish survey forms, 10 days is not enough	None	Accomplishing the survey forms should require the presence of the enumerator
VII	Should be given at the start of the year Need longer time to accomplish the survey forms	Some questions are not applicable to the respondent (e.g. Number of Managers and Supervisors in schools) OSH portion of BITS confusing	None
VIII	Allow more time for establishments to accomplish the questionnaires	Simplify matrix/ presentation	None
IX	None	Layout need some improvement Survey forms should be industry - specific Minimize the number of pages/survey items	None
X	None	Reduce the number of questions/survey items Font size and color should be improved Survey forms should be customized	Same as items # 1 & 3 in CAR
XI	None	Some definitions/ survey items need further clarification/explanation Survey forms should be industry-specific (school setting)	Same as item # 2 in CAR
XII		Need extra sheets for salary	Same as item # 2 in CAR
Caraga	Need more time to accomplish the questionnaires	Survey forms should be customized for the utility industry Portion on coverage/ reference period should be properly highlighted to better guide respondents in filling-up the survey forms	Follow-up should be done on personal basis (physically present) to guide respondent in accomplishing the questionnaire

**TABLE 7 - BLES Staff Observations on the Implementation of DOLE ROs on 2010
BITS and OWS Survey Operation**

Region	Observation/Remarks		
	Editing of Questionnaires	Major Deviations from Procedures	Other Remarks
I	Good.	No tokens to establishments.	
CAR	Good.	Some survey forms not signed by regional supervisor. No tokens to establishments.	
II	Good.	Payroll prepared on the last day of field operation Survey verification form not used	
III	Need improvement	RFV forms were not used; No tokens to respondents	
IV-A	Good		Low retrieval rate (55.6%) as of February 2, 2010
IV-B	No editing done	Did not conduct briefing/training to field personnel Did not hire area supervisor No tokens to establishments	No monitoring done in the provinces Poor Retrieval rate
V	Editing not given proper attention	Did not hire area supervisor Did not use RFV forms in validation	No monitoring done in the provinces Poor Retrieval rate (67.0% as of Feb.2,2011)
VI	Good.	RFV forms were not used; No tokens to respondents	
VII	Good.	No token to respondents	
VIII	Not done properly (more than half of retrieved questionnaires for validation)		
IX -	Generally good except for some lapses	Did not hire area supervisor	
X	Generally good except for some lapses		
XI	Fairly good	Did not hire area supervisor	Notable improvement in retrieval rate from previous survey performance
XII	Good	Did not hire area supervisor	
Caraga	Good	No token to respondents	