**Methodology**

**Purpose**

The IFC developed the “Inspection Reform” project to ensure high quality in future business inspections in Jordan. There are a few reasons why the quality of an inspection could be in question. The three biggest ones are that the inspectors are biased, there is an unequal distribution between surprise and planned visits and that there are inspections that are either excessive or redundant.

The main objectives of the study project were to assess the results of the IFC project, i.e., effectiveness and impact of the reforms supported by the project, more specifically the performance of the inspections and determine areas in which improvement is needed. There are a few reasons why the Jordanian government might have questions about the quality of inspections. These reasons range from the level of awareness that the employees and/or inspectors have about inspection procedures or legal rights of the businesses inspected and whether there was a lack of planning or coordination between different agencies. The latter could be an intriguing factor to evaluate as companies could become more disgruntled as the number of inspections, surprise or not, increases over time. This study was designed to assess where the private sector is getting it right when it comes to inspections and where they can improve.

**Method**

Several methodological considerations must be taken care of to get results that provide valuable insight. The important questions relate to: a) the structure of the study in relation to its objectives; b) the nature of the data collected, e.g. quantitative or qualitative; c) the appropriateness of the sample size and sampling method; d) the quality of the data collected, especially whether it is free of bias as much as possible; and e) the time period covered by the study, i.e. whether it covers one period or multiple periods

A few years prior, a baseline was developed for future studies on the inspection quality. This study used a combination of qualitative and quantitative data gathering methods to assess the quality of inspections and satisfaction of the private sector with the inspection process.

There were two main ways that the data was collected: surveys and Key Informant Interviews (KII). 155 businesses were surveyed using a structured questionnaire. The questions covered the level of awareness that both the business and the inspectors had towards the procedure and legal rights, the time and resources spent for each inspections, the distribution of surprise/planned visits, and whether the quality of the inspections changed over time. The surveys were taking place concurrently with key informant interviews (KII). The Key Informant Interviews were designed to create a qualitative understanding of the inspection process in different agencies. The subjects for these interviews were determined by a developed understanding of the sectors.

After the surveys and interviews were designed, the researchers split the data into three types: ordinal results that captured perceptions of change over time, binary results that were yes or no, and discrete numbers that described the frequency of visits and number of employees involved. While the study resembled one that was longitudinal, it was not because the data was collected during one period.

Once the data collection was created, the study team used an iterative approach, where data was continually built upon to derive results and close any data gaps.

The findings have been reported in two formats. A qualitative discussion based on the KIIs and quantitative tables based on the survey data. The quantitative results are simple summary statistics showing percentage distribution and averages. A further study could be done with the data to determine correlation, and maybe even apply machine learning techniques to predict future responses. These analysis techniques could expand the scope of the project and provide even more insight based on the data collected.