

# World Value Survey – Czech Republic 2022

## Technical Report

### I. Survey method:

The survey method was computer assisted personal (face-to-face) interviewing (CAPI).

### II. Universe characteristics vs. sample characteristics

The sample universe includes non-institutionalized population of Czech Republic, 18 years and older. The sample covers the whole territory of the country. Usual place of residence is the address where a person usually resides. It may also be his/her legal residence. This may be different from the place where s/he actually is at the time of the survey. For the purposes of the survey, a person's usual residence is the place where they normally sleep.

The source of information we used to draw the sample were data from the last Census of Statistical Office of the Czech Republic (delivered in 2011; data from census 2021 are not yet available). We had the data for population 18+, at our disposal and we used them in preparation of sample.

According to the data, the official number of people aged 18+, was 8 585 396.

Table 1 and Table 2 present the official data of the population of Czech Republic aged 18+ by size of settlement and by regions.

Table 1. Population in Czech Republic aged 18+ by regions and size of settlement (absolute numbers)

REGION (NUTS 3 level)	SIZE of SETTLEMENT				CZECH REPUBLIC
	1 – 4 999	5 000 – 19 999	20 000 – 99 999	100 000+	
Prague	0	0	0	1079179	1079179
Střední Čechy (Central Bohemia)	596432	286306	163864	0	1046602
Jihozápad (Southwest)	486638	169261	186463	144209	986571
Severozápad (Northwest)	281529	240380	375731	0	897640
Severovýchod (Northeast)	517024	334917	282790	84773	1219504
Jihovýchod (Southeast)	636608	197385	214940	325718	1374651
Střední Morava (Central Moravia)	474760	184570	249452	84468	993250
Moravskoslezsko (Moravian-Silesian)	255903	133511	353424	245161	987999
<b>CZECH REPUBLIC</b>	<b>3248894</b>	<b>1546330</b>	<b>1826664</b>	<b>1963508</b>	<b>8585396</b>

Source: Statistical Office of the Czech Republic; Census 2011

Table 2. Population in Czech Republic by regions and size of settlement (relative numbers)

REGION (NUTS 3 level)	SIZE of SETTLEMENT				CZECH REPUBLIC
	1 – 4 999	5 000 – 19 999	20 000 – 99 999	100 000+	
Prague	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	12,6%	12,6%
Střední Čechy (Central Bohemia)	6,9%	3,3%	1,9%	0,0%	12,2%
Jihozápad (Southwest)	5,7%	2,0%	2,2%	1,7%	11,5%
Severozápad (Northwest)	3,3%	2,8%	4,4%	0,0%	10,5%
Severovýchod (Northeast)	6,0%	3,9%	3,3%	1,0%	14,2%
Jihovýchod (Southeast)	7,4%	2,3%	2,5%	3,8%	16,0%
Střední Morava (Central Moravia)	5,5%	2,1%	2,9%	1,0%	11,6%
Moravskoslezsko (Moravian-Silesian)	3,0%	1,6%	4,1%	2,9%	11,5%
<b>CZECH REPUBLIC</b>	<b>37,8%</b>	<b>18,0%</b>	<b>21,3%</b>	<b>22,9%</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: Statistical Office of the Czech Republic; Census 2021

*Weighting*

We weighted the survey data (variable “w” in the data file). The report findings are based on the weighted data. We used weighting procedure in order to make adjustment for deviations between the distribution of selected demographic characteristics (gender x age, education, nationality, size of settlement and region) in the sample and the population of Czech Republic. Differences between sample and official data of the adult Czech population are shown in Tab 3.

Table 3. Demographic characteristics of the sample – comparison of unweighted and weighted Sample data with Population data.

	<i>Population data*</i>	<i>Sample data, n=1200</i>	
		<i>unweighted</i>	<i>weighted</i>
<b>GENDER x AGE</b>			
male + 18-24	5,5%	3,8%	5,5%
male + 25-34	9,5%	8,0%	9,5%
male + 35-44	9,4%	7,5%	9,4%
male + 45-54	7,9%	9,2%	7,9%
male + 55-64	8,4%	9,2%	8,4%
male + 65+	7,7%	8,4%	7,7%
female + 18-24	5,3%	4,2%	5,3%
female + 25-34	9,0%	8,7%	9,0%
female + 35-44	9,0%	9,8%	9,0%
female + 45-54	7,8%	11,0%	7,8%
female + 55-64	9,0%	7,9%	9,0%
female + 65+	11,4%	12,4%	11,4%
<b>EDUCATION</b>			
lower (elementary/secondary without a school leaving exam)	52,3%	41,4%	52,3%
secondary school with a school leaving exam	34,1%	44,2%	34,1%
university	13,6%	14,4%	13,6%
<b>SIZE OF SETTLEMENT</b>			
up to 4 999	37,8%	38,3%	37,8%
5 000 – 19 999	18,0%	18,3%	18,0%
20 000 – 99 999	21,3%	20,8%	21,3%
100 000+	22,9%	22,5%	22,9%
<b>REGION (NUTS 2 level)</b>			
Prague	12,6%	12,5%	12,6%
Střední Čechy (Central Bohemia)	12,2%	11,7%	12,2%
Jihozápad (Southwest)	11,5%	11,7%	11,5%
Severozápad (Northwest)	10,5%	10,0%	10,5%
Severovýchod (Northeast)	14,2%	14,2%	14,2%
Jihovýchod (Southeast)	16,0%	16,7%	16,0%
Střední Morava (Central Moravia)	11,6%	11,7%	11,6%
Moravskoslezsko (Moravian-Silesian)	11,5%	11,7%	11,5%

\* Source: Statistical Office of the Czech Republic, Census 2011, own recalculations

### III. Sampling plan

The sample design, which we used was a multi-stage, random one. We used random walk sampling (as far as we know, a complete and up-to-date listing of the population is not available in Czech Republic for research purposes). The primary sampling units (PSUs) were drawn after stratification by equivalents to NUTS2 regions (8 categories) and by degree of urbanization (4 categories) within these. Then follows the allocation of PSUs according to the level of urbanisation and geographical regions. In one PSU we carried out 10 interviews. As the given table shows, the original selection plan included 120 PSUs to achieve the final number of 1 200 interviews.

Table 4. Sample and PSUs distribution by regions and size of settlement

NUTS2 CODE	NUTS2 REGION	SIZE of SETTLEMENT	Population 18+ (%)	Proportional Sample distribution	Sample Distribution (adjustment for 10 interviews per PSU)	Number of PSUs
CZ01	Prague	100.000 and more	12,57 %	150,8	150	15
CZ01	Prague	20.000 - 99.999	0,00 %	0,0	–	–
CZ01	Prague	5.000 - 19.999	0,00 %	0,0	–	–
CZ01	Prague	up to 4.999	0,00 %	0,0	–	–
CZ02	Střední Čechy (Central Bohemia)	100.000 and more	0,00 %	0,0	–	–
CZ02	Střední Čechy (Central Bohemia)	20.000 - 99.999	1,91 %	22,9	20	2
CZ02	Střední Čechy (Central Bohemia)	5.000 - 19.999	3,33 %	40,0	40	4
CZ02	Střední Čechy (Central Bohemia)	up to 4.999	6,95 %	83,4	80	8
CZ03	Jihozápad (Southwest)	100.000 and more	1,68 %	20,2	20	2
CZ03	Jihozápad (Southwest)	20.000 - 99.999	2,17 %	26,1	30	3
CZ03	Jihozápad (Southwest)	5.000 - 19.999	1,97 %	23,7	20	2
CZ03	Jihozápad (Southwest)	up to 4.999	5,67 %	68,0	70	7
CZ04	Severozápad (Northwest)	100.000 and more	0,00 %	0,0	–	–
CZ04	Severozápad (Northwest)	20.000 - 99.999	4,38 %	52,5	50	5
CZ04	Severozápad (Northwest)	5.000 - 19.999	2,80 %	33,6	30	3
CZ04	Severozápad (Northwest)	up to 4.999	3,28 %	39,3	40	4
CZ05	Severovýchod (Northeast)	100.000 and more	0,99 %	11,8	10	1
CZ05	Severovýchod (Northeast)	20.000 - 99.999	3,29 %	39,5	40	4
CZ05	Severovýchod (Northeast)	5.000 - 19.999	3,90 %	46,8	50	5
CZ05	Severovýchod (Northeast)	up to 4.999	6,02 %	72,3	70	7
CZ06	Jihovýchod (Southeast)	100.000 and more	3,79 %	45,5	50	5
CZ06	Jihovýchod (Southeast)	20.000 - 99.999	2,50 %	30,0	30	3
CZ06	Jihovýchod (Southeast)	5.000 - 19.999	2,30 %	27,6	30	3
CZ06	Jihovýchod (Southeast)	up to 4.999	7,42 %	89,0	90	9
CZ07	Střední Morava (Central Moravia)	100.000 and more	0,98 %	11,8	10	1
CZ07	Střední Morava (Central Moravia)	20.000 - 99.999	2,91 %	34,9	30	3
CZ07	Střední Morava (Central Moravia)	5.000 - 19.999	2,15 %	25,8	30	3
CZ07	Střední Morava (Central Moravia)	up to 4.999	5,53 %	66,4	70	7
CZ08	Moravskoslezsko (Moravian-Silesian)	100.000 and more	2,86 %	34,3	30	3
CZ08	Moravskoslezsko (Moravian-Silesian)	20.000 - 99.999	4,12 %	49,4	50	5
CZ08	Moravskoslezsko (Moravian-Silesian)	5.000 - 19.999	1,56 %	18,7	20	2
CZ08	Moravskoslezsko (Moravian-Silesian)	up to 4.999	2,98 %	35,8	40	4

#### **IV. Sampling procedure**

Sampling procedure was based on the Census data from the Statistical Office of the Czech Republic, delivered in 2011. A multistage random proportional selection was applied – sample was proportionate by NUTS2 regions and settlement hierarchy. The sample was drawn through the following steps:

1. Calculation of the relative shares of adult population of Czech Republic by NUTS2 regions and by size of settlement within these (see also Table 4). Then we counted number of interviews for each unit for total 1200 interviews. Then we adjusted numbers of interviews for 10 interviews by PSU. So it means that the selection of the PSUs was stratified according to these two criteria.
2. The number of primary sampling units (PSUs) for 1200 interviews in 10 interviews per PSU is 120.
3. Selection of settlements – we had a list of each settlement where population resides. We also had information on the size of settlement and the region it belongs to. Therefore we had to distribute our PSUs among these settlements.
4. In this step we specified a point for each PSU, where the interviewer has to start her/his route. We do not have complete listings, or at least reasonably good listings of all residential addresses in Czech Republic. So we have used maps to set the starting point of the random route. In each PSU, an address (= starting point) was selected at random.
5. Next stage of the sampling procedure was the selection of households (every-third dwelling unit selection) and then a respondent inside of the household, applying random route rules.

##### *Selection of respondent*

Interviewer made a list of all adult members in selected household. Than computer randomly selected the member of the household who will be the respondent. This is how we secured that each member has equal chance to be included in the survey.

##### *Revisits*

According to a random route procedure, each household had to be visited at least 3 times (if during the first or second visit nobody is contacted). If after the third visit a contact was not possible to be made, the random route continued and that particular household could be substituted.

We used a separate document (Random Route Administration Sheet) that describes the process which interviewer had to carry out during the random route. This document holds the records of all the contacts of interviewers with potential respondents/households or other residential units.

Random route statistics are presented in next tables.

**Table 5. First contact**

		a number of first contacts
No contact with household	Nobody at home	1281
	No access to the building (locked, security, etc.)	161
Refusal	Hard Refusal by household or respondent	1642
	Break-off, terminated interview	18
No successful contact with respondent	Language barrier	13
	Respondent is not capable (mentally or physically disabled)	16
	Respondent not at home	174
	Respondent unavailable for interview from other reasons	16
	Respondent is not available for the entire survey period	55
	No suitable respondent in the household	10
Successful contact with respondent	Break-off, appointment made	5
	<b>Completed interview</b>	<b>597</b>
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRST CONTACTS</b>		<b>3988</b>

**Table 6. Second contact**

		a number of second contacts
No contact with household	Nobody at home	717
	No access to the building (locked, security, etc.)	65
Refusal	Hard Refusal by household or respondent	335
	Break-off, terminated interview	10
No successful contact with respondent	Language barrier	0
	Respondent is not capable (mentally or physically disabled)	8
	Respondent not at home	153
	Respondent unavailable for interview from other reasons	0
	Respondent is not available for the entire survey period	5
	No suitable respondent in the household	0
Successful contact with respondent	Break-off, appointment made	5
	<b>Completed interview</b>	<b>322</b>
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF SECOND CONTACTS</b>		<b>1620</b>

**Table 7. Third contact**

		a number of third contacts
No contact with household	Nobody at home	473
	No access to the building (locked, security, etc.)	23
Refusal	Hard Refusal by household or respondent	117
	Break-off, terminated interview	3
No successful contact with respondent	Language barrier	0
	Respondent is not capable (mentally or physically disabled)	0
	Respondent not at home	36
	Respondent unavailable for interview from other reasons	3
	Respondent is not available for the entire survey period	5
	No suitable respondent in the household	0
Successful contact with respondent	Break-off, appointment made	0
	<b>Completed interview</b>	<b>281</b>
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF THIRD CONTACTS</b>		<b>941</b>

**Table 8. Final status**

		a number of final status
No contact with household	Nobody at home	473
	No access to the building (locked, security, etc.)	23
Refusal	Hard Refusal by household or respondent	2094
	Break-off, terminated interview	31
No successful contact with respondent	Language barrier	13
	Respondent is not capable (mentally or physically disabled)	24
	Respondent not at home	36
	Respondent unavailable for interview from other reasons	19
	Respondent is not available for the entire survey period	65
	No suitable respondent in the household	10
Successful contact with respondent	Break-off, appointment made	0
	<b>Completed interview</b>	<b>1200</b>
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF THIRD CONTACTS</b>		<b>3988</b>

## **V. Description of field force**

### *Recruitment of interviewers*

Recruitment of interviewers was based on a selection procedure and criteria defined by the professional standards. The most important requirements were: communicative skills, responsibility, and professional ethics.

### *Brief description of interviewers' profile*

The total number of interviewers for the survey in Czech Republic was 87 in all regions of Czech Republic.

The profile of these interviewers was as follows:

- Total number of interviewers: 87
- Gender: 22 male and 65 female
- Experiences of interviewers: minimum 1 year, maximum 15 years, average: 9 years.

### *Interviewers' training:*

Most of the participating interviewers had had some previous experience with surveys based on random route sampling method and therefore they did understand the process of selection of respondents as well as recording the random route procedure into the routing slips. Each interviewer was contacted by Field Manager online, prior to the survey. S/he thus received all the necessary information on the project, its goals, methodological sampling requirements and all the other important issues. Based on this introductory conversation, appropriate interviewers were selected.

Each interviewer obtained a detailed instruction manual by post before the start of fieldwork. The instruction manual included:

- contacting instructions: when to start fieldwork, when to visit, how to select respondents, how to deal with refusals or difficult respondents
- conducting an interview: keeping information confidential, conducting the interview in privacy, using standard interviewing techniques
- interview procedures: what to do when interviews cannot be completed/respondent interrupts the interview/respondent refuses to answer sensitive questions/interviewer finds it difficult to ask some questions
- how to fill out random route administration sheet
- explanation of questions in questionnaire: question by question, rules for entering responses, test link on disposal

Certainly, interviewers could have contacted the Field Manager by telephone anytime during the fieldwork and solve any potential problems occurring immediately.



All interviewers were instructed to assure each respondent of complete anonymity. FOCUS Agency at all stages protected the confidentiality of individuals participating in the survey.

## **VI. Interviewing**

Fieldwork period: February 11, 2022 – May 13, 2022

Interviews were collected by professional interviewers. The interviewers had undergone the necessary training and have a considerable experience (they regularly participate in national or regional surveys). Interviewers conducted the required number of interviews with persons designated under the sampling plan. Interviewers met the highest standards of professional competence, and were supervised by Fieldwork Manager.

Up to 3 visits were made in attempt to achieve an interview with the chosen respondent. First repeated visit (revisit) could have been carried out the very same day, any further revisits no sooner than the next day or later. Interviewers were aware that a revisit on the same day must be at least one hour later than the first visit. People's lives run on different schedules; some work in the evening hours, many do classical office hours and so on – so interviewers also changed the times of visits when returning to the same address.

*Fieldwork procedures, which aimed to increase the response rate, were as follows:*

1. At every address up to 3 visits were made in attempt to achieve an interview with the chosen respondent;
2. Interviews were mainly carried out in the afternoon and in the evening (2pm – 9pm) and at weekends (10am – 9pm) to ensure proper representation of the target groups;
3. If the respondent could not be found during the first visit, the interviewer contacted other household members and gathered information about the time schedule of the target person and tried to arrange a meeting;
4. The interviewer gave full information about the agency s/he was representing and provided contact names in case the respondent wanted to check the interviewer's identity.
5. The interviewers left information letter in households of potential respondents, with basic information about the survey.
6. The interviewer gave full information about the survey – the general objectives, the types of questions that would be asked and all the information that would make the respondent feel more predisposed and willing to participate.

*Address non-contact:*

7. In order to increase the chance of finding the respondent the interviewer tried different strategies: making attempts to contact the respondent during different periods of the day (for example, in the morning, in the afternoon or in the evening, also at the weekend or during working days); some of the interviewers left a note behind saying they had visited the address and would come by again;
8. Gathered information from neighbours about the selected sample unit's household – if they were on vacation, the approximate date of their arrival, if they were temporary absent, etc.

*Refusal Problems:*

9. If the respondent was available (contacted) but there was a soft refusal for participation in the survey (for example, had no time at the moment), the meeting was rescheduled in order for the interview to be conducted in a convenient time for the respondent;
10. The interviewer tried to convince the respondent that his/her participation was very important for the success of the whole survey project.

*Contact rate and Response rate:*

Out of 3988 contacted addresses, which were considered inhabited by households, nobody has been reached in 496 addresses even despite being revisited or it was not possible to enter the building. In the case of 3492 households, the interviewer managed to contact some household member. In case of 2094 households there was a refusal by household or by the respondent. In the case of 31 households there was break-off and refusal during interview. In the case of 131 households there was some another problem which prevented to conduct interview in this household (for example respondent was ill, language barrier, respondent was mentally or physically disabled, etc.). In 36 households there was selected respondent not at home during third attempt. In total there was 2292 households with successful contact where we were not able to carry out an interview and 1200 households with successful interview.

Or put differently, out of 3988 households we have managed to contact 3492 households (a contact with a household member), i.e. **CONTACT RATE** oscillates at the level of **88%**. **RESPONSE RATE** achieved the level of **30%**.

## **VII. Questionnaire translation**

### **Translation**

There were no questions or terms, which proved to be particularly difficult to translate into Czech language. All disputable points and changes in the translation have been consulted with the Client and approved by the Client.

## **VIII. Data processing**

The survey method was computer assisted personal interviewing (CAPI). So no manual data entry was needed.

FOCUS Agency was responsible for processing, cleaning, and clearly coding the data. FOCUS Agency produced the final data file in SPSS format with variables and values according to final Czech questionnaire.

After the collection of the data, we carried out a qualitative checking on the “personal level” to make sure that the data collected for each person is coherent and does not pose any apparent empirical contradictions. We have checked accuracy of the data in the cases where there is objective information (e.g. questions on size of the city/village, administrative region, ...).

## **IX. Fieldwork supervision and Verification**

### *Fieldwork supervision:*

Interviewers' network department coordinated fieldwork by ensuring regular contact with interviewers. Interviewers contacted the fieldwork manager responsible for the whole interviewers' network when they needed assistance in solving field problems.

### *Verification:*

The control procedures employed by FOCUS Agency were:

1. 100% of the work of interviewers was verified by employees of Interviewers' Network Department. This included fulfilment of the sampling plan, random routing and completion of the questionnaire.
2. The telephone back check was made to 20% of the interviews. We have re-contacted the respondents and asked them whether they had been interviewed and how satisfied with interviewer's behaviour/performance they had been.

As a whole, the verification showed that there were no serious problems connected with the quality of interviewers' work in the field.

## **X. Feedback from interviewers**

### *Fieldwork:*

During the fieldwork, no unusual or significant problems occurred. Just like in case of other surveys carried out by the "random route" method, our interviewers reported the following problems:

- Demanding method ("random route") for interviewers as well as respondents; interviewers consider this method of random route as very demanding, it takes too much time, energy and patience.
- Refusals in general.
- Especially in larger cities (where the level of social anonymity is higher), the respondents were not willing to let strangers into their households (due to the theft fear). It is often quite problematic to even get through the front entrance of residential buildings to the flats. The first contact usually is only via a telephone door entry access system (an entry phone placed at the front entrance), which complicates addressing respondents.
- Respondents' fears of losing their anonymity. Some of the respondents feared the asking of their personal data and that their anonymity would not be kept. They have not trusted the interviewers' explanations that they need them just for checking purposes (to check the work of the interviewers). There is a lot of mistrust among the respondents regarding this.