

World Value Survey - Slovakia 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 Slovakia, 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 Slovak Republic (delivered in 2021). 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 4 424 283.

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

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

REGION (NUTS 3 level)	SIZE of SETTLEMENT								SLOVAKIA
	under 1 000	1000 – 1 999	2 000 – 4 999	5 000 – 9 999	10 000- 19 999	20 000- 49 999	50 000- 99 999	100 000+	
Bratislavsky	6942	24534	51619	46404	24816	35480	0	391784	581579
Trnavsky	56666	81269	120226	20783	75570	60438	52682	0	467634
Trenciansky	66822	81015	79339	22201	77718	108262	45930	0	481287
Nitriansky	84866	115134	105124	50384	18895	126626	65600	0	566629
Zilinsky	60468	101661	108498	74218	36258	67600	112164	0	560867
Banskobystricky	123827	72391	59166	58648	45373	90708	63642	0	513755
Presovsky	153182	86234	97726	36867	78666	110421	70471	0	633567
Kosicky	118298	90675	71013	50708	22292	77203	0	188776	618965
SLOVAKIA	671071	652913	692711	360213	379588	676738	410489	580560	4424283

Source: Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic; Census 2021

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

REGION (NUTS 3 level)	SIZE of SETTLEMENT								SLOVAKIA
	under 1 000	1000 – 1 999	2 000 – 4 999	5 000 – 9 999	10 000- 19 999	20 000- 49 999	50 000- 99 999	100 000+	
Bratislavsky	0,2%	0,6%	1,2%	1,0%	0,6%	0,8%	0,0%	8,9%	13,1%
Trnavsky	1,3%	1,8%	2,7%	0,5%	1,7%	1,4%	1,2%	0,0%	10,6%
Trenciansky	1,5%	1,8%	1,8%	0,5%	1,8%	2,4%	1,0%	0,0%	10,9%
Nitriansky	1,9%	2,6%	2,4%	1,1%	0,4%	2,9%	1,5%	0,0%	12,8%
Zilinsky	1,4%	2,3%	2,5%	1,7%	0,8%	1,5%	2,5%	0,0%	12,7%
Banskobystricky	2,8%	1,6%	1,3%	1,3%	1,0%	2,1%	1,4%	0,0%	11,6%
Presovsky	3,5%	1,9%	2,2%	0,8%	1,8%	2,5%	1,6%	0,0%	14,3%
Kosicky	2,7%	2,0%	1,6%	1,1%	0,5%	1,7%	0,0%	4,3%	14,0%
SLOVAKIA	15,2%	14,8%	15,7%	8,1%	8,6%	15,3%	9,3%	13,1%	100,0%

Source: Statistical Office of the Slovak 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 Slovakia. Differences between sample and official data of the adult Slovak 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>
GENDER x AGE	%	%	%
male 18 - 29	8,5	5,4	8,5
male 30 - 39	9,7	7,3	9,6
male 40 - 49	10,1	8,0	10,2
male 50 - 59	7,9	9,1	8,0
male 60 - 69	7,3	10,4	7,3
male 70 +	5,0	5,8	5,0
female 18 - 29	8,1	3,8	7,9
female 30 - 39	9,2	7,3	9,1
female 40 - 49	9,5	9,4	9,5
female 50 - 59	8,0	11,2	8,0
female 60 - 69	8,4	12,2	8,4
female 70 +	8,4	10,1	8,4
EDUCATION			
lower (elementary/secondary without a school leaving exam)	41,2	35,9	40,8
secondary school with a school leaving exam	36,3	45,5	36,5
university	22,5	18,6	22,8
NATIONALITY			
Slovak	88,6	94,5	89,1
Hungarian	8,2	4,6	7,8
other	3,2	0,9	3,1
SIZE OF SETTLEMENT			
up to 1 000	15,2	15,0	15,2
1 000 – 1 999	14,8	15,0	14,7
2 000 – 4 999	15,7	15,0	15,7
5 000 – 9 999	8,1	8,3	8,3
10 000 – 19 999	8,6	9,2	8,7
20 000 – 49 999	15,3	15,0	15,3
50 000 – 99 999	9,3	10,0	9,2
100 000+	13,1	12,5	13,1
REGION (NUTS 3 level)			
Bratislavsky	13,1	12,5	13,1
Trnavsky	10,6	10,8	10,8
Trenciansky	10,9	10,8	10,8
Nitriansky	12,8	12,5	13,0
Zilinsky	12,7	12,5	12,6
Banskobystricky	11,6	11,7	11,6
Presovsky	14,3	15,0	14,2
Kosicky	14,0	14,2	14,0

* Source: Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic, Census 2021, 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 Slovakia for research purposes). The primary sampling units (PSUs) were drawn after stratification by equivalents to regions (8 categories) and by degree of urbanization (8 categories) within these. This means that the sample is proportionate by these two criteria (see also Table 1 and Table 2).

Here (Table 4) 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. PSUs distribution by regions and size of settlement

	SIZE of SETTLEMENT/ Number of interviews per PSU								
	under 1 000/ 10 interviews	1 000- 1 999/ 10 interviews	2 000 - 4 999/ 10 interviews	5 000 - 9 999/ 10 interviews	10 000 - 19 999/ 10 interviews	20 000 - 49 999/ 10 interviews	50 000 - 99 999/ 10 interviews	100 000+ 10 interviews	
REGION									TOTAL
Bratislavsky	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	10	15
Trnavsky	2	2	3	1	2	2	1	0	13
Trenciansky	2	2	2	1	2	3	1	0	13
Nitriansky	2	3	3	1	1	3	2	0	15
Zilinsky	1	3	3	2	1	2	3	0	15
Banskobystricky	3	2	1	2	1	3	2	0	14
Presovsky	4	3	3	1	2	2	3	0	18
Kosicky	4	2	2	1	1	2	0	5	17
TOTAL	18	18	18	10	11	18	12	15	120

IV. Sampling procedure

Sampling procedure was based on the Census data from the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic, delivered in 2021. A multistage random proportional selection was applied – sample was proportionate by regions and settlement hierarchy. The sample was drawn through the following steps:

1. Calculation of the relative shares of adult population of Slovakia by regions and by size of settlement within these (see also Table 1 and Table 2). So it means that the selection of the PSUs was stratified according to these two criteria.
2. The number of primary sampling units (PSUs) had to be selected. In this case we have used 120 PSUs.
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. It meant that from villages and towns we selected an appropriate number by random method. All settlements were included in the selection.
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

Slovakia. So in case of majority of towns of 5, 000+, we have used maps and in smaller villages we have used public buildings to set the starting point of the random route. In each settlement, 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. Then 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
Wrong addresses	Not residential address (company, office, school, hospital, ...)	55
	Address is probably not occupied (empty, second home, etc.)	62
No contact with household	Nobody at home	778
Refusal	Hard Refusal by household	457
	Hard Refusal by respondent	75
	Break-off, terminated interview	14
No successful contact with respondent	Respondent not at home	79
	Respondent is not capable (mentally or physically disabled)	5
	Language barrier	1
	Respondent unavailable for interview from other reasons	6
Successful contact with respondent	Appointment made	191
	Completed interviews	464
	TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRST CONTACTS	2187

Table 6. Second contact

		a number of second contacts
Wrong addresses	Not residential address (company, office, school, hospital, ...)	0
	Address is probably not occupied (empty, second home, etc.)	0
No contact with household	Nobody at home	200
Refusal	Hard Refusal by household	163
	Hard Refusal by respondent	38
	Break-off, terminated interview	9
No successful contact with respondent	Respondent not at home	41
	Respondent is not capable (mentally or physically disabled)	2
	Language barrier	1
	Respondent unavailable for interview from other reasons	9
Successful contact with respondent	Appointment made	134
	Completed interviews	465
	TOTAL NUMBER OF SECOND CONTACTS	1062

Table 7. Third contact

		a number of third contacts
Wrong addresses	Not residential address (company, office, school, hospital, ...)	0
	Address is probably not occupied (empty, second home, etc.)	0
No contact with household	Nobody at home	48
Refusal	Hard Refusal by household	60
	Hard Refusal by respondent	12
	Break-off, terminated interview	0
No successful contact with respondent	Respondent not at home	1
	Respondent is not capable (mentally or physically disabled)	0
	Language barrier	0
	Respondent unavailable for interview from other reasons	0
Successful contact with respondent	Appointment made	0
	Completed interviews	271
	TOTAL NUMBER OF THIRD CONTACTS	392

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 Slovakia was 91 in all 8 regions of Slovakia.

The profile of these interviewers was as follows:

- Total number of interviewers: 91
- Gender: 9 male and 82 female
- Experiences of interviewers: minimum experience 5 years, maximum experience 17 years, average: 13 years.

Interviewers' training:

All 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: January 20, 2022 – February 23, 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 (12am – 8pm) and at weekends (10am – 8pm) 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 2,187 contacted addresses, 117 addresses were probably uninhabited (not-residential addresses or nobody resided there). The remaining 2,070 addresses were considered inhabited by households. Out of 2,070 addresses, nobody has been reached in 56 addresses even despite being revisited or it was not possible to enter the building. In the case of 2,014 households, the interviewer managed to contact some household member. In case of 802 households there was a refusal by household or by the respondent. In the case of 12 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 as many as 1,200 households we were able to carry out an interview.

Or put differently, out of 2,070 inhabited addresses we have managed to contact 2,014 households (a contact with a household member), i.e. **CONTACT RATE** oscillates at the level of **97%**. **RESPONSE RATE** achieved the level of **58%**.

VII. Questionnaire translation

Translation

There were no questions or terms, which proved to be particularly difficult to translate into Slovak 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 Slovak 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.