

## **STUDY DESCRIPTION:**

### **81. SERBIA**

### **82. MONTENEGRO**

#### **Principal investigators:**

Prof. Ronald Inglehart (USA), prof. H.D. Klingemann (Europe), and Dragomir Pantic, director of the Institute of Social Sciences, Belgrade (FRY)

#### **Sample type:**

A three-stage stratified probability sample, 18 years and older, was planned and accomplished in Serbia (N = 1.200) and Montenegro (N = 1.060). In order to get the average data for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the data for Serbia should be multiplied by 13 (12.97) or the data for Montenegro should be multiplied by 0.077 (0.08, rounded), having in mind a great difference in population of the two republics of FRY (there are 6.525.000 voters in Serbia, 444.500 voters in Montenegro, that is, citizens at the age of 18 years and over).

The sample was proportionally stratified by regions in three stages inside both republics. The subsamples in Serbia were: Belgrade area, province of Voivodina and Central Serbia, and in Montenegro: Northern Montenegro, Central Montenegro and Southern Montenegro.

In each subsample, municipalities were chosen on the basis of cumulative frequencies, using tables of random numbers. In Serbia, 60 municipalities were included (approximately one half) and in Montenegro all 21 municipalities. Inside each municipality, local communities were chosen randomly (an election station as a survey point with 20 respondents). A systematic selection was applied from the voters registration lists, starting from a random beginning (person under No. 2) and taking each tenth voter. For each 20 respondents, the plan ensured 20 reserves, chosen in the same way.

Unfortunately, during conducting the field study an alternative procedure had to be used in 7% of points (each third house in the point, picking up a person having the closest birthday), because in eight points the registration lists were incomplete or unavailable.

Otherwise, the interviewers were obliged to make at least three visits in order to find the persons selected from the lists in the sample points.

Standard error (SE) for the Serbian sample is 2.83 (encircled 3%), level 95% for the greatest variability (fifty-to-fifty case) and 3.01 for the Montenegrin sample.

The fieldwork in Serbia faced greater difficulties than in Montenegro:

Modalities of non-response	Serbia	Montenegro
Reject to be interviewed	9.7%	5.2%
Seriously ill and persons at hospitals	4.3%	3.2%
Absent because of travel	6.4%	5.7%
Moved to some other place, changed addresses	7.4%	2.2%
Busy persons (work shifts, on board, etc)	9.0%	3.4%
Died	1.4%	0.2%
Unknown persons	5.4%	0.4%
Other reasons	4.8%	2.1%
TOTAL	48.4%	22.4%

Note: The percentages are expressed in relation to a number of respondents in the samples, that is, 1200 in Serbia and 1060 in Montenegro.

Response rate based on formula:  $N/N + (R + I + B + T)$ , where:

N = Number of accomplished interviews

R = Number of refusals

I = Number of ill people

B = Number of busy people

T = Number of people absent because of travel.

Response rate Serbia : 0.773      Response rate Montenegro: 0.852

## Fieldwork:

The fieldwork in Serbia (October 29 - November 8, 2001) was conducted by 60 interviewers regularly trained, skilled and controlled by the Institute of Social Sciences – Center for Political Studies and Public Opinion Research, and 46 interviewers in Montenegro (November 1 - November 17, 2001). All of them are members of the permanent fieldwork network of the Center. The majority of them are B.A. psychologists (about two thirds), others are sociologists, social workers, political scientists, and specialized pedagogues. Each interviewer dealt with 20 respondents, except for seven in Montenegro (40 respondents).

The interviewers observed the study, that is, the instrument as a very long and difficult for processing, but, at the same time, as very interesting, important and motivating for the interviewees.

Control of interviewers' work consisted of three standard procedures: phone control of 10% cases, mail control of 20% cases (still not quite

completed), and personal visits to 10% respondents. No indications of any serious irregularities were found until now.

### **Estimation of sampling measures and weighting procedure:**

All independent variables hit within the population parameters (with deviation less than SE, that is, 3%), except for the percentage of housewives in Montenegro (deviation of plus 5 percentage points) and college educated people in Serbia (7% instead of about 4%). However, all these deviations of sampling measures do not deserve applying any weighting procedure. Weighting procedure, as described above, is needed only for expressing data for FRY.