



FIELDWORK REPORT

**Project Title: COVID-19 Georgia High Frequency Survey (GHFS) Wave 8,
2022**

**Poverty and Equity Global Practice, The World Bank
Caucasus Research Resource Center**

Prepared by:
Elene Ergeshidze,
Kristina Vacharadze

FOR PUBLIC USE

January 2023

Objectives

The second set of the COVID 19 Monitor Survey was conducted in partnership with the World Bank. It built upon the COVID 19 Monitor survey that was conducted in April-June 2020 and aims to understand the poverty impacts of COVID 19 on the population of Georgia as well as a number of related outcomes. The survey used random digit dialing for sampling, with an achieved sample size of 2051 individuals. This was the 8th wave of the survey.

Geographical and population coverage

For the current survey, CRRC-Georgia used Computer-assisted telephone-interview (CATI) technique for data collection. This approach allowed us to eliminate illegal values in the dataset. As the skip patterns were assigned automatically, it was impossible to violate predefined flow of the questionnaire.

The team used android-based tablet computers (Samsung Galaxy Tab3 and Tab5). The hardware had integrated sim-cards, which permits uploading completed interviews instantly via mobile internet. CRRC employed the open-source software ODK (Open Data Kit) to create the questionnaire forms.¹ ODK, a free, standardized and open-source software package, allows quick deployment and adjustment of the forms based on survey needs.

The survey results are representative of the adult population of Georgia.

Interviews were conducted in Georgian, Armenian, Azerbaijani and Russian.

Sampling design

The survey initially intended to have close to 2000 respondents. In practice, 2051 interviews were completed. The sample was representative of the adult population of Georgia.

For this purpose 22,222 mobile phone numbers were randomly generated. Randomly generated numbers were stratified by existing mobile operator indices: 551, 555, 557, 558, 568, 571, 574, 577, 579, 591, 592, 593, 595, 597, 598, and 599. For calculation of distribution of randomly generated numbers across indices, the set of existing Tbilisi-based mobile numbers from CRRC's earlier phone surveys was used as a representative random sample of Tbilisi mobile-phone users:

Index	Distribution across indices from earlier surveys				Average	Numbers generated within the index
	2019 Feb	2020 Sep	2020 Feb	Phone List		
551	2.5%	2.9%	3.0%	4.6%	3.3%	724
555	16.9%	14.9%	19.6%	9.1%	15.1%	3362
557	1.5%	2.8%	1.4%	6.6%	3.1%	682
558	8.3%	3.4%	2.1%	4.6%	4.6%	1024
568	1.1%	1.5%	0.7%	5.6%	2.2%	489
571	0.5%	1.2%	0.7%	4.8%	1.8%	398
574	0.6%	2.7%	0.7%	4.5%	2.1%	469

¹ See <http://opendatakit.org/about>

577	10.9%	8.7%	8.5%	9.3%	9.3%	2075
579	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	5.1%	1.5%	322
591	4.1%	4.0%	2.6%	6.3%	4.3%	945
592	0.5%	0.8%	0.1%	3.9%	1.3%	299
593	8.1%	5.5%	5.5%	5.7%	6.2%	1376
595	8.0%	6.9%	5.2%	6.3%	6.6%	1469
597	1.4%	2.1%	1.2%	5.8%	2.6%	579
598	8.6%	10.6%	8.1%	6.6%	8.5%	1884
599	27.0%	31.2%	40.7%	11.4%	27.6%	6125
TOTAL						22222

Sampling frame

There was no physical sampling frame as the phone numbers were randomly generated. The virtual sampling frame was the list of all possible mobile phone numbers in Georgia.

Fieldwork

Fieldwork personnel consisted of 34 individuals in total (See Table below for details).

Gender	Age	Education	Years of working as an interviewer	Region
Female	34	Higher Education	1	Adjara - Guria
Male	23	Higher Education	3	Kvemo Kartli
Female	36	Higher Education	5	Kakheti
Female	63	Higher Education	15	Kakheti
Female	70	Higher Education	20	Kakheti
Female	40	Higher Education	1	Kakheti
Female	41	Higher Education	1	Kakheti
Female	52	Technical Education	5	Tbilisi
Female	55	Higher Education	5	Tbilisi
Female	43	Higher Education	10	Tbilisi
Female	51	Technical Education	7	Tbilisi
Female	49	Higher Education	6	Tbilisi
Female	27	Higher Education	6	Tbilisi
Female	43	Higher Education	10	Tbilisi
Female	63	Higher Education	7	Tbilisi
Female	42	Higher Education	4	Tbilisi
Female	21	Student	0	Tbilisi
Female	40	Higher Education	6	Tbilisi
Female	44	Higher Education	1	Tbilisi
Female	63	Secondary	1	Tbilisi

Female	49	Higher Education	8	Tbilisi
Female	49	Higher Education	8	Tbilisi
Female	45	Higher Education	1	Tbilisi
Female	20	Student	1	Tbilisi
Female	23	Higher Education	1	Tbilisi
Female	48	Higher Education	1	Tbilisi
Female	30	Higher Education	1	Tbilisi
Female	46	Higher Education	5	Tbilisi
Female	36	Higher Education	1	Tbilisi
Female	29	Higher Education	1	Tbilisi
Female	47	Higher Education	1	Tbilisi
Female	29	Higher Education	0.5	Tbilisi
Female	32	Higher Education	1	Tbilisi
Female	49	Higher Education	1	Tbilisi

For the survey CRRC Georgia conducted two trainings in Tbilisi on December 16, 2022 using the Zoom program. During the trainings, interviewers practiced the questionnaire, sampling instructions, and discussed possible problems or challenges that might arise during the fieldwork.

The training covered the following topics:

- Sampling instructions
- Respondent selection
- Overview of the questionnaire with special attention to problematic questions
- Conducting test interviews

Overall, the fieldwork went well. Interviewers did not note any problems.

Data management and analysis

Data cleaning

Data cleaning was carried out to identify and, where possible, correct inconsistencies. In addition, open-ended questions with textual responses were recoded so that these answers matched numeric codes. It should be noted that, with CATI, the cleaning process was straightforward: pre-programmed questionnaire forms help to eliminate ambiguous codes from being entered in the dataset. Also, the form did not accept errors related to selecting more values than permitted in the questionnaire. Additional protocols for data cleaning are summarized in Table 8:

Issue	Protocol
String responses were typed ambiguously, but the data cleaning specialist could determine the intended response.	The value was changed to the response identified by the data cleaning specialist.

String responses were typed ambiguously, but the data cleaning specialist could not determine the intended response.	The value was changed to a question non-response code.
--	--

Weighting

Census data was used to calculate poststratification weights for individuals and households. For individual level weights national data on adult population by settlement type (Capital Urban or Rural) , ethnicity (Georgian or other), age group (18-34, 35-54 and 55+), sex, and education (secondary or lower, vocational, and higher) were used. Census data on the average household size and number of households was used to calculate post stratification household weights.

By using HH-weights, the sample is representative of the households at national level. By using the individual weights, the sample is representative of the adult population at settlement type (Capital Urban or Rural) , ethnicity (Georgian or other), age group (18-34, 35-54 and 55+), sex, and education (secondary or lower, vocational, and higher) levels. Tables below present proportions of each level in the nonweighted, weighted dataset, and in population.

Stratum	Sample (without weights)	Weighted Sample	Population (Census)
Capital	34	30	30
Urban	33	27	27
Rural	32	43	43
Age	Sample (without weights)	Weighted Sample	Population (Census)
18-34	25	31	31
35-54	38	35	35
55-120	37	34	34
Sex	Sample (without weights)	Weighted Sample	Population (Census)
Male	45	46	46
Female	55	54	54
Education	Sample (without weights)	Weighted Sample	Population (Census)
Secondary or lower	37	51	51
Vocational	17	19	19
Higher	46	30	30
Ethnic	Sample (without weights)	Weighted Sample	Population (Census)
Georgian	93	87	87

Non-Georgian	7	13	13
--------------	---	----	----

Households	Sample (without weights)	Weighted Sample	Population (Census)
1 member	7	15	15
2 members	15	21	21
3 members	15	18	18
4 members	21	17	17
5 members	17	14	14
6 members	12	9	9
7 members	7	4	4
8 members	4	2	2
9 members	1	1	1
10 members	1	0	0
11 members	0	0	0
12 members	0	0	0
13 members			0

Back Check

CRRC-Georgia conducted a back check of 10% of the interviews after the fieldwork. The back check fieldwork was conducted on December 24 – December 28, 2022 simultaneously with the fieldwork. The backcheck fieldwork personnel consisted of 1 interviewer. The backcheck showed that interviews were conducted properly.

Back check interviews were selected using the RAND() function in excel one day before the fieldwork was complete. In sum, 200 interviews were selected and checked.

Response rate

The minimum response rate for the survey was 25%. The response rate calculations are provided in the table below.

	Your survey data go below
Interview (Category 1)	
Complete (all versions)	2026
Partial (all versions)	176
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)	
Refusal and breakoff (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	2890

Refusal (phone, IPHH, mail, web)	
Household-level refusal (phone, IPHH, mail, web)	
Known-respondent refusal (phone, IPHH, mail, web)	
Implicit refusal (phone, mail, mail_U)	
Break off/ Implicit refusal (phone, mail, web, mail_U)	
Non-contact (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	
Respondent never available (phone)	
Telephone answering device confirming HH (phone)	
Answering machine household-no message left (phone)	
Answering machine household-message left (phone)	
Respondent unavailable during field period (IPHH, mail, mail_U)	
Respondent unavailable during field period (web)	
Other, non-refusals (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	
Deceased respondent (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	
Language problem (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	221
Household-level language problem (phone, IPHH, mail)	
Respondent language problem (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	
No interviewer available for needed language/Wrong language questionnaire (phone, IPHH, mail)	
Literacy problems (mail) or sound quality (phone, mail, mail_U)	
Location/Activity not allowing interview (phone)	
Miscellaneous (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	17
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)	
Unknown if housing unit/unknown about address (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	
Not attempted or worked/not mailed/No invitation sent (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	
Always busy (phone)	71
No answer (phone)	664
Answering machine-don't know if household (phone)	7
Call blocking (phone)	2045
Technical phone problems (phone)	
Unclear if HH (phone)	
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	
No screener completed (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	
Unknown if person is a HH resident/ mail returned undelivered (phone, mail, web, mail_U)	
Other (phone, IPHH, web)	
Not eligible (Category 4)	
Out of sample - other strata than originally coded (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	1
Fax/data line (phone)	

Non-working/disconnect (phone)	
Non-working number (phone)	1994
Disconnected number (phone)	
Temporarily out of service (phone)	
Special technological circumstances (phone)	
Number changed (phone)	
Call forwarding (phone)	
Residence to residence (phone)	
Non-residence to residence (phone)	
Pager (phone)	
Cell phone (phone)	
Landline phone (phone)	
Nonresidence (phone, IPHH)	
Business, government office, other organizations (phone, IPHH)	15
Institution (phone, IPHH)	
Group quarters (phone, IPHH)	
Person not HH resident (phone)	
No eligible respondent (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	52
Quota filled (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	1
Not eligible - duplicate listing (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	
Other	9
Total sample used	10189
I=Complete Interviews (1.1)	2026
P=Partial Interviews (1.2)	176
R=Refusal and break off (2.1)	2890
NC=Non Contact (2.2)	0
O=Other (2.0, 2.3)	238
Calculating e: e is the estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible. Enter a different value or accept the estimate in this line as a default. This estimate is based on the proportion of eligible units among all units in the sample for which a definitive determination of status was obtained (a conservative estimate). This will be used if you do not enter a different estimate. For guidance about how to compute other estimates of e, see AAPOR's 2009 <i>Eligibility Estimates</i> .	0.720
UH=Unknown Household (3.1)	2787
UO=Unknown other (3.2-3.9)	0
Response Rate 1	

$I/(I+P) + (R+NC+O) + (UH+UO)$	0.250
Response Rate 2	
$(I+P)/(I+P) + (R+NC+O) + (UH+UO)$	0.271
Response Rate 3	
$I/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))$	0.276
Response Rate 4	
$(I+P)/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))$	0.300
Cooperation Rate 1	
$I/(I+P)+R+O)$	0.380
Cooperation Rate 2	
$(I+P)/((I+P)+R+O))$	0.413
Cooperation Rate 3	
$I/((I+P)+R))$	0.398
Cooperation Rate 4	
$(I+P)/((I+P)+R))$	0.432
Refusal Rate 1	
$R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O) + UH + UO))$	0.356
Refusal Rate 2	
$R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O) + e(UH + UO))$	0.394
Refusal Rate 3	
$R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O))$	0.542
Contact Rate 1	
$(I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC+ (UH + UO)$	0.657
Contact Rate 2	
$(I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC + e(UH+UO)$	0.726
Contact Rate 3	
$(I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC$	1.000