Fieldwork Report

REPORT

Project Title: COVID-19 Georgia High Frequency Survey (GHFS) Wave 1, 2020
Poverty and Equity Global Practice, The World Bank
Caucasus Research Resource Center

Prepared by:

Kristine Vacharadze,
Giorgi Babunashvili,
Elene Ergeshidze

FOR PUBLIC USE

January 2020

Objectives

The second set of 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 understand a number of related outcomes. The survey used random digit dialing for sampling, with an achieved sample size of approximately 2000 individuals.

Geographical and population coverage

For the current survey, CRRC-Georgia used the 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.

Android-based tablet computers (Samsung Galaxy Tab3 and Tab5) were used. The hardware had integrated sim-cards, which permits uploading completed interviews instantly via mobile internet. CRRC used the open-source software Open Data Kit (ODK) to create questionnaire forms. 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 intended to have 2000 respondents. Overall, 1986 interviews were completed. The sample is representative of the population of adult population of Georgia.

For this purpose 25,001 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 the distribution of randomly generated numbers across indices, the set of exsting 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				Numbers generated within the index
	2019 Feb	2019 Sep	2020 Feb	Average	
551	2.5%	2.9%	3.0%	2.8%	703
555	16.9%	14.9%	19.6%	17.1%	4285
557	1.5%	2.8%	1.4%	1.9%	474
558	8.3%	3.4%	2.1%	4.6%	1154
568	1.1%	1.5%	0.7%	1.1%	269
571	0.5%	1.2%	0.7%	0.8%	199
574	0.6%	2.7%	0.7%	1.3%	333
577	10.9%	8.7%	8.5%	9.4%	2342
579	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.2%	57

591	4.1%	4.0%	2.6%	3.6%	891
592	0.5%	0.8%	0.1%	0.5%	121
593	8.1%	5.5%	5.5%	6.4%	1590
595	8.0%	6.9%	5.2%	6.7%	1677
597	1.4%	2.1%	1.2%	1.6%	389
598	8.6%	10.6%	8.1%	9.1%	2277
599	27.0%	31.2%	40.7%	33.0%	8240
TOTAL					25001

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 44 individuals in total (40 interviewers and 4 supervisors - see Table below for details).

Gender	Age	Education	Years of working as an interviewer	Region
Female	38	Tertiary	12	Samtskhe Javakheti
Male	40	Tertiary	4	Samtskhe Javakheti
Female	32	Tertiary	5	Samtskhe Javakheti
Female	37	Secondary technical	8	Imereti
Male	35	Tertiary	1	Imereti
Female	53	Tertiary	11	Samgrelo-Zemo Svaneti
Male	59	Tertiary	10	Samgrelo-Zemo Svaneti
Female	24	Tertiary	5	Samgrelo-Zemo Svaneti
Female	58	Tertiary	4	Samgrelo-Zemo Svaneti
Female	56	Tertiary	4	Samgrelo-Zemo Svaneti
Female	61	Tertiary	12	Kakheti
Female	53	Tertiary	4	Tbilisi
Female	20	Student	2	Tbilisi
Female	55	Tertiary	6	Tbilisi
Female	60	Tertiary	10	Tbilisi
Female	58	Tertiary	4	Tbilisi
Female	46	Tertiary	3	Tbilisi
Female	37	Tertiary	14	Tbilisi

Female	40	Tertiary	3	Tbilisi
Female	55	Tertiary	3	Tbilisi
Female	58	Tertiary	6	Tbilisi
Female	65	Tertiary	10	Tbilisi
Female	19	Student	0.3	Tbilisi
Female	42	Tertiary	13	Tbilisi
Female	21	Tertiary	2	Tbilisi
Female	49	Vocational	5	Tbilisi
Female	47	Tertiary	X	Tbilisi
Female	40	Tertiary	9	Tbilisi
Female	60	Tertiary	3	Tbilisi
Female	39	Tertiary	3	Tbilisi
Female	21	Tertiary	3	Tbilisi
Female	46	Tertiary	1	Tbilisi
Female	36	Tertiary	0.4	Tbilisi
Female	38	Tertiary	4	Tbilisi
Female	47	Tertiary	8	Tbilisi
Female	47	Tertiary	10	Tbilisi
Female	43	Tertiary	0.3	Tbilisi
Female	23	Tertiary	3	Tbilisi
Male	21	Tertiary	4	Kvemo Kartli-Mtskheta Mtianeti
Female	58	Tertiary	10	Tbilisi
Female	57	Tertiary	18	Tbilisi
Female	35	Tertiary	0.1	Tbilisi
Female	25	Tertiary	2	Tbilisi
Female	22	Incomplete tertiary	0.6	Tbilisi

For the survey, CRRC Georgia conducted one training in Tbilisi on December 18, 2020 using Zoom. 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 report any problems.

Check all that apply and add a corresponding description <u>including the solution applied</u>. If there were no problems, ignore the table. Add or remove rows if necessary.

Problem	Description
☐**Location inaccessible**	
☐**Not enough households in the cluster**	
☐**Respondents with specific characteristics cannot be found**	
☐**Weather conditions**	
☐**Police/government interference**	
☐**Authorities did not cooperate**	

Table 5: Fieldwork problem descriptions

Data collection took place between the 18th and 24th of December. The average interview time was 7.6 minutes. Data collection took place throughout the day on all days of fieldwork. 90% of completed interviews were completed on the first contact attempt, 7% on the 2nd attempt, and 3% on the third contact attempt.

1st contact attempt	2nd contact attempt	3rd contact attempt
1784	148	54
90%	7%	3%

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 helped 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 an question non-response code (-3, interviewer error).

Table 8. Data entry protocol

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.

Back Check

CRRC-Georgia conducted a back check of 10% of the interviews after the fieldwork. The back check fieldwork was conducted on December 23-25, 2020 simlutaniously with the fieldwork. The backcheck fieldwork personnel consisted of 1 interviewer. The backcheck showed that interviews were conducted properly and only two of them were removed, one respondent was not elligible because of the age and one number was not registered.

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

Response rate

The minimum response rate for the survey was 40.2% The response rate was calculated using the AAPOR 4.0 Phone RDD survey response rate calculator. The calculations for this are presented in the table below:

	Final Disposition Codes	Survey data
Interview (Category 1)		
Complete (all versions)	1.0/1.10	1986
Partial (all versions)	1.2	104
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)	2	
Refusal and breakoff (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	2.1	1176
Refusal (phone, IPHH, mail, web)	2.11	
Household-level refusal (phone, IPHH, mail, web)	2.111	
Known-respondent refusal (phone, IPHH, mail, web)	2.112	
Implicit refusal (phone, mail, mail_U)	2.113	
Break off/ Implicit refusal (phone, mail, web, mail_U)	2.12	
Non-contact (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	2.2	
Respondent never available (phone)	2.21	
Telephone answering device confirming HH (phone)	2.22	
Answering machine household-no message left (phone)	2.221	
Answering machine household-message left (phone)	2.222	
Respondent unavailable during field period (IPHH, mail, mail_U)	2.25	
Respondent unavailable during field period (web)	2.26	
Other, non-refusals (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	2.3	
Deceased respondent (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	2.31	

Physically or mentally unable/incompetent (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	2.32	
Language problem (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	2.33	28
Household-level language problem (phone, IPHH, mail)	2.331	
Respondent language problem (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	2.332	
No interviewer available for needed language/Wrong language questionnaire (phone, IPHH, mail)	2.333	
Literacy problems (mail) or sound quality (phone, mail, mail_U)	2.34	
Location/Activity not allowing interview (phone)	2.35	
Miscellaneous (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	2.9	6
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)	3	
Unknown if housing unit/unknown about address (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	3.1	
Not attempted or worked/not mailed/No invitation sent (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail)U)	3.11	
Always busy (phone)	3.12	74
No answer (phone)	3.13	425
Answering machine-don't know if household (phone)	3.14	3
Call blocking (phone)	3.15	1144
Technical phone problems (phone)	3.16	
Unclear if HH (phone)	3.161	
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	3.2	
No screener completed (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	3.21	
Unknown if person is a HH resident/ mail returned undelivered (phone, mail, web, mail_U)	3.3	
Other (phone, IPHH, web)	3.9	
Not eligible (Category 4)	4	
Out of sample - other strata than originally coded (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	4.1	57
Fax/data line (phone)	4.2	
Non-working/disconnect (phone)	4.3	
Non-working number (phone)	4.31	5670
Disconnected number (phone)	4.32	
Temporarily out of service (phone)	4.33	
Special technological circumstances (phone)	4.4	
Number changed (phone)	4.41	
Call forwarding (phone)	4.43	
Residence to residence (phone)	4.431	

Non-residence to residence (phone)	4.432	
Pager (phone)	4.44	
Cell phone (phone)	4.45	
Landline phone (phone)	4.46	
Nonresidence (phone, IPHH)	4.5	
Business, government office, other organizations (phone, IPHH)	4.51	3
Institution (phone, IPHH)	4.52	
Group quarters (phone, IPHH)	4.53	
Person not HH resident (phone)	4.54	
No eligible respondent (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	4.7	58
Quota filled (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	4.8	
Not eligible - duplicate listing (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	4.81	
Other	4.9	4
Total sample used		10738
I=Complete Interviews (1.1)		1986
P=Partial Interviews (1.2)		104
R=Refusal and break off (2.1)		1176
NC=Non Contact (2.2)		0
O=Other (2.0, 2.3)		34
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 *Eligibility Estimates.*		0.3629564
UH=Unknown Household (3.1)		1646
UO=Unknown other (3.2-3.9)		0
Response Rate 1		
I/(I+P) + (R+NC+O) + (UH+UO)		0.4015366
Response Rate 2		
(I+P)/(I+P) + (R+NC+O) + (UH+UO)		0.4225637
Response Rate 3		
I/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))		0.509567
Response Rate 4		
(I+P)/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))		0.5362513

Cooperation Rate 1		
I/(I+P)+R+O)		0.6018182
Cooperation Rate 2		
(I+P)/((I+P)+R+O))		0.6333333
Cooperation Rate 3		
I/((I+P)+R))		0.6080833
Cooperation Rate 4		
(I+P)/((I+P)+R))		0.6399265
Refusal Rate 1		
R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O) + UH + UO))		0.2377679
Refusal Rate 2		
R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O) + e(UH + UO))		0.3017376
Refusal Rate 3		
R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O))		0.3563636
Contact Rate 1		
(I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC+ (UH + UO)		0.6672058
Contact Rate 2		
(I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC + e(UH+UO)		0.8467126
Contact Rate 3		
(I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC		1