

TECHNICAL REPORT
On Survey in Uzbekistan («CPart-2004»)

CONTENTS

1. Questionnaire documents	2
2. Piloting	2
3. Training for supervisors and interviewers	3
4. Regional distribution of interviewers according to the number of the interviews conducted	4
5. Repeated visits and refusals to participate in interviews	4
6. Quality control and the outcome of the checks conducted	5
7. Problems during the questionnaire conduct	15
8. Attachments	17

I. QUESTIONNAIRE DOCUMENTS

To perform questioning, the following documents have been prepared (attached):

- Questionnaire (in Uzbek, in Russian and in Karakalpak languages).
- Sets of cards (in Uzbek, in Russian and in Karakalpak languages).
- Forms of the respondent's sampling and records of the households' visits with Kish's cards (in Russian and Uzbek languages).
- Forms of the households' sampling in selected points of questioning (in Russian language).
- Sampling instructions (in Russian and Uzbek languages).
- Instructions on households and respondents' sampling (in Russian and Uzbek languages).
- Examples how to fill in sampling forms
- Covering letter to local authorities of 2 types (in Cyrillic and in Latin).

II. PILOTING.

The piloting of the questionnaire was performed from 13 August until 15 August. To conduct the pilot survey of 60 questionnaires, 3 mahallas were selected – one in Tashkent City, the second one in the village of Ulugbek and the third one is the village of Chinabad of Kibrai region. Skilful interviewers and supervisors, which have experience in questionnaire conduct under various themes and who have worked as a minimum 2-3 years in relevant field, were selected to perform questionnaire piloting. Further the list of these interviewers is given below:

Table 1. List of interviewers, who participated in piloting training

No	First and last name.	Place of conduct
1	Muminahunova R.	The city of Tashkent
2	Yusupova Muhabbat	The city of Tashkent
3	Yodgorov S.	The city of Tashkent
4	Irnazarova S.	The city of Tashkent
5	Raisa Islamovna	The city of Tashkent
6	Koldibekova Z.	Ulugbek village
7	Igamberdieva S.	Ulugbek village
8	Muhammedova F.	Ulugbek village
9	Akbarova Saida	Ulugbek village
10	Hodjaev Z.	Ulugbek village
11	Mamajanova Nurida	Village
12	Nuriddinova Alfiya	Village
13	Nabiev R.	Village
14	Eshtuharova M.	Village

Training for piloting questionnaire was performed on 13 August 2004. Goals and tasks of the questionnaire were explained, analysis of each question from the questionnaire was made, a working schedule and the schedule of the survey conduct were discussed at the training. Representatives of the Client, Anika Airapetyan and Dina Muhammadiyeva were present at the training. The Centre Director Joldasov A.A. and Project-Manager Pogrebov I.B. carried out

the training. The Clients' representatives also took part in interviews at places with our interviewers on 14 and 15 August.

On 17 August the outcome of the piloting survey was discussed with participation of all the interviewers and client's representatives. During discussion all the issues, which revealed respondents' difficulties or problems in understanding, were examined. Under the piloting outcome many amendments were added to Russian, as well as to Uzbek and Karakalpak variants of questionnaires.

III. TRAINING FOR SUPERVISORS AND INTERVIEWERS

IV. The following types of training were performed during preparation for the questioning:

- Training for piloting survey was carried out on 14 August 2004.
- Principal training for Tashkent interviewers was held on 4 and 5 September 2004.
- Training on the sampling and identification of the respondent under Kish's card for new interviewers, who took part in similar surveys on 6 September 2004.
- Training in oblast centres for local interviewers - depending on the beginning of field works in each province (from 7 September up to 9 September 2004).

(1) Training for supervisors and interviewers.

So that interviewers perceive goals and tasks of the survey at a more qualitative level, the training was divided for 2 days held in Tashkent and conducted by the Client's Representative Dina Muhammadieva, Project Manager Igor Pogrebov and Project Supervisor H. Nazarov, and consisted of the following procedures:

- Training of interviewers and supervisors on interview conduct guidance. (See Attachment 1. on p. 17). During this training a tête-à-tête interview with interviewers and exemplary performances, imitating the establishing of contact with households and respondents were played.
- Explanation of the general survey strategy.
- Explanation of respondents' sampling rules for the survey.
- Explanation of households' sampling rules for the survey according to the sample form.
- General interviewing face-to-face questions and the technique of an interview performance.
- A question by question analysis of the questionnaire.
- Conduct of trial interviews.
- Analysis of field works organisational issues in oblasts.
- Sampling of interviewers.

Table 2. List of supervisors, responsible for field works' organisation and performance

No	Supervisor's first and last name	Oblast
1	Dauletbaeva Mira	The Republic of Karakalpakstan
2	Irnazarova Safura	Samarkandskaya
3	Saidaliev S.	Ferghanskaya
4	Saidaliev S.	Namanganskaya
5	Saidaliev S.	Andijanskaya
6	Nazarov Hasan, Azamatova Natasha	Tashkent , Tashkentskaya

7	Nee Lyudmila Vasilievna	Sirdar'inskaya
8	Dauletbaeva Mira	Khorezmskaya

Practical lessons on performance of sampling at places of questioning, as well as trial interviews between interviewers were carried out along with the explanation of general survey strategy, rights and responsibilities of supervisors, analysis of the questionnaire and discussion of some organisational aspects.

(3) Training for interviewers in provinces (oblasts)

Training for interviewers in provinces was carried out by provincial supervisors depending on the beginning of field works in every province. All in all 56 interviewers and 7 supervisors participated in the survey. Among them 48 interviewers speak Uzbek and Russian languages, whereas 3 interviewers speak only Russian and 4 interviewers – only Russian and Karakalpak and 1 interviewer – Russian, Karakalpak and Uzbek.

V. REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF INTERVIEWERS ACCORDING TO THE AMOUNT OF CONDUCTED INTERVIEWS

While distributing the interviews' amount between interviewers, we adhered to the principle that each interviewer should have no more than 30 interviews. Still in some cases this principle had to be broken. This was stipulated by different efficiencies of interviewers, as well as by some specifics in the questioning' s organisation and by the fact that prior and after questioning in provinces, some interviewers had to work in Tashkent. Besides, households' repeated questioning was to be made after control visits to some locations.

Supervisors, who organised field works in provinces, were not prohibited to conduct interviews on their own, if there were no obstacles in actual situation. That is why supervisor S. Irnazarova combined her organisational work with that of an interviewer.

VI. REPEATED VISITS AND REFUSALS TO PARTICIPATE IN AN INTERVIEW

In accordance with specifications, if an interview performance was impossible at the first visit to the household, an interviewer was to make not less than 2 repeated visits. Only after the third visit, when it was still impossible to carry out an interview, did the interviewer stop his efforts and registered his visit as a failed interview, and switched to another addressee. As a rule, interviewers made repeated visits the next day. Sometimes, however, a repeated visit took place at another hour of the same day (for example, the first visit was in the morning, and the second one in the evening).

Reasons of refusals to grant interviews during field works were different.

According to interviewers, mostly (in most cases) it was caused by the absence of household members at the given address. If in town this is due to urban dwellers being at work the whole day, in rural location it is owing to cotton gathering season. It is for this reason that interviewers had to work since early morning (before people go in the field) until the latest hour.

The second ground was a household member's or a respondent's firm refusal from an interview. Obviously this refusal is based on the incapability of interviewers to persuade a required respondent to agree to converse, so in the future this aspect of questioning performance should be attended to more scrupulously. The same refers to the refusal of other members of households to contact a required respondent. These reasons are a specific urban

phenomenon, that is why interviewers, who work in town, should receive further particularly meticulous instructions before starting questionnaire.

VII. QUALITY CONTROL AND THE OUTCOME OF CONDUCTED CHECKS

Field works were completed (latest questionnaires entering) on 21 September 2004. Processing (check, codification) were started immediately upon the first questionnaires entering, i.e. since 11 September 2004. The first questionnaires were entered into the database on 14 September 2004.

Quality control included the following stages:

1. Check of correctness of the sampling filled in forms.
2. Check of correctness of respondent's sampling.
3. Check of the correspondence between the number of Kish' card and the number of the sampling form.
4. Check of correctness of the questionnaires filled in.
5. Check of the correspondence between answers and questions in terms of logic.

Check visits were made from 23 September until 30 September 2004.

In Table 3 below results of the checks, conducted in all regions after field works completion are given. The difference in shares of checks from the total amount of interviews according to regions (column 14) is stipulated by the procedure used.

After the field works' completion each interviewer, who participated in the questioning, was checked. With this purpose 20% of the conducted interviews were selected, which were presented to the headquarters' as filled out questionnaires. An interview' selection for check was made at a random in the database from interviews, submitted by each interviewer. Addresses, where an interviewer had made mistakes while filling out during questioning, were added to them (there were about 30 such addresses). Interviewers, who worked in other regions, performed check.

If the check's results proved to be positive (the procedure of respondent's or household's sampling was not violated or questionnaire was filled in according to the interview taken etc.), the check of the given interviewer was considered completed. If an interviewer under check made a sampling mistake or falsified the interview, than all the interviews, he had conducted, were subjected to check.

The following violations were discovered:

In Samarkandsaya oblast in PSU № 32 (the town of Kattakurgan), due to the illness of an interviewer, a supervisor had to urgently replace him with another one, and so an interviewer, who had a bad command of Uzbek language, was performing interviews in Russian. In this connection we decided to send another interviewer so that she interviewed those respondents, who either did not speak Russian, or spoke it no good, or understood poorly at least one of the questionnaire's item. Such respondents were three in number and another interviewer questioned them.

In the Republic of Karakalpakstan one case of the respondent's replacement was found out and the checking person conducted a repeated questioning.

In Navoiyskaya oblast two cases of the respondent's replacement were found out, but it was discovered during the questionnaire's hand over and the interviewer himself performed a repeated questioning. No remarks were made during check regarding his other addressees.

In Bukharskaya oblast 1 case of the respondent's replacement was found out, and the checking person conducted a repeated questioning.

In Andijanskaya and Ferghanskaya oblast 1 case of the respondent's replacement per each were discovered as well, and an interviewer in charge of check conducted a repeated questioning.

In Surhandar'yinskaya oblast – 2 cases.

And in Tashkentskaya oblast -2 cases.

Totally 10 respondents' replacement were exposed, where they were re-questioned by other interviewers. It should be noticed that these cases of respondents' replacement were not deliberate, but owing to a technical error of the interviewer either at the respondent's sampling (3 cases) or at compiling a household members list (breach of men and women's age priority).

In the course of check visits one case of an interview's falsification was found out (PSU № 28), i.e. "non-visit". The interviewee was a 97 years old woman, but during check she said that "the interviewer came, but asked only just about 20 questions and left". During check a repeated questioning was made at this address too.

After questionnaires' processing the following data were received referring duration of an interview performance:

The longest interview lasted for 110 minutes.

The shortest one was 50 minutes.

Average time is 67.9 minutes.

Under the interview conduct time we have discovered such a fact: on the whole some interviewers (Fe. Musaeva M.) held interviews during 70 or 80 minutes sharp (Musaeva's 21 interviews lasted for 70 minutes and 2 interviews lasted for 80 minutes) etc. It speaks for an intended interviewer's inclination to round up the time of interview (duration). Certainly we are unable to check the exact amount of these questionnaires in fact (for instance), and in what cases the time was rounded up. Nevertheless we undertook appropriate measures so that similar instances should not repeat.

We have also found out a large number of refusals, mostly in towns, and in some districts of provinces. Below some cases are cited, when the number of refusals prevailed over the number of interviews:

№	PSU name	№ PSU	Interviewer's first name	Quantity of refusals
---	----------	-------	--------------------------	----------------------

1	The city of Tashkent.	63	Nasyrov R.	70
2	The city of Tashkent	62	Koldibekova Z.	56
3	The city of Tashkent	60	Musaeva M.	39
4	The city of Tashkent	61	Zinovieva D.	37
5	Kashkadar'inskaya oblast	21	Mamajanova N.	47
5	Andijan	6	Mamayusupova M.	34
6	Namangan	27	Mdrahimova M.	23
7	The town of Kuvasai	49	Prohorova L.I.	27

We have carried out check visits to these households as well, where for whatever grounds an interview had not been conducted. In the course of checks many cases were revealed when inhabitants either do not agree to be interviewed or they do not live in their apartments. Many apartments according to explanations are empty as they are for instance let to students, who have gone to gather cotton, or they are purchased as real estate etc. Here are concrete examples of such checks:

The town of Andijan

In PSU №6, neighbours – household 131 – said that a young family moved in 2-3 days ago, but they did not live there yet.

In household 130 – “That period I had lived with my son in another place (another district). The neighbours told me that somebody came and asked for us”.

In household 129 – “Yes, they came, but we did not want to converse, as I have a sick 75-year old mother”.

The town of Namangan

In household 593 – “Students live there, but presently they are at cotton gathering works”. Neighbours.

In household 591 – “We have bought it recently, and now making repair”. “ The old owner also used to come here seldom, he was a businessman”. Neighbours.

In household 587 – “Inhabitants show up sometimes, but do not live here”. Neighbours from the upper floor.

The town of Kuvasai

Household1133 – “Dwellers live here, but come very late and leave very early, as they work at the plant. That woman (interviewer) came three times, but failed to find them home”. Neighbour.

Household1134 – “They do not live here, for they have a village house. Mahalla representative.

Household 1138 – “They do not live here and they have even been sued for municipal services non-payment”. Neighbours.

Household1140 – “Few people live here, as gas, water etc. are unavailable”. Neighbours from apartments number 17, 18.

Household 1139 – The house is situated in the corner of the crossing and according to mahalla lists, it is referred to Kodiri street (house 14), but virtually its dwellers say, that their postal address is Burhonova street 19. They also said that a part of house is referred to Kodiri street till now, but it's a non-living area.

Household 1139 (Azizova street, house 203, apartement 41) – “The owner of apartment shows up sometimes, but he lives in another district, in a land plot house”. Neighbour Faya from apartment 42.

In the city of Tashkent under various reasons people in charge of check could not find the dwellers neither and got an answer from neighbours:

Household 1464 – they would not open the door and shout at the controlling person to get away. Evidently, the interviewer had been treated in the same manner.

Household 1463 – here lives Feruza, but she is working days and nights (in “Ambulance”. Her son Timur and someone else were at home, but they did not open the door.

Household 1449 – A dweller of this house Mukaddas is in the hospital.

Household 1456 – This apartment has been in repair already for 3 weeks, and maintenance workers answered that the owners live in another place.

Table 3. Results of checks conduct in regions

№	Region	Total number of interviews						Number of checks						Sampling procedure violation		Interview falsification		Total number of breaches	
		town		Village		total		Town		village		total		number	% κ 13	number	% κ 13	number	% to 13
		number	% per column	Number	% per column	number	% per column 7	number	% to 3	number	% κ 5	number	% κ 7						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	Andijanskaya oblast					134	8,933					32	2,1	1	3,7			1	
2	Ferghanskaya oblast					163	10,867					33	2,2	1	3,0			1	
3	Namanganskaya oblast					119	7,933					24	1,6		0,0	1		1	
4	Samarkandskaya oblast					164	10,933					33	2,2	3	9,1			3	
5	Kashkadar'inskaya oblast					135	9,000					27	1,8		0,0				
6	Sirdar'inskaya oblast					39	2,600					8	0,5		0,0				
7	Djizakskaya oblast					61	4,067					12	0,8		0,0				
8	Bukharskaya oblast					87	5,800					17	1,2	1	5,9			1	
9	Tashkent City					127	8,467					25	1,7		0,0				
10	Karakalpakstan					91	6,067					18	1,2	1	5,6			1	
11	Navoiskaya oblast					47	3,133					9	0,6		0,0			2	
12	Surhandar'inskaya oblast					108	7,200					22	1,4	2	9,1			2	
13	Tashkentskaya oblast					143	9,533					29	1,9	2	6,9			2	
14	Khorezmskaya oblast					82	5,467					16	1,1						
Total						1500	100					305	20,3	13	4,3	1	0,33	14	4,59

After the beginning of field works, no particular difficulties were faced in provinces. There were only some problems for interviewers to identify some PSU and to specify the amount of households in them. It looked like the following:

1. Households' amount at locations did not coincide with our data. This occurred due to the changes (mahalla' growth or vice versa) in our data since 2002. For example, a significant difference was found in the town of Urgench, mahalla "Jambul". As a matter of fact, "Jambul" mahalla was split into 2 mahallas. (PSU №55). Similar instances took place in the village of Kulbu'i (PSU №53) and in the village of Eskibog (PSU №22). Or if we take PSU №16, on the contrary, according to our data, there are 219 households, whereas factually their number is 610. Also for some PSU there were families or addresses data, but interviewers for a more precise sampling (and for work convenience too) used data on households.
2. There were cases of non-coincidence of PSU's names with our data. This might be explained by the fact that we printed names (mostly in Uzbek languages) in Russian; also at names entering, some letters were put by mistake: for example, instead of "Hojakul" – "Hojakala" (PSU №3), or instead of "Pillakash" - "Tillakash", instead of "Balik kul" – "Bolikul".
3. Sampling was very complicated for PSU №33, which unites 3 villages (Kish Yalangoch (17) + Kish Kurulish (27) + Kish Galaba (39), so interviewers had to look for all persons responsible in the villages and to collect record books of the inhabitants of households.
4. Searches of households lists in PSU 6 (Andijan-town) were no easy either, as the mahalla did not have households lists as the data were not modified. Without the lists there was no sampling method left as only to write down the streets and houses, with the clarification of the number of houses, apartement, and to make the mahalla plan (map).

Some questionnaires submission was delayed only in Tashkent City, caused by:

1. Large refusals amount (60-70 refusals per 22 interviews) –access denied to apartments.
2. Limited access to households in elite districts (for example, PSU № 232)

Also the following embarrassments were encountered in Tashkent City:

1. Non-benevolent attitude of mahalla committees' representatives.
2. To gain access to household lists.
3. Addresses search (Wrong addresses: for example, house number and apartment number are given, the house is found, but such an apartment does not exist at all, i.e. this apartement is currently a pharmacy, organisation, office. etc).

VIII. PROBLEMS DURING QUESTIONING CONDUCT

Different problems arose during questioning conduct. For instance, in Samarkandskaya oblast local authorities did not permit to conduct survey until superior (oblast hokimiyat) authorities endorse it in written. It usually takes 3-4 days to obtain such permission (the time, this issue is studied in khokimiyat). But in this case the supervisor phoned directly from the khokimiyat's representative and afterwards a promise was given to accelerate the process. Works were started the following day.

At PSU 45 of Angren town there were problems, i.e. the mahalla committee's representative refused to grant households lists without the authorities (khokimiyat) permission. But after the interviewer went to khokimiyat with a letter and showed it to them, the khokimiyat representative made a call to the mahalla committee telling them to render assistance to her.

In Tashkent City almost in all (in four among five) mahallas there were similar problems. There were difficulties in interviewers' contacts with respondents. For instance in Tashkent, when an interviewer knocked the door, this household's dwellers told him to wait and asked by telephone their neighbours to come. When the neighbours gathered around, the dweller said that he did not know this individual (interviewer), but that the latter would like to visit them.

In many places, mostly, in rural locations, interviewers had to work from early morning until late evening due to cotton gathering season. People went to fields early in the morning (since 5-6 AM) and came back home towards 21-22 PM. That is why interviewers had also to visit them at such hours.

Interviewers had some difficulties in obtaining household lists of a PSU, where PSU consisted of a few settlements. For example, in PSU №33 an interviewer had to collect lists of all three villages, as not all lists were in SGB.

In PSU №2 due to the household lists unavailability in the mahalla committee (as they had been handed over to house committees for update) an interviewer tried to collect these lists from these house committees, but without success, as they, in their turn, also handed over the lists to their assistants. So the interviewer had to find the mahalla's map, where all mahalla's street were designated and houses numerated, and to make sampling.

In Kashkadar'ya oblast, Guzar district, our interviewer asked a woman from this village to show locations of several households, and she joined our interviewer for half a day. But the inhabitants of PSU №21 took our interviewer for a wahhabist and wanted to drive away from the village the woman, who assisted her in showing addresses, for "the help to a wahhabist". On the second day our interviewer was detained by police and after examining her documents, they warned her, that the mahalla's women were waiting to meet her in the street and even to beat her. As to the woman, who showed her addresses the first day, she was already "done", i.e. they came to her house, scolded and insulted her, etc. and left only after her husband came home. The interviewer had to ask a police station officer that somebody from the mahalla's committee accompany her. For this reason she had many refusals in this village, (the rumours of the wahhabist' coming to their mahalla ran ahead of the "wahhabist" (our interviewer) herself), and so the inhabitants feared to answer her and would not open the door or pretended that they were out).

According to observations and notes of interviewers during questioning, various obstacles impeded their work. So, rather frequently during interviews, the interviewee's relatives would

also announce their wish to participate in them. Most often it was done by men (husbands or fathers), who did not want to leave their wives or daughters all alone with the interviewer. In the majority of cases, interviewers, using skills, obtained during contact establishing training and the interviewer's behaviour in likewise cases, managed to persuade other family members not to distract the interviewee, but sometimes it was rather hard. Here are some observations of interviewers, which complete the questioning situation:

The respondent's (woman's) husband did not permit to interview his wife, explaining that they were not in need of additional problems. But in the given case, the interviewer asked to call for both his wife and other relatives. When they came up, he once again made the purpose of his visit and the survey clear to them and said, that if they did not agree to be interviewed, he would have to stay for a few days more to find somebody to replace them. Afterwards they gave permission. But during the interview the respondent's husband did not leave them alone and did not go away. According to the interviewer, though, he absolutely did not interfere and did not join the interview.

Or others would say "And what shall we get? What for should we waste our time?" In such cases people did not mean personal profit, but the benefit for all, and they asked if this survey would promote to "plants and factories opening in their settlement or district" or "if the researchers (we) are able of augmenting their pensions" etc.

Interviewers had to "talk into" not only ordinary people, but even mahalla representatives. For example, a similar situation occurred in a mahalla, when its representative said to the interviewer that *"it is roughly tens of times that likewise organisations with various surveys come to us, but not a single one has brought changes for the better, which we might feel"*. It took place in PSU №36 of Samarkandskaya oblast. The interviewer responded to him, that "even if our results be used for improvement in any sphere, it is will not happen that soon, as before and after materials are submitted, it takes a few years for consideration of issues. And we are just researchers, our goal is to study public opinion regarding this or that matter, and other people, experts, are in charge of improvement, so we are unaware when our survey will be used for improvement or the issue solution".

Many respondents were interested to know what the use, they would get from those questioning, is, and if their lives would improve afterwards. Some relatives put pressure on respondents, trying to persuade them not to waste the time. Most often the respondents' behaviour was normal.

In general, 2 kinds of people's opinions are most often spread – that any conducted questioning is aimed at the life's improvement and that it will give its results. The second one is the incredulity that any benefit may arise from these surveys. This is the source of their inadequate reaction towards interviewers, accusing them in doing waste job, which brings benefit to nobody. According to the interviewer, there were instances, when even mahalla's representative told him that it was useless and asked why he (interviewer) does not fill in questionnaires and hand over his work instead of visiting households. And that he ostensibly knows that the population would fail to answer properly in any case. Here the interviewer explained that "the given questioning is a sampling study of the population opinion on living standards, national economy situation and the ties with other Central Asian countries and that each respondent's opinion is very precious to us and we need opinions of many individuals. And that we have no aim to get "proper" answers, but any people's view, and therefore we do not divide the responses and opinions into right or wrong".

Though the interviewers had passed "the interview conduct technique and the correct contact establishing with the household members" training and they had on their hands "general guidance on an interview conduct", many of them, who worked in town, received refusals. For instance, Rustam Nasirov had 70 refusals (Tashkent City), Koldibekoiva Z. had 56 refusals

(Tashkent city), Musaeva M. – 39 refusals (Tashkent city) etc. The same situation may be observed not only in Tashkent City, but also in other towns of the republic. For example, in Andijan, Navoi, Kuvasai etc. The explanation lies in rural inhabitants being more amiable, hospitable, as compared with their urban counterparts, and one can always find another member of the household to talk to, identify a respondent and appoint another hour of visit or ask him to inform the respondent about it. As for cities, it is impossible there, as children are at school, parents are at work, and the elderly will not open the door. Besides, in cities people are busy from morning till evening and after work they may refuse to grant an interview, whereas in villages even after work people usually do not refuse the guest.

IX. ATTACHEMENTS.



Manual with changes.zip