

Field report, WVS Romania 2012

Note: This field report includes information complementary to the one contained in the Methodological Questionnaire. Please read first the Methodological Questionnaire for details about sampling and response rates. In this short report we offer only additional information on the fieldwork, the network of field operators, and some details which document eventual bias induced by the substitution procedure that we have used. All the bellow figures are derived from the database with contact forms filled in by the operators of MetroMedia Transilvania, the data collecting agency. Nevertheless, this report is far from fully exploiting the mentioned information. Its role is to inform about how the fieldwork was carried out. On behalf of the Romanian Team for the Study of Social Values, this report was written and supervised by Bogdan Voicu. The annex includes Mircea Comşa's description of the sampling procedure, as approved by the WVSA Executive Committee before the fieldwork.

Organization of the data collecting

Research design

The Romanian Team for the Study of Social Values (www.iccv.ro/valori/index.htm) was in charge with designing the entire research, following the guidelines of the World Values Survey Association.

Bogdan Voicu, Claudiu Tufiş and Mircea Comşa were the Principal Investigators.

The host institution of the team is The Research Institute for Quality of Life (ICCV), within the Romanian Academy of Science. However, the team members belong to various organizations, as following:

Bogdan Voicu: research fellow ICCV,
and associate professor, Department of Sociology, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu (ULBS)

Mircea Comşa: associate professor Department of Sociology, Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj (UBB)

Claudiu Tufiş: assistant professor, Department of Political Science, University of Bucharest (UB)
(in the first part of the activities he was also research fellow with ICCV)

Monica Şerban: research fellow ICCV,
and associate professor, Department of Sociology, UB

Mălina Voicu: researcher, GESIS Leibnitz Institute, Köln

Horaţiu Rusu: associate professor, Department of Sociology, ULBS

Marian Vasile: research fellow ICCV
and assistant professor, Department of Sociology, UB

Andreea Constantin: PhD student, Graduate School, University of Köln

Elena Tudor: PhD student, Department of Sociology, UB

Alexandra Deliu: PhD student, Department of Sociology, UB

Data collecting

Metromedia Transilvania (shortly, MMT; www.mmt.ro) was the data collecting agency. Septimiu Suciu, Călin Moldovan and Petre Dănilă were the ones to supervise the entire data collecting activity.

Fieldwork control

According to the Romanian academic data collecting unwritten norms proposed by the Public Opinion Barometer teams in mid 1990s and still valid, there are two steps of controlling the quality and reliability of data provided by the fieldwork interviewers in order to avoid fraud. First, the data collecting agency does its internal checks. Second, an external agency provides supplementary supervision. In the case of WVS Romania 2012, this role was assumed by AB Research (ABR; <http://www.abresearch.ro>), represented by Ana Bulai.

The network of field interviewers

MMT used **92 field interviewers**. 61 are women, and 31 men. At the time of data collecting, 19 had a master degree or were master students, 43 had a BA or were undergraduate students, 3 have graduated other tertiary forms of education (“posthighschool”), 26 were highschool graduates, one graduated vocation secondary education (“professional school”). Further information is included in the following tables.

		Gender		
		Men	Women	Total
Age	20-24 years	10	13	23
	25-29	3	15	18
	30-39	8	11	19
	40-49	3	13	16
	50+	7	9	16
	Total	31	61	92

Marital status:

married	47
partnership	14
divorced	7
single	24

Other employment (except being a field operator)

Employed, full time	42
Employed, part time	9
Self-employed	4
Retired	6
Housewife	9
Student	14
Unemployed	1
Other	7

Language usually spoken at home

Romanian: 85, Hungarian: 6, Spanish: 1

Experience as field operator: year of the first data collecting

Year	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1997	1	1,1
1998	1	2,2
2000	1	3,3
2001	1	4,3
2002	2	6,5
2003	2	8,7
2004	3	12,0
2005	9	21,7
2006	3	25,0
2007	5	30,4
2008	6	37,0
2009	6	43,5
2010	9	53,3
2011	15	69,6
2012	27	98,9
unknown	1	100,0
Total	92	

Experience as field operator: number of studies

Zero (this is the first)	12
1-4	19
5-9	19
10+	42
Total	92

Preparing the fieldwork

Each fieldwork interviewer received a set of instructions (6 pages long, in Romanian language), including specifications for selecting the interviewees, and applying the questionnaire. Four trainings were organized, in București, Cluj-Napoca, Timișoara, and Iași, with the fieldwork interviewers attending one of the trainings depending on regional proximity. All questionnaires were filled in using CAPI.

30 local coordinators (located mainly at county level) and 8 regional coordinators (București, Moldova, Transilvania, Banat, Brașov, Dobrogea, Oltenia, Muntenia) were in charge with supervision and control.

Controlling the correctness of data collecting

Total number of contacted addresses: 2073.

Total number of interviews: 1503.

MMT, the data collecting agency produced a methodological report (in Romanian language), which includes the following mentions to the internal control and supervision of data collecting:

- Permanent contact was ensured between supervisors and field interviewers.
- 15 special supervisors randomly checked each field operator, and had either phone, either face-to-face contact with the interviewees.
- Fraud in data completing, including unpermitted substitutions, fake interviews, not asking all questions are among the situations that were checked. When problems were identified, the questionnaires were reapplied.

Apart from MMT's internal control, an external check was done by ABR. This is documented by a control report (also available in Romanian language). The bellow table summarizes the observations received from ABR.

	TOTAL	Percentage from the total collected data
Regions where checking was done	8	100%
Field interviewers which were checked in	18	20%
Applied questionnaires that were checked for fraud	197	51% of the questionnaires collected by the 18 field interviewers
Addresses which were verified	208	10% of the total number of addresses
Questionnaires/addresses with no problem reported	184	93%
Fraud: no questionnaire applied	5	2% of the controlled interviews
Wrong data (considering the address)	8	4% of the controlled addresses
Errors in selecting the interviewee	7	-

In the case of potential fraud, we have asked MMT to re-check all questionnaires applied by the corresponding field interviewers. It turned out that 7 of them were complete fraud, while other errors were

either unintended, random errors, which did not affect the quality of collected data, either turned out that additional information (produced by supplementary checks) eliminates the fraud suspicions. The seven fraud cases were corrected by filling in questionnaires with the corresponding interviewees.

Types of selection

Among the 2073 addresses to be contacted, 547 did not finalize with questionnaire application. Three quarters of the applied interviews were originated from the titular list. 226 substitutes refused interview or it was impossible to be contacted for various reasons, and were at their turn substituted (see the annex for an extended sampling procedure).

		Initial status		
		List of titulars	List of substitutes	Total
status	Not applied	321	226	547
	applied	1115	388	1503
	Total	1436	614	2050

		Initial status		
		List of titulars	List of substitutes	Total
status	Not applied	59%	41%	100%
	applied	74%	26%	100%
	Total	70%	30%	100%

In 68% of the cases selection was done on voting lists (62%) or other lists (8%). However, in some localities the townhall did not allow access to lists, therefore random route procedures were employed. Out of the 1503 interviewees, 62% were selected on lists and 38% using random route.

			Initial status		
			List of titulars	List of substitutes	Total
Final status	Not applied	Type of selection			
		voting lists	60%	88%	72%
		other lists	13%	8%	11%
		random route	27%	3%	17%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	
	Applied	voting lists	51%	78%	58%
		other lists	5%	1%	4%
		random route	44%	20%	38%
Total		100%	100%	100%	

There are fewer reported refusals for random route selection (which is natural considering the fact that random route selection can not be affected by wrong addresses, for instance).

Among the applied questionnaires, 43% of the respondents are men. Among the refusals, men count for 48% of the cases. Considering the two lists (titular vs. substitute), among the applied questionnaires with titulars, 43% were men, the corresponding figure for substitutes being 42%.

Among the refusals, the average age is lower, but considering the applied questionnaire is basically no average age difference between titular and substitutes. Considering both applied questionnaires and refusals, the difference in average ages is very low (0.7-0.8 years).

Average AGE (years)		Initial status		
		List of titulars	List of substitutes	Total
status	Not applied	42,5	46,8	44,4
	applied	48,5	48,4	48,5
	Total	47,7	47,9	47,8

Same differences are noticed when considering the age distributions (see the next two tables), but, overall, the distributions are very similar. The main difference is a higher rejection rate among those aged 30-29 who were selected using random route, and a corresponding lower refusal for those aged between 50 and 59.

			Initial status		
			Titular	Substitute	Total
status	Not applied	age			
		1 18-19	2%	1%	2%
		2 20-29	17%	18%	17%
		3 30-39	31%	17%	25%
		4 40-49	19%	26%	22%
		5 50-59	17%	11%	14%
		6 60-69	6%	12%	9%
		7 70+	9%	14%	11%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	
	applied	1 18-19	3%	2%	2%
		2 20-29	15%	14%	15%
		3 30-39	17%	17%	17%
		4 40-49	16%	22%	17%
		5 50-59	20%	18%	19%
		6 60-69	17%	13%	16%
		7 70+	13%	14%	13%
		Total	100%	100%	100%
	Total	1 18-19	3%	2%	2%
		2 20-29	15%	15%	15%
		3 30-39	19%	17%	18%
		4 40-49	16%	23%	18%
		5 50-59	19%	16%	18%
		6 60-69	16%	13%	15%
		7 70+	12%	14%	13%
Total		100%	100%	100%	

			Selection		
			age	lists	Random route
status	Not applied	1 18-19	2%	0%	2%
		2 20-29	19%	3%	17%
		3 30-39	22%	46%	25%
		4 40-49	23%	21%	22%
		5 50-59	15%	5%	14%
		6 60-69	8%	15%	9%
		7 70+	11%	10%	11%
		Total	100%	100%	100%
	applied	1 18-19	2%	3%	2%
		2 20-29	15%	15%	15%
		3 30-39	19%	14%	17%
		4 40-49	17%	17%	17%
		5 50-59	19%	20%	19%
		6 60-69	16%	17%	16%
		7 70+	13%	14%	13%
		Total	100%	100%	100%
	Total	1 18-19	2%	3%	2%
		2 20-29	16%	14%	15%
		3 30-39	19%	16%	18%
		4 40-49	19%	17%	18%
		5 50-59	18%	19%	18%
		6 60-69	14%	17%	15%
		7 70+	12%	14%	13%
		Total	100%	100%	100%

There was a higher rejection rate among those living in large collective houses (blocks of flats). No differences were noticeable depending of the state of the building (poor, well maintained, etc.) or the wealth of the neighborhood.

		status		Total
		Not applied	applied	
Type of building	Individual house, one household	53,0%	63,7%	60,9%
	House with 2-6 apartments	1,8%	2,9%	2,6%
	6-11 apartments	2,9%	2,1%	2,3%
	Block of flats (12 apartments or more)	41,1%	31,1%	33,7%
	Tent or caravan		0,1%	0,0%
	other	1,1%	0,1%	0,3%
Total		100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

ANNEX.

Sampling procedure: WVS Romania 2012

Mircea Comşa, Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj

Romanian Group for Studying Social Values

Targeted sample size:

1500.

Sampling universe:

Persons 18-85 years who are resident in private households in Romania

N = 17,494,061 (INSSE, Tempo-Online, www.insse.ro)

Remarks:

Areas of the population excluded:

- Temporary emigrants (around 5-10%);
- Homeless, foreigners and institutional population (maximum 0.5%).

Sampling frame:

Voting precincts (districts) used for Local elections in 2012

Remarks:

- **The electoral lists were recently updated, but they may still include inaccurate data (deceased, moved) (~5%).**
- We will not consider special voting districts (military areas), voting districts from abroad and the voting districts with any electors.
- Roma/Gypsies are a little under-represented in voting lists because of lack of identity cards for some of them. In our previous samples the weight of gypsies was 1.5-2% (according to INS they are 2.5% from total population).

Sample type:

Stratified two-stage probability sampling, with stratification in the first stage of the primary selection units (voting districts) proportional to their number of secondary selection units (adults registered on the voting lists).

Stratification factors:

- The socio-cultural area (18 areas)

-The type and size of the locality (poor communes, medium developed communes, developed communes, cities with less than 30 thousands inhabitants, cities of 30-100 thousands inhabitants, cities of 100-200 thousands inhabitants, cities with more than 200 thousands inhabitants)

Stages

Stage 1:

Primary sampling units: voting districts

Total number of primary sampling units: 150

PSU selection type: probability proportional to size (PPS); size is the number of registered adults

The number of PSU's to be selected within a stratum is obtained by multiplying the sample size $n = 1,500$ with the proportion p_i of each stratum in the population of electors. The number of voting districts used for selection is obtained by $np_i / 10$ (usually not an integer).

Stage 2:

10 registered electors are selected by systematic sampling with equal probabilities from the electoral list of a selected voting district.

Sampled unit after office sampling:

Individuals (name, address, age).

Call-backs: 4

The call-backs are scheduled for different days of the week and different times of the day.

We will try to convert the soft refusals.

Allowed substitutions:

1. No substitution within the household is allowed. However, we admit the below exception.
2. Tenants:

Premises

- In Romania, some 90% of the households own their house. Some 5% benefit from social housing or have a house given by their employer. All these people are registered on the voting lists.
- The remaining 5% are tenants, most of them not being enlisted on the voting lists. However, for most of these houses, the owner is enlisted on the respective voting list (in the section where the house belong; the owner is usually also enlisted on the voting lists from the place where he actually lives)

Decision:

- Let's suppose that Ion Ionescu is selected from the voting lists. Contacting him at the indicated address proves that he is only the owner, but at the respective address there are tenants living. Ion Ionescu will be replaced in this case (and only in this case) by one of the tenants, randomly selected within the household by using the rule of having the first letter of his/her name closer to the beginning of the alphabet.

Main and secondary samples:

Premises

- Huge external (irregular) migration affects Romania. Some 4 million out of 21.5 are said to be part of the phenomena. Most of this migration started in 2001-2006. This makes difficult to compare the resulting sample to the framework given by the 2002 census. The 2011 census data is suspected to be poor in quality.
- There are very different response rates from one locality to another, depending on the size of locality, the distance to Bucharest, the North-South and East-West location etc. One may opt for designing different sample sizes for each locality type, depending on the expected response rate and desired number of interviews. However, this may make extremely difficult to administrate the entire data collection, and would actually modify the resulting (average) response rate.
- In order to avoid at least one of the two above biases in the sample structure and to allow creating a reliable weighting procedure, one may opt for reducing the second source of errors (given by the different response rates within various localities). The practice of surveying in Romania, offers the solution below, which led to excellent results in the previous researches.

Decision:

- For each voting section there will be two random samples drawn from the voting lists.
 - The main list of subjects will include 10 people (randomly selected).
 - The secondary list of subjects will include 10 people. They are also randomly selected from the voting lists, in such a way that they have a low probability to belong to the same household with any of the people from the main list (however, if any of the people from the secondary list break this rule, he/she will be automatically removed from the respective list).
 - The field operator will start by interviewing the people from the main list of subjects. In case of no contact/refusal to answer of any of these "titulars", the operator will approach the first name from the secondary list. If another "titular" can not be contacted or refuses to answer, the second person from the secondary list will be approached etc.
 - At the end of the process, in each voting section, the sample will contain about the same number of interviews as the desired one. (Some of the questionnaires will not be filled in and others will be excluded from analysis for various reasons related to the reliability of the field operators). The overall structure will not differ from the structure of the population at least on geographical, locality size and ethnical criteria.

Weighting:

According to sampling schema this is a self-weighted sample (the design weights are equal to 1).

To adjust for differential response rate, most probably the final sample will be weighted in order to reproduce the population structure by sex x age x locality type (according to 2011 Census data).