Sociology is first of all responsibility [TM]

IPSC® **Institute for Political and Sociological Consulting**

SURVEY:

Poll: Last Assessment of Pre-Electoral Armenia

DOCUMENT:

METHODOLOGICAL REPORT
April, 2012

Poll: Last Assessment of Pre-Electoral Armenia

SOCIOLOGICAL OPINION POLL

Methodological Report

Approved

Seal

CONTENT

Introduction

The opinion poll is designed according to the internationally recognized standards and best practices through the intense communication and agreement upon the methodology, questionnaire, sample calculation process and quality control mechanisms with *TNS opinion* (www.tnsglobal.com) a leading pollster on politics and elections. The trainings for interviewers and fieldwork implementation were monitored by *TNS opinion*. Experts from *TNS opinion* visited IPSC during 22-25 February, 2012 to discuss the design, methodology and challenges of the poll and to monitor the institutional capacities of IPSC for both projects implementation (personnel, logistics, organizational culture, etc.). The partner was also in charge of questionnaire translation approval and for the quality control of the fieldwork. *TNS opinion* representatives conducted parallel visits and call backs to monitor the quality of interviewers' work in the field.

TNS opinion is supposed to submit a separate quality control report over the fieldwork implementation and data monitoring.

1. **Sample Description**

Taking into consideration the coverage and the main purpose of the poll the sample was designed a multi-stage, random (probability) sampling design was used. In the first stage, primary sampling units (PSU) were selected from each of the administrative regional units. This was agreed as best methodology between IPSC and *TNS opinion*.

The sample was designed according to the following steps:

Step 1. Sample size calculation

Step 2. Distribution of sample size among RA Marzes and Yerevan

Step 3. Selection of the cities, villages and the streets in Yerevan

Step 4. Design of random walking method principals.

STEP 1. Sample size calculation:

At the given parameters of **N=2,521,167**, γ=95% confidence and Δ=±2.43 marginal error, the sample size for the Republic of Armenia (RA) **n=1,600**, plus 1.5% for possible invalid questionnaires and missing values the final sample size for RA is **n=1,624**.

The distribution of sample size among Yerevan and Marzes is represented below.

Location	18+ population (de facto)	%	n–sample size
Yerevan	887,737	35.2%	572
Marzes	1,633,430	64.8%	1,052
Total	**2,521,167**	**100.0%**	**1,624**

Table 1. Distribution of sample in RA among Yerevan and marzes

STEP 2. Distribution of sample size among regions and Yerevan

The opinion poll was conducted in all 10 Marzes of RA and in all the communities of Yerevan. Firstly, the sample was proportionally distributed in all RA Marzes and Yerevan communities. After making corrections, based on decision of minimal sample size for each community and Marz, the sample was finally designed.

The sample distribution in Yerevan communities is shown below in the Table 2. It should be noted that Norq Marash and Nubarashen communities due to their small population size were included in the opinion poll attached accordingly to Kentron and Erebuni communities.

Community	18+ population (de facto)	%	Sample size – n, (after corrections)	Number of questionnaires received
Ajapnyak	85,435	9.6	55	55
Avan	40,750	4.6	34	34
Arabkir	109,870	12.4	68	68
Davitashen	31,568	3.6	30	30
Erebuni + Nubarashen	100,988	11.4	64	64
Kentron + Norq Marash	118,156	13.3	70	70
Malatia - Sebastia	113,092	12.7	69	69
Nor Norq	113,136	12.7	68	68
Shengavit	111,877	12.6	69	69
Qanaqer- Zeytun	62,865	7.1	45	45
Total	**887,737**	**100.0**	**572**	**572**

Table 2. Sample distribution in Yerevan communities

The sample is distributed among all 10 Marzes of RA and the final regional sample is presented in the Table 3.

Marzes	18+ population (de jure)	%	Sample size, (after corrections)	Urban % (de jure)	Rural % (de jure)	Urban sample size (after corrections)	Rural sample size (after corrections)	Urban/number of questionnaires received	Rural/number of questionnaires received
Aragatsotn	106,244	6.5%	83	24.2%	75.8%	20	63	20	63
Ararat	213,415	13.1%	124	29.5%	70.5%	37	87	37	87
Armavir	216,591	13.3%	126	36.4%	63.6%	46	80	46	80
Gegharquniq	180,065	11.0%	112	34.3%	65.7%	38	74	38	73
Lori	219,469	13.4%	126	59.3%	40.7%	75	51	75	51
Kotayq	218,325	13.4%	126	56.7%	43.3%	71	55	71	55
Shirak	214,109	13.1%	124	61.1%	38.9%	76	48	76	48
Syuniq	119,077	7.3%	89	69.5%	30.5%	62	27	62	27
Vayoc Dzor	42,912	2.6%	60	35.4%	64.7%	21	39	21	39
Tavush	103,223	6.3%	82	39.9%	60.1%	33	49	33	49
Total	**1,633,430**	**100.0%**	**1,052**			**479**	**573**	**479**	**572**

Table 3. Sample distribution in RA Marzes

STEP 3. Selection of the cities, villages and the streets in Yerevan

On the next step of sampling rural and urban sample was calculated based on the population size. Number of villages and cities from each Marz was selected according to the sample size of that Marz. Afterwards, the villages and cities in a separate Marz were selected by random choice technique from the combined list of all Marz villages and cities. The minimal sample for each rural community was set to not less than 8 household members and for each urban community was set to not less than 16

household members. Totally 21 cities and 56 villages were selected from Marzes and 58 streets were selected in Yerevan.

STEP 4. Design of random walking method principals

While using random walking method the following principles were kept:

1. **Selection of the building/house in the street and the apartment (in case of the buildings)**
   The step of selecting the building/house was based on the following method:
   - In urban communities the interviewer counted the number of buildings/houses in the given street and then divided this number into the number of interviews that should be conducted in that street. The received figure was the step of selecting the building/house.
   - The step of the apartment in the building is a standard step, i.e. each 5th apartment in Yerevan and each 3rd in Marz cities. If there is a multi-storey building (more than 10 storey block or more than 3 entrances) – 2 interviews per building were allowed.
   - In rural communities the random walking step was each 3rd right wing house.

2. **Selection of the respondent in the family**
   Respondents were selected from all household members aged 18+ whose birthday is the closest to the day that interview takes place. Up to 2 call-back visits per address were performed (3 in the Marzes and maximum possible in Yerevan) when:
   - the respondent asked to come later, as it was not appropriate time for him/her;
   - the respondent was not at home;
   - no one was available at the moment and neighbours say they will be late.

   No call-back visits in the situations when:

   - the respondent was not available (is abroad, is in the army, etc.) during the fieldwork days;
   - the respondent refused to participate in the interview;
   - no one is available and the neighbours said the apartment/house was not inhabited;
   - the respondent was sick and is not able to participate in the opinion poll during the fieldwork days;
   - there were language barriers.

2. Fieldwork description

2.1 Fieldwork duration

The fieldwork was implemented on the following days:

Yerevan - 17.04.2012 – 22.04.2012

Marzes - 17.04.2012 – 21.04.2012

2.2 Days of fieldwork

On each day the following Marzes were visited:

I day – Yerevan, Shirak, Armavir, Lori, Tavush;

II day – Yerevan, Vayots Dzor, Tavush, Aragatsotn, Gegharquniq, Shirak;

III day – Yerevan, Kotayq, Armavir, Tavush, Gegharquniq;

IV day – Yerevan, Aragatsotn, Armavir, Syuniq, Gegharquniq;

V day – Yerevan, Syuniq, Kotayq, Ararat;

VI day – Yerevan.

The number of interviewers working in the field is the following:

Yerevan – 30 interviewers,

Marzes –31 interviewers.

Each interviewer conducted around 8-16 interviews per day.

2.3 The process of fieldwork organization

Each day in Yerevan the fieldwork started from 9.45-11.00 and finished at 20.00-21.00, and in regions from 8.00-9.30 and lasted until 21.00-23.00 (return to Yerevan 23.00-01.00). The filled in questionnaires of each day were accepted and checked every next morning before sending interviewers to the field in order to avoid errors and flaws in the filled questionnaires. Along with this, the interviewers report problems that have occurred during the fieldwork regarding the sample, the interviews, etc. Each day interviewers were provided with the necessary number of the questionnaires and other materials (routes list, fieldwork guide, sample and questionnaire guides, cards, badges, lighters and etc.).

2.4 Number of received questionnaires

After completion of the fieldwork the number of the questionnaires received from the field composed **1,623**.

2.5 Rejections

In total 5,137 cases were applied. The successful interview rate composes 31.6%. The rate of rejections is presented in the table below. The table includes the reasons of not selecting the household and not interviewing the selected adults.

Reasons for not interviewing in the household	Cases	%
Conducted interviews	1,623	31.6%
Not conducted interviews	3,514	68.4%
Total	5,137	100.0%
Reasons for not conducting interviews in the household	Cases	%
Address not found	344	9.8%
Empty address	719	20.5%
Reconstruction	24	0.7%
No reply	205	5.8%
No need of call-back visit (limitation up to 3 call-back visits)	273	7.8%
Refusal without opening the door	604	17.2%
A person owns several houses which are included in the sample step	3	0.1%
The adults return home late	25	0.7%
The respondent is a sociologist with whom we do not conduct	2	0.1%
Family problems	2	0.1%
The central entry door of the building was locked	40	1.1%
The family lives in the apartment for a short period of time	15	0.4%
The family/respondent will return home late	66	1.9%
All the members of family are not citizen of Armenia	33	0.9%
Language problems	3	0.1%
It was necessary to conduct a revisit but the interviewer didn't conduct	4	0.1%
The door is not opened	320	9.1%
Missing	2	0.1%
Eligible adult selected	830	23.6%
of which:		
• Selected adult refused to answer to questions	160	19.28%
• The respondent returns late	367	44.22%
• Health problems	47	5.66%
• Selected adult does not live in the household temporary	100	12.05%
• The respondent lives at the apartment less than 6 months	29	3.49%
• Interview interrupted	71	8.55%
• Selected adult is out of home	44	5.30%
• Family problems	5	0.60%
• While conducting an interview another sample unit	4	0.48%
• Refusal from other family members	1	0.12%
• Language problems	2	0.24%

Table 4. Reasons for not conducting Interviews in the household

2.6 The problems during the fieldwork

The following table represents the main problems which were encountered during the fieldwork and the solution given to them by IPSC:

№	Problem	Solution
1.	It was difficult to keep random walking steps in the villages, as the houses did not have numbers.	Interviewers were instructed to follow the right-wing step principle and enter each 3rd house in the line.
2.	The apartment numbers were mixed in some multi-storey buildings in Yerevan and other towns, so it was impossible to follow the numbering (for example: apartment №28 was the next after apartment №2).	In these cases interviewers entered each 5th for Yerevan and 3rd for Marzes apartment without keeping the numbers.
3.	The interviewers have missed some information (time, refusal reasons etc.) when filling in the contact lists.	On the second day of the fieldwork last minute trainings were organized with each group to clarify all the issues regarding the contact list completion.
4.	Originally selected 2 villages were substituted: Fialetovo by Margahovit and Lermontov by Gugarq (Lori marz), because the main population are Russians, who do not speak or understand Armenian	N/A
5.	Originally selected village Vaghatur was substituted by Verishen village in Syunik Region because of the bad road conditions and landslide.	N/A

Table 5. Problems identified during the fieldworks and the proposed solutions

3. Quality Control and Monitoring

The quality check-up of interviewers and the work conducted in the framework of the opinion poll has been implemented in the following stages:

3.1 Interviewers' control by the field coordinators (quality control coordinators)
3.2 Primary check-up of the received questionnaires quality
- Technical monitoring of the questionnaires
- Content and logical monitoring of the questionnaires

3.3 Call check-ups
3.4 Return visits.

3.1 Interviewers' Control by the Field Coordinators

Each interviewer has been controlled by the field coordinators during the opinion poll. The coordinators have been present at the interviews and have taken notes over the conducted work (both about the sample preservation and the way of interview conduction) guided by initially instructed standards. The controlled questionnaires have been signed by the coordinator with blue pen.

All interviewers have been controlled during the fieldwork. The coordinators have been present in average at 7 interviews per day. As a result the rate of controlled interviews composed **18.7%**.

3.2 Primary Check-Up of Questionnaire Quality

a. Technical Monitoring of Questionnaire

All the questionnaires (**100%**) have been strictly checked by the person responsible for the questionnaire quality. The systematic omissions discovered have been filled in by the interviewers through phone calls, and non-systematic ones through phone calls by the control specialist. During the questionnaires check-up the following points have been specially noted:

- ✓ Comparability of interview duration and minutes marked on the questionnaire,
- ✓ Clear and right infill of demographic questions and their logical correspondence to the questionnaire in general,
- ✓ In-fill rate of the respondents' telephone number and address,
- ✓ Distribution of addresses according to sampling rules,
- ✓ Sameness of handwriting and pen ink per interviewer,
- ✓ In-fill of the interviewer's data (code, name, surname),
- ✓ In-fill of the technical data (location code, questionnaire number, etc.),
- ✓ Presence of interview minutes and contact information in not less than 85% of questionnaires of each interviewer.

b. Content and logical analyses of the questionnaires

All the questionnaires (**100%**) have been monitored by the Quality Control Department of IPSC with the focus on the following criteria:

- ✓ Keeping the passages within the questionnaire,
- ✓ Non-adequate and wrong answers,
- ✓ Logic of the responses to cross questions,
- ✓ General logic of the questionnaire,
- ✓ Inconsistency within the responses,
- ✓ Technical problems (omissions),
- ✓ Number of "Don't know"s (D./K.) responses supposing passages,
- ✓ Detection of new, non-recurring information and repetition of information,
- ✓ Detection of systematic errors,
- ✓ Detection and counting of missing responses.

The person responsible has made corresponding notes over the problems and has passed the information to the Quality Control Manager.

As a result of the questionnaire primary check-up **5** questionnaires has been found invalid and were rejected from the fieldwork.

3.3 Phone call check-ups

In total **30.2%** of the questionnaires has been checked up through phone calls. The distribution according to the interviewers has been maintained. The following variables were controlled over the phone calls:

- ✓ Respondent's age,
- ✓ Respondent's gender,
- ✓ Respondent's education,
- ✓ Topic of the opinion poll,
- ✓ Interviewer's gender,
- ✓ Interview duration,
- ✓ 3 questions of and 1 out of the questionnaire.

As a result no questionnaire was found as invalid.

3.4 Return Visits

As a result of return visits **3.5 %** of interviews have been checked up. The distribution according to the interviewers has been maintained. The variables have been as follows:

- ✓ Respondent's age,
- ✓ Respondent's gender,
- ✓ Respondent's education,
- ✓ Respondent's address,
- ✓ Respondent selection method,
- ✓ Number of people who participated in the interview,
- ✓ Number of interviews conducted in a family,

- ✓ Topic of the opinion poll,
- ✓ Interviewer's gender,
- ✓ Interview duration,
- ✓ 3 questions of and 1 out of the questionnaire.

As a result no questionnaire was found as invalid.

3.5 Final Results of Quality Control and Check-Up

The following table summarizes the quality control results described above:

Quality Control	Accompanied visit		Phone Call		Return Visits		Total	
Number of Questionnaires	Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity	%
1,623	303	18.7%	490	30.2%	57	3.5%	850	**52.4%**
Evidence	Coordinators signature on the questionnaire by blue pen		Callers list of telephone numbers to be called		Coordinators signature on the questionnaire by red pen			

Table 6. The Results of the Quality Check-Up

Invalid Questionnaires	Questionnaire Monitoring		Phone Call		Return Visits		Total		Database
Number of Questionnaires	Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity
1,623	5	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	0.3%	**1,618**

Table 7. Invalid questionnaires

As a result of the quality control and monitoring the opinion poll has been qualified as **APPROVED**: **1,618** questionnaires entered into the SPSS database are considered valid.

4. Data Processing

Data processing has been implemented through the following steps:

1. Questionnaire design,
2. Training of the interviewers,
3. Pilot testing and preparation of the final field version of the questionnaire,
4. Preliminary and secondary control of the questionnaires and identification of problems occurring during fieldwork,
5. Professional editing and coding,
6. Preparation of SPSS database,
7. Data entry into the database,
8. Final checking and cleaning of the database.

4.1 Questionnaire design and pilot test preparation

The quantitative survey questionnaire has been developed and edited by the specialists of IPSC. The questionnaire has been intensively discussed and finalized together with the Client (*European Friends of Armenia*) and *TNS opinion*. For some questions consistency with the questionnaire of the previous poll of March 2012 was kept, while many questions were adapted to local cultural contest. The final version of the questionnaire was proof-read for English/Armenian consistency by specialists from *TNS opinion.*

The prepared questionnaire includes in total 31 questions (25 content and 6 demographic questions) according to the project tasks and objectives (is composed of 10 x A4 pages). The final version of the questionnaire in English is attached to this Methodological Report in *Appendix 2*. The final version of the questionnaire in Armenian is presented in *Appendix 3*.

4.2 – 4. 3 Questionnaire instruction, testing and preparation of field version

Being present at the questionnaire instruction is a mandatory condition for all interviewers. The instruction is organized of the following sections:

➤ Presentation of survey tasks and objectives,
➤ Introduction to the questionnaire,
➤ Role play,
➤ General institutional training.

The instructions have taken place in three stages:

1. **First Stage** (April 13, 2012) – during this stage the interviewers were introduced with the questionnaire and the sample peculiarities. After the training, each interviewer conducted two pilot interviews based on which the Data Manager has been informed about the obvious errors, as well as about several issues which have been incomprehensible for the respondents. Based on the pilot interview results the questionnaire was revised, finalized and sent to be printed. Based on the final version of the questionnaire a Questionnaire Completion Guide to was developed by the Data Manager where all the technical and content information is introduced in regard to the filling of the questionnaire.

2. **Second Stage** (April 16, 2012) – the interviewers were introduced with the final and approved version of the questionnaire.
3. **Third Stage** (April16, 2012) – to revise the questionnaire and to avoid technical and content errors during the interview a role play has been scheduled later that day, during which one of the interviewers has acted as a respondent, while the other one as an interviewer. The corresponding specialists of IPSC have noted the errors during the interview and informed the all the interviewers about that.

4.4 Primary and secondary check-up of the questionnaires right after field stage

The main stages of data processing are presented below which follow the field stage:

1. **Primary check-Up of the questionnaires by the quality controllers:** the questionnaires from the field were checked by the corresponding specialists of IPSC. During the verification process specific attention has been paid to content errors, omissions, to wrong in-fill of the questionnaire and the deviation from the sample. At the beginning of each field day the interviewers have been informed about the errors to reduce the possibility of making the same errors during the following days.

2. **Secondary check-up of the questionnaire through phone calls.** On this stage the questionnaires have been checked through phone calls after which all the invalid questionnaires have been removed. Based on the provided information Quality Control Manager has selected the processed questionnaire to pas them for the next stage of the database completion.

3. **After the first two stages the questionnaires are being numbered:** only based on the numbering the questionnaires are entered into the database. Besides the questionnaires, the contact lists were also being numbered. After it the corresponding specialists have reviewed all the lists which include logical analyzes and coding to finalize and prepare for data entry.

4.5 Professional editing and coding

On this stage following the field the coders extracted responses to the semi-closed questions, which include also the "Other" option for some questions. The responses of the respondents were professionally treated based on which classified coding categories were created aimed at categorizing those questions. Furthermore, each questionnaire has been processed through the coding list and all the semi-closed questions have been coded. Each coder was responsible for a given section of the coding (for some open-end questions and for "Other"). After coding, all the coded questionnaires were entered into the database by the data entry operators.

4.6 SPSS database preparation

Based on the final version of the questionnaires an SPSS database was prepared which consists of 254 variables. During the database preparation peculiarities of each question were taken into account and

necessary information about variables and their values was inserted. The open-ended questions codes were entered into the database as well.

4.7 Data entry

Data entry was performed by 3 data entry operators, using in total 4 computers (3 data entry computers plus 1 computer of a supervisor). The operators have been instructed on the data entry logic before the data entry process. The data entry operators were also provided with Data Entry Guide with detailed description of each variable to be entered. The whole process of data entry was monitored by Data Manager.

25% (each 4th questionnaire) of all entered questionnaires was checked by operators after the data entry process was completed. In case of every detected mistake the data entry operator had to check one additional questionnaire. As a result, 25% of the questionnaires have been verified in 100% accuracy.

4.8 Database clean-up

The database quality check is followed by the database clean-up process which is composed of the two stages:

I. Discovery and correction of errors found in the database. The database clean-up is implemented based on the frequencies analysis, which, as a rule, is implied for categories such as gender, age, residence, aimed at correcting possible inconsistencies.

II. After the clean-up of the residence codes and codes of the interviewers, other independent variables are being cleaned according to each question, and the visible errors are being eliminated based on the data from the corresponding paper questionnaire.

After the final database was ready the special statistical operations were performed to maintain data consistency. The processing showed 18 (random 1%) inconsistent questionnaires (percentage of missing values more than $^1/_3$ of total, invalid data, etc.). These questionnaires were deleted from the final database, which thus includes **1,600 confirmed cases**.

The data was weighted according to region, age, gender to make it accurate to a maximum margin of error of ±2.4% for the overall sample.

After finishing all these stages the database was sent for the data analysis and final report preparation, which is submitted to the Client separately from this Methodological Report.

Appendix 1.   Route list and contact sheet form

№			Հարցման թերթիկ №
_/04/12	Շտրախկոդի բար _	11.	Հարցման կրթություն 1. Միջնակարգ կամ ցածր 2. Միջին մասնագիտական կամ թերի բարձրագույն 3. Բարձրագույն կամ բարձր	
		10.	Տարիք	
Ամսաթիվ		9.	8. Ընդհատման պատճառները 1. Հետաձգված հնդիրներ 2. Հետաքրքրված չէ 3. Այլ ժամանակ չունի 4. Հանձնարել է 5. Ոչվերադառնում է պատասխանել հարցերին 6. Հետանմելան հնդիրներ	Սեռ 1. արական 2. իգական
	Մեուն ազգանուն	7. Մերժման պատճառները 1. Հետաքրքրված չէ 2. Ժամանակ չունի 3. Չի վստահում 4. Երբեք չի տալիս այսպիսի հարցումներին 5. Ոչվերադառնում է պատասխանել հարցերին 6. Հետանմելան հնդիրներ 7. Այլ		
Բնակավայր		6. Հարցազրույցի սկսել ընտրված հարցերի հետ	
	ԵոՐoA-3/12	5. Հարցազրույցի սկսել	
		4. Բնակարանի կյամ	
		3. Չնեղի №	
Կացարանայնության կյամ	2. Հասցե		
1.		Կատարված 1. այո 2. ոչ	
Ամսաթիվ	Ժամ		

Հարցման թերթիկ №						
	1	2	3	4	5	6