

Life in Transition Survey IV for the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Technical report

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms.....	5
1 Introduction.....	6
1.1 Background to the survey	6
1.2 Project overview	6
1.3 Project management	9
2 Development and translation of fieldwork materials and survey tools.....	12
2.1 Questionnaire development	12
2.2 Development of other survey materials	16
3 Sampling.....	18
3.1 Survey population	18
3.2 Sampling frames	18
3.3 Sample design	22
4 Translation of the questionnaire and survey materials.....	26
4.1 Languages covered	26
4.2 Translation team and coordination.....	27
4.3 Translation Notes	28
4.4 Translation trainings	28
4.5 The Translation Process	28
4.6 Other translated fieldwork materials	30
5 Interviewer selection and training.....	32
5.1 Central Train-the-Trainer briefing	32
5.2 Interviewer training.....	33
6 Mainstage fieldwork	37
6.1 Overview.....	37
6.2 Fieldwork progress.....	38
6.3 Interview length	40
6.4 Questionnaire feedback	42
6.5 Respondent profile	42
6.6 Incentives	46
6.7 Fieldwork quality control	47
6.8 Fieldwork outcomes	49
7 Data processing.....	52
7.1 Overview of data processing stage	52
7.2 Data processing and quality control.....	52
7.3 Data protection	55
8 Weighting	56
8.1 Sample design weights	56
8.2 Post-stratification or calibration weights	58
8.3 Trimming weights	59

8.4 Country population (cross-national) weights 59

Abbreviations and acronyms

CAPI	Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing
CCT	Central Coordination Team
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ECS	Electronic Contact Sheet
PSU	Primary Sampling Unit

1 Introduction

1.1 Background to the survey

The Life in Transition Survey (LiTS) seeks to understand how shifts in the role of the state, economic reforms and other ‘transition’ policies are perceived by those who live through them. The focus of the initial survey, in 2006, was the former Communist bloc and Türkiye, but the scope of LiTS has expanded to include other countries in which the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) now operates as well as including western comparator countries, and shows the many forms that political and economic transition can take. This wave of the survey covered 33 EBRD economies and four comparator economies, making it the most ambitious in scale to date and following possibly one of the most turbulent periods in recent history across the whole world. The LiTS has been carried out 3 times previously, in 2006, 2010 and 2016.

Since LiTS III (2016), many economies covered by the survey have experienced great change. Most recently, the COVID-19 pandemic has affected countries globally including those covered by LiTS. The pandemic has exacerbated what were already fragile social, economic and political developments in the region. The economies of two of the largest countries covered by LiTS, Russia and Türkiye, had been described as stagnant before the COVID-19 pandemic.

This wave, for the first time, LiTS will look at countries in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean, and their journey through transition. LiTS is a critical data source for the EBRD. It allows it to understand how transition has affected the lives of people in the region, and how economic characteristics and experiences affect people’s views on issues such as markets, the role of the state, trust, happiness, and prospects for the future. Since the first LiTS round in 2006, three Transition Reports – the EBRD’s flagship publication – have been primarily or partly based on the LiTS. LiTS data are also used to support EBRD’s project work on economic inclusion and the new “Investment Climate and Governance Initiative”.

The LiTS is also an important public good. It has been extensively used by the policy and research community in analysing economic and social problems in the transition region. This encompasses a diverse range of topics including financial development, the impact of the 2008-09 crisis, institutions, corruption, public services, social inclusion, happiness, and social trust.

There has been much political and economic change in the region since LiTS III. The survey will be an important tool to help the EBRD understand the transition process.

1.2 Project overview

The survey explores a range of issues concerning discrimination based on grounds prohibited by EU and international human rights law such as sex, race, skin colour, ethnic origin, religion or religious belief, membership of a national minority, disability, age or sexual orientation, as well as respondents’ experience of harassment, policing and violence (including hate crime). Other thematic areas that the survey covers include rights awareness, civic and political participation, and group relations. To allow for analysis on housing, income and living conditions, it additionally collected a number of relevant demographic characteristics of persons and households.

The survey was conducted in 33 countries of operation of EBRD as well as four comparator countries: Algeria, Belarus, Germany and Russia. It was conducted among the general population aged 18 and over living in each of the survey countries.

In advance of the main stage fieldwork, a pilot was conducted in all countries to test the questionnaire, all fieldwork materials and sampling approaches. The pilot fieldwork stage took place during the summer of 2022 – a separate report details the findings and recommendations from the pilot. A number of amendments were made following the pilot. Mainstage fieldwork was carried out from October 2022.

The survey was conducted face-to-face interviewing using random probability sampling methods in all countries except in Czechia where a quota sampling approach was implemented. Interviews were carried out in-home.

A total of 37,489 interviews were achieved in the mainstage.

Table 1.1: Key features of the survey

Country	Fieldwork start date	Fieldwork end date	Number of interviews	Sampling method
Albania	23/10/2022	17/03/2023	1,039	Random walk
Algeria	08/11/2022	19/02/2023	1,000	Random walk
Armenia	07/11/2022	12/03/2023	1,012	Random walk
Azerbaijan	03/01/2022	05/07/2023	1,012	Random walk
Belarus	13/03/2023	03/11/2023	1,002	Random walk
Bosnia and Herzegovina	22/10/2022	10/02/2023	1,003	Random walk
Bulgaria	24/10/2022	09/02/2023	1,008	Address register
Croatia	29/10/2022	04/03/2023	1,006	Random walk
Czechia	22/10/2022	31/05/2023	1,055	Quota
Estonia	27/10/2022	31/03/2023	1,009	Individual register
Georgia	25/10/2022	26/12/2022	1,003	Random walk
Germany	28/10/2022	05/03/2023	1,020	Random walk
Greece	12/12/2022	10/03/2023	1,001	Random walk
Hungary	31/10/2022	04/04/2023	1,000	Individual register
Jordan	18/10/2022	30/01/2023	1,019	Random walk
Kazakhstan	17/11/2022	10/02/2022	1,028	Random walk
Kosovo	04/11/2022	02/04/2023	1,004	Random walk
Kyrgyz Republic	19/11/2022	21/02/2023	1,002	Random walk
Latvia	02/12/2022	09/08/2023	1,004	Random walk
Lebanon	23/11/2022	08/03/2023	1,010	Random walk
Lithuania	11/11/2022	11/04/2023	1,005	Address register
Moldova	10/11/2022	28/04/2022	1,002	Random walk
Mongolia	21/11/2022	02/04/2023	1,001	Random walk
Montenegro	29/10/2022	28/01/2023	1,006	Random walk
Morocco	16/11/2022	28/02/2023	1,000	Random walk
North Macedonia	02/11/2022	08/02/2023	1,002	Random walk
Poland	18/10/2022	04/12/2023	1,005	Address register
Romania	01/11/2022	14/02/2023	1,010	Random walk
Russia	03/11/2022	19/12/2022	1,017	Random walk
Serbia	26/10/2022	10/02/2023	1,001	Random walk
Slovak Republic	28/10/2022	06/02/2023	1,002	Random walk
Slovenia	18/10/2022	09/02/2023	1,004	Individual register
Tajikistan	01/12/2022	16/08/2023	1,034	Random walk
Tunisia	26/10/2022	17/02/2023	1,036	Random walk
Türkiye	01/11/2022	18/07/2023	1,109	Individual register
Uzbekistan	30/01/2023	28/08/2023	1,006	Random walk
West Bank and Gaza	17/11/2022	13/04/2023	1,012	Random walk

1.3 Project management

1.3.1 Ipsos Central Coordination team

EBRD managed the survey in close cooperation with the contractor, Ipsos. The Ipsos Central Coordination Team (CCT) was responsible for the overall coordination and management of LiTS IV.

The CCT itself was made up of professionals from the Ipsos Public Affairs, all of whom have extensive experience in delivering large, multi-country studies, led by Sara Grant-Vest (Project Director), Tanja Stojadinović (Sampling and Weighting Director) and Jelena Krstic (Project Manager).

The team was further supported by a number of project executives: Ljubica Conic, Svetoslav Hristov, and Monika Nadjer. Due to the large number of countries included in the survey, responsibilities for inter-partner liaison were shared between these three ‘hub’ coordination managers, each responsible for day-to-day correspondence with the local agencies. In addition, Lucija Bosnjak support Tanja with the sampling and weighting tasks.

Figure 1.1: Management structure



1.3.2 Local agencies and project managers

The national research teams consisted of local Ipsos offices and Ipsos network partners. Each research team assigned a project manager to lead the project at country-level. The contracted agencies and local project managers for the pilot and mainstage of the project are summarised in the Table 1.2.

Table 1.2: Local agencies

Country	Fieldwork agency
Albania	Ipsos
Algeria	Ipsos
Armenia	Media Model
Azerbaijan	SIAR Research and Consulting Group
Belarus	SIAR Research and Consulting Group with SATIO
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Ipsos
Bulgaria	Ipsos
Croatia	Ipsos
Czechia	Median
Estonia	B&B Research
Georgia	IPM
Germany	Ipsos
Greece	Ipsos
Hungary	Ipsos
Jordan	Ipsos
Kazakhstan	Ipsos
Kosovo	Ipsos
Kyrgyz Republic	SIAR Consult
Latvia	Latvian Facts and SIA Aptauju Centrs
Lebanon	Ipsos
Lithuania	Baltic Surveys
Moldova	IMAS
Mongolia	SIAR Consult
Montenegro	Ipsos
Morocco	Ipsos
North Macedonia	Ipsos
Poland	Ipsos
Romania	Ipsos
Russia	Ipsos
Serbia	Ipsos
Slovak Republic	ACRC
Slovenia	Ipsos
Tajikistan	SIAR Research and Consulting Group with YMS LLC
Tunisia	Ipsos
Türkiye	Ipsos
Uzbekistan	SIAR Research and Consulting Group with MAMC TADQIQOT
West Bank and Gaza	Ipsos and Alpha Research

1.3.3 Permissions to conduct the research

In several countries permission to conduct the research had to be granted from the relevant local and national governments. This activity was led by the local teams with support from EBRD as required. This is summarised in table 1.3.

Table 1.3: Organisation from which permission was needed to proceed with the survey

	Local/National authority
Egypt	Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics Egypt Permission was never granted in Egypt despite multiple attempts by both EBRD and Ipsos to contact the relevant authorities and submitting the required information
Jordan	Department of Statistics, Intelligence Department, Ministry of Interior
Kazakhstan	Akimats of settlements included in the sample
Tajikistan	Statistics Committee
Uzbekistan	16 different ministries/departments – see below
West Bank and Gaza	Ministry of Interior

In Uzbekistan, a change in local requirement meant that permission had to be sought from 16 different ministries and government departments. Letters were sent to all of these by the local teams but not all responded. It was decided by the local team to proceed with the survey regardless as none of the organisations contacted replied to survey could not go ahead.

Table 1.4: Organisations from which permission was sought in Uzbekistan

No response received
Committee under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ministry of Investment, Industry and Trade
Ministry of Finance and Economy
Ministry of Poverty Reduction and Employment
Central Bank
Agency of Tashkent region khokimiyat
Agency of Surkhandarya region khokimiyat
Agency of Jizzakh region khokimiyat
Agency of Tashkent city khokimiyat
Ministry of Communal Services
Promised to answer
Committee on Religious Affairs under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan
Agency for Statistics under President of the Republic of Uzbekistan
Ministry of Construction and Housing and Communal Services
Gave permission
Ministry of Health
Ministry of Internal Affairs
Agency of Samarkand region khokimiyat

2 Development and translation of fieldwork materials and survey tools

2.1 Questionnaire development

A draft questionnaire was provided by EBRD based on previous rounds of LiTS with the addition of several new questions. Ipsos worked closely with EBRD on the development of the final questionnaire.

The structure of the questionnaire¹ followed a modular approach and was divided into the following sections as presented in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Overview of questionnaire structure and content

Section	Topics covered
Introduction and household roster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Household information (household grid: age, gender and relationship to head of household of each household member) • Language, marital status and education level of primary respondent/other knowledgeable household member where applicable • Education level of respondents' mother and father
Dwelling and assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age and most recent refurbishment of the dwelling • Size and purpose of rooms • Ownership of dwelling, ownership of other property and land • Household assets including mobile phone and car ownership • Expenditure and cost of living
Work and learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment history including sector and type of occupation • Income and employee benefits • Education and skills requirements for current job • Reasons for unemployment • Current/recent participation in education or training
Attitudes and values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views on the political situation of the country • Quality of life • Trust in other and institutions • Views on government priorities and different economic and political systems • Risk taking • Climate change and environmental issues
Migration and remittances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Household members who have migrated or currently live in another country • Remittances received
Digitalisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of the internet including 3G, 4G, mobile data and WiFi • Online privacy • Computer skills
Impact of the crisis (COVID-19)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of COVID-19 on household income, education and health • Views on government policy in response to COVID-19
Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General health • COVID-19 vaccination status • Self-identification of belonging to different societal groups • Religion • Parents' and grandparents' involvement in WW2 • Attitudes towards equality, including gender, LGBTQ+ people and migrants

¹ The final source questionnaire is provided in the Annex 1.

Sections 1 and 2 of the questionnaire were to be answered by a knowledgeable household member. If this was not the randomly selected respondent, another household member could answer these questions. These sections could be answered either at the start of the questionnaire or the end.

In Albania, Armenia, Georgia, Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan an additional module on climate change was included on behalf of the World Bank.

2.1.2 Country-specific tailoring

A number of country-specific questions/categories were required in order to accurately capture the education level of respondents and household income.

Education

The questions regarding the highest level of education gained within a survey country were based on the internationally comparable ISCED 2011 categories.² The local project managers provided the country specific categories for use in their respective countries along with how they would be mapped onto the harmonised code frame, which were approved by EBRD prior to their use.

Income

Respondents were asked about their household's monthly income (2.25) and if they were working their earnings in a typical month from the main (3.13) and other jobs (3.14). This was recorded in local currency.

Sale of assets

Respondents were asked how much they could sell various of their household assets for (e.g., dwelling, car), with responses recorded in the local currency (2.30).

Bank accounts

The largest 10 banks in each country were listed for the question asking about which bank the respondent held their primary bank account with (2.34). These were provided by EBRD and verified by the local teams. The post office was included, where applicable, and respondents were also able to state other banks with these responses recorded verbatim.

Emergency payment

For the question measuring whether a household could afford to make an emergency payment (2.28), the amount specified was set at 1/20 of the gross national income per capita. It was specified in the local currency.

Place of previous residence, birth and secondary schooling

For countries included in the survey, a list of regions at the NUTS1 level or equivalent were pre-programmed into the script for selection of area where respondents and previously lived, were born and completed secondary school. For all non-survey countries, the region was recorded verbatim.

Questions on receiving amounts of money

Questions 4.15a and 8.10 asked respondents if they would prefer to receive 55% of the median household daily income or 85% of the median household daily income in different time periods. The question included the local currency units and the euro equivalents.

² <https://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/international-standard-classification-of-education-isced-2011-en.pdf>

Questions on remittances

In section 5 questions on the amount of remittances sent or received could be recorded in the local currency or in euros.

Identity

A list of different identities covering nationality, ethnicity, regional affiliation and religion was prepared for each country for use on a question about identity (8.11). This was compiled by the local teams under the guidance of EBRD.

2.1.3 Questions excluded by country

Due to local laws and sensitivities in some countries certain questions had to be excluded. Table 2.2 provides these details.

Table 2.2: Questions excluded by country

Question	Country exclusions
1.08a	Words 'or long-term partner' excluded in Jordan
3.47, option 2	Slovenia
4.01a, h, i	Jordan, Morocco, Belarus
4.03b, c, d, e, f, g	Belarus
4.03l	Morocco
4.07a	Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, West Bank and Gaza
4.07b	Belarus
4.08a-e	Morocco, Belarus
4.08a, c	Jordan
4.09a	Belarus
4.10b part a	Belarus
4.10b part c	Jordan, Morocco, Belarus
4.10b part d	Jordan, Belarus
4.14a-c	Morocco, Belarus
4.14c	Jordan
4.15	Belarus
5.20, 5.21, 5.23, 5.24	Belarus
8.11	Morocco
8.14, 8.14b, 8.14c	Morocco
8.26b	Algeria, West Bank and Gaza
8.27a	Algeria
8.29a-d	Algeria, Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia, Uzbekistan, West Bank and Gaza
8.29d	Jordan
8.30	Algeria, Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia, Uzbekistan, West Bank and Gaza
8.31c	Belarus
8.31e	West Bank and Gaza
8.35	Belarus
QRecontact	Germany
GPSPermission	Germany, Russia, Tunisia

2.1.4 Scripting

Interviewing was conducted face-to-face via CAPI in all countries. The CAPI data collection used interviewer touch-screen devices (tablets). Ipsos' iField data collection platform was used to field the questionnaire. iField is a fully integrated system covering all aspects of data collection for face-to-face surveys, including random probability and quota.

The contact sheet and questionnaire were scripted by Ipsos once the Word versions of both documents were initially approved by EBRD. The Word documents contained the scripting instructions necessary for the scripters (e.g., the conditions for questions to be skipped, whether questions are single or multi-coded, whether certain text should be underlined, in certain colours etc.).

The Electronic Contact Sheet (ECS) and the questionnaire were set-up so that the relevant information collected during completion of the ECS was pulled through to the questionnaire, that is, the names/initials, age and gender of eligible household members.

The following checks were made on the scripted ECS and questionnaire:

- manually checking the questionnaire for accuracy and completeness; and
- flooding the script with dummy data and checking the data output files to ensure that all questions were being asked and that all routing was correct based on the expected base sizes for each question if the routing had been accurately implemented.

EBRD also extensively checked both the ECS and questionnaire scripts and provided detailed feedback.

When the iField scripts were approved by EBRD, they were then exported into an 'MR Translate' (MRT) file. This is an Excel file which contains the full questionnaire and any necessary 'code' that affects the appearance of the script on the devices used for data collection (for example, whether text should start on a new line or be a certain font colour or style). This is the version of the questionnaire that was used for translation.

Once the translated/adapted versions of the ECS and questionnaire were approved, the source script was overwritten with the country/language versions of the scripts. The translated ECS and questionnaire scripts were provided to the local project managers to check that the country/language versions of the scripts had been correctly uploaded.

2.1.5 Key post-pilot questionnaire changes

A number of recommendations were made for changes to the questionnaire following the pilot. The full list can be found in the Pilot Report. Key changes made are as follows.

Table 2.3: Summary of main post-pilot questionnaire changes

Issue	Change made
Interview length	Due to the interview length the following questions were removed from the questionnaire for the main stage of data collection: 2.02, 3.17, 3.48, 3.49, 4.23c-g-h-i- k-l-m, 5.22, 6.09, 7.07.2, 8.07 answer options reduced
Mismatch between verbatim responses and interviewer coding of occupation (Q3.20, Q3.36b)	It had initially been intended to record verbatim the respondents current and previous occupation in the pilot only. However, given that coding occupation on the spot is a demanding requirement, verbatim responses for occupation were recorded as well as interviewers coding this during the interview for EBRD to check post-data collection.
New questions	The following questions were added for the main stage data collection: 3.35b, 7.13, 7.14,

2.2 Development of other survey materials

In addition to the questionnaire, the following list of materials was used for the implementation of the survey:

- Electronic contact sheets
- Introductory letter
- Privacy notice
- Showcards
- Interviewer manual

2.2.1 Electronic Contact Sheet (ECS)

LiTS IV made use of Ipsos' integrated data collection platform, iField, which includes an Electronic Contact Sheet (ECS). The use of contact sheets was a vital part of the sampling procedures and underwent significant development to make them as easy to administer as possible, while capturing the necessary information in light of the different sampling methods undertaken across the survey countries.

The ECS was used to manage the sample, screen households, make appointments, select the respondents for interview (if applicable) and start the interview. The ECS and main survey data were designed to be linked via the iField portal.

Four versions of the ECS

1. Random walk: this was used in all countries except those listed below.
2. Address register: Bulgaria, Lithuania, Poland, Türkiye.
3. Individual register: Estonia, Hungary, Slovenia.
4. Quota: Czechia.

The following tables provide the structure of the ECS.

Table 2.4: Structure of electronic contact sheets used for random walk/address/ individual sampling approaches

Section	Content
General information	<input type="checkbox"/> Entering selected address (random route only) <input type="checkbox"/> Numbers of dwelling units and dwelling unit selection
Neighbourhood characteristics (core addresses only)	<input type="checkbox"/> Confirmation that address is main and residential <input type="checkbox"/> Type and condition of accommodation (interviewer assessment) <input type="checkbox"/> Presence of entry phone system
Date and time of visit	<input type="checkbox"/> Date and time of each visit
Introduction and respondent selection	<input type="checkbox"/> Survey introduction <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent selection
Interim and final outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> The outcome of each visit to each address

Table 2.5: Structure of electronic contact sheet used for quota approach

Section	Content
General information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Address information ▪ Date and time visit
Introduction and screening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Survey introduction ▪ Assessment of eligibility if screening refused
Final outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Final outcome of visit

2.2.2 Respondent-facing materials

The respondent-facing materials for the survey were developed by Ipsos in close collaboration with EBRD, building on those already used in previous rounds of LiTS. Table 2.6 provides an overview of respondent-facing materials and their use.

Table 2.6: Overview of respondent-facing materials

Material	Overview of content
Information letter	The letter provided information on the survey topic and length, the incentive and the survey sponsor.
Privacy notice	The privacy notice consisted of a detailed description of what kind of personal data EBRD collects from respondents and how the agency uses that data, in line with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) requirements. It also provided details on who respondents could contact with an enquiry or complaint.
Showcards	Showcards were based on the approved questionnaire translations and used in paper format.

All materials were translated into all survey languages used.

2.2.3 Interviewer manual

An interviewer manual was developed to accompany interviewer training and served as a reference for interviewers once fieldwork had started. The interviewer training manual was largely based on the one used for LiTS III but was adapted and tailored to reflect the sampling and random walk requirements for LiTS IV including how to use the ECS and with question specific guidance for the LiTS IV questionnaire. The following topics were covered:

- Introduction, background and objectives of the survey
- Sampling and contact sheet
- Fieldwork and maximising response rates
- Ethical and cultural considerations
- Fieldwork materials
- Quality control and interviewer feedback.

The interviewer manual was translated into the main national language of each country and tailored as necessary according to the sampling method implemented.

3 Sampling

This section defines the survey population, describes the sample frames available across all 37 countries covered by the survey and provides a description of the sampling methodologies implemented.

3.1 Survey population

The survey population is defined as adults aged 18 years and above, who live in private households and have lived in the selected household for at least six months.

In each country, at least 1,000 households were interviewed. The main survey respondent was selected randomly among all eligible household members in all countries except for Czechia, where a quota approach was used. When the main respondent was not able to answer the household modules of the questionnaire (sections 1 and 2), the head of household or another knowledgeable household member was asked to complete these modules. All other modules of the questionnaire were completed by the main respondent.

3.2 Sampling frames

In the survey preparatory phase, suitable sample frames that would make it possible to create representative random probability samples were sought in each country. Ideally, registers that allow direct sampling of individuals (adults aged 18 and above) would be used in each. However, sample frames of this type were accessible only in Estonia, Hungary and Slovenia.

In Bulgaria, Lithuania, Poland and Türkiye, address registers that enable direct sampling of addresses were available. In the remaining countries no sampling frames that would allow direct sampling of individuals or addresses were accessible. In these, the smallest sampling units that could be preselected from existing lists were identified, within which addresses could later be sampled by interviewers.

Details of the available population and address registers used for direct sampling of individuals or addresses are provided in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Population and address registers

Country	Register type	Register name	Register provider	Update
Bulgaria	Address	National Classifier of Current and Permanent Addresses, Civil Registration and Administrative services (GRAO);	Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works	2021
Estonia	Individual	Estonian Population Register (Rahvastikuregister)	Ministry of Internal Affairs	Register is continuously updated
Hungary	Individual	National Population Register	Ministry of the Interior	Register is continuously updated
Lithuania	Address	Registru Centras	The State Enterprise Centre of Registers	2022
Poland	Address	National Official Register of the Territorial Division of the Country	Central Statistical Office	2018
Slovenia	Individual	Central Population Register (CRP)	Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia	Updated on the first day of each month
Türkiye	Address	Address based population register system (ABPRS)	TURKSTAT	The register is updated twice a year, in February and August.

For those countries where registers that would enable direct sampling of individuals or addresses were not accessible for research purposes, addresses had to be selected through applying random walk procedures. For this approach it is necessary that information on population numbers for relatively small territorial units that can be covered in the random walk is available. In countries where the population or individual registers were available it was also beneficial to use relatively small territorial units, to organise interviewers' work within them. Exhaustive national lists of suitable sampling units were available in all the countries where the survey was conducted. These units were used in the first stage of the sample selection, that is, they served as Primary Sampling Units (PSUs).

In Germany and Slovenia an exhaustive list of territorial units was only available for larger units, but it was possible to split these territories further, and select smaller units in the second stage of the sample selection – these units served as Secondary Sampling Units (SSUs).

In the cases of larger PSUs in other countries, the selection of addresses in the next sampling stage was spread across different parts of the PSU; for register samples, individuals or addresses were selected randomly across the whole territory of the PSU, while in case of the selection via random walk, multiple starting points were used to ensure covering different parts of the PSU.

Table 3.2: Primary sampling units (PSUs)

Country	Primary Sampling Units (PSUs)	Provider of the list	Update
Albania	Polling station territories	Central Election Commission of the Republic of Albania	2021
Algeria	Communes	National Statistics Office	2008 ³
Armenia	Polling station territories	Central Election Commission	2020
Azerbaijan	Census list of administrative areas	State Statistical Committee	2009 ⁴
Belarus	Administrative areas	National Statistical Committee of the Republic of Belarus	2018
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Polling station territories	Central Election Commission Bosnia and Herzegovina	2008 ⁵
Bulgaria	Electoral areas	Civil Registration and Administrative services (GRAO)	2021
Croatia	Polling station territories	State Electoral Commission of the Republic of Croatia	2021
Czechia	Settlements	Population Register, Czech Statistical Office	2021
Estonia	Territorial units (LAU2, reformatted)	Population Register (Statistics Estonia)	2021
Georgia	Geo-administrative areas (created by the National Statistics Office of Georgia)	Statistics Committee of Georgia	2015
Germany	Municipalities	DESTATIS	2015
Greece	Settlements	Hellenic Statistical Authority	2011 ⁶
Hungary	Settlements	Hungarian Statistical Office	2019
Jordan	Governorate sub-districts	Department of Statistics	2019
Kazakhstan	Census list of administrative areas	National Statistical Committee	2021
Kosovo	Polling station territories	Central Election Commission Republic of Kosovo	2014
Kyrgyz Republic	Settlements	National Census of Kyrgyz Republic	2009 ⁷
Latvia	Lower administrative territorial units	The Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs	2021
Lebanon	Municipalities	Ministry of Interior and Municipalities	2018
Lithuania	Municipalities	Agency of Central Electoral Commission of the Republic of Lithuania	2022 (preliminary data)
Moldova	Polling station territories	Central Electoral Committee (www.cec.md)	2021
Mongolia	Soums + districts of Ulaanbaatar	National Census of Mongolia	2020
Montenegro	Polling station territories	State Election Commission of Montenegro	2011 ⁸
Morocco	Province (or Préfecture) x Urbanity	The High Commission for Planning (HCP), Moroccan national statistics office	2018

³ The data collection for Census 2022 was underway during the LiTS IV sample selection.

⁴ The 2019 Census data was not released at PSU level by the time the LiTS IV sample selection.

⁵ This was the latest available update of the PSU list.

⁶ The 2021 Census data was not released by the time of the LiTS IV sample selection.

⁷ The 2022 Census data was not released by the time of the LiTS IV sample selection.

⁸ This was the latest available update of the PSU list.

North Macedonia	Polling station territories	State Election Commission of Macedonia	2017
Poland	Statistical Areas	Central Statistical Office	2018
Romania	Electoral territorial units	Permanent Electoral Authority	2020
Russia	Geo-administrative census area sample frame	National Statistical Office	2010 ⁹
Serbia	Polling station territories	Republic Electoral Commission Republic of Serbia	2011 ¹⁰
Slovak Republic	Settlements	Population Register, Slovak Statistical Office	2021
Slovenia	Municipalities	Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia (SURS)	2021
Tajikistan	Census list of administrative areas	Statistical Agency under President	2020
Tunisia	Municipality x Urbanity	Institute of Statistics	2014
Türkiye	ABPRS district list	TURKSTAT	2021
Uzbekistan	Census list of administrative areas	State Committee on Statistics	1989 ¹¹
West Bank and Gaza	Localities	Central Bureau of Statistics	2021

Details on the SSUs used in Germany and Slovenia are provided in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: Secondary sampling units (SSUs)

Country	Secondary Sampling Units (SSUs)	Provider of the list	Update
Germany	ADM areas	ADM-Master-Sample	2015
Slovenia	Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia (SURS) PSUs	Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia (SURS)	2021

⁹ The 2020 Census data was not released at PSU level by the time of the LiTS IV sample selection.

¹⁰ This was the latest available update of the PSU list.

¹¹ The new census was set to be carried out in 2022 but it had been postponed to 2023. Interior Ministry updates the latest census data twice a year based on citizens' legal registration form, however this data is not available.

3.3 Sample design

The selection of the sample design for each country was based on accessibility of the sampling sources and the local circumstances. In all countries, a multi-stage clustered sample design was used, with primary sampling units (PSUs) selected at the first stage, and one of the following methods used for second stage selection:

- Addresses or individuals selected randomly from registers;
- Addresses selected via random walk;
- Addresses and individuals selected conveniently, following a quota approach (Czechia only)¹².

When addresses were selected in the second stage (from either an address register or via random walk), another stage of selection was implemented – an individual was randomly selected from among all individuals eligible for the survey at the address. In Czechia, the main respondent was selected based on quotas set on gender by age and education.

The approaches to selecting the addresses and main respondents in each surveyed country is presented in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4: Approaches to selecting addresses and main respondents

Country	Approach to selecting addresses	Approach to selecting main respondents ¹³
Albania	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Algeria	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Armenia	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Azerbaijan	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Belarus	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Bulgaria	Address register	Random selection in the ECS
Croatia	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Czechia	Quota	Quota
Estonia	Individual register	Individual register
Georgia	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Germany	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Greece	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Hungary	Individual register	Individual register
Jordan	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Kazakhstan	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS

¹² Response rates to random probability surveys in Czechia have been on the continual decline which means the samples delivered by random probability sampling offer limited advantage over quota-based samples and in turn have become prohibitively expensive. After speaking to the most reputable fieldwork agencies in the country and learning that other major studies have been moved from random probability to quota sampling, it was decided to implement a quota approach for Czechia in LiTS IV.

¹³ ECS stands for Electronic Contact Sheet.

Kosovo	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Kyrgyz Republic	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Latvia	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Lebanon	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Lithuania	Address register	Random selection in the ECS
Moldova	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Mongolia	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Montenegro	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Morocco	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
North Macedonia	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Poland	Address register	Random selection in the ECS
Romania	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Russia	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Serbia	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Slovak Republic	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Slovenia	Individual register	Individual register
Tajikistan	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Tunisia	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
Türkiye	Address register	Random selection in the ECS
Uzbekistan	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS
West Bank and Gaza	Random walk	Random selection in the ECS

The following sections provide more details on each stage of selection.

3.3.1 Sampling unit selection

The intention when selecting the PSUs is to arrive at a ‘balanced’ (stratified) selection of PSUs. The stratification increases the precision of survey estimates when using the variables which are linked to the key survey variables, as it ensures that the sample proportions match the wider country population proportions on these variables. Region and urbanity were used to stratify the samples. In each country, the selection of 50 PSUs was distributed in proportion to the most recent population statistics across region by urbanity.

In those countries included in LiTS II and/or LiTS III, 33 PSUs were selected among the LiTS II and/or LiTS III sample PSUs – ‘repeat’ PSUs,¹⁴ while the remaining 17 PSUs were selected among PSUs that were not included in LiTS II and LiTS III samples – ‘fresh’ PSUs.¹⁵

The 33 ‘repeat’ PSUs were allocated in proportion to the population statistics across region by urbanity strata, in the same way the entire sample of 50 PSUs was distributed. When the number of LiTS II PSUs available and identified in the current full PSU list was higher than the number of PSUs allocated to the stratum for the LiTS IV sample, a random selection was done. Equal probabilities of selection were

¹⁴ All LiTS II were selected in LiTS III, and an additional set of PSUs was added to the LiTS III sample.

¹⁵ LiTS II and LiTS III did not include Algeria, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia and West Bank and Gaza. The described approach to selecting ‘repeat’ and ‘fresh’ PSUs was applied in all other countries.

assumed at this stage, given that a selection with Probabilities Proportional to Size (PPS) was already applied in LiTS II. When the number of available LiTS II PSUs was lower than the number allocated to the stratum for the LiTS IV sample, all LiTS II PSUs were selected, and the remaining PSUs were randomly selected from LiTS III PSUs that were not part of the LiTS II sample following the same logic.¹⁶

The 17 'fresh' PSUs were also allocated in proportion to the population statistics across region by urbanity strata, and within each stratum a random selection with PPS was applied.

In countries not included in LiTS II or LiTS III, 50 PSUs were selected from the full list of PSUs following the allocation of PSUs in proportion to the most recent population statistics across region by urbanity strata. The PSUs were selected randomly with PPS, in the same way fresh PSUs were selected in other countries.

In Germany and Slovenia, within each sampled PSU, selection of the Secondary Sampling Units (SSUs) replicated the procedures implemented when selecting the PSUs.

3.3.2 Address selection

Within PSUs, addresses were selected randomly in all countries except for Czechia.¹⁷ In the case of address registers, they were selected randomly from among all addresses in the PSU. In countries where direct sampling of individuals or addresses was not possible, the addresses were selected randomly through the application of the random walk procedures, starting from a randomly selected address and selecting every *n*th address on the walk.

For addresses with multiple dwelling units or multiple households, additional steps of selection were implemented:

- a. If addresses were selected from an address register, interviewers were asked to confirm if multiple dwelling units were found at the address (for example, if an apartment was split in two and the register data had not been updated accordingly). In those cases, one dwelling unit was randomly selected within the Electronic Contact Sheet (ECS).
- b. If addresses were selected from an address register or via the random walk, interviewers were asked to confirm if more than one household was found at the address/ dwelling unit. In those cases, one household was randomly selected within the ECS.

In each PSU, at least 20 households completed the survey.

3.3.3 Main respondent selection

In countries where an individual register was available, the main respondent was randomly selected among all eligible individuals within the PSU. In Czechia, the main respondent was selected following quotas set on gender by age and on education.

In countries where addresses were selected from an address register or via the random walk method, the main respondent was randomly selected among all eligible household members. All eligible

¹⁶ Greece was not included in LiTS II, so all repeat PSUs were selected from the LiTS III sample.

¹⁷ In case of individual registers, individuals were selected randomly among all individuals in the PSU. In Czechia, individuals were selected based on pre-defined quotas.

household members were listed in the Electronic Contact Sheet (ECS) which is programmed to make a random selection.

3.3.4 Sample adjustment in Türkiye due to Earthquake

Following the earthquake during June 2023 fieldwork work became infeasible in nine PSUs as these areas entered a state of emergency. In total, 89 interviews had already taken place in these PSUs.

To ensure a nationally representative sample in Türkiye nine new PSUs were draw, seven from the fresh sample and two from the repeat sample. The new PSUs required 20 complete interviews meaning that in the final sample for Türkiye there are 50 PSUs with at least 20 completed interviews and an additional 89 interviews from the nine PSUs affected by the earthquake where fieldwork became infeasible.

4 Translation of the questionnaire and survey materials

4.1 Languages covered

A total of 48 target language versions were prepared for the LiTS IV, however 47 target language versions were used during the study¹⁸. Some countries (e.g., Estonia) used more than one language, whilst others used adapted versions of base translation texts (e.g., Russian in Latvia). Table 4.1 details the range of languages prepared for the survey.

Table 4.1: Language versions prepared for the LiTS IV questionnaire

Country	Language	Separate translation process required?	Adapted from (if country/territory shares a language[s] with another)
Albania	Albanian	Yes	
Algeria	Arabic	No	Egypt (Classic Arabic)
Armenia	Armenian	Yes	
Azerbaijan	Azeri	Yes	
	Russian	No	Russian (Based on version from Estonia)
Belarus	Belarusian	Yes	
	Russian	No	Russian (Based on version from Estonia)
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bosnian	Yes	
Bulgaria	Bulgarian	Yes	
Croatia	Croatian	Yes	
Czechia	Czech	Yes	
Egypt	Classic Arabic	Yes	
Estonia	Estonian	Yes	
	Russian	Yes	
Georgia	Georgian	Yes	
Germany	German	Yes	
Greece	Greek	Yes	
Hungary	Hungarian	Yes	
Jordan	Classic Arabic	No	Egypt (Classic Arabic)
Kazakhstan	Kazakh	Yes	
	Russian	No	Russian (Based on version from Estonia)
Kosovo	Albanian	No	Albania (Albanian)
	Serbian	No	Serbia (Serbian)
Kyrgyz Republic	Kyrgyz	Yes	
	Russian	No	Russian (Based on version from Estonia)
Latvia	Latvian	Yes	
	Russian	No	Russian (Based on version from Estonia)
Lebanon	Arabic	No	Egypt (Classic Arabic)
Lithuania	Lithuanian	Yes	
Moldova	Mongolian	No	Romania (Romanian)

¹⁸ Egypt did not take part in the LiTS IV fieldwork.

	Russian	No	Russian (Based on version from Estonia)
Mongolia	Mongolian	Yes	
Montenegro	Montenegrin	No	Serbia (Serbian)
Morocco	Moroccan Arabic	Yes	
North Macedonia	Albanian	No	Albania (Albanian)
	Macedonian	Yes	
Poland	Polish	Yes	
Romania	Romanian	Yes	
Russia	Russian	No	Russian (Based on version from Estonia)
Serbia	Serbian	Yes	
Slovakia	Slovak	Yes	
Slovenia	Slovenian	Yes	
Tajikistan	Tajik	Yes	
Tunisia	Tunisian Arabic	Yes	
Türkiye	Turkish	Yes	
Uzbekistan	Russian	No	Russian (Based on version from Estonia)
	Uzbek	Yes	
West Bank and Gaza	Classic Arabic	No	Egypt (Classic Arabic)

4.2 Translation team and coordination

The translation process for LiTS IV was managed centrally by the Ipsos CCT. The team was responsible for coordinating the translation of the questionnaire (as well as other fieldwork materials), collecting feedback, making recommendations, and the overall documentation of the translation process.

cApStAn (Ipsos' translation partner) was responsible for coordinating the translation process locally, distributing all translation materials to the translators, providing direct assistance and feedback to their linguists, and collating the translations. The project manager from cApStAn liaised with the Ipsos CCT when they encountered difficulties or had any queries.

Aside from the Ipsos CCT, the following people were involved in the questionnaire translation of the LiTS IV questionnaire:

- The **translators** from cApStAn who were responsible for producing the first-line translations.
- The **verifiers** from cApStAn who were responsible for reviewing the translation produced by translators and producing the final translation.
- The **adapters** from cApStAn who were responsible for producing the adapted versions of the questionnaire based on the first-line translations.
- The country **project managers** were responsible for reviewing the final translation produced by the verifiers.

The linguists (translator, verifiers and adapters) were selected on the basis of being fluent in both English and the target language, having experience of translating questionnaires and other materials for market and social research purposes.

4.3 Translation Notes

Item-specific translation and adaptation notes were added when preparing the source version: these include clear instructions about national adaptations that were necessary, desirable or ruled out; information about the question intent; and clarifications about the way certain terms or phrases should be understood, so that the translators, the verifier and the adaptors were guided in their work without having to cycle back and forth between several reference documents. They were also intended to provide guidance on how to accurately and consistently translate or adapt question stems, response options or categories, instructions for the interviewers, recurring expressions or repeated response options. The translation and adaptation notes were included in the Translation, Adaptation and Verification File (TAVF).

4.4 Translation trainings

Two web-based training seminars were organised by cApStAn together with Ipsos for the translators and for the verifiers/adaptors separately, using GoToWebinar technology by Citrix. Attending the webinar was a prerequisite for participation in the project.

The webinars – their average duration was 70 minutes – contained a theoretical part (aims of the study, survey-specific features, translation and adaptation guidelines) and a section with guidelines on how to translate, verify and adapt surveys as well as a presentation of the tools to be used during the process. The presentation used PowerPoint slides and ended with a live demonstration on how to work with the project's Excel file (TAVF) and OmegaT software.

cApStAn walked the participants through the translation and verification design, explained the workflows, drew attention to survey-specific aspects, explained how to use the tools and elaborated on selected instructions using concrete examples. cApStAn dedicated a part of the training sessions to the use of OmegaT. The webinars ended by Question & Answers session. At the end, the participants received a link to the recording of their training sessions so that they could consult it again.

4.5 The Translation Process

Two slightly different translation processes were used for the LiTS IV. The one that was employed for each target language depended on whether a separate translation process was required for a target language (i.e., where a translation was made directly from the English language source text), or if a target language version was adapted (for a specific country) from another version of that same language.

The following two sub-sections provide an overview of each of these two translation processes.

4.5.1 Main Translation Process

Translation verification process was used in the LiTS IV which involved one translator and one verifier in each country. Translation verification consists of a systematic comparison of source and target versions, combined with documentation of proposed edits by means of standardised verifier intervention categories.

One translator for each language undertook the translation of the source English questionnaire into the target language versions before the pilot. The translation was prepared in the TAVF using cApStAn software (OmegaT). The existing translation from the LiTS III was shared with cApStAn and added in the translation memory in the OmegaT. The translators translated the new and modified questions/answers scales ensuring coherence between the translation of the new and the existing questions. The

translators were required to simultaneously review the existing questions from previous waves to ensure coherence between the translation of the new and the existing questions.

The verifier reviewed the translation and documented any issues by providing a description of the issues in the TAVF. The verifier compared the target version to the source version sentence-by-sentence, checked that the translation matches the source and is linguistically correct, and checked that the translation notes were taken into account in the translation. The Ipsos CCT systematically reviewed the verifier feedback, resolved residual issues, and made the verified files available to EBRD together with the verification feedback. The verifier updated the translation based on EBRD comments.

Each finalised target questionnaire was proofread by the country project managers from the local agencies. They ensured that no residual errors, typographical errors, punctuation, grammar, accidentally omitted items and the like were present. They also updated the country specific information such as country name, local agency name and incentive amount. The whole questionnaire was also double-checked and validated by the project managers during the script checking process.

Based on the findings from the pilot survey, a number of changes were made to the questionnaire. The impact of these changes on the translations was relatively limited and all post-pilot changes to the translations were implemented by the translators from local agencies and proofread by the local country managers. Final Translation and Verification files were sent to EBRD for approval.

The translation process was expanded for languages spoken in more than one country. An adaption process was used for countries that share a language that is extremely similar to each other or where it is spoken by a minority. The finalised translation was prepared by the country where there is a greater number of speakers of the language, and this was used as a basis and adapted for local use. Further detail on this process and the countries and languages involved can be found in the next sub-chapter of the report.

During the translation process, no major issues were encountered. Overall, the Excel translation file showed that the Translation verification process had been applied correctly and those involved had, where required, argued their cases well, in sufficient detail.

4.5.2 Adaptation translation approach

For countries that share a languages that are extremely similar to each other (e.g. Albanian in Albania and in Kosovo) or where it is spoken by a minority, an initial translation (following the approach described previously) was prepared by the country where there is a greater number of speakers of the language (in this example, Albania). This 'first-line version' was then adapted by a native speaker of the language from the second country, to ensure it was suitable for local usage and context.

Table 4.2 details which countries used the adaptation approach:

Table 4.2: Countries/languages with adaptation

Country	Language(s)	Adapted from:
Algeria	Arabic	Translation adapted from Egypt
Azerbaijan	Russian	Translation adapted from Estonia
Belarus	Russian	Translation adapted from Estonia
Jordan	Classic Arabic	Translation adapted from Egypt
Kazakhstan	Russian	Translation adapted from Estonia
Kosovo	Albanian	Translation adapted from Albania
Kosovo	Serbian	Translation adapted from Serbia
Kyrgyz Republic	Russian	Translation adapted from Estonia
Latvia	Russian	Translation adapted from Estonia
Lebanon	Arabic	Translation adapted from Egypt
Moldova	Moldovan	Translation adapted from Romania
Moldova	Russian	Translation adapted from Estonia
Montenegro	Montenegrin	Translation adapted from Serbia
North Macedonia	Albanian	Translation adapted from Albania
Russia	Russian	Translation adapted from Estonia
Uzbekistan	Russian	Translation adapted from Estonia
West Bank and Gaza	Classic Arabic	Translation adapted from Egypt

The following people were involved in the adaptation process:

- The **adapters** from CAPStAn who were responsible for producing the adapted versions of the questionnaire based on the first-line translations.
- The country project managers were responsible for reviewing the adaptation produced by the adaptor and producing the final proofread version.

Adaptors reviewed the first-line versions of the translations in their entirety, making updates as required for usage in their country. The Ipsos CCT created a list in the adaptation template summarising the main items/sentences within the questionnaire that required localisation (e.g., country specific information) to help the adaptor ensure the necessary changes were made to these items. The adaptor ensured that their final translation was consistent across the entire questionnaire. Concise explanations in English were provided by the adaptor about the adaptation made and/or about the proposed resolution of the issue.

This version was submitted to the local agency for final review and validation of the translation to be used for their country. The final review was performed by the country project manager. They prepared the final version of the adapted translation whilst ensuring consistency, accuracy, and adherence to guidelines.

During the adaptation process, no major issues were detected.

4.6 Other translated fieldwork materials

The LiTS IV fieldwork materials were created jointly by Ipsos and EBRD to aid the implementation of the project. As these documents were to be used by the local teams (interviewers, project managers), they needed to be translated from English into the local languages.

Ipsos was responsible for coordinating the translation of all the research tools into the target languages of each country. For survey instruments other than the questionnaire, a single-translation approach and proofread approach was implemented. These translations were undertaken by the translators from local agencies with proof-reading undertaken by the country project managers in each country – given their extensive research experience. Shared languages used one primary translation which was then adapted to accommodate national differences.

The CCT reviewed all translated materials to ensure all key requirements have been actioned, such as the inclusion of country-specific text. The CCT also checked that the layout of the documents was consistent with the original format. This version was provided to EBRD for its approval.

Table 4.3 lists all fieldwork materials that were translated:

Table 4.3: List of the translated fieldwork materials

Material	Document format
Interviewer manual	Word
Introduction letter	Word
Briefing slides	PowerPoint
Privacy notice	Word

5 Interviewer selection and training

This chapter describes the interview selection criteria and process, and the training that interviewers were required to undertake before fieldwork start.

5.1 Central Train-the-Trainer briefing

The train-the-trainer briefing, which formed the basis of the interviewer training for the local project managers to deliver in their countries, was held ahead of the survey pilot. Three briefing sessions were organised to limit the number of project managers attending each to aid engagement, where possible align by sampling methods and accommodate time differences.

- Session 1 was held on 17, 18 and 19 May 2022 and attended by Algeria, Estonia, Egypt, Germany, Greece, Hungary (17/5), Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon Moldova, Montenegro, Morocco, Romania, Slovenia, West Bank and Gaza.
- Session 2 was held on 20, 23, 24 May 2022 and attended by Albania, Bulgaria (20/5), Czechia., Hungary (23, 24/5), Kosovo, Lithuania, North Macedonia, Poland, Slovakia and Türkiye, Slovakia.
- Session 3 was held on 25, 26 and 27 May 2022 Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia, Croatia, Belarus, Bulgaria (26, 27/5), Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Russia, Serbia, Tajikistan, Tunisia and Uzbekistan.

The agenda for the train-the-trainer briefing sessions is provided in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1: Overview of the central project briefing

Welcome, Introduction and overview
Background and policy context of the study
Sampling and how to use the ECS
Fieldwork (introducing the survey, language assistance, maximising response, ethical and cultural considerations and progress reporting)
Questionnaire overview
Group read through of questionnaire with question specific guidance
Interview practice
Pilot requirements and deliverables
Interviewer training
Quality control
ECS repo
Quiz and final Q&A

These sessions were well received overall and seen as well managed and delivered. The role plays and quiz were also noted as very useful by the local project managers.

5.2 Interviewer training

All interviewers who worked on the project received two days of training prior to starting fieldwork, following a very similar agenda to the train-the-trainer session as detailed in section 5.1. In addition, interviewers had to complete and upload test interviews, including practice on the iField contact sheet. These were checked by the local project manager before each interviewer started to work on the project.

Table 5.2 provides a summary of the briefing dates by country.

Table 5.2: Overview of dates of the interviewer training sessions and number of interviewers trained

Country	Date(s)	Format of the briefing	Number of interviewers	
			Briefed	Completing at least one interview
Albania	Briefing 1: 21-22 October 2022 Briefing 2: 4-5 November 2022 Briefing 3: 28 February & 1 March 2023	In person	53	41
Algeria	Briefing 1: 2-3 November 2022 (Algiers) Briefing 2: 4-5 November 2022 (Constantine) Briefing 3: 12-13 November 2022 (Tlemcen) Briefing 7: 20-21 November 2022 (Setif) Briefing 9: 23-24 November 2022 (Tizi Ouzou) Briefing 12: 27, 28, 29 November 2022 Djelfa) Briefing 14: 2-3 December 2022, 2 January 2023 (Oran)	In person	40	38
Armenia	Briefing 1: 5-6 November 2022 Briefing 2: 22-23 November 2022 Briefing 3: 15-16 December 2022	In person	29	17
Azerbaijan	Briefing 1: 21-25 November 2022 Briefing 2: 1-2 December 2022 Briefing 3: 27-28 December 2022 Briefing 4: 9 January 2023 Briefing 5: 28 February 2023 Briefing 6: 16-17 March 2023 Briefing 9: 19-20 May 2023	In person	50	37
Belarus	Briefing 1: 1-2 March 2023 Briefing 2: 6-7 March 2023	In person	92	92
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Briefing 1: 6-7, 18 October 2022	In person and online (18 October)	37	37
Bulgaria	Main briefing: 25-26 September 2022	In person and online	56	51

	Additional online sessions:10 November 2022, 24 November 2022, 2 December 2022.			
Croatia	Day 1: 17 October 2022 Day 2: Several sessions held in October, November and December	Remote	68	55
Czechia	Briefing 1: 3-4 August 2022 Briefing 2: 4-9 September 2022 Briefing 3: 27 September 2022 Briefing 4: 15 January 2023 Briefing 5: 23 February 2023 Briefing 6: 6 March 2023 Briefing 7: 11 April 2023 (The one day sessions were with 1-2 interviews each hence being shorter)	Briefings 1-5: In person Briefings 6-7: Remote	73	40
Estonia	Briefing 1: 6 and 7 October 2022. Briefing 2: 10 and 11 October 2022 Briefing 3: 12 and 13 October 2022 Briefing 4: 12 and 13 December 2022 Briefing 5: 24 and 25 January 2023 Briefing 6: 8 and 9 February 2023	In person/remote	52	33
Georgia	Briefing: 20-21 October 2022	Remote	115	111
Germany	Briefing 1: 28-29 September 2022 Briefing 2: 19-20 October 2022	Remote	35	33
Greece	Briefing 1: 8-9 December 2022 (Athens) Briefing 2: 12-13 December 2022 (Athens) Briefing 3: 15 – 16 December 2022 (Creta) Briefing 4: 27-28 December 2022 (Thessaloniki) Briefing 5: 23-24 January 2023 (Athens)	In person	47	47
Hungary	Briefing 1: 4-5 October 2022 Briefing 2: 10-11 October 2022	In person	78	70
Jordan	Briefing 1: 16, 17, 18 October 2022	In person/remote	53	35
Kazakhstan	Briefing 1: 14, 15 & 16 November 2022	In person/remote	65	65
Kosovo	Briefing 1: 24-25 October 2022 Briefing 2: 7-8 November 2022 Briefing 3: 14-15 November 2022 Briefing 4: 22-23 November 2022 (Serbian interviewers) Briefing 5: 12-13 December 2022 Briefing 6: 12-13 January 2023 Briefing 7: 14-15 February 2023	Remote (Serbian session in person)	88	51
Kyrgyzstan	Briefing 1: 13-14 November 2022 Briefing 2: 17-18 November 2022	In person	50	44

Latvia	Latvian Facts Briefing 1: 29 and 30 November 2022 Briefing 2: 8 and 9 December 2022 Briefing 3: 18 and 19 December 2022 Briefing 4: 4 and 5 January 2023 Briefing 5: 6 and 7 January 2023 Briefing 6: 12 and 13 January 2023 Briefing 7: 4 and 5 April 2023 Briefing 8: 22 and 23 May 2023 Briefing 9: 30 and 31 May 2023	In person	39	17
	SIA Aptauju Centrs Briefing 1: 20 and 22 February 2023 Briefing 2: 6 and 7 June 2023	In person/remote	20	17
Lebanon	Briefing 1: 8-9 November 2022	Remote	42	42
Lithuania	Briefing 1: 2, 3, 4, 6 November 2022	In person/remote	42	30
	Briefing 2: 3-4 February 2023 Briefing 3: 5, 7, 9, 10 February 2023			
Moldova	Briefing 1: 6-8 October 2022	Briefings 1-4: In person; briefing 5 remote	32	19
	Briefing 2: 24-26 November 2022 Briefing 3: 29 November - 1 December 2022 Briefing 4: 15-17 December 2022 Briefing 5 11-13 January 2023			
Mongolia	Briefing 1: 15-16 November 2022 Additional training and briefing sessions were organized regularly until end of the project.	Remote	51	51
Montenegro	Briefing 1: 14-15 October 2022	In person	62	45
	Briefing 2: 24-25 October 2022 Briefing 3: 16-17 November 2022			
Morocco	Briefing 1: 7-8 November 2022	In person	34	31
North Macedonia	Briefing 1: 22-23 October 2022	Briefings 1-2: remote; briefing 3: in person	57	50
	Briefing 2: 3-4 November 2022 Briefing 3: 12-13 November 2022			
Poland	Briefing 1: 5-6 October 2022	Remote	47	47
	Briefing 2: 12-13 October 2022			
Romania	Briefing 1: 14-15 June 2022	Briefing 1: In person, briefings 2 and 3: remote	63	51
	Briefing 2: 21-22 October 2022 Briefing 3: 28 November 2022 (refresher session)			
Russia	Briefing 1: 1, 2, 3, 7 November 2022	1, 2, 3 November: remote; 7 November: in person	122	121
Serbia	Briefing 1: 6 and 20 October 2022	Remote	60	50

Slovakia	Briefing 1: 26-27 October 2022	Remote	60	51
Slovenia	Briefing 1: 6-7 October 2022	Remote	39	38
Tajikistan	Briefing 1: 5-6 November 2022 (Dushanbe), Briefing 2: 7-8 November 2022 (Khatlon) Briefing 3: 9-10 November (Sughd) Briefing 4: 26, 28 May 2023	In person	75	69
Tunisia	Briefing 1: 12-13 October 2022 Briefing 2: 24-25 October 2022 Briefing 3: 26-27 October 2022	In person/remote	25	25
Türkiye	Main briefing: 11 – 12 October 2022 Additional training sessions: 28 November 2022, 4 January 2023, 15 February 2023, 17 April 2023, 21 May 2023	In person/remote	100	71
Uzbekistan	Briefing 1: 9-10 August 2022 Briefing 2: 31 January 2023 (refresher session) Briefing 3: 17-18 March 2023 Briefing 4: 6 July 2023 (refresher session)	In person/remote	64	50
West Bank and Gaza	Briefing 1: 6-7 November 2022	In person	47	42

As can be seen in a number of countries, some interviewers dropped out following the training they received or during the course of fieldwork. A common reason was due to the difficulty of administering the long interview. More details are provided in the country specific sections of the report.

6 Mainstage fieldwork

6.1 Overview

Fieldwork was completed face-to-face using CAPI in all countries, with a total of 1,000 interviews (minimum) conducted per country.

Table 6.1 shows the fieldwork dates and the number of interviewers achieved.

Table 6.1: Fieldwork dates and achieved interviews

Country	Fieldwork start date	Fieldwork end date	Number of interviews
Albania	23/10/2022	17/03/2023	1,039
Algeria	08/11/2022	19/02/2023	1,000
Armenia	07/11/2022	12/03/2023	1,012
Azerbaijan	03/01/2022	05/07/2023	1,012
Belarus	13/03/2023	03/11/2023	1,002
Bosnia and Herzegovina	22/10/2022	10/02/2023	1,003
Bulgaria	24/10/2022	09/02/2023	1,008
Croatia	29/10/2022	04/03/2023	1,006
Czechia	22/10/2022	31/05/2023	1,055
Estonia	27/10/2022	31/03/2023	1,009
Georgia	25/10/2022	25/12/2022	1,003
Germany	28/10/2022	05/03/2023	1,020
Greece	12/12/2022	10/03/2023	1,001
Hungary	31/10/2022	04/04/2023	1,000
Jordan	18/10/2022	30/01/2023	1,019
Kazakhstan	17/11/2022	10/02/2022	1,028
Kosovo	04/11/2022	02/04/2023	1,004
Kyrgyz Republic	19/11/2022	21/02/2023	1,002
Latvia	02/12/2022	09/08/2023	1,004
Lebanon	23/11/2022	08/03/2023	1,010
Lithuania	11/11/2022	11/04/2023	1,005
Moldova	10/11/2022	28/04/2022	1,002
Mongolia	22/11/2022	02/04/2023	1,001
Montenegro	29/10/2022	28/01/2023	1,006
Morocco	16/11/2022	28/02/2023	1,000
North Macedonia	02/11/2022	16/01/2023	1,002
Poland	18/10/2022	04/12/2023	1,005
Romania	01/11/2022	14/02/2023	1,010
Russia	07/11/2022	19/12/2022	1,017
Serbia	26/10/2022	10/02/2023	1,001
Slovak Republic	28/10/2022	06/02/2023	1,002

Latvia	0	0	23	103	152	155	148	114	303	4	2	0	0	1,004
Lebanon	0	87	509	414	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,010
Lithuania	0	159	227	197	229	193	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,005
Moldova	0	14	83	247	101	483	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,002
Mongolia	0	123	473	164	83	157	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,001
Montenegro	77	615	262	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,006
Morocco	0	153	766	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,000
North Macedonia	0	608	369	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,002
Poland	20	448	322	167	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,005
Romania	0	425	188	332	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,010
Russia	0	694	323	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,017
Serbia	16	411	440	123	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,001
Slovak Republic	6	452	332	201	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,002
Slovenia	50	396	242	284	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,004
Tajikistan	0	0	125	175	0	0	0	0	257	475	2	0	0	1,034
Tunisia	115	451	421	43	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,036
Türkiye	0	53	173	190	77	240	92	193	20	71	0	0	0	1,109
Uzbekistan	0	0	0	1	11	165	7	113	250	184	275	0	0	1,006
West Bank and Gaza	0	0	552	408	49	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,012
Algeria	0	365	371	263	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,000

6.2.1 Factors affecting fieldwork

Azerbaijan: The local team did not provide any specific details regarding the longer than average fieldwork period required. It is suspected that there was a shortage in interviewing resources during the first months of fieldwork.

Belarus: The political situation in the country has been difficult throughout fieldwork, delaying both the start of fieldwork and resulting in slow progress. The public are reluctant to participate in surveys and suspicious of interviewers arriving unannounced at their homes. There have been situations where the police have been called requiring the local management team to accompany interviewers in the field and provide documentation about the fieldwork agency which has contributed to the extended fieldwork period.

Czechia: The team commented that the time of year that the fieldwork started (winter) did result in some delays (though this was the same for all countries). Generally they found a fair degree of distrust among the public to participate in this type of data collection and that even highlighting the survey was for an international institution did not help. The interview length was off putting for many. There was also a high degree of interviewer turnover due the complexity and length of the survey which also hindered fieldwork.

Latvia: The start of fieldwork was delayed/impacted due to an increase in the prevalence rate of COVID-19 in Latvia during November 2022 with social distancing messages suggested by state health care institutions. There was also a shortage of interviewing resources. This was in part due to another large scale national survey being run at the same time which was being particularly well paid with many interviewer opting to work on that. The complexity and length of the LiTS IV was off putting to some interviewers. Due to very slow progress with the initially appointment fieldwork agency (Latvian Facts) a second agency was engage (SIA Aptauju Centrs) to cover some sample points. This helped with

progress. Latvian Facts had more success in June when interviewer capacity increased due to the other national survey being completed.

Tajikistan: Fieldwork started in December and progressed very quickly in the first few weeks. Fieldwork was put on hold while the first 50% of the data could be checked which revealed some quality concerns. The local team spent several weeks investigating these and establishing which interviewers could be included in the data. It then took several more weeks for interviewers to be re-briefed and for fieldwork to start again, hence the lack of any interviews being completed between February and May. A letter confirming that government approval had been granted to conduct the survey had been requested by the local team at the outset of the project. While approval was received there was no official letter available. This hindered progress to some extent.

Türkiye: Fieldwork started on time, but the earthquake in the south-eastern part of Türkiye in February 2023, meant fieldwork in this region had to be stopped and the sample points reassigned. Given the scale of the disaster fieldwork was also slower in other regions for a period of time. The general election in May 2023 impacted fieldwork with some potential respondents reluctant to take part in research during this time.

Uzbekistan: The fieldwork started later than planned and shortly before the expected start date, the local team received information that permission from various authorities was needed to proceed. Letters were sent to all these authorities. Eventually responses were only received from three organisations and the local team started fieldwork regardless of this. Reasons given for the slow progress following this include the long interview length, the remote nature of some of the PSUs and the pauses in fieldwork while data quality was checked. Following the latter, due to the length of the pause, some interviewers decided not to work on the project so new teams had to be briefed.

Common issues across countries

Further details on the progress per country and experiences in field are provided in the country specific sections. However, there were some common issues mentioned by some countries.

Bad weather conditions were mentioned by many. This was noted by Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Czechia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Türkiye and Uzbekistan. In all these countries fieldwork was conducted through the height of winter, hence the cold and reduced daylight hours meant conditions were not favourable for interviewers at times, increasing the overall time needed for fieldwork and making it more difficult to keep interviewers engaged with the survey in some instances.

COVID-19 was mentioned as having some sort of impact in 16 out of 37 countries. In Croatia, Germany, Latvia, Mongolia, Poland and Slovakia increases in cases of COVID-19 resulted in some interviewer illness which had an impact on fieldwork to varying degrees. In these countries as well as Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Estonia, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Moldova and Slovenia it was also noted that as a result of the pandemic a general trend has been noticed of the public being more reluctant or cautious of participating in face-to-face, in-home research.

6.3 Interview length

Overall, the median interview length was 62 minutes, ranging from 48 minutes in Moldova to 87 minutes in West Bank and Gaza. Table 6.3 provides a breakdown of the minimum, maximum, mean and median interview length by country. All interviews that were under 50 minutes were validated via back checks or listening to audio-recordings.

Table 6.3: Interview length in minutes

Country	Minimum	Median	Maximum	Mean
Albania	26	51	132	54
Algeria	25	59	110	60
Armenia	30	65	142	66
Azerbaijan	32	61	135	64
Belarus	26	54	139	57
Bosnia and Herzegovina	34	68	129	68
Bulgaria	30	60	137	61
Croatia	30	59	119	61
Czechia	26	65	130	67
Estonia	31	80	132	80
Georgia	28	72	137	73
Germany	37	82	125	83
Greece	35	61	110	63
Hungary	24	62	128	63
Jordan	38	74	136	76
Kazakhstan	25	52	130	55
Kosovo	33	67	125	68
Kyrgyz Republic	25	68	156	71
Latvia	32	66	128	70
Lebanon	29	54	113	55
Lithuania	26	54	98	55
Moldova	31	48	125	51
Mongolia	25	57	136	61
Montenegro	25	59	114	62
Morocco	26	61	118	61
North Macedonia	27	57	133	59
Poland	25	55	130	58
Romania	30	55	131	56
Russia	28	63	137	64
Serbia	26	68	131	70
Slovak Republic	27	63	131	68
Slovenia	29	62	128	65
Tajikistan	31	71	169	73
Tunisia	22	53	112	54
Türkiye	32	62	128	64
Uzbekistan	28	54	141	59
West Bank and Gaza	39	87	130	89
Overall	22	62	169	65

6.4 Questionnaire feedback

While for the majority of counties the median interview length was within the 75 minutes specified in the original terms of reference, every country commented that the interview duration was problematic in some way. The stated interview length in the introduction was off-putting for many respondents so impacting response rates to some degree. Several countries also noted that respondents found the interview long, that some would become impatient for it to be completed and lost concentration in the later sections.

The questions in section 2 regarding income, assets and expenditure were considered intrusive by some, with interviewers noting that some respondents seemed more reluctant to answer these questions. This was highlighted in Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Hungary, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Romania, Russia, Slovakia and Slovenia.

Questions regarding equality and specifically the LGBTQ+ community were met with some resistance in some countries. This includes Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Tajikistan, Türkiye and Uzbekistan. This ranged from interviewers commenting that some respondents were not familiar with the terminology (Armenia) or being reluctant to answer (Lithuania) to some more extreme reactions such as interviewers being told to leave the area in one PSU (in Kazakhstan) and complaints made to the authorities (Türkiye).

In a few countries, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Tajikistan and West Bank and Gaza, the questions in section 4 covering views on the political situation, public bodies government priorities and political systems were less well received by some respondents.

6.5 Respondent profile

Interviews were conducted with one randomly selected respondent in each household (the primary respondent). Where this respondent was not knowledgeable enough to answer the detailed questions about the household, dwelling unit and household expenditure, a second knowledgeable household member was asked to complete these questions (sections 1 and 2 of the questionnaire). A second (knowledgeable) respondent was only required in a small minority of cases (511), with all countries commenting that the household structure meant that the randomly selected respondent was sufficiently knowledgeable to answer all sections of the questionnaire in most cases. Tables 6.4 and 6.5 provide the profile of the primary respondent and of the knowledgeable household member by age and gender (which are very similar given how few second respondents were needed).

Table 6.4: Age and gender profile of the primary respondents

	18-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65+		Male		Female		Total
Country	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Albania	84	8%	175	17%	119	11%	195	19%	195	19%	271	26%	472	45%	567	55%	1,039
Algeria	93	9%	247	25%	254	25%	192	19%	128	13%	86	9%	352	35%	648	65%	1,000
Armenia	56	6%	147	15%	173	17%	145	14%	202	20%	278	28%	315	31%	686	69%	1,001
Azerbaijan	129	13%	234	23%	202	20%	187	18%	174	17%	86	8%	482	48%	530	52%	1,012
Belarus	109	11%	213	21%	213	21%	157	16%	177	18%	133	13%	393	39%	609	61%	1,002
Bosnia and Herzegovina	64	6%	95	9%	138	14%	197	20%	222	22%	287	29%	502	50%	501	50%	1,003
Bulgaria	48	5%	92	9%	149	15%	176	17%	195	19%	348	35%	415	41%	593	59%	1,008
Croatia	68	7%	115	11%	132	13%	146	15%	215	21%	330	33%	426	42%	580	58%	1,006
Czechia	81	8%	199	19%	211	20%	213	20%	187	18%	164	16%	527	50%	528	50%	1,055
Estonia	44	4%	109	11%	174	17%	183	18%	190	19%	309	31%	415	41%	594	59%	1,009
Georgia	66	7%	150	15%	173	17%	139	14%	203	20%	272	27%	315	31%	688	69%	1,003
Germany	77	8%	155	15%	195	19%	193	19%	167	16%	233	23%	514	50%	506	50%	1,020
Greece	54	5%	189	19%	174	17%	202	20%	198	20%	184	18%	451	45%	550	55%	1,001
Hungary	78	8%	125	13%	160	16%	196	20%	165	17%	276	28%	409	41%	591	59%	1,000
Jordan	165	16%	201	20%	240	24%	194	19%	106	10%	113	11%	358	35%	661	65%	1,019
Kazakhstan	132	13%	224	22%	294	29%	195	19%	117	11%	66	6%	370	36%	658	64%	1,028
Kosovo	132	13%	168	17%	182	18%	173	17%	190	19%	159	16%	425	42%	579	58%	1,004
Kyrgyz Republic	99	10%	236	24%	204	20%	178	18%	158	16%	127	13%	403	40%	599	60%	1,002
Latvia	68	7%	104	10%	117	12%	144	14%	161	16%	410	41%	372	37%	632	63%	1,004
Lebanon	106	10%	177	18%	187	19%	207	20%	166	16%	167	17%	438	43%	572	57%	1,010
Lithuania	70	7%	168	17%	147	15%	134	13%	119	12%	367	37%	452	45%	553	55%	1,005
Moldova	72	7%	108	11%	158	16%	130	13%	187	19%	347	35%	327	33%	675	67%	1,002
Mongolia	70	7%	219	22%	260	26%	179	18%	160	16%	113	11%	434	43%	567	57%	1,001
Montenegro	100	10%	223	22%	211	21%	158	16%	126	13%	188	19%	444	44%	562	56%	1,006
Morocco	143	14%	299	30%	231	23%	184	18%	88	9%	55	6%	318	32%	682	68%	1,000
North Macedonia	59	6%	137	14%	183	18%	157	16%	184	18%	282	28%	411	41%	591	59%	1,002
Poland	41	4%	156	16%	177	18%	191	19%	176	18%	264	26%	420	42%	585	58%	1,005
Romania	49	5%	152	15%	188	19%	172	17%	166	16%	283	28%	470	47%	540	53%	1,010
Russia	118	12%	162	16%	229	23%	195	19%	165	16%	148	15%	346	34%	671	66%	1,017
Serbia	87	9%	131	13%	178	18%	206	21%	177	18%	222	22%	456	46%	545	54%	1,001
Slovak Republic	36	4%	104	10%	157	16%	188	19%	222	22%	295	29%	462	46%	540	54%	1,002
Slovenia	67	7%	85	8%	143	14%	163	16%	200	20%	346	34%	461	46%	543	54%	1,004
Tajikistan	142	14%	211	20%	244	24%	196	19%	146	14%	95	9%	337	33%	697	67%	1,034
Tunisia	98	9%	179	17%	216	21%	186	18%	182	18%	175	17%	364	35%	672	65%	1,036
Türkiye	160	14%	338	30%	233	21%	168	15%	130	12%	80	7%	557	50%	552	50%	1,109

Uzbekistan	147	15%	260	26%	232	23%	186	18%	116	12%	65	6%	334	33%	672	67%	1,006
West Bank and Gaza	171	17%	235	23%	243	24%	149	15%	110	11%	104	10%	343	34%	669	66%	1,012

Table 6.5: Gender and age profile of the secondary respondents

	18-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65+		Male		Female		Total
Country	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Albania	84	8%	175	17%	118	11%	195	19%	196	19%	271	26%	472	45%	567	55%	1,039
Algeria	89	9%	245	25%	255	26%	195	20%	130	13%	86	9%	358	36%	642	64%	1,000
Armenia	44	4%	138	14%	168	17%	168	17%	211	21%	272	27%	306	31%	695	69%	1,001
Azerbaijan	129	13%	234	23%	202	20%	187	18%	174	17%	86	8%	482	48%	530	52%	1,012
Belarus	108	11%	213	21%	214	21%	157	16%	177	18%	133	13%	392	39%	610	61%	1,002
Bosnia and Herzegovina	62	6%	93	9%	139	14%	201	20%	221	22%	287	29%	509	51%	494	49%	1,003
Bulgaria	46	5%	92	9%	147	15%	178	18%	196	19%	349	35%	414	41%	594	59%	1,008
Croatia	70	7%	114	11%	136	14%	142	14%	217	22%	327	33%	416	41%	590	59%	1,006
Czechia	81	8%	199	19%	211	20%	213	20%	187	18%	164	16%	527	50%	528	50%	1,055
Estonia	44	4%	109	11%	174	17%	182	18%	190	19%	310	31%	408	40%	601	60%	1,009
Georgia	65	6%	151	15%	174	17%	138	14%	203	20%	272	27%	314	31%	689	69%	1,003
Germany	74	7%	154	15%	195	19%	196	19%	168	16%	233	23%	514	50%	506	50%	1,020
Greece	52	5%	189	19%	175	17%	203	20%	199	20%	183	18%	449	45%	552	55%	1,001
Hungary	78	8%	124	12%	160	16%	198	20%	164	16%	276	28%	407	41%	593	59%	1,000
Jordan	126	12%	195	19%	253	25%	215	21%	117	11%	113	11%	363	36%	656	64%	1,019
Kazakhstan	132	13%	224	22%	294	29%	195	19%	117	11%	66	6%	370	36%	658	64%	1,028
Kosovo	127	13%	165	16%	180	18%	177	18%	193	19%	162	16%	428	43%	576	57%	1,004
Kyrgyz Republic	95	9%	222	22%	203	20%	184	18%	164	16%	134	13%	399	40%	603	60%	1,002
Latvia	66	7%	107	11%	112	11%	143	14%	163	16%	413	41%	374	37%	630	63%	1,004
Lebanon	106	10%	178	18%	186	18%	207	20%	166	16%	167	17%	437	43%	573	57%	1,010
Lithuania	71	7%	168	17%	147	15%	134	13%	119	12%	366	36%	452	45%	553	55%	1,005
Moldova	72	7%	108	11%	158	16%	130	13%	187	19%	347	35%	327	33%	675	67%	1,002
Mongolia	69	7%	221	22%	262	26%	177	18%	160	16%	112	11%	435	43%	566	57%	1,001
Montenegro	96	10%	223	22%	210	21%	157	16%	129	13%	191	19%	448	45%	558	55%	1,006
Morocco	144	14%	299	30%	230	23%	185	19%	87	9%	55	6%	318	32%	682	68%	1,000

North Macedonia	46	5%	131	13%	187	19%	163	16%	187	19%	288	29%	425	42%	577	58%	1,002
Poland	40	4%	155	15%	178	18%	192	19%	176	18%	264	26%	419	42%	586	58%	1,005
Romania	49	5%	152	15%	188	19%	173	17%	165	16%	283	28%	473	47%	537	53%	1,010
Russia	118	12%	162	16%	229	23%	195	19%	165	16%	148	15%	347	34%	670	66%	1,017
Serbia	80	8%	126	13%	179	18%	207	21%	183	18%	226	23%	456	46%	545	54%	1,001
Slovak Republic	35	3%	104	10%	157	16%	189	19%	222	22%	295	29%	459	46%	543	54%	1,002
Slovenia	62	6%	84	8%	145	14%	170	17%	200	20%	343	34%	458	46%	546	54%	1,004
Tajikistan	142	14%	210	20%	244	24%	196	19%	147	14%	95	9%	337	33%	697	67%	1,034
Tunisia	88	8%	175	17%	216	21%	189	18%	191	18%	177	17%	374	36%	662	64%	1,036
Türkiye	161	15%	333	30%	233	21%	171	15%	131	12%	80	7%	557	50%	552	50%	1,109
Uzbekistan	144	14%	260	26%	232	23%	189	19%	116	12%	65	6%	335	33%	671	67%	1,006
West Bank and Gaza	161	16%	234	23%	248	25%	151	15%	114	11%	104	10%	336	33%	676	67%	1,012

6.6 Incentives

Incentives were used in the majority of countries as summarised in Table 6.6. The type and value of the incentive was determined by the local project managers in line with what is appropriate in each country. The incentive was appreciated by respondents, though the feedback from many countries was that the respondents often commented that the value was not in line with the survey length.

Table 6.6: Type and value of incentive

Country	Type of incentive	Value of incentive
Albania	Cash	ALL1,000
Algeria	Mobile phone credit	DZD500
Armenia	Mobile phone credit	AMD1,000
Azerbaijan	Mobile phone credit	USD9
Belarus	Cash	USD9
Bosnia and Herzegovina	None	-
Bulgaria	Pack of coffee and Ipsos tote bag	EUR6.80
Croatia	Retail voucher	HRK50
Czechia	Cash/Food gifts	EUR8-15
Estonia	Retail voucher	EUR10
Georgia	Drinking glasses	GEL10
Germany	Cash	EUR20
Greece	Supermarket voucher	EUR20
Hungary	Supermarket voucher	HUF6,000
Jordan	Supermarket voucher	JOD10
Kazakhstan	Cash	USD4
Kosovo	None	-
Kyrgyz Republic	Cash	EUR5.50
Latvia	Gift of coffee, tea, sweets	EUR5
Lebanon	Mobile credit	USD5
Lithuania	None	-
Moldova	Gift of coffee, tea	EUR3.30
Mongolia	Mobile credit	USD4
Montenegro	None	-
Morocco	Retail voucher	USD13
North Macedonia	None	-
Poland	Gift of coffee, tea, sweets	PLN20
Romania	Retail voucher	RON20
Russia	Gift of coffee, tea	RUB400
Serbia	Supermarket voucher	RSD50
Slovak Republic	Cash	EUR15
Slovenia	Cash	EUR15
Tajikistan	Cash of gift food	EUR9
Tunisia	Retail voucher	TND20
Türkiye	Retail voucher/Supermarket vouchers	TRY150-200
Uzbekistan	Cash	USD9
West Bank and Gaza	Mobile phone credit	USD20

6.7 Fieldwork quality control

Every local agency was required to re-contact a minimum of 10% of respondents to validate interviewers' work via back checks. This process provided the opportunity to confirm that the data had been gathered from genuine respondents, that interviews had been conducted correctly, and that the respondent had been left with a good impression of Ipsos or the local agency. Local agencies were required to conduct back checks by telephone.

The back-checking process was spread over the fieldwork period. Each interviewer's work was aimed to be checked early so that they could be provided with feedback if needed.

If problems were detected, local agencies were required to increase the number of checks carried out. Where serious problems were identified, the interviewer was removed from the project and their interviews were excluded from the final data. In less serious cases, interviewers were re-briefed to prevent future errors.

Quality control was also conducted via listening to audio-recordings and interviewer accompaniment. During the course of fieldwork many respondents were also re-contacted to check certain responses following EBRD's data checks

The variables included in the back-check questionnaire are summarised in Table 6.7.

Table 6.7: Quality checks conducted and outcomes

Country	Number of interviews checked via back checks, audio recording, re-contact	Number of interviews removed/replaced
Albania	642	20
Algeria	839	225
Armenia	170	8
Azerbaijan	669	115
Belarus	481	0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	370	29
Bulgaria	347	37
Croatia	299	39
Czechia	150	0
Estonia	102	7
Georgia	519	5
Germany	171	5
Greece	325	0
Hungary	403	104
Jordan	822	6
Kazakhstan	351	13
Kosovo	457	86
Kyrgyzstan	360	86
Latvia	162	0
Lebanon	268	83
Lithuania	134	43
Moldova	408	20
Mongolia	216	15

Montenegro	353	92
Morocco	357	15
North Macedonia	537	31
Poland	256	24
Romania	423	23
Russia	271	90
Serbia	320	42
Slovakia	414	36
Slovenia	263	0
Tajikistan	TBC	350
Tunisia	631	9
Türkiye	567	677
Uzbekistan	667	10
West Bank and Gaza	814	30

Interviews were removed for a number of different reasons including fraudulent interviews (rare), the random walk not being followed correctly, interview length too short, incorrect completion of the ECS and the wrong person interviewed. More details are provided in the country specific sections.

6.8 Fieldwork outcomes

Table 6.8 provides a summary of fieldwork outcomes by country and the associated response rate. The response rates vary from 11% in Türkiye to 83% in Tajikistan. Commentary on the response rate per country is provided in the country sections of the report.

Table 6.8: Response rate

Country	Total sample	Interviewed household (I)	Confirmed eligible household (CEH)	Confirmed ineligible household (CIH)	Unknown eligibility (UE)	Invalid address	Eligibility rate (e) %	Response rate %
Albania	1,784	1,039	1,155	5	476	148	100%	64%
Algeria	2,889	1,000	1,290	0	1,137	462	100%	41%
Armenia	2,709	1,001	1,313	0	1,142	254	100%	41%
Azerbaijan	1,408	1,012	1,285	1	104	18	100%	73%
Belarus	1,452	1,002	1,182	0	252	18	100%	70%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1,902	1,003	1,374	0	463	65	100%	55%
Bulgaria	2,227	1,008	1,110	1	878	238	100%	51%
Croatia	3,438	1,006	1,151	1	2,085	201	100%	31%
Estonia	2,407	1,009	1,475	207	698	27	88%	48%
Georgia	1,806	1,003	1,387	1	361	57	100%	57%
Germany	3,508	1,020	1,049	1	2,398	60	100%	30%
Greece	1,785	1,001	1,085	0	687	13	100%	56%
Hungary	1,656	1,000	1,203	84	301	68	93%	67%
Jordan	2,599	1,019	1,330	0	1,080	189	100%	42%
Kazakhstan	2,593	1,028	1,327	1	957	308	100%	45%
Kosovo	2,510	1,004	1,212	0	962	336	100%	46%
Kyrgyz Republic	1,438	1,002	1,082	0	333	23	100%	71%
Latvia	2,192	1,004	1,076	5	909	202	100%	51%
Lebanon	2,602	1,010	1,142	0	1,011	449	100%	47%
Lithuania	2,002	1,005	1,010	0	797	195	100%	56%
Moldova	3,423	1,002	1,163	0	1,942	318	100%	32%
Mongolia	1,382	1,001	1,072	4	256	50	100%	75%
Montenegro	1,930	1,006	1,134	1	745	50	100%	54%
Morocco	1,346	1,000	1,210	0	114	22	100%	76%
North Macedonia	1,965	1,002	1,121	1	691	152	100%	55%
Poland	2,347	1,005	1,028	2	1,207	110	100%	45%
Romania	1,985	1,010	1,062	3	828	92	100%	54%
Russia	2,225	1,017	1,111	6	1,019	89	99%	48%
Serbia	3,393	1,001	1,212	1	1,884	296	100%	32%
Slovak Republic	1,516	1,002	1,024	0	461	31	100%	67%
Slovenia	3,691	1,004	1,938	525	1,158	70	79%	35%
Tajikistan	1,256	1,034	1,137	1	107	11	100%	83%
Tunisia	1,980	1,036	1,367	1	297	315	100%	62%
Türkiye	11,706	1,109	1,276	3	9,020	1,407	100%	11%
Uzbekistan	1,328	1,006	1,139	2	151	36	100%	78%
West Bank and Gaza	2,487	1,012	1,397	0	867	223	100%	45%

A response rate for Czechia is not calculated as a quota sampling approach was implemented.

The final outcome codes allocated to each of the categories in Table 6.8 is provided on the following pages.

The number of **eligible** addresses is based on addresses that were given one of the following final outcome codes:

- Completed interview
- Refusal by target respondent before interview
- Refusal by proxy (other household member) after respondent selection
- Refusal during the interview
- Broken appointment, no re-contact
- Respondent away/in hospital during fieldwork period
- Language barrier with target respondent
- Ill at home during field period
- Contact made at address, but not with target respondent
- Personal information consent refused (after screening)

The number of **ineligible** addresses is based on addresses that were given a final outcome code:

- Resident household, but not eligible for the survey
- Named respondent not living at address
- Named respondent deceased
- Selected respondent not eligible

The number of addresses with an **unknown** eligibility is based on addresses that were given a final outcome code of:

- Refused to take part or give any information
- Information refused about number of dwelling units/households at the address
- Information refused about whether resident(s) are eligible
- Unable to screen due to language barriers/Household language barrier
- Unable to screen as physically or mentally unable
- Address inaccessible
- No contact with anyone at the address
- Unable to confirm eligibility of target respondent due to non-contact
- Personal information consent refused (pre-screening)
- Office refusal

Invalid addresses are those assigned codes below but are not included in the calculation.

- Unable to locate address
- Not yet built/under construction
- Address demolished/derelict
- Address vacant/empty
- Non-residential address
- Address occupied, but no resident persons (e.g., second/holiday home)
- Communal establishment/institution

Interviews not accepted for quality control reasons are not included in the calculation.

The eligibility rate is calculated as follows:

$$e = \frac{CEH}{CEH + CIH}$$

where: CEH = Confirmed eligible households and CIH = Confirmed ineligible households

The response rate is calculated as follows, and in accordance with the RR3 definition of response rates by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)¹⁹.

$$\text{Response rate} = \frac{I}{CEH + e(UE)}$$

where I = interviewed households and UE = Households where eligibility is unknown.

¹⁹ p. 46 in The American Association for Public Opinion Research. 2011. Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys. 7th edition. AAPOR.

7 Data processing

7.1 Overview of data processing stage

7.1.1 Main data

All countries conducted data collection via Ipsos' iField platform. Data was delivered on multiple occasions during fieldwork to allow for ongoing data quality checks.

The questionnaire contained one question which had an "Other – specify" response code (2.33 concerning the respondents primary bank account). Where a respondent selected this option, their verbatim response was captured. Questions regarding the current and past occupations of the respondents also collected via verbatim from the respondents. These responses were provided to EBRD in the original language and were not coded.

The data from all 37 countries was combined into a single data file, with one row of data per household. Each household was assigned a unique ID.

7.1.2 Contact sheet data

The Electronic Contact Sheet (ECS) was used to manage the sample, to make appointments, to identify the sampled respondent, and to carry out interviews. This was managed through the iField application.

The ECS data was regularly checked, first, for logical errors and, second, to ensure alignment with the main data during fieldwork and after completion. A unique ID was assigned to each case in the ECS data, matching the main data file for those cases where there was a successfully completed interview.

7.1.3 Codebook

The codebook outlines the format of the datasets delivered. They include the variable name, type, label, range and value labels. The questionnaire filters are provided for every variable that was not asked of all respondents.

7.2 Data processing and quality control

In all countries, the ECS and questionnaire were administered on tablets via Ipsos' iField platform. For each case, the interviewer would first open an ECS to complete the details about their visit. Where applicable, they would then enter the questionnaire. Once they had finished the interview, the script would take them back to the ECS to record an outcome code. Any data collected would be automatically saved to the device, and data was transferred to the Ipsos Data Processing (DP) team once the device had an internet connection.

Once face-to-face data was received the DP team would process the data into the SPSS format in accordance with the codebook.

Various quality checks were made on the main interview data throughout mainstage fieldwork and after completion by the CCT, EBRD, and at the local agency level.

7.2.1 Centralised quality control

To ensure the quality of the data, checking syntax was written centrally in SPSS. The syntax checked the following in the main data:

- The data matched the data map
- The ID numbers were unique and that there were no duplicate records
- The routing had been adhered to
- Only permitted values were inputted
- Any short or long interviews
- High levels of item non-response (INR)

The ECS data was also regularly checked for logical errors during fieldwork and after completion, including:

- Confirming that the outcome code matched ECS_C1 (whether the address was occupied and residential).
- Confirming that the number of eligible people in the household (ECS_E1) did not exceed the total number of people in the household as indicated in the main questionnaire (Q1).
- Confirming that the number of face-to-face visits was correctly derived.
- Confirming that all cases had been assigned a final outcome by the end of fieldwork, and all ECS records had a final visit indicated at variable ECS_A3.
- Confirming that every interview in the main questionnaire data had a Contact Sheet with a productive outcome, and that every contact sheet with a productive outcome had an interview in the main questionnaire data.

7.2.2 EBRD quality control

EBRD checked the data on several occasions during fieldwork and on receipt of the final data to also check that the routing had been adhered to, that only permitted values were inputted, interview length and level of item non-response. In addition to this they conducted a number of sense checks on the data. These included for example, the size of dwelling units in comparison to the number of household members, income versus expenditure and the number of identities selected by respondents. Where necessary and possible respondents were re-contacted to verify or correct certain responses. Local agency feedback was also sought on a number of potentially implausible answer patterns as detailed in Table 7.1

Table 7.1: Local agency feedback to some inconsistent data raised by EBRD

Issue	Possible explanations
Income vs expenditures – there are some interviews in which the respondent is simultaneously spending more than they earn and saving a positive amount of money each month	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Respondents not declaring full income as undertaking some ‘unofficial’ work or salaries paid in cash. ▪ Not including sale of agricultural products in rural areas. ▪ Providing estimated expenditure. ▪ Receipt of money from family as gifts which are ‘saved’. ▪ Confusing household income with personal income. ▪ Expenses are often more than income, but many people still set aside a small amount of money as an emergency fund. ▪ Using savings to pay for household expenditure. ▪ Using credit to pay for household expenditure. ▪ Lack of knowledge on how best to manage income/expense/savings. ▪ Remittances not being included in household income. ▪ Temporary additional expenses. ▪ Impact of inflation.
Heating questions - there are some interviews where the respondent says heating is metered while at the same time reporting that they do not need heating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Possible to have a meter but not to be using the heating
Remittances - there are some interviews with unexpected values in the question on total remittances (q521b) from anyone living abroad (either unusually high, or zero, or smaller than the quantity they report in the question q519b).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most often attributed to misunderstanding of the question. When smaller than the amount stated in the previous question, respondents may have only been considering additional remittances received, not total remittances. ▪ Not wishing to declare the actual amounts received. ▪ Not considering the value of payments in kind.
Dwelling size/number of household members ratio – there are some interviews with dwelling sizes falling outside the range 1-900 sqm., and/or for which the dwelling size to number of cohabitants ratio is smaller than 10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For certain demographic groups and in certain regions it is not uncommon for some families to live in overcrowded situations.
Have internet, spend 0 – there are some cases in which respondents report about having internet at home, but also about not spending any amount of money on it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sharing WiFi with another household/their neighbours (common practice in many countries). ▪ Not separating out internet costs from other telecommunication costs.
Don’t have internet, spend money – there are some cases in which respondents report about spending money on internet despite also reporting about not having internet at home.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confusion with mobile internet or packages combining different services – that is not counting this as having the internet at home. ▪ Paying for internet, but not using it themselves.
Monthly salary – one case in Jordan with very high income.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verified with respondent that in a senior/high paid role.

7.2.3 Localised quality control

In addition to the quality control implemented by the CCT and EBRD, local agencies were required to follow up on short interviews, verify GPS coordinates, and back check a minimum of 10% of interviews. Any irregularities were automatically flagged on iField for the local agencies to review by inspecting the case in more detail, and occasionally liaising with the interviewer.

The CCT and EBRD observations on the data were also communicated with the local teams so that they could discuss with the interviewers concerned whether to establish if individual responses were correct or whether a re-contact needed to be made and additional briefing instruction issued to interviewers as needed. For example, it was identified that many interviewers were recording only one identity for respondents in question 8.11. In this case many respondents were re-contacted to check their response to this question and the data was updated as necessary.

7.3 Data protection

The following protocols were followed to ensure privacy and compliance with General Data Protection Requirements (GDPR).

- Informed consent was obtained from all survey respondents.
- Survey data was stored securely on servers located within the EU in accordance with GDPR protocols and any transfer of data was completed using Ipsos' secure and encrypted transfer system "Ipsos Transfer". Any respondent identifying information was securely and permanently deleted once it was no longer necessary to retain it for this survey.
- Personal data and other confidential data held on Ipsos' systems are stored in an encrypted format, with access limited to authorised staff via the network settings and/or database access control policies.
- Respondents were informed of their right to access, rectify, or withdraw their data via a privacy notice in line with the General Data Protection Requirements (GDPR).
- Only anonymous and aggregated data has been reported on. Survey results will be presented in a statistical report and no individual will be identified in the published report or in the published data set.
- Respondents were asked for permission to pass on GPS Coordinates to EBRD. Such data (where consent permitted) was provided separately to the main survey data via secure transfer.
- After fieldwork, any personal information was securely destroyed.
- All members of the CCT have been trained to ensure a high level of data protection awareness and data protection adherence.

8 Weighting

This section describes the weighting procedures applied for each surveyed country.

The overall weighting design reflected the sampling methods used at each stage of sampling. The weights were calculated in two stages:

1. sample design weights
2. post-stratification weights

The design weights were not calculated for Czechia, given that the quota approach was used for selecting households and respondents.

8.1 Sample design weights

Design weights were required to equalise differential selection probabilities arising from the sample design. The sample design weights included the following stages:

1. **Sampling unit selection weight** – to correct for differential selection probabilities used when selecting sampling units (PSUs in one-stage selection, and PSUs and SSUs in two-stage selection);
2. **Address (or individual) selection weight** – to correct for differential selection probabilities used when selecting addresses (or individuals, if selected directly from a population register within a PSU);

For addresses with multiple dwelling units or multiple households, additional weights were calculated:

- a. When multiple dwelling units were found at the address and one was randomly selected in the ECS, an additional weight was calculated to correct for unequal selection probabilities – **dwelling unit selection weight**.
- b. When more than one household was found at the address/ dwelling unit and one was randomly selected in the ECS, an additional weight was calculated to correct for unequal selection probabilities – **household selection weight**.

3. **Individual respondent selection weight** – to correct for differential selection probabilities used when selecting one individual (main respondent) to participate in the interview. (This stage is not required when individuals are selected directly from the register – in that case, correcting for differential selection probabilities is covered in stage 2. above.)

The product of the probabilities calculated at each stage provides the overall probability of inclusion for each case in the sample, and the design weight is calculated as the inverse of this probability.

8.1.1 Sampling unit selection weight

Sampling units were selected with variable probabilities of selection, as detailed in section 3.3.1. However, calculating weights that reflect variable selection probabilities across different PSU types would introduce substantial variance in the overall country level weights. Given that LiTS IV sample is

nationally representative on its own, a simplified approach was used to avoid introducing substantial variance in weights. In weighting, for each country it was assumed that all 50 PSUs were selected with PPS in a single step from the full list of PSUs, following the allocation of PSUs in proportion to the most recent population statistics across region by urbanity strata.

The sampling unit selection probability, p_{PSU1} , is calculated as follows:

$$p_{PSU1} = n_{hPSU} * size_i / \sum_h size_i$$

Where:

n_{hPSU} = number of PSUs sampled in region by urbanity stratum h

$size_i$ = size of PSU i

$\sum_h size_i$ = sum of sizes of all PSUs in stratum h

The sampling unit selection weight DW_{PSU1} is calculated as the inverse of its probability, p_{PSU1} :

$$DW_{PSU1} = 1 / p_{PSU1}$$

In Germany and Slovenia, where the sampling units were selected in a two-stage process, the sampling unit selection probability is a multiplication of the selection probability of the Primary Sampling Unit (PSU) within the region by urbanity stratum, and the selection probability of the Secondary Sampling Unit (SSU) within the PSU.

8.1.2 Address (or individual) selection weight

Within each sampling unit, either individuals (sampled directly from a register) or addresses were selected randomly, with equal probability within a sampling unit. The selection of addresses was done either via an address register or via random route. Individuals/addresses have different selection probabilities across sampling units, given the sampling units were of different sizes, and the numbers of individuals/addresses selected varied to deliver the same numbers of interviews in each sampling unit. The probability of selection of each individual/ address (conditional on selection of its sampling unit) is:

$$p_{unit1} = n_{unit1} / N_{unit1}$$

Where:

n_{unit1} = number of individuals/addresses selected and used in the sampling unit (i.e. the number visited, whether interviewed or not).

N_{unit1} = total number of individuals/addresses in the sampling unit.

The individual/address selection weight DW_{unit1} is calculated as the inverse of its probability, p_{unit1} :

$$DW_{unit1} = 1 / p_{unit1}$$

Dwelling unit selection weight

Dwelling units were selected randomly from the list of all dwelling units at the address. The probability of selection of each is:

$$p_{DU1} = 1 / N_{DU1}$$

Where:

N_{DU1} = number of dwelling units at the address.

The dwelling unit selection weight DW_{DU1} is calculated as the inverse of its probability, p_{DU1} :

$$DW_{DU1} = 1 / p_{DU1}$$

Household selection weight

Households were selected randomly from the list of all households at the address/dwelling unit. The probability of selection of each is:

$$P_{HH1} = 1 / N_{HH1}$$

Where:

N_{HH1} = number of households at the address/dwelling unit.

The household selection weight DW_{HH1} is calculated as the inverse of its probability, p_{HH1} :

$$DW_{HH1} = 1 / p_{HH1}$$

8.1.3 Individual respondent selection weight

The probability of a respondent being selected (conditional on selection of their household) is:

$$p_{ind} = 1 / N_{ind}$$

Where:

N_{ind} = total number of eligible individuals in the household

The individual respondent selection weight DW_{ind} is calculated as the inverse of its probability, p_{ind} :

$$DW_{ind} = 1 / p_{ind}$$

Overall design weight

The overall design weight (W_{dw}) is the product of each of the weights required for the applicable sample design:

$$W_{dw1} = DW_{PSU1} * DW_{unit1} * (DW_{DU1}) * (DW_{HH1}) * (DW_{ind})$$

8.2 Post-stratification or calibration weights

To ensure that the samples accurately reflect the structure of the target populations, a final weighting procedure is required to align the sample to external population data. In line with the previous waves of LiTS, age, gender, region and urbanity were used in weighting. Interlocked population statistics were available for region by urbanity and for age by gender. Region and urbanity variables used in the sample stratification were used in weighting. In countries with a large number of regions used in stratification, the

neighbouring ones were grouped to reduce the total number of region by urbanity strata used in the calibration weighting. Four age categories, 18-24, 25-39, 40-64, 65+, were used interlocked with gender.

The weights were calculated by means of rim weighting (raking). The resulting in-country weights were calibrated to the average of 1 within each country dataset.

8.3 Trimming weights

Large weights can result in substantial losses in sample efficiency and so it is common practice to trim weights. The weights were trimmed at several stages during the weighting. The iterative process is recommended as it means that the effect of later stages of weighting is retained in the sample. If all trimming is done at the end this would disproportionately affect certain cases.

It is usual to trim weights on both side of its distribution if the distribution is symmetric. However, if the distributions of weights are skewed towards lower values, it is accepted to apply the trimming only to larger values. These values are the ones distant from the mean, and they have a great impact on variability. If the lowest values of weights on the other side are very similar, given the skewed distribution, trimming them would have a limited impact on variability.

The weights were trimmed at country level. The following trimming was consistently done across all countries:

- combined sampling unit and address/individual selection weight – at 5th and 95th percentile;
- dwelling unit selection weight – at 95th percentile;
- household selection weight – at 95th percentile;
- individual selection weight – at 95th percentile;
- final weight – at 5th and 95th percentile.

8.4 Country population (cross-national) weights

The country level weights were calculated as the product of design weights (where applicable), and post-stratification/calibration weights, and were scaled to the average of 1 within each country dataset. In the next weighting stage, an additional weight was calculated, grossing the country level weight to the target population size in each country. This weight allows analysing the data for a group of countries.

The weight can also be used for within-country analyses, as within each country it gives the same results as the standardised (to the average of 1) country level weight.

