

Annex: Sampling methodology

This annex outlines the sampling methodology employed for the survey. This methodology was designed to make the sample nationally representative. In order to achieve this, a two-stage clustered stratified sampling procedure was used to select the households to be included in the sample. In 25 transition countries, France, Germany, Italy and Sweden, the survey was conducted face-to-face in 1,000 randomly chosen households. In Russia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Serbia, Poland and the United Kingdom there were 1,500 household interviews in order to allow for a reasonably large sample for a follow-up telephone survey, which will be based on a shortened version of the current questionnaire and which will be conducted one year after the face-to-face survey, i.e., in autumn 2011.

First stage: establishing sample frame of Primary Sampling Units

In all countries, the most recent available sample frame of Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) was selected as the starting point. Local electoral territorial units were used as PSUs wherever it was possible, as they tend to carry the most up-to-date information about household addresses. The following sampling frames were used:

Electoral districts: Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Serbia.

Polling station territories: Albania, Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Moldova, Montenegro.

Census Enumeration Districts: Slovak Republic, Sweden, Tajikistan, Turkey.

Geo-administrative divisions: the remaining countries.

The total number of PSU sample frames per country varied from 182 in the case of Mongolia to over 48,000 in the case of Turkey. In order to ensure an even distribution across regions and type of settlement, PSUs were ordered by geographical region and levels of urbanity or rurality.¹ Then, 50 PSUs in most countries and 75 PSUs in Russia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Serbia, Poland and the UK were selected from these lists, with probability of selection proportional to PSU size. The size was measured as the number of households in the PSU. If that information was not available, size was taken as the adult population or total population.

Second stage: selection of households

The second stage in sampling consisted of selecting households within each PSU. The aim was to make sure that each household was selected with an equal probability within any given PSU and hence all households in the country had the same probability of being selected. Two sampling procedures were used. In the majority of countries, a random walk fieldwork procedure was used: the fieldwork coordinator selected the first address to be sampled, and the interviewer was given clear instructions on how to select remaining addresses within the PSUs. For a small number of countries – Hungary, Lithuania, Slovenia and Sweden and the United Kingdom – the sample was pre-selected to ensure that the probability of any household's inclusion was always equivalent to the probability generated by random selection.

If more than one household was resident at a particular address, interviewers were instructed to produce a list of all households in the contact sheet and randomly select one household. In order to select a household randomly, they were asked to use the same instructions as for the selection of a respondent in a household.

Selection of respondents within households

Interviewers were instructed to explain the purpose of their visit when first making contact with the household, and to attempt to make contact with the head of the household.² Interviewers then completed a household roster. All people living under the same roof in the household and sharing their meals together were included in the roster.³

In order to select a respondent from a household randomly interviewers used a selection grid.⁴ These grids used sets of randomly ordered numbers 1 to 12, which were generated by the central coordinating office. Interviewers were provided with a random grid for each address which they visited. Using these selection grids, interviewers made a random selection of individuals to be interviewed. The interviewer read the numbers from left to right until they found the ID code of a household member 18 years old or older. This person was selected to be the respondent for sections 3-7 of the questionnaire. If the selected respondent was also the head

¹Some PSUs were excluded in Mongolia, Russia and Turkey because they were too geographically remote. Eight PSUs were replaced with similar PSUs in Italy as a result of incomplete geographical coverage. Additional PSUs were selected in the UK due to lower than expected response rates.

²In Sweden interview subjects were recruited over the phone and the interviews were then conducted face-to-face.

³Household members who were away for a period of one month or longer on work or study in another geographical location or country were excluded from the selection.

⁴In LiTS I the "last birthday" method and Kish grids were used.

Table 1
Profile of principal respondents in LiTS 2010

	Gender		Age			Location		OECD equivalised household expenditure (USD)		
	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60+	Urban/Metro	Rural	<4000	4000-6000	>6000
Albania	44.7	55.3	45.3	39.7	15.0	61.8	38.2	33.8	23.8	42.4
Armenia	34.6	65.4	41.1	35.4	23.4	71.7	28.3	62.0	21.9	16.1
Azerbaijan	35.5	64.5	54.3	35.3	10.4	66.1	33.9	34.0	29.0	37.0
Belarus	38.0	62.0	56.6	30.1	13.3	72.8	27.2	17.1	28.4	54.4
Bosnia and Herzegovina	43.3	56.7	46.5	30.7	22.8	53.9	46.1	23.6	27.8	48.6
Bulgaria	36.7	63.3	27.9	36.3	35.8	68.5	31.5	26.9	27.2	45.9
Croatia	43.9	56.1	31.5	34.9	33.6	62.1	37.9	9.5	15.6	75.0
Czech Republic	39.3	60.7	41.0	38.1	20.9	76.9	23.1	2.4	19.2	78.4
Estonia	28.8	71.2	32.2	26.7	41.1	59.0	41.0	9.3	33.4	57.2
France	47.8	52.2	27.4	40.5	32.1	71.2	28.8	2.5	9.3	88.2
Georgia	30.8	69.2	35.5	34.3	30.2	50.0	50.0	70.3	16.3	13.4
Germany	43.5	56.5	29.6	43.4	27.1	71.9	28.1	3.6	8.5	87.9
United Kingdom	43.7	56.3	30.6	31.2	38.2	77.3	22.7	9.0	16.0	75.0
Hungary	40.4	59.6	27.0	33.9	39.1	70.5	29.5	20.5	33.6	45.9
Italy	33.9	66.1	33.3	42.7	24.0	40.0	60.0	2.4	10.7	86.9
Kazakhstan	31.9	68.1	49.2	37.2	13.6	56.0	44.0	48.0	29.9	22.1
Kyrgyz Republic	40.9	59.1	51.7	34.5	13.8	40.1	59.9	72.3	21.1	6.6
Latvia	40.6	59.4	33.6	30.5	35.9	73.6	26.4	19.7	31.7	48.6
Lithuania	32.8	67.2	27.2	34.3	38.5	62.2	37.8	14.2	31.3	54.5
FYR Macedonia	44.5	55.5	43.5	36.3	20.2	62.8	37.2	19.3	25.1	55.6
Moldova	35.8	64.2	30.2	36.7	33.1	40.1	59.9	55.2	22.3	22.5
Mongolia	44.7	55.3	61.1	27.4	11.5	48.6	51.4	61.4	18.1	20.5
Poland	47.5	52.5	36.6	33.4	30.0	46.8	53.2	17.8	29.0	53.3
Romania	42.9	57.1	32.4	33.0	34.6	57.9	42.1	45.8	27.8	26.4
Russia	30.4	69.6	41.2	31.9	26.9	72.9	27.1	11.4	28.2	60.4
Serbia	43.9	56.1	31.6	38.6	29.8	55.9	44.1	15.6	24.0	60.5
Slovak Republic	38.4	61.6	48.2	41.3	10.5	66.4	33.6	5.3	22.4	72.2
Slovenia	44.2	55.8	39.2	37.8	23.0	58.5	41.5	1.9	7.9	90.2
Sweden	53.8	46.2	23.8	42.7	33.6	90.2	9.8	3.6	10.1	86.3
Tajikistan	40.5	59.5	55.6	34.3	10.0	15.9	84.1	74.6	14.3	11.1
Turkey	34.3	65.7	54.5	33.0	12.5	76.6	23.4	33.6	31.8	34.6
Ukraine	30.0	70.0	40.3	31.2	28.5	65.2	34.8	39.3	24.5	36.2
Uzbekistan	39.7	60.3	55.3	34.1	10.7	41.3	58.7	73.4	19.4	7.2
Kosovo	42.6	57.4	64.9	25.3	9.8	44.1	55.9	88.0	9.0	3.0
Montenegro	44.9	55.1	52.4	30.7	16.9	56.4	43.6	6.9	17.8	75.4

of household or knowledgeable member they completed all sections (including section 1 – contact sheet and section 2 – housing and expenses).

The standard interview method called for each selected household to be visited at least three times before being replaced. In the majority of cases (79 per cent), however, the interviews were completed on the first visit. In 61 per cent of cases, the head of the household and the principal respondent were the same person; in the remaining 39 per cent, two different interviews were required to be carried out in the same household. The profile of the principal respondents is depicted in Table 1.

In all countries, except for France, Poland and Sweden, there is a significant majority of females and relatively older people in the sample. This is likely to have resulted from the fact that household members who were away from home on a permanent basis, either for work or studies, were excluded from the sample.

In order to correct this problem, a weighting scheme was introduced. In the first step, the weighting scheme identifies target populations in each country, disaggregated by age and gender. In the second step, weights are assigned in order for the sample to reproduce the gender and age breakdown within the country's population. All the figures presented in this report are weighted using this scheme.

Chapters 1 and 3 calculate regional averages on a 'democratic' basis, i.e., all countries are weighted by their population, whereas chapters 2, 4, 5 and the country pages calculate averages on a 'federal' basis, i.e., all countries are weighted equally.

Acknowledgements

This report on the Life in Transition Survey (LiTS) was prepared by the Office of the Chief Economist and the Department for Stakeholder Relations at the EBRD with contributions from World Bank staff.

The report was edited by Franklin Steves (EBRD) under the general direction of Erik Bergl f, Chief Economist, and Jeromin Zettelmeyer, Deputy Chief Economist and Director of Research at the EBRD.

Franto Ricka (EBRD) and Peter Sanfey (EBRD) provided valuable editorial input into the report. Zlatko Nikoloski (EBRD, UCL) and Alexander Teytelboym (EBRD, University of Oxford) provided excellent research assistance and project management support for the entire report.

The writing teams for the chapters and boxes comprised:

Chapter 1

Benu Bidani, Mame Fatou Diagne and Salman Zaidi of the World Bank.

Chapter 2

Franto Ricka and Peter Sanfey of the EBRD. Zlatko Nikoloski (EBRD, UCL) provided excellent analytical support.

Chapter 3

Mame Fatou Diagne, Dena Ringold, and Salman Zaidi of the World Bank. Martin Cumpa and Santhosh Srinivasan provided invaluable research assistance.

Chapter 4

Franklin Steves (EBRD) and Alexander Teytelboym (EBRD, University of Oxford).

Chapter 5

Eva Fodor of the Department of Gender Studies, Central European University, with inputs from Cecile Divino of the EBRD's Gender Team.

The authors are grateful to the following for comments and suggestions on parts of the Report: Ihsan Ajwad, Asad Alam, Paolo Belli, Erik Bergl f, Zeljko Bogetic, Willem van Eeghen, Indermit Gill, Pauline Grosjean, Rekha Menon, Michal Myck, John Newman, Svenja Petersen, Biljana Radonjic Ker-Lindsay, Martin Raiser, Claudia Senik, Lars Sondergaard, Yvonne Tsikata and Jeromin Zettelmeyer.

Editorial, design, and production guidance was provided by Jane Ross and Dan Kelly from EBRD's Communications Department.

Editorial support was provided by Richard German.

The report was designed by Andy Ritchie from BN1 Creative. Artwork was provided by Alexander Chmelev.

It was printed by Fulmar Colour Printing Company Limited.

The Life in Transition Survey II

The second Life in Transition Survey (LiTS II) was designed by the EBRD's Office of the Chief Economist and the World Bank's Europe and Central Asia (ECA) Region (Office of the Chief Economist and Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Unit), under the general direction of Erik Bergl f (Chief Economist, EBRD) and Indermit Gill (Chief Economist, ECA Region, World Bank).

The EBRD and the World Bank worked in close collaboration with Juan Mu oz (Sistemas Integrales) on the design of the survey and the fieldwork implementation. Pauline Grosjean (University of San Francisco) provided extensive comments and suggestions for the design of the questionnaire.

The design and implementation of the survey fieldwork was undertaken by a team at the global market research firm Ipsos MORI, which was chosen by a competitive tender. The team was led by Andrew Johnson, Sara Grant-Vest and Hayk Gyuzalyan, under the overall supervision of Brian Gosschalk.

LiTS II was funded by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Central European Initiative (CEI), the UK Department for International Development (DFID), the World Bank and the EBRD Shareholder Special Fund (SSF).

The EBRD and World Bank are extremely grateful to CIDA, CEI and DFID for their continuing support for the Life in Transition Survey.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying and recording, without the written permission of the copyright holder. Such written permission must also be obtained before any part of this publication is stored in a retrieval system of any nature. Applications for such permission should be addressed to permissions@ebrd.com.

Printed in England by Fulmar which operates an environmental waste and paper recycling programme.

The Life in Transition Survey 2011 is printed on an environmentally responsible, sustainable source paper manufactured by paper mills which are FSC and ISO14001 certified.

Photography: Simon Crofts (Front cover bottom right); Arnhel de Serra (36); Mike Ellis (Front cover top, 6 bottom left and right, 18 bottom right and left, 48 top and bottom right, back cover top left; back cover middle left); MBFA (26 bottom left); Vladimir Pirogov (Front cover bottom left, 18 top, 26 top, 48 bottom left, back cover bottom); Bryan Whitford (6 top, 26 bottom right, back cover middle right).

7779 Life in Transition Survey 2011 (E/3,000)

© European Bank for Reconstruction and Development





European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

One Exchange Square
London EC2A 2JN
United Kingdom

Switchboard/central contact

Tel: +44 20 7338 6000
Fax: +44 20 7338 6100
SWIFT: EBRDGB2L

Information requests

For information requests and general enquiries,
please use the information request form at
www.ebrd.com/inforequest

Project enquiries

Tel: +44 20 7338 7168
Fax: +44 20 7338 7380
Email: projectenquiries@ebrd.com

EBRD publications

Tel: +44 20 7338 7553
Fax: +44 20 7338 6102
Email: pubsdesk@ebrd.com

Web site

www.ebrd.com
www.ebrd.com/lifeintransition

