

Mongolia - Peri-Urban Rangeland 2012-2014, Phase II

Innovations for Poverty Action

Report generated on: June 11, 2015

Visit our data catalog at: <http://microdata.worldbank.org>

Sampling

Sampling Procedure

BASELINE:

All households that were members of groups that applied to the project were included in the survey (total 923 interviewed). Moreover two neighbor households were intended to be surveyed for each group, randomly chosen from a list provided by a firm that had mapped the households in the areas (total 420 interviewed). For project applicants, power calculations were performed for one key outcome variable, average daily milk yield per milking cow (liters): Baseline value = 2.19, Std Dev. = 1.3, MDE = 0.25

FOLLOW-UP (Wave 2):

Sample from baseline was augmented by any PURP treatment and control households that were missed in the baseline survey (total 24).

Additionally, since few groups in the baseline survey had two successful neighbor interviews, neighbors were re-sampled in Wave 2. If a group had one or two neighbors interviewed in the baseline survey, then the same neighbors were to be interviewed in Wave 2. If the group did not have a full set of two neighbors in the baseline, then a list of all neighbor households within ten kilometers of the lease area were given by the herder group leaders. The survey firm then attempted to locate these households. The first two households within 5 kilometers of the lease boundary were to be interviewed. If there were not two households within 5 kilometers, then neighbors up to ten kilometers away could be interviewed. In total 143 new neighbors were added to the sample for Wave 2.

Deviations from Sample Design

BASELINE:

Some groups did not have two neighbors within 2km of their lease area boundary. In these cases sometimes less than two neighbors were interviewed per group. This was especially the case in the Choibalsan peri-urban area, because households are spread very widely apart.

Response Rate

BASELINE:

92.6% (Treatment households)
 89.1% (Control households)
 72.1% (percent of Treatment groups with at least one neighbor interview)
 71.7% (percent of Control groups with at least one neighbor interview)

Notes:

-response rates for neighbors differed substantially by peri-urban area, and were much lower in Choibalsan area (45%) compared to Kharkhorin area (86%)

FOLLOW-UP (Wave 2):

90.3% (Treatment households)
 82.4% (Control households)
 84.8% (percent of Treatment groups with at least one neighbor interview)
 85.2% (percent of Control groups with at least one neighbor interview)

Notes:

-these are listed as a proportion of the original baseline sample list, augmented with new households discovered during the follow-up survey
 -response rates for neighbors differed substantially by peri-urban area, and were much lower in Choibalsan area (64%) compared to Kharkhorin area (96%)

Weighting

No sample weighting is required for this dataset

Questionnaires

Overview

Household questionnaire - collects basic socio-economic and key herding related outcomes from the households (in Mongolian)

Herder Group Leader questionnaire - collects information about group members and their joint business activities (in Mongolian)

Soum Governor questionnaire - collects information about soum level demography, livestock census, land information, and development projects (in Mongolian)

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle
2012-01-30	2012-04-21	Household & Group Leader Baseline (Wave 1)
2014-05-04	2014-08-04	Household & Group Leader Follow-up (Wave 2)

Data Collectors

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation
Wave 1: Joint affiliation of MEC and MCDS LLC		
Wave 2: Joint affiliation of MEC and MCDS LLC		

SUPERVISION

Interviewing was conducted by 2 teams of interviewers. Each interviewing team comprised of 1 team leader, 6 interviewers, and 2 drivers. Each team used 2 four wheel drive vehicles to travel from cluster to cluster (and where necessary within cluster).

The role of team leader was to ensure the overall coordination and technical oversight of all the tasks, maintain the communication with IPA and MCA-Mongolia, coordinate with local authorities, and make arrangements for accommodation and travel. Additionally, the team leader was responsible for ensuring the quality of data collection by checking all the paper copy of questionnaires that are filled out by interviewers at the end of everyday.

Data Processing

Data Editing

Data editing took place at a number of stages throughout the processing, including:

- a) Field check by survey firm team leaders
- b) Checking the discrepancies of 1st and 2nd data entry
- c) Internal logic check by survey firm
- d) Manual check by IPA
- e) Logic control check by IPA
- f) Data cleaning by IPA

BASELINE

All surveys were checked for logical consistency by interviewer supervisors in the field, the day they were collected. If a survey contained inconsistent answers, the respondent was re-interviewed to clarify the problematic questions.

FOLLOW-UP

Consistency checking, including skip patterns and restricted value ranges, when applicable, were programmed into the survey software.

Several types of missing value were recorded. These are operationalized as extended missing values in the Stata datasets.

Note: Questions that were accurately skipped (.s) were generally not coded for the baseline survey and were instead left blank. All valid skips were coded in the follow-up survey.

Numeric missing value code is given first (followed by string code in parentheses)

.s (.skip) -- Question was skipped according to a correct skip pattern

.r (.refusal) -- respondent refused to give a valid answer to the question

.d (.don't know) -- respondent did not know the answer to the question

.q (.qre refused) -- respondent refused to give answers to an entire section of the questionnaire

Other Processing

BASELINE:

Data entry was conducted by 6 data entry staff. All the data entry was conducted at Survey firm internally developed software, which was approved by IPA. First all the questionnaires were scanned and manually entered twice by 2 different data entry staff. Then the two entries were reconciled to produce a third dataset. Next, IPA took a random sample of 1500 data points from his third dataset and manually checked them against the paper copies of the questionnaires. The data was accepted from the data collection contractor when the error rate found by the manual check was below 0.5%.

FOLLOW-UP (Wave 2):

Data collection was conducted on tablets and thus data was entered directly. Interviews were audio-recorded and a random sample of audio recordings were checked against the dataset to verify data integrity. Errors were scored based on their severity and the average error rate was required to fall below a preset threshold.

Data Appraisal

No content available

Related Materials

Questionnaires

Baseline Questionnaires

Title	Baseline Questionnaires
Country	Mongolia
Language	English
Description	The .zip file contains the household, herder group, and Soum governor questionnaires used in the baseline survey round
Filename	Baseline Questionnaires.zip

Interim Questionnaires

Title	Interim Questionnaires
Country	Mongolia
Language	English
Description	The .zip file contains the household, herder group, and Soum governor questionnaires used in the interim survey round
Filename	Interim Questionnaires.zip

Reports

Evaluation Design Report

Title	Evaluation Design Report
Author(s)	Innovations for Poverty Action
Date	2013-01-01
Country	Mongolia
Language	English
Filename	PURP - Project Impact Evaluation Strategy (EDR).pdf
