FIELDWORK REPORT

Project Title: COVID-19 Georgia High Frequency Survey (GHFS) Wave 6, 2022
Poverty and Equity Global Practice, The World Bank
Caucasus Research Resource Center

Prepared by:

Elene Ergeshidze,
Kristina Vacharadze

FOR PUBLIC USE

May 2022

Objectives

The second set of the COVID 19 Monitor Survey was conducted in partnership with the World Bank. It built upon the COVID 19 Monitor survey that was conducted in April-June 2020 and aims to understand the poverty impacts of COVID 19 on the population of Georgia as well as a number of related outcomes. The survey used random digit dialing for sampling, with an achieved sample size of 2190 individuals. This was the sixth wave of the survey.

Geographical and population coverage

For the current survey, CRRC-Georgia used Computer-assisted telephone-interview (CATI) technique for data collection. This approach allowed us to eliminate illegal values in the dataset. As the skip patterns were assigned automatically, it was impossible to violate predefined flow of the questionnaire.

The team used android-based tablet computers (Samsung Galaxy Tab3 and Tab5). The hardware had integrated sim-cards, which permits uploading completed interviews instantly via mobile internet. CRRC employed the open-source software ODK (Open Data Kit) to create the questionnaire forms.[1] ODK, a free, standardized and open-source software package, allows quick deployment and adjustment of the forms based on survey needs.

The survey results are representative of the adult population of Georgia.

Interviews were conducted in Georgian, Armenian, Azerbaijani and Russian.

Sampling design

The survey initially intended to have close to 2000 respondents. In practice, 2048 interviews were completed. The sample was representative of the adult population of Georgia.

For this purpose 24,933 mobile phone numbers were randomly generated. Randomly generated numbers were stratified by existing mobile operator indices: 511, 514, 551, 555, 557, 558, 568, 571, 574, 577, 579, 591, 592, 593, 595, 596, 597, 598, and 599. For calculation of distribution of randomly generated numbers across indices, the set of exsting Tbilisi-based mobile numbers from CRRC's earlier phone surveys was used as a representative random sample of Tbilisi mobile-phone users:

Index	Distribution across indices from earlier surveys				Numbers generated within the index
	2019 Sep	2020 Feb	2021 Jun	Average	
511	0.0%	0.0%	0.05%	0.0%	4
514	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4
551	2.9%	3.0%	1.5%	2.5%	619
555	14.9%	19.6%	16.9%	17.1%	4284
557	2.8%	1.4%	1.4%	1.8%	462
558	3.4%	2.1%	2.1%	2.6%	638
568	1.5%	0.7%	0.5%	0.9%	219
571	1.2%	0.7%	0.3%	0.7%	181

---

[1] See http://opendatakit.org/about

574	2.7%	0.7%	0.8%	1.4%	352
577	8.7%	8.5%	7.9%	8.3%	2087
579	0.7%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	73
591	4.0%	2.6%	1.9%	2.8%	710
592	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	91
593	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	1377
595	6.9%	5.2%	5.1%	5.7%	1436
596	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4
597	2.1%	1.2%	0.5%	1.3%	320
598	10.6%	8.1%	7.6%	8.8%	2198
599	31.2%	40.7%	47.4%	39.8%	9941
TOTAL					25000

Sampling frame

There was no physical sampling frame as the phone numbers were randomly generated. The virtual sampling frame was the list of all possible mobile phone numbers in Georgia.

Fieldwork

Fieldwork personnel consisted of 71 individuals in total (See Table below for details).

Gender	Age	Education	Years of working as an interviewer	Region
Female	57	Higher Education	11	Shida Kartli
Female	36	Tertiary	6	Shida Kartli
Female	51	Technical Education	5	Shida Kartli
Female	36	Higher Education	1	Samtskhe-Javakheti
Female	23	Tertiary	1	Samtskhe-Javakheti
Female	21	Tertiary	1	Samtskhe-Javakheti
Female	23	Tertiary	0.5	Samtskhe-Javakheti
Female	38	Tertiary	0.5	Samtskhe-Javakheti
Female	51	Higher Education	12	Imereti
Female	50	Higher Education	8	Imereti
Female	44	Higher Education	1	Imereti
Female	58	Higher Education	20	Imereti
Female	43	Tertiary	12	Imereti
Female	65	Higher Education	10	Imereti
Female	57	Higher Education	8	Imereti
Female	38	Higher Education	2	Imereti

Female	46	Technical Education	5	Adjara-Guria
Female	44	Higher Education	5	Adjara-Guria
Female	53	Higher Education	6	Adjara-Guria
Female	52	Higher Education	5	Adjara-Guria
Female	55	Higher Education	2	Adjara-Guria
Female	38	Tertiary	1	Adjara-Guria
Female	34	Higher education	0.5	Adjara-Guria
Female	55	Higher Education	15	Samegrelo
Female	38	Tertiary	5	Samegrelo
Male	61	Higher Education	10	Samegrelo
Female	26	Higher Education	6	Samegrelo
Female	61	Higher Education	11	Samegrelo
Female	58	Higher Education	10	Samegrelo
Female	20	Student	0.5	Samegrelo
Female	56	Higher Education	13	Kvemo Kartli
Female	35	Technical Education	9	Kvemo Kartli
Female	62	Higher Education	22	Kakheti
Female	36	Tertiary	5	Kakheti
Female	63	Higher Education	15	Kakheti
Female	50	Tertiary	3	Kakheti
Female	69	Tertiary	9	Kakheti
Female	22	Tertiary	0.5	Kakheti
Female	32	Tertiary	0.5	Kakheti
Female	34	Technical Education	1	Tbilisi
Female	60	Higher Education	17	Tbilisi
Female	59	Higher Education	17	Tbilisi
Female	57	Higher Education	5	Tbilisi
Female	57	Tertiary	14	Tbilisi
Female	62	Higher Education	12	Tbilisi
Female	41	Higher Education	8	Tbilisi
Female	51	Technical Education	2	Tbilisi
Female	55	Higher Education	1	Tbilisi
Female	48	Higher Education	27	Tbilisi
Female	67	Technical Education	7	Tbilisi
Female	21	Tertiary	2	Tbilisi
Male	20	Student	1	Tbilisi
Female	19	Student	0.5	Tbilisi
Female	50	Technical Education	5	Tbilisi
Female	49	Higher Education	3	Tbilisi
Female	27	Tertiary	6	Tbilisi
Female	40	Tertiary	0.5	Tbilisi
Female	21	Tertiary	0.5	Tbilisi

Female	40	Tertiary	6	Tbilisi
Female	29	Tertiary	0.5	Tbilisi
Female	43	Higher Education	0.5	Tbilisi
Female	25	Tertiary	0.5	Tbilisi
Female	24	Higher Education	0.5	Tbilisi
Female	45	Tertiary	1	Tbilisi
Female	30	Tertiary	0.5	Tbilisi
Female	36	Tertiary	0.5	Tbilisi
Female	20	Student	0.5	Tbilisi
Female	37	Tertiary	1	Tbilisi
Female	29	Higher Education	1	Tbilisi
Male	21	Student	2	Tbilisi
Female	20	Student	0.5	Tbilisi

For the survey CRRC Georgia conducted two trainings in Tbilisi on May 3 and May 4, 2022 using the Zoom program. During the trainings, interviewers practiced the questionnaire, sampling instructions, and discussed possible problems or challenges that might arise during the fieldwork.

The training covered the following topics:

- Sampling instructions
- Respondent selection
- Overview of the questionnaire with special attention to problematic questions
- Conducting test interviews

Overall, the fieldwork went well. Interviewers did not note any problems.

Data management and analysis
Data cleaning

Data cleaning was carried out to identify and, where possible, correct inconsistencies. In addition, open-ended questions with textual responses were recoded so that these answers matched numeric codes. It should be noted that, with CATI, the cleaning process was straightforward: pre-programmed questionnaire forms help to eliminate ambiguous codes from being entered in the dataset. Also, the form did not accept errors related to selecting more values than permitted in the questionnaire. Additional protocols for data cleaning are summarized in Table 8:

Issue	Protocol
String responses were typed ambiguously, but the data cleaning specialist could determine the intended response.	The value was changed to the response identified by the data cleaning specialist.

| String responses were typed ambiguously, but the data cleaning specialist could not determine the intended response. | The value was changed to a question non-response code. |

Weighting

Census data was used to calculate poststratification weights for individuals and households. For individual level weights national data on adult population by settlement type (Capital Urban or Rural) , ethnicity (Georgian or other), age group (18-34, 35-54 and 55+), sex, and education (secondary or lower, vocational, and higher) were used. Census data on the average household size and number of households was used to calculate post stratification household weights.

By using HH-weights, the sample is representative of the households at national level. By using the individual weights, the sample is representative of the adult population at settlement type (Capital Urban or Rural) , ethnicity (Georgian or other), age group (18-34, 35-54 and 55+), sex, and education (secondary or lower, vocational, and higher) levels. Tables below present proportions of each level in the nonweighted, weighted dataset, and in population.

Stratum	Sample (without weights)	Weighted Sample	Population (Census)
Capital	35	30	30
Urban	33	27	27
Rural	32	43	43
Age	Sample (without weights)	Weighted Sample	Population (Census)
18-34	25	31	31
35-54	37	35	35
55-120	39	34	34
Sex	Sample (without weights)	Weighted Sample	Population (Census)
Male	44	46	46
Female	56	54	54
Education	Sample (without weights)	Weighted Sample	Population (Census)
Secondary or lower	35	51	51
Vocational	20	19	19
Higher	45	30	30
Ethnic	Sample (without weights)	Weighted Sample	Population (Census)

Georgian	93	87	87
Non-Georgian	7	13	13

Households	Sample (without weights)	Weighted Sample	Population (Census)
1 member	9	15	15
2 members	15	21	21
3 members	17	18	18
4 members	20	17	17
5 members	16	14	14
6 members	12	9	9
7 members	6	4	4
8 members	3	2	2
9 members	1	1	1
10 members	0	0	0
11 members	0	0	0
12 members	0	0	0
13 members	0	0	0

Back Check

CRRC-Georgia conducted a back check of 10% of the interviews after the fieldwork. The back check fieldwork was conducted on May 5 – 11, 2021 simlutaniously with the fieldwork. The backcheck fieldwork personnel consisted of 1 interviewer. The backcheck showed that interviews were conducted properly.

Back check interviews were selected using the RAND() function in excel one day before the fieldwork was complete. In sum, 200 interviews were selected and checked.

Response rate

The minimum response rate for the survey **was 27.6%.** The response rate calculations are provided in the table below.

	Your survey data go below
Interview (Category 1)	
Complete (all versions)	2166
Partial (all versions)	156
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)	
Refusal and breakoff (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	2713

Refusal (phone, IPHH, mail, web)	
Household-level refusal (phone, IPHH, mail, web)	
Known-respondent refusal (phone, IPHH, mail, web)	
Implicit refusal (phone, mail, mail_U)	
Break off/ Implicit refusal (phone, mail, web, mail_U)	
Non-contact (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	
Respondent never available (phone)	
Telephone answering device confirming HH (phone)	
Answering machine household-no message left (phone)	
Answering machine household-message left (phone)	
Respondent unavailable during field period (IPHH, mail, mail_U)	
Respondent unavailable during field period (web)	
Other, non-refusals (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	
Deceased respondent (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	
Language problem (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	170
Household-level language problem (phone, IPHH, mail)	
Respondent language problem (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	
No interviewer available for needed language/Wrong language questionnaire (phone, IPHH, mail)	
Literacy problems (mail) or sound quality (phone, mail, mail_U)	
Location/Activity not allowing interview (phone)	
Miscellaneous (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	20
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)	
Unknown if housing unit/unknown about address (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	
Not attempted or worked/not mailed/No invitation sent (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail)U)	
Always busy (phone)	93
No answer (phone)	599
Answering machine-don't know if household (phone)	9
Call blocking (phone)	1920
Technical phone problems (phone)	
Unclear if HH (phone)	
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	
No screener completed (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	
Unknown if person is a HH resident/ mail returned undelivered (phone, mail, web, mail_U)	
Other (phone, IPHH, web)	
Not eligible (Category 4)	
Out of sample - other strata than originally coded (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	6
Fax/data line (phone)	

Non-working/disconnect (phone)	
Non-working number (phone)	6693
Disconnected number (phone)	
Temporarily out of service (phone)	
Special technological circumstances (phone)	
Number changed (phone)	
Call forwarding (phone)	
Residence to residence (phone)	
Non-residence to residence (phone)	
Pager (phone)	
Cell phone (phone)	
Landline phone (phone)	
Nonresidence (phone, IPHH)	
Business, government office, other organizations (phone, IPHH)	13
Institution (phone, IPHH)	
Group quarters (phone, IPHH)	
Person not HH resident (phone)	
No eligible respondent (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	50
Quota filled (phone, IPHH, mail, mail_U)	
Not eligible - duplicate listing (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)	
Other	12
Total sample used	14620
I=Complete Interviews (1.1)	2166
P=Partial Interviews (1.2)	156
R=Refusal and break off (2.1)	2713
NC=Non Contact (2.2)	0
O=Other (2.0, 2.3)	190
Calculating e: e is the estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible. Enter a different value or accept the estimate in this line as a default. This estimate is based on the proportion of eligible units among all units in the sample for which a definitive determination of status was obtained (a conservative estimate). This will be used if you do not enter a different estimate. For guidance about how to compute other estimates of e, see AAPOR's 2009 *Eligibility Estimates*.	0.435
UH=Unknown Household (3.1)	2621
UO=Unknown other (3.2-3.9)	0
Response Rate 1	

I/(I+P) + (R+NC+O) + (UH+UO)	0.276
Response Rate 2	
(I+P)/(I+P) + (R+NC+O) + (UH+UO)	0.296
Response Rate 3	
I/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))	0.340
Response Rate 4	
(I+P)/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))	0.365
Cooperation Rate 1	
I/(I+P)+R+O	0.415
Cooperation Rate 2	
(I+P)/((I+P)+R+O))	0.444
Cooperation Rate 3	
I/((I+P)+R))	0.430
Cooperation Rate 4	
(I+P)/((I+P)+R))	0.461
Refusal Rate 1	
R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O) + UH + UO))	0.346
Refusal Rate 2	
R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O) + e(UH + UO))	0.426
Refusal Rate 3	
R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O))	0.519
Contact Rate 1	
(I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC+ (UH + UO)	0.666
Contact Rate 2	
(I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC + e(UH+UO)	0.821
Contact Rate 3	
(I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC	1.000