Caucasus Research Resource Centers

Access to Justice in Central Asia Methodology and Fieldwork Report

March 2011

This document provides a detailed description of the methodology and fieldwork for nationwide surveys conducted in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan in winter 2010/2011.[1] The surveys are part of a research project within the program "Access to justice in Central Asia: Equal before the law?", initiated by the Eurasia Foundation for the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.

In addition to the surveys, the research project consisted of extensive desk research, expert interviews, and focus groups. The main outcome of the project is the report "Equal before the law? A study of how citizens experience access to justice in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan". All material, including frequency tables and datasets, are available directly from the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC).

Please direct questions to nana@crrccenters.org.

[1] The survey was designed and overseen by CRRC and was carried out by the research company M-Vector, based in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan.

Table of contents

I. Sampling methodology

1.1 Sampling overview

Under supervision of the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC), M-Vector designed the sample and randomly selected primary sampling units (PSUs). The sampling frames consisted of census data on settlements and their population sizes from the state statistical agencies in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. The design used was a multistage sample design with stratification both by geographic area and by settlement type (urban/rural).

The urban/rural stratification was used because residents of settlements in the two strata were expected to have different answers to the survey questions of interest: respondents in the capital and big cities should have better access to justice than those in rural areas. The sample was distributed amongst strata in proportion to their relative population sizes (with a minimum of one settlement sampled per stratum) in order to minimize margins of error for estimates made for the population size as a whole.

The settlement selection within the strata was carried out randomly using a random number generator. For example, the selection of settlements in the Chuy oblast urban substratum in Kyrgyzstan was done using a list of all cities in Chuy oblast assigning a randomly generated number to each one, rearranging the list of settlements in order of the randomly generated numbers and selecting the first *n* cities.

After the selection of settlements, the sampling team made some necessary changes. Settlements where the estimated number of households divided by the target household sample size per PSU was less than five were removed (the targeted number of households could not be achieved in these settlements). The districts of Darband and Tavildarinskiy in the District of Republican Subordination (DRS) in Tajikistan were also removed due to martial law and inaccessibility.

The selection of replacement settlements/PSU's was done through a random selection from the entire list of regions. In the case of Tajikistan the sample was out of representativeness within two districts in DRS , with a total number of districts equaling 63.

A sample of households in each selected PSU was selected via random route sampling, a form of systematic sample. The protocol for the random walk varied between strata. However, the protocol for selecting respondents from among household members was the same in both urban and rural strata.

1.2 Sampling

The sample design had three stages. The first stage was the stratification. The primary sampling units were settlements, city districts, or voting precincts, depending on the stratum. These were selected using random number generation. Secondary sampling units (SSUs) were households and they were selected using a random walk method. At the third stage respondents were selected within households using the "last birthday" method.

1.2.1 First stage of sampling

At the first stage, the countries were divided into strata. The stratification was based on two criteria: administrative areas (oblasts) and cities of national significance. Cities of national significance included the capitals and the one major city after the capital: Almaty in Kazakhstan, Osh in Kyrgyzstan and Hujend in Tajikistan. These three cities plus the capitals constituted separate strata, which only had urban components. Within all other strata, settlements were classified as urban or rural substratum. The following number of strata were obtained: 19 strata in Kyrgyzstan, 30 strata in Kazakhstan, and 14 strata in Tajikistan.

The total target sample size in each country was 800 respondents. This sample size was divided by 50 PSUs (primary sampling units), so that 50 PSUs would be sampled per country and 16 respondents would be targeted for interviews in each PSU. A minimum of one PSU was sampled within each substratum, and further distribution was based on the proportion of the adult population in each stratum.

Table 1. The total number of PSUs and the number of sampled PSUs by stratum, Kazakhstan.

№	Region	Settlement type	Total number of PSU's	Number of PSU's sampled
1	Akmola	Urban	2	1
2	Akmola	Rural	245	2
3	Aktobe	Urban	1	1
4	Aktobe	Rural	97	1
5	Almaty	Urban	10	1
6	Almaty	Rural	55	3
7	Atyrau	Urban	1	1
8	Atyrau	Rural	80	1
9	West-Kazakhstan	Urban	1	1
10	West-Kazakhstan	Rural	150	1
11	Zhambyl	Urban	9	1
12	Zhambyl	Rural	177	2
13	Karaganda	Urban	11	3
14	Karaganda	Rural	109	1
15	Kostanay	Urban	2	2
16	Kostanay	Rural	129	2
17	Kyzylorda	Urban	15	1
18	Kyzylorda	Rural	150	1
19	Mangistau	Urban	2	1
20	Mangistau	Rural	30	1
21	S-Kazakhstan region.	Urban	10	2
22	S-Kazakhstan region.	Rural	18	4
23	Pavlodar	Urban	10	2
24	Pavlodar	Rural	17	1
25	N - Kazakhstan	Urban	8	1

26	N - Kazakhstan	Rural	116	1
27	E- Kazakhstan	Urban	8	3
28	E- Kazakhstan	Rural	256	2
29	Astana	Urban	3	2
30	Almaty	Urban	7	4
Total:		**30**	**1 729**	**50**

Table 2. The total number of PSUs and the number of sampled PSUs by stratum, Kyrgyzstan.

№	Region	Settlement type	Total number of PSU's	Number of PSU's sampled
1	Bishkek city , Leninsky	Urban	61	2
2	Bishkek city, Oktyabrskiy	Urban	61	2
3	Bishkek city, Pervomayskiy	Urban	51	2
4	Bishkek city, Sverdlovsky	Urban	52	2
5	Osh	Urban	92	2
6	Chui oblast	Urban	4	1
7	Chui oblast	Rural	336	7
8	Talas oblast	Urban	1	1
9	Talas oblast	Rural	91	2
10	Issyk-Kul oblast	Urban	3	1
11	Issyk-Kul oblast	Rural	178	3
12	Naryn oblast	Urban	1	1
13	Naryn oblast	Rural	136	2
14	Osh oblast	Urban	3	1
15	Osh oblast	Rural	477	9
16	Jalal-Abad oblast	Urban	7	1
17	Jalal-Abad oblast	Rural	411	7
18	Batken oblast	Urban	4	1
19	Batken oblast	Rural	195	3
Total:		**16**	**2 164**	**50**

Table 3. The total number of PSUs and the number of sampled PSUs by stratum, Tajikistan.

№	Region	Settlement type	Total number of PSU's	Number of PSU's sampled
1	Dushanbe. Sino district	Urban	59	2
2	Dushanbe. Somoni district	Urban	61	1
3	Dushanbe. Firdausi district	Urban	14	1
4	Dushanbe. Shohmansur district	Urban	38	1
5	Soghd region	Urban	10	2
6	Soghd region	Rural	713	12

7	Khatlon region	Urban	4	1
8	Khatlon region	Rural	1228	15
9	GBAO	Urban	1	1
10	GBAO	Rural	398	2
11	RRP	Urban	2	1
12	RRP	Rural	1225	9
13	Khujend right bank	Urban	15	1
14	Khujend left bank	Urban	14	1
Total:		**9**		**50**

PSUs were selected from each stratum using simple random sampling. The following units were used for PSUs:

- Settlements in all substrata excluding the capitals and cities of national significance
- Voting precincts in Bishkek and Osh
- Administrative districts in Astana, Almaty, Dushanbe, and Hujend

1.2.2 Second stage of sampling

A random route sampling was used to collect systematic samples from selected PSUs. The reason was that logistical constraints prevented the construction of sampling frames of households within selected PSUs. Each interviewer was given instructions for the random walk:

- *Random walk protocol for urban strata*

STARTING POINT: The polling station was used as the starting point. Interviewers stood with their backs to the main entrances and made every turn to the right. If they came in a full circle they widened the circle by moving straight and passing the right turn they had already made.

PRIVATE HOUSES: Selection of every 5th house (selection step) after the first selected house along the route.

APARTMENT HOUSES: Inside apartment buildings the household (apartment) which number coincided with the last number of next questionnaire was selected for interview. Each 10th apartment number after the first randomly selected apartment was selected after that.

- *Random walk protocol for rural strata*

STARTING POINT: Three points were selected within the settlement: one in the geographical center of settlement, one on the settlement's border furthest from the center, and one on the settlement's border closest to the center point. These three points were the interviewer's starting points for three independent random walks. From the starting points, the interviewers moved as follows:

From the starting point on the boundaries: The interviewer chose the first household in the direction to the center. The step size was four, and the interviewer continued until s/he had covered five households, so that ten households were targeted in the two boundary sectors combined.

From the starting point near the center: The direction was determined randomly – either using a random number table or using the method of lottery ticket (putting notes with all directions into a hat or pocket and randomly selecting one). The interviewer conducted the random walk in the randomly selected direction utilizing a step size of four, until s/he had targeted six households. The selection interval was four.

PRIVATE and APARTMENT HOUSES: The selection interval was every fourth household.

1.2.3 Third stage of sampling

At the last stage, all family members 18 years and older were listed in each household. The household member with the most recent birthday was selected for the interview.

Interviewers entered each address in the cover sheets, which recorded the results of each contact with each household. The cover sheets include the results of all interview attempts, regardless of whether an interview was conducted or not. Following the completion of data collection, data entry, and data cleaning, M-Vector, under the supervision of CRRC, calculated sampling weights. Thus, under specified conditions, the sample is representative of the adult populations of the three countries.

1.3 Weighting methodology

Most of the questions in the survey were addressed to individual respondents. The sampling weights for those questions were calculated as follows:

$$w_{hij} = \frac{N_h}{n_h} \frac{\hat{M}_{hi}}{m_{hi}} \frac{Q_{hij}}{q_{hij}}$$

Where:

N_h = the total number of PSUs in substratum *h*

n_h = the number of PSUs sampled from substratum *h*

$\hat{M}_{hi}$ = the estimated total number of households (SSUs) in PSU *i* of substratum *h*

m_{hi} = the number of households (SSUs) sampled responses in PSU *i* of substratum *h*

Q_{hij} = the total number of adults (TSUs) in SSU *j* of PSU *i* of substratum *h*

q_{hij} = the number of adults (TSUs) sampled in SSU *j* of PSU *i* of substratum *h*

Note: q_{hij} always = 1

For a number of questions, the information was asked about the respondent's household. For those questions, the sampling weights were calculated as

$$w_{hij} = \frac{N_h}{n_h} \frac{\hat{M}_{hi}}{m_{hi}}$$

Where:

N_h = the total number of PSUs in substratum *h*

n_h = the number of PSUs sampled from substratum *h*

$\hat{M}_{hi}$ = the estimated total number of households (SSUs) in PSU *i* of substratum *h*

m_{hi} = the number of households (SSUs) sampled (Full response) in PSU *i* of substratum *h*

N_h was taken from the sampling frame for each country (data provided by National statistical committee in KR and agencies of Statistics' in TJ and KZ (Annual statistical compilations) official published data was used for calculating: and was used for calculating $\hat{M}_{hi}$.

$\hat{M}_{hi}$ was calculated by dividing the total population of PSU *i* of substratum *h* by the average household adult members in substratum *h*:

$$\hat{M}_{hi} = \frac{P_{hi}}{\overline{Q}_h}$$

Where:

P_{hi} = the official adult population size of PSU *i* of substratum *h*.

$\overline{Q}_h$ = the official average household adult members number in substratum *h* of the country. Because the number of respondents was small in some strata, $\overline{Q}_h$ values were calculated by averaging across all strata of a given "settlement type," capital, urban non-capital, and rural.

Calculations were carried out in the statistical program SPSS using an auxiliary weighting matrix in Excel MS office.

1.4 Inaccessibility

Due to geographic constraints, winter weather conditions (the survey was conducted December 2010 – January, 2011), language issues, and civil unrest, interviews could not be conducted in a number of rural settlements initially selected for sampling. The sampling team was forced to replace the inaccessible settlements with additional randomly selected settlements.

The reason for sampling being unfeasible in the settlements is as follows:

Table 4. Inaccessibility of primary sample.

Country	Region/Oblast	District	Primary settlement	Resampled settlement	The reason of replacement
Kyrgyzstan	Chuy	Sokuluksky	Kashkabash	Aral	Too small population size - 370 people in total.
		Chuisky	Vostochnoye	Ak-Beshim	Too small population size - 117 people in total.
	Jalal-abad	Nooken	Sakaldy	Kokandyk	The village is located on the boarder to Uzbekistan and no Kyrgyz or Russian speaking population here.
Tajikistan	Sughd	Asht	Gudos kishlak	Pangaz kishlak	In previous surveys interviewers had been taking hostage in this settlement.
		Penjikent	Kichishkurnova kishlak	Sarazm kishlak	The population of this settlement speaks only Uzbek.
	Khatlon	Muminobod	Utling village	Sherozi village	Inaccessible village.
		Saris	Zardaki village	Dahsna village	Inaccessible village.
	DRS	Darband district	Tegerim village	Varzob village (Varzob district)	Martial law in the district of Darband.
			Navabadi calon village	Gulbutta village (Rudaki district)	
			Saripulak village	Chillamazor village (Vahdat district)	
		Tavildarinskiy	Dehaimullo village	Rohati village (Rudaki district)	Inaccessible district.
		Faizabadskiy	Kashkaroha village	Miskinabod village	Inaccessible settlement.
Kazakh-stan	No settlements were inaccessible.				

2. Questionnaire and fieldwork

2.1 Questionnaire

2.1.1 Questionnaire development

The questionnaire was developed by CRRC in collaboration with M-Vector and experts on rule of law in Central Asia. The questionnaire contained only closed-ended questions.

The English language source questionnaire was translated into Russian and local languages (Kazakh, Kyrgyz and Tajik). The translated questionnaires were back-translated into English to ensure the accuracy of the translations.

M-Vector conducted pre-tests in all three countries. Ten test interviews (in Russian and local languages) were conducted in the capitals of each country.

The questionnaires were finalized based on the results from the pre-tests.

2.1.2 Issues with the questionnaire

According to the fieldwork reports submitted by the fieldwork supervisors in each country, there were some questions that were problematic for different reasons. Despite the adjustment of the questionnaires after the pre-tests, the following questions showed to be somewhat problematic:

- Question № 7 - Many of the respondents irresolutely chose the option "Other".
- Question № 8 - Some respondents, especially in Kazakhstan, were reluctant to answer the question about household income.
- Question № 10 - In the Kyrgyz language questionnaire the option "Ombudsman" was included. In all other questionnaires it was removed after the pre-tests. Keeping the "Ombudsman" option in the Kyrgyz questionnaire did, however, not cause major problems as this variable was removed from the SPSS database, assuring that all three datasets include the same variables.
- Question № 15 - Several respondents were reluctant to answer questions about arrest (their own or household member's).
- Question № 17 - The interviewers were instructed not to read out the answer options and to correspond to the respondent's answer. Many interviewers reported difficulty in corresponding respondent's answers to the options provided.
- Question № 33 and 36 - Some male respondents were apparently perplexed for some time after these questions (dealing with domestic violence and divorce).
- Question № 41 - Some respondents named the year of the process apprehensively.
- Question № 54 - Many respondents refused to reveal the amount of the unofficial payment (bribe).

2.2 Conducting the fieldwork

2.2.1 Fieldworkers

192 fieldwork specialists were involved in the research project (see Table 5).

Table 5. Fieldwork staff.

Staff	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Tajikistan
Supervisors	7	7	4
Controllers	16	13	15
Interviewers	35	50	45
Total:	**58**	**70**	**64**

In addition, the fieldwork was supervised by three field department executives (one from each country) and a project manager at the M-Vector Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, head office.

2.2.2 Training of supervisors and interviewers

The trainings for interviewers and supervisors in Kazakhstan were conducted December 23-30, 2010. CRRC supervised the trainings in Astana and recommendations from CRRC were included in the trainings in the other regions.
The trainings in Kyrgyzstan were conducted in Bishkek on December 20, 2010 under supervision of CRRC.

The training in Tajikistan was conducted on December 28, 2010, under the supervision of CRRC.

In order to increase the response rates, the interviewers were instructed to work preferably after working hours and during the weekends and to choose different times when visiting the same household for the second or third time.

2.2.3 Timing

The timing of the fieldwork preparations and the actual fieldwork is presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Timing of the fieldwork.

№	Kind of work	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Tajikistan
1.	Pre-test preparation, pre-tests, correction and translation of questionnaires	10-15 December	7-13 December	17-23 December
2.	Fieldwork preparation	16 - 22 December	14 - 19 December	23 - 27 December
3.	Fieldwork trainings	23 December	20 December	28 December
4.	Fieldwork	24 December - 25 January	20 December - 15 January	28 December - 20 January
5.	Control visits and call-backs	5-25 of January	3 - 19 of January	8-24 of January
6.	Data entry	26-29 of January	20 - 25 of January	25-27 of January

The interviews lasted from 15 to 60 minutes. In urban areas the average duration of interview was 30 minutes, and in rural areas 45 minutes.

2.2.4 Response rates and household visit outcomes

As mentioned above, 800 people were sampled in each country. In Kazakhstan the response rate was 67% (535 completed interviews), in Kyrgyzstan 78% (624 completed interviews) and in Tajikistan 93% (745 completed interviews).

The number of completed interviews and reasons of non-completed interviews are specified in tables 7, 8 and 9..

2.2.4.1 Fieldwork issues – Kazakhstan

Table 7. Household visit outcomes in Kazakhstan.

The outcome of attempt	I attempt	II attempt	III attempt	Total
Dwelling inaccessible	1	-	-	1
Dwelling inaccessible and will not become accessible during the period of the fieldwork	13	3	1	17
Household closed /no contact made	131	86	62	279
No adult available	13	3	1	17
Arranged day and time for interview	34	12	1	47
The person who opened the door did not speak any of the languages available in this cluster	-	1	-	1
Household/the person who opened the door refused to be interviewed	105	16	12	133
Respondent not at home and will not return during the period of the fieldwork	16	2	5	23
Respondent refused to be interviewed	19	1	1	21
Respondent was not capable of being interviewed	3	2	-	5
Interview completed	465	52	18	535

The following specific problems were present during the fieldwork in Kazakhstan:

- The fieldwork was conducted in a time of severe temperature falls and snowstorms. In the Pavlodar region the fieldwork had to be postponed until January 12 due to snowstorms. The situation was similar in the Kostanai region.
- In a number of buildings the heating was turned off. The people in these buildings were frustrated with the situation and not particularly interested in being interviewed.
- Some of the respondents were not sure about their family members' dates of birth, which caused some confusion in selecting the household member with the most recent birthday.
- Some respondents did not understand the necessity of having the family member with the most recent birthday participating in the survey. In some cases other household members also wanted to participate in the survey. In these cases the interviewers explained that this was not possible.

- Some of the respondents had difficulties with some of the terminology (non-profit organization, criminal case, civil case, family income).

- Many respondents found it difficult to assess government institutions (corrupted or not corrupted, competent or not competent, fair or not fair) because they had had no contact with these institutions.

- The questions on domestic violence caused indignation among some men and embarrassment among some women.

2.2.4.2 Fieldwork issues – Kyrgyzstan

Table 8. Households visit outcomes in Kyrgyzstan.

Description	I attempt	II attempt	III attempt	Total
Dwelling inaccessible	7	3	2	12
Dwelling inaccessible and will not become accessible during the period of the fieldwork	5	3	15	23
Household closed/no contact made	53	28	0	81
No adult available	12	4	-	16
Arranged day and time for interview	19	3	0	22
Household/the person who opened the door refused to be interviewed	81	8	7	96
Respondent not at home and will not return during the period of the fieldwork	17	1	8	26
Respondent was not capable of being interviewed	13	1	2	16
The respondent was unable to complete the interview in applicable language.	6	2	1	9
Interview interrupted by respondent's household member(s)	2	0	0	2
Interview completed	585	36	3	624

The main problems conducting the fieldwork in Kyrgyzstan were the following:

- Due to the limited time frame in which the fieldwork had to be conducted, the interviewers were not always able to return to the selected households for a third time (in case they were not available for the first and second attempt).
- Not all sampled buildings were accessible and three villages had to be replaced (see Table 4).
- There was an absence of street names and household numbers in some clusters, which caused problems for the quality control visits. In these cases the interviewers draw maps of the settlement.

- Some of the respondents were not sure about their family members' dates of birth, which caused some confusion in selecting the household member with the most recent birthday.

- The lack of lights in the apartment buildings made it difficult for the interviewers to locate the apartments where they should conduct the interviews.
- In the villages Tuz-bel Jash-Tilek in Osh and in Dargaz in Batken there is no mobile network. The villages are situated in inaccessible area and there is only one stationary telephone in these village. For the fieldwork quality control it was no possibility to do call-backs and it was instead necessary to make return visits.

- The respondents were reluctant to give out their phone numbers for call-backs in some areas.
- Negative emotions related to the latest events in Kyrgyzstan (not only in the Southern settlements but in the North as well) made several inhabitants react with concern to strangers in their settlement.

2.2.4.3 Fieldwork issues – Tajikistan

Table 9. Household visit outcomes in Tajikistan.

The outcome of attempt	I attempt	II attempt	III attempt	Total
Dwelling inaccessible	12	6	-	18
No adult available	7	-	-	7
Arranged day and time for interview	7	3	-	10
Household/the person who opened the door refused to be interviewed	18	-	4	22
Respondent not at home and will not return during the period of the fieldwork	3	-	2	5
Respondent refused to be interviewed	17	1	2	20
Respondent was not capable of being interviewed	1	1	-	2
Respondent was unable to complete interview in applicable language	4	-	-	4
Respondent interrupted interview	2	-	-	2
Interview completed	729	15	1	745

Tajikistan had the significantly highest response rates. Still, the following issues occurred during the fieldwork:

- Almost all rural areas had power cuts which caused the interviewers' some orientation problems.
- There were difficulties surveying women in some rural areas as they were sometimes prohibited to talk to strangers in absence of their husbands. Still, 52% of the respondents in Tajikistan were women.
- Many of the respondents in villages were not sure about their family members' dates of birth, which caused some confusion in selecting the household member with the most recent birthday.

The high response rates in Tajikistan are assumed to be because:

- The time of survey coincided with the holidays and most of the adult population were at home.

- Most of the involved interviewers were familiar with the PSUs they were working in.

- Based on previous surveys conducted by M-Vector, the Tajik population is open for communication and rarely hesitates to participate in surveys.

2.2.5 Respondents' attitudes toward the survey

In general, most people had a positive or neutral attitude toward the survey. The absolute majority of the respondents appeared comfortable or neutral during the interview (according to interviewers' assessments). The respondents also appeared honest and less than ten percent gace a dishonest impression. Around 80 percent of the respondents in all three countries were considered never reluctant to answer the questions, or reluctant to answer just a few questions.

In general, people in rural areas showed greater interest in the survey whilst the urban population was more inclined to be distrustful. This is CRRC's experience also from other countries. Younger and well-educated people also showed a greater interest in participating in the survey than the older and not so well educated segment of the society.

Despite the relatively short length of interview (see section 2.2.3 Timing) some respondents pointed out there were too many questions.

In some cases the interviewers had to point out several times that the interviewee's participation in the survey was important as the respondents questioned the value of the survey. For example in Karauylkeldi, Kazakhstan, close to half of the selected households refused to participate in the survey saying that the survey topic had no value for them.

2.2.6 Fieldwork quality control

Fieldwork quality controls were conducted throughout the course of the fieldwork. The interviewers, working in the cities and nearby urban settlements, handed in their work to the supervisor by the end of each working day. Interviewers working further away from the cities handed in their work as soon as logistically possible. The supervisors checked mistakes, lapses, respondent and household sample methodology. Only after this were the interviewers allowed to resume their work. The quality of the filled-out questionnaires was controlled by the supervisors and the fieldwork department experts.

For the final control M-Vector used a special testing form, which included a list of the main testing questions and several demographic characteristics. M-Vector conducted quality control of all interviews. For half of the interviews M-Vector staff re-visited the households and in half of the cases the quality control was done through phone calls. The quality control targeted both the interviewer control and sampling methodology control.