HWF SURVEY: TECHNICAL NOTES
BY COUNTRIES

The United Kingdom

Study title: HWF Survey. As an individual survey
(i.e., the HWF questionnaire constituted the whole survey)


Contractor: Hatfield Campus
University of Hertfordshire
College Lane
Hatfield Herts. AL10 9AB
UK

Principal investigator: Dr Christine Cousins (c.r.cousins@herts.ac.uk)

Sample type: Postcode Address File (PAF). Small Users, PAF provides a sample of addresses. Each
address has an equal chance of selection, regardless of the number of people living at
that address. The probability of selection of individuals at a selected address is in-
versely proportional to the number of eligible people at the address. Since this bias is
known about in advance, it is easy to correct for it by collecting the number of eligible
adults at the address as part of the questionnaire data, and using this as a weighting
variable. Finally, Kish grid method was used to identify a respondent.

Fieldwork method: Personal face-to-face interviews with trained interviewers.

Fieldwork institute: NFO World Group (formally System Three Social Research)
Wembley Point
Harrow Road, Wembley
Middlesex HA9 6DE
UK

Context of the questionnaire: There are several country specific questions. Not all original questions are included
into the UK questionnaire

Sample size: 945

Response rate: 48.56%

Language: English

Weighted: See above related different probabilities of the selection. Weights are calculated to cor-
rect for this (to be applied for individual level data); for age within sex (for the individ-
ual respondent) as well as region (at household and individual level) to correct for dis-
parity of responses.

Finally, the dataset included household and individual weights, as follows:
Household weight: A regional weight was included to take into account discrepancies
between the regional profile of the survey sample and of the population of households
in the UK containing adults aged 18-65.

Individual weight: An individual level weight was calculated to correct firstly for the
fact that, because the sample design was based on households rather than individuals,
respondents in larger households had a lower chance of being selected for interview
than those in smaller households. The weight applied was equal to the number of eligi-
able adults in the household.

In addition a weight by age within sex was applied, to correct for discrepancies be-
tween the profile of the survey sample and of the survey population.
### The Netherlands

**Study title:** HWF Survey. As an individual survey  
(i.e., the HWF questionnaire was the whole survey)

**Fieldwork dates:** March 12, 2001 – April 9, 2001

**Contractor:** STOAS

**Postal address:**
STOAS Research  
P.O. Box 78  
6700 AB Wageningen  
The Netherlands

**Visiting address:**  
Agro Business Park 10  
6708 PW Wageningen  
The Netherlands

**Principal investigator:**  
Ms Annet Jager (anj@stoas.nl)  
Mrs Yvonne Kops (yko@stoas.nl)

**Sample type:** Stratified/quota sample

**Fieldwork method:** Telephone interviews with trained interviewers.

**Fieldwork institute:** Desan market research STOAS  
PO box 78  
6700 AB Wageningen  
The Netherlands

**Context of the questionnaire:** There are plenty of country specific questions. Not all original questions are included into the Dutch questionnaire

**Sample size:** 1007

**Response rate:** 15%

**Language:** Dutch

**Weighted:** Yes Weighing factor is created on basis of information on population composition with regarding to gender and age.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Study title:</strong></th>
<th>HWF Survey. As an individual survey (i.e., the HWF questionnaire was the whole survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fieldwork dates:</strong></td>
<td>February 19, 2001 – May 8, 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Contractor:** | Department of Sociology at Umeå University  
Sociological Institute,  
University of Umea,  
S-90187 Umea  
Sweden |
| **Principal investigator:** | Prof. Thomas Boje (thomas.boje@soc.umu.se, boje@ruc.dk) |
| **Sample type:** | Random sample of population 18-65 drawn from the national Swedish register of residents. |
| **Fieldwork method:** | Survey was conducted by using postal method. |
| **Fieldwork institute:** | Statistics Sweden  
SCB  
S-701 89 ÖREBRO  
Sweden |
| **Context of the questionnaire:** | There are plenty of country specific questions. Not all original questions are included into the Swedish questionnaire |
| **Sample size:** | 1892 |
| **Response rate:** | 68% |
| **Language:** | Swedish |
| **Weighted:** | No |
### Slovenia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Study title:</strong></th>
<th>The HWF was a part of a larger ‘Omnibus Survey’.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fieldwork dates:</strong></td>
<td>April 20, 2001 – June 12, 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Contractor:** | SICENTER (Socio-economic Indicators Center)  
Brajnikova 19  
1000 Ljubljana  
Slovenia |
| **Principal investigator:** | Prof. Niko Tos (Niko.Tos@uni-lj.si)  
Prof. Pavle Sicherl (Pavle.Sicherl@sicenter.si, Pavle.Sicherl@link.si) |
| **Sample type:** | Systematic multi-stage sample method with random start of adults aged 18 or older at non-institutional addresses in Slovenia is based on the Central Register of the population. Final clusters with known – and equal – probability was formed at the first stage. Named individual are selected at the second stage.  
Institutional population was excluded. |
| **Fieldwork method:** | Personal face-to-face interviews with trained interviewers. |
| **Fieldwork institute:** | Public Opinion and Mass Communication Research Center (CJMMK),  
Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana  
Kardeljeva ploscad 5, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia |
| **Context of the questionnaire:** | There are some country specific questions. Not all original questions are included into the Slovenia questionnaire |
| **Sample size:** | 1008 |
| **Response rate:** | Not lower than 65% |
| **Language:** | Slovenian |
| **Weighted:** | No |
## Czech Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study title:</th>
<th>HWF Survey. As an individual survey (i.e., the HWF questionnaire was the whole survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork dates:</td>
<td>January 03, 2001 – June 10, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor:</td>
<td>Institute of Sociology, AS CR Institute of Sociology, Czech Academy of Sciences Jilská 1 110 00 Praha 1 Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal investigator:</td>
<td>Prof. Jiri Vecernik (<a href="mailto:vecernik@soc.cas.cz">vecernik@soc.cas.cz</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample type:</td>
<td>Database of household cost payers -SIPO. Yes, known - and equal – probability. Household. Nearest birthday of a complete list of household members. Higher proportion of old age group Higher proportion of single member households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork method:</td>
<td>Personal face-to-face interviews with trained interviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork institute:</td>
<td>STEM - Centre for empirical research Jilska 1, 110 00 Praha 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context of the questionnaire:</td>
<td>There are some country specific questions. Not all optional questions are included into the Czech questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size:</td>
<td>1556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate:</td>
<td>45.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language:</td>
<td>Czech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Study title:** HWF Survey is a part of a larger survey ‘OMNIBUS 2001/2’

**Fieldwork dates:** January 31, 2001 – February 07, 2001

**Contractor:** THE TÁRKI GROUP
TARKI
Budaörsi út 45
1112 Budapest
Hungary

**Principal investigator:** Prof. Endre Sik (Sik@tarki.hu)

**Sample type:** Hungarian population census Age 18-65, Yes-known-and equal probability.

The sample was created in two steps. First they have stratified the localities according the number of adults living in each of them. From these nine strata of the localities are chosen by random sampling method. In the second step they have chosen individuals from the set of those 93 settlements.

**Fieldwork method:** Personal face-to-face interviews with trained interviewers.

**Fieldwork institute:** THE TÁRKI GROUP
TARKI
Budaörsi út 45.
1112 Budapest
Hungary

**Context of the questionnaire:** Some optional questions were not been asked on the Hungarian questionnaire.

**Sample size:** 1116

**Response rate:** 65%

**Language:** Hungarian

**Weighted:** Yes. Weighing factor is created on basis of information on population composition with regarding to gender, age, education, and location. Weight is based on the data for 18-65 in Micro-Census 1996. Weight is necessary because women and older people are much likely to answer the questionnaire than men and younger people.
### Bulgaria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study title:</th>
<th>HWF Survey. As an individual survey (i.e., the HWF questionnaire was the whole survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork dates:</td>
<td>February 20, 2001 – March 06, 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Contractor:          | The Faculty of Business and Social Sciences  
                        Paissii Hilendarski State University  
                        Mладезка 20-B  
                        4002 Plovdiv  
                        Bulgaria                                      |
| Principal investigator: | Dr. Siyka Kovatcheva  
                        (kovachev@netvisio.net)                              |
| Sample type:         | Two stage random cluster sample with 200 clusters, each with ten cases. The sample units were named individuals. All members of the population were sample with known probability. Named individual unit emerged from the office sampling |
| Fieldwork method:    | Personal face-to-face interviews with trained interviewers.                           |
| Fieldwork institute: | Fact Sociological Agency,  
                        Sofia 1000, 6th of September Street, No. 6B  
                        Bulgaria                                     |
<p>| Context of the questionnaire: | All variables are included                                                            |
| Sample size:         | 1806                                                                                  |
| Response rate:       | 87%                                                                                   |
| Language:            | Bulgarian                                                                              |
| Weighted:            |                                                                                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Study title:</strong></th>
<th>HWF Survey. As an individual survey (i.e., the HWF questionnaire was the whole survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fieldwork dates:</strong></td>
<td>February 1, 2001 – March 5, 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Contractor:** | Centre for the Study of the Quality of Life  
ICCV Calea  
13 Septembrie No.13  
Sector 5 Lod  
76 117 Bucharest  
Romania |
| **Principal investigator:** | Mrs Manuela Stanculescu  
(manuela@iccv.ro) |
| **Sample type:** | From the electoral list.  
From other lists (such as agricultural register).  
Random route method |
| **Fieldwork method:** | Personal face-to-face interviews with trained interviewers. |
| **Fieldwork institute:** | The Institute for the Study of the Quality of Life, Bucharest,  
Sector 5, Calea 13 Septembrie, No. 13. |
| **Context of the questionnaire:** | Almost all standard questions are included, there are some country specific variables |
| **Sample size:** | 1864 |
| **Response rate:** | 85% |
| **Language:** | Romania |
| **Weighted:** | No |