

**CROSS – CULTURAL DATA PRODUCTION:
THE CASE OF RUSSIA**

By

Jonathan W. Carver

A degree project submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Public Administration

University of Washington

2003

Approved by

C. Leigh Anderson
Evans School of Public Affairs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Chapter I: International Aspects of Survey Research.....	6
• University of Washington – SAPA – BIBM Partnership.....	13
Chapter II: Survey Design and Method Theory.....	17
Chapter III: Implementing the Survey in Russia.....	24
• Unexpected Obstacles.....	26
• Obtaining a Random-Sample.....	26
• Influence of Local Elite.....	30
• Survey Awareness.....	33
Chapter IV: Cross – Cultural Factors.....	36
• Differing Ideas of Community, Civil Society and Social Capital.....	38
• Discount Rate.....	40
Chapter V: Recommendations and Strategies.....	44
Attachments	
• English language survey.....	47
• Russian language survey.....	53
Bibliography	59

INTRODUCTION

Opportunities to conduct research in the Russian Federation have greatly increased in the last decade. With the opening of borders, Western scholars have seized the opportunity to conduct qualitative and quantitative research in Russia. Russian marketing and media groups have also expanded their scope of activity tracking everything from public opinion to economic growth in an attempt to provide reliable statistical alternatives to *Goskomstat*, the beleaguered Russian statistics agency. The increase in empirical scholarship has had a profound effect on the understanding of post-communist Russian society. Despite the successes, insufficient attention has been devoted to the limitations of transplanting western research methods, or data production techniques, to Russia.¹

This paper is intended to expose the problems, challenges, and dilemmas associated with conducting research in Russia. It has two goals. First, this paper discusses obstacles to effective quantitative research in Russia. Technical issues, such as linguistic equivalence, the construction of effective measuring instruments, and local reception of the survey affect the outcomes of quantitative research in different settings. A comparison of internationally accepted standards with the field experience of one research program during the summer of 2002 highlights the challenge of implementing rigorous methodological research in Russia.

This analysis of survey design, methodology, and practical implementation in Russia also reveals the limitation of cross-cultural data production in post-Communist transitioning economies more generally. Despite a framework of liberal democracy and constitutions guaranteeing free speech and respect for human rights, the cultural and social

¹ Relatively little literature has been published on the limitations of social science research in Russia and the former Soviet Union. See Cynthia J. Buckley, "Ideology, Methodology, and Context: Social Science Surveys in the Russian Federation," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Oct. 1998), p. 223-236. In a broader international context, there is a considerable amount of research on the problems of exporting Western research methods abroad. See for example, Martin Bulmer, "The Problem of Exporting Social Survey Research," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Oct. 1998), p. 153-168 and Manfred Kuechler, "The Survey Method: An Indispensable Tool for Social Science Research Everywhere?" *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Oct. 1998), p. 178-200. See also, *Social Research in Developing Countries: Surveys and Censuses in the Third World*, Martin Bulmer and Donald Warwick, eds., Chichester, New York (1983).

norms in former Soviet societies do not fully reflect those in the democratic West. The fact remains that there continues to be evidence of a lack of tolerance to opinions that disagree with the official government position on issues ranging from defense, foreign policy, and Chechnya. Disparities in income, resources and opportunities between the center (Moscow and St. Petersburg) and the rest of the country have only grown since the end of the Soviet Union. These factors make it difficult to counter-impose Western survey research methodology directly into Russian cities and villages located in the regions. While the insights and recommendations of this paper are applicable to all of Russia, they are specific to Novosibirsk and Irkutsk oblasts² in Siberia, which were our main research sites.

The second goal of this paper is to understand how cross cultural factors, including language, communication, and the socio-historical legacies of the Soviet Union affect research efforts in the Russian Federation. Directly transferring western survey methodology to Russia may not be appropriate given local circumstances that complicate even the best research efforts. In addition, U.S. government efforts to promote democracy and market capitalism in Russia influence local public opinion, often in a negative manner. American or western researchers implementing a survey in Russia must be aware of how they are perceived in light of Russia's relationship with the West. Thus, both macro and micro political, economic, and cultural issues challenge research efforts in Russia. These issues, unfortunately, are rarely addressed in the classroom. While most students and researchers accept quantitative data from Russia at face value, the purpose of this paper is to highlight the numerous ways that data production in Russia can be of dubious quality.

Chapter One places this discussion within the current academic dialogue on international survey research. The literature on cross-cultural data production suggests that researchers must be aware of the cultural norms, traditions, and hierarchies of power, which may influence the direct transfer of research methods abroad. Only since the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union have researchers had an opportunity to conduct extensive research in Russia. Most of this research has taken place in Moscow and St. Petersburg. Not surprisingly, there is limited information specifically on survey research in

² There are 89 subjects of the Russian Federation, including 49 oblasts, which are roughly equivalent to the

Russia's regions. Chapter Two explains the theory behind survey research techniques and considers numerous survey approaches that could have been applied in Russia. Chapter Three suggests that the practical realities of conducting research in the field often challenge survey theory, with important implications for the quality of data. This chapter examines specific contextual issues of implementing the survey in Russia in the regions. Trade-offs are involved in decisions on which research method to use in the field. Chapter Four discusses numerous cross-cultural factors, which affect how the survey may be received locally, including differing interpretations of important conceptual issues like social capital and civil society. The problems associated with cross-national data comparison are also addressed. Finally, Chapter Five assesses the trustworthiness of data coming from Russia. It asks, in particular, what information a researcher would need to provide so that others can accurately ascertain the data is valid and reliable.

CHAPTER I: International Aspects of Survey Research

The survey continues to be exported abroad by scholars attempting to replicate western standards of research in developing countries and non-European regions of the world. Some researchers are interested in analyzing specific regions of the world, while others conduct research for comparative purposes. The standardized survey method is thought to provide the ideal vehicle for making cross-national comparisons on a wide-array of topics. Despite the recognition that there are problems associated with conducting survey research in developing or non-European parts of the world, the lack of attention of these issues in graduate survey methods courses is startling. As Martin Bulmer points out, “A student can pass through a year-long course without any awareness that research techniques may have to be modified in other cultures.”³ While the forces of globalization have caused the world to become more integrated, there is little substantive discussion on adapting the process by which information is collected in non-Western societies.

Survey research is complicated by factors associated with development in Third World countries and transition issues in post-communist societies. The political system and cultural norms of a given society, and especially of societies emerging from decades of dictatorial or communist rule, may negatively affect survey validity. Manfred Kuechler recognizes two crucial systemic conditions that affect survey data in a given country. First, he argues that a country must recognize freedom of speech as a basic human right. This freedom must be routinely practiced without fear of persecution or discrimination. Second, survey research methodology is predicated upon cultural norms that favor individualism. In societies that tolerate variations in opinion and behavior, survey research is far more likely to produce valid results.⁴ The assumption here is that respondents will provide honest and accurate answers to survey questions because they trust the objectives and motivations of the researchers. This may not be the case for societies emerging from Soviet influence. For social scientists studying transitional economies like Russia, a change in the political system

³ Bulmer, Martin “The Problem of Exporting Social Survey Research,” *The American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 42, No. 2, (Oct. 1998), p. 155.

⁴ Kuechler, Manfred, “The Survey Method: An Indispensable Tool for Social Science Research Everywhere?” *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Oct. 1998), p. 178.

from a one-party rule to a Western-style democracy does not immediately change the behavior of its citizens. Internalizing new cultural norms favoring individualism requires a long process. While this process is currently underway in Russia, it is taking longer than most observers expected. Even though there has been an explosion in comparative research in Russia, political and cultural norms rarely factor into the discussion of data validity or methodology. Much of the current research on Russia accepts the Western, rationale-individual to be paradigmatic, when, in fact, the Soviet legacy still maintains a strong grip on social norms in virtually all levels of Russian society.

The survey is defined as the collection of data for the purpose of scholarly inquiry by use of a standardized questionnaire administered by specially trained interviewers (in person or over the phone) or distributed (predominantly by mail) to a (randomly) selected sample of respondents for self-completion.⁵ The power of the survey method rests on the assumption that a clear and precise question is administered in a controlled fashion to a sample of individuals randomly drawn for a target population.⁶ This is rarely achieved in practice, however, and even less so in developing and transitioning countries. It is also plausible that certain questions or the manner in which the survey is administered can go against local norms, affecting how local residents accept the survey. When specific questions violate cultural norms or when individual responses tend to be conform to socio-political and cultural norms, then the survey research must be questioned. Kuechler claims that the survey may be useful for gauging public opinion in Western societies, but it may be inherently deficient when used in other countries.

Social survey research originated in British poverty studies in the late 19th century. Random sampling and modern survey methodology was established by George Gallup in the 1930s and expanded by various academic institutions in the United States, including the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Science Research and the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center. In the last several decades, the U.S. government has expanded its role in social science research, while a substantial number of nonprofit and for-profit research organizations conduct policy research and analysis at the

⁵ Kuechler, p. 178.

federal and state level. The United States is arguable the most surveyed society in the world, yet the prevalence of survey research in other countries around the world is evidence of its exportability.⁷ The survey has been disseminated throughout the world through research exchange of international scholars, international migration, international training, academic publications, conferences, and via international academic partnerships. These networks have expanded rapidly since the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991.

There is growing attention in the social science literature to the problems of exporting social survey research. Globalization has led to a dramatic increase in opportunities to conduct research in nearly every country of the world. There has been little examination of the implications of western research models on data production in other countries, however. Cross-cultural research still tends to take industrial society and the psychology of the western individual as paradigmatic. Martin Bulmer argues that location and context of where a survey is implemented has profound ramifications on survey results. He suggests, “One dimension in terms of which the reception of survey research varies is the familiarity with survey research in the society into which it is introduced.”⁸ Surveys pervade Western society and they are accepted by a majority of the population. This assumption cannot be made in many developing countries, especially those of the former Soviet Union, where the relationship between state and society has made many people distrustful of government or officials attempting to get information. A legacy of state manipulation of information for Communist propaganda and stories of incidents where data on religion, income, and profession have been used against people has left a negative attitude towards survey research. This can hinder even the best attempts to conduct rigorous fieldwork in Russia.

In many regions of the world, Bulmer notes a movement in the direction of greater use of expertise and more reliance on social science survey research to interpret trends that are occurring in a given society.⁹ In the West, social research was first associated with

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Bulmer, p. 155.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid., p. 157.

urban social reform as it sought to uncover problems of poverty and living conditions. Later, it was used to analyze voting patterns. Most recently it has been used to support public policy programs designed to address local and national issues. According to Bulmer, it does not follow that evolution of social research will follow a similar trajectory in other countries. He notes, “It is likely that different models will emerge in different parts of the world of the relationship between survey research, the public, and the policy.”¹⁰ This is a key insight that must be recognized when conducting research in Russia.

Survey research has become a common feature in urban Russian life. Romir Research Agency, a Gallup affiliate, and the Center for Public Opinion Research (VCIOM) are two of the leading public opinion agencies in Russia.¹¹ A significant amount of this new public opinion research is paid for by private companies, which have a vested interest in making sure that the results are valid and reliable. Cynthia Buckley has reported that over 500 professional monitoring and marketing firms conduct survey research in Russia today.¹² This has led to a veritable explosion of information on virtually every imaginable subject in Russia. The sheer quantity and private sector financing of public opinion research seem to indicate that specialists in Moscow and St. Petersburg are well aware of the standards for survey design and methodology. Nonetheless, the Soviet history of manipulating and suppressing data continue to present validity concerns. Buckley notes, “If earlier, little was known and nothing believed, presently, everything is known and little believed.”¹³ The Soviet legacy of data and information manipulation remains a powerful reason why Russian data commands so little trust and respect.

Disparities between the center and the periphery complicate survey research in Russia. Moscow, with its 15 million inhabitants, and the rest of the center in European Russia, represent a very different situation from life in the provinces. Moscow has a higher standard of living than the rest of the country and the city is more closely connected to

¹⁰ Bulmer, p. 157.

¹¹ For more information, see the Romir Research Agency at <<http://www.romir.ru>> and the Center for Public Opinion Research at <<http://www.vciom.ru>>.

¹² Buckley, Cynthia, “Ideology, Methodology, and Context,” p. 223.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 224.

mainstream European influences. The periphery is characterized by lower living standards, unemployment, and a general local orientation beyond the influence of Europe and the United States. Center-periphery relations have typically been problematic throughout Russia's history. Moscow's often heavy-handed approach to administration in the provinces has bred mutual lack of respect and antagonism. This deep-seated animosity may be rooted in the modernization and anti-*kulak* (peasant) campaigns initiated by Stalin in the 1930s designed to eradicate the peasantry and create communist society. What works in Moscow or the big cities in the center in terms of survey research may not work well in the towns and villages of the periphery.

Many Russians in the regions remain skeptical of the ends to which survey research or census data will be used. While Soviet data was almost never trusted, Russian data seems to be commonly accepted when very little has changed between Soviet and Russian data collection methods. Consumers of information routinely accept at face value the figures and statistics that pour out *Goskomstat* without giving serious thought to the methodology and process for obtaining that data. Arguably, this is more of a problem in the regions than it is in the center. Nevertheless, western researchers are now able to access Russian society like never before, despite the numerous obstacles to conducting acceptable field research, whether in Novosibirsk, Krasnoyarsk, or Vladivostok. I argue that researchers should not accept that all of Russia is "Western" only twelve years following the break-up of the USSR. Because of this, survey research may not be the most effective tool for international comparison purposes. Nevertheless, the reality is that comparative research in Russia will only continue to grow. My aim is to equip researchers interested in Russia's regions with an understanding of the obstacles they might face in the field.

Survey research is an instrument of modernization. While scientific research in Russia is quite advanced, social science research has lagged behind for a number of reasons. There are contextual and historical explanations for this. First, scientific research in Russia was conducted at the bequest of the state, often solely for military purposes. Social science research, also conducted by the state, led to policies that had negative impacts on society. This includes ethnographic research to support special schools for

ethnic minorities, and doctoring research to conform to ideological objectives. The misuse of data has had a long-term affect on the population's acceptance of social research. Second, much of the recent social science research has highlighted everything negative about Russian society, including dramatic demographic data, information on suicide and domestic violence, and other information regarding alcoholism and unemployment. This serves to reinforce negative stereotypes abroad – a sensitive topic for many Russians. Indeed, Russia has a “fallen-empire” syndrome and many Russians feel defensive about more intrusive research into the chaos of their post-communist transition. Finally, ideology continues to play an important role in any research project in Russia. The stronger role of the federal government under President Putin in local and oblast affairs may actually be having a negative impact on the freedom of information and the exchange of ideas in Russia.

The standard assumption about the context in most survey methods classes and textbooks is that the people accept the research bargain, i.e., respondents agree to cooperate through the belief that the research is an end in itself.¹⁴ They do not demand compensation. There is also the assumption that it is socially unproblematic for a woman interviewer to conduct research with an adult man or vice-versa. Margaret Newby et al. have documented negative attitudes towards research in Bangladesh stemming from being unused to participating in research, particularly if the interviewers were women.¹⁵ This debate more generally concerns the insider/outsider dichotomy that is faced by many Western researchers abroad. Outsiders may be unlikely to have an adequate understanding of a given society, or may not be permitted to participate in that society's rituals and customs. Survey research involving an outsider is likely to be fraught with numerous challenges. Little discussion is given to the difficulties that an interviewer can face in the field, where there may be no place to eat or rest. Warwick (1993) observed that the political reactions to a given field study are often situation-specific.¹⁶ Anti-American sentiment in Russia reached a high during the 1998 bombings in Kosovo and recently in 2003 during the war in

¹⁴ Bulmer, p. 155.

¹⁵ Newby, Margaret, Sajeda Amin, Ian Diamond and Ruchira T. Naved, “Survey Experience Among Women in Bangladesh,” *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 2, No. 2, (Oct. 1998), p. 252.

Iraq. As a result, American sponsorship of research projects may be a liability for researchers in Russia. The political relationship between America and its neighbors in the global community will influence individual survey responses, often in a negative manner. All of these issues do not seem to enter into the classroom discussion on survey methodology.

Language and linguistic equivalence is another big problem in exporting survey research. Buckley notes that much of the problem in survey research in Russia is the apparent lack of Russian skills and area-studies knowledge by those leading research projects in the field. Even those with Russian language skills wished that they had more advanced capacity.¹⁷ Communication within the American-Russian research team may also be problematic, as more often than not, the Russian scholars will be working in English. Poor communication between research collaborators can lead to myriad problems, although linguistic issues are most frequently cited.

Thinking through language and context can help researchers overcome the difficulties of translating terms such as “community,” “business” and “democracy.” It is apparent that literally translated words often do not have the same conceptual meaning in different societies, and even between diverse ethnic groups in a population. The translation of a survey, therefore, is critical to the quality of data. One technique that is used to control for proper translation is the practice of translating the survey into the local language and then having it translated back into English with another translator. Distortions between the two English versions can help identify problematic terminology. In addition to standardizing the research methodology, it is essential for researchers to understand the local contextual issues (social, historical, and institutional) associated with conducting research in Russia. The following section discusses those local issues in Novosibirsk and Irkutsk.

¹⁶ Warwick, D.P. “The Politics and Ethics of Field Research,” p. 315-330, in Bulmer & Warwick, eds, *Social Research in Developing Countries: Surveys and Censuses in the Third World*, London, UCL Press, 1983.

¹⁷ Buckley, p. 226.

University of Washington – SAPA – BIBM Partnership

A program conducted jointly with the Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs at the University of Washington, the Siberian Academy for Public Administration (SAPA) in Novosibirsk and the Baikal Institute of Business and Management (BIBM) in Irkutsk represents a microcosm of the opportunities and challenges associated with research in Russia. The goal of the partnership was to jointly develop a unique curriculum, conduct innovative and applicable research, and promote professional training and outreach in the field of micro-finance. There are compelling reasons to promote micro-finance in the underdeveloped regions of Russia, particularly in Siberia. As government-owned industries in Russia continue to fail, small and medium businesses offer an alternative model for economic development and employment. Micro-finance organizations offer savings and credit programs that extend small loans to the very poor for self employment projects that have the potential to generate income, encourage entrepreneurship, build social capital, and allow individuals to care for themselves and their families.

The two Siberian cities of Novosibirsk and Irkutsk differ dramatically in terms of history, population diversity and size, and economy. Novosibirsk was founded during the construction of the Trans-Siberian Railway in the late 19th century and it grew quickly because of its strategic location for Russian settlers going further on into Siberia. Novosibirsk is situated along the banks of the Rivers Ob and Kamenka facilitating both trade and transport. During the 1920-30s, Novosibirsk gained ideological and strategic importance as a center for building socialism during the first of Stalin's five-year plans. Later during World War II, the evacuation of factories from European Russia greatly increased local industry and promoted massive population growth. The city continues to be a center for metallurgy, food and chemical production, and military industry.

The Russian Academy of Sciences opened its Siberian branch in Novosibirsk in 1943. Since then Novosibirsk has been the educational center of Siberia, famous for its

“Academ-gorodok” university campus located in the forest not far from the center of town. Given its strategic location, industrial development, and academic institutions, Novosibirsk became one of the most important cities in Russia after Moscow and St. Petersburg. With a major conservatory, drama theatre, and the ballet, Novosibirsk also contributes to high Russian culture. In the post-Soviet era, Novosibirsk remains the capital of Siberia, although its economy has been severely affected by the post-1999 economic collapse in Russia. Today, Novosibirsk ranks as the fourth largest city in Russia.¹⁸

Irkutsk is located further to the east in Siberia. The city is much older than Novosibirsk, dating to the 17th century. The trans-Siberian railroad arrived in Irkutsk in 1898 and contributed to the city’s further development. Irkutsk has been inextricably tied to St. Petersburg’s political currents and is largely responsible for the association of Siberia with labor camps and prisons. Tsar Nikolai I (1825-1855) exiled A.N. Radischev, a radical intellectual, and the Decembrists, a group of high-ranking officers who marched in St. Petersburg to abolish serfdom and create a constitutional monarchy in Russia. They were sent to the Irkutsk region where they were forced to work in extremely difficult conditions. Despite numerous challenges, these political dissidents and their heirs made a great contribution to the study of Siberia’s history, geography, economy and ethnography. Irkutsk is a living testament to the enduring quality of the Russian spirit to overcome the most difficult challenges.

Today Irkutsk is a regional center drawing a diverse population of traders from Central Asia and the Far East. Its proximity to Lake Baikal, the world’s largest fresh water lake, has spawned a growing eco-tourism industry. Irkutsk has a population of 650,000, which is much smaller than Novosibirsk’s two million inhabitants. However, its architecture, cultural diversity, and the beauty of its natural environment make Irkutsk an exceptionally interesting place to visit and research. In the twentieth century, Nikolai Shelgunov wrote, “Irkutsk is the only Siberian city, which has the city character. As England created London, France – Paris, Siberia created Irkutsk. Siberia is proud of

¹⁸ This information was adapted from Louis, Victor and Jennifer, *The Complete Guide to the Soviet Union*, St. Martin’s Press, New York, NY, 1980, available at: <<http://www.utopiasprings.com/instnovo.htm>>, accessed on

Irkutsk. Not to see this city means not to see Siberia.”¹⁹ With its wide boulevards, classical architecture, and pastel colored buildings, Irkutsk is the easternmost European city in Asia.

Novosibirsk and Irkutsk provide two different perspectives on Siberia. Novosibirsk was built largely during the Soviet experience and has inherited much of the economic inefficiencies and government bureaucracy of the communist past. As an enduring testimony to the formative role of the Communist Party in Novosibirsk, Lenin’s statue still figures prominently in the main square across from the Opera Theatre. The bureaucratic legacy is represented by a high concentration of government industries and a massive military-industrial complex. Yet, Novosibirsk has managed to attract major investment and as one instructor at the Siberian Academy of Public Administration remarked, “As long as they keep on building, we will survive!” A visitor walking down Lenin Street in the center of the city will notice new coffee shops, American pizza restaurants, Irish pubs, and numerous designer boutiques selling the latest European fashions. Novosibirsk is also home to one of Russia’s largest outdoor flea markets, the infamous *Barakholka*. This massive trading space, located on the outskirts of the city, is a magnet for small businesses and entrepreneurial activity and is contrasted only with the surrounding apartment buildings, which are crumbling in disrepair.

Irkutsk inherited a different institutional legacy. It does not have the massive concentration of Soviet bureaucracies or the military-industrial complex, which provide the backbone of economic and political development in Novosibirsk. With its legacy of radical dissent, Irkutsk residents claim a different intellectual history. It feels much more removed from the Soviet past, with an atmosphere unlike most other Russian cities. A visitor to Irkutsk notices the diverse population of Buryatians, Tuvans, Chinese, Kazakhs, Koreans, Mongols and Russians. One can get lost in the Asian market, a meandering, rug and tarp-covered maze of shops where everything from textiles, jeans, shoes, and fur hats are sold in an intense environment. While Irkutsk may not have the investment resources

May 18, 2003.

of Novosibirsk, it has attracted more westerners to the city, many of whom, however, head straight for Lake Baikal. Thus, Novosibirsk and Irkutsk represent different institutional contexts and different Russian realities. They make for interesting research locations precisely because they have such different economic, social and political histories.

In the following analysis, I present a brief discussion of the standard western practices in survey methodology followed by an analysis of the reasons we chose to conduct the survey using a self-administered methodology. The discussion highlights the unexpected obstacles that we faced in Novosibirsk and Irkutsk. It confirms the observations made by Buckley and others about the limitations of directly exporting survey research abroad.

¹⁹ Quoted in “An Essay About Irkutsk,” available at < <http://www.manus.baikal.ru/eng/essay.htm>>, accessed on May 18, 2003.

CHAPTER II: Survey Design and Method – Theory

Surveys are either designed to look at a specific population or the population at large. If the survey includes a random sample of the population, the results can be generalized to the entire population and compared to other groups. Many researchers in Russia can reasonably expect to want both types of information. For example, our goal was to obtain targeted information on entrepreneurs in both the urban and rural areas in Siberia, as well as to generate a random sample of the population in Novosibirsk and Irkutsk.

When a researcher is looking to make statements about the characteristics of an entire population, there are two options: a survey and a census. When administered correctly, a survey can provide a snapshot of certain characteristics of a population without having to ask every member of that population. A census involves questioning every member of a population, an expensive and time-consuming undertaking.

Only through the use of unbiased methods, which are described below, can a survey on an appropriate sample size of people be used as an accurate tool for estimating characteristics about the entire population, including those who were not surveyed.²⁰ A scientifically valid survey, by American standards, has the following elements: a large enough sample size to yield accurate results, the people completing the survey must be selected randomly, and the questions must be asked in a way that respondents can answer accurately.²¹

A survey requires a large enough sample size to produce the desired accuracy; the survey results will then closely resemble those of the true population. If enough people are not sampled or the sampling is not conducted randomly, then the survey will have *sampling error*. An example of this would be conducting a randomly-selected telephone survey during the day-time hours, from 9 to 5. A significant portion of the people who work from

²⁰ When trying to collect information that cannot be scientifically extrapolated to an entire population, the following non-survey methods are used: using existing or secondary data, conducting in-depth case studies, analyzing pre-existing written material and conducting interviews with people who are not selected at random.

²¹ Salant, Priscilla & Dillman, Don A. How to Conduct Your Own Survey. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1994).

nine to five would be missing, the survey would not be conducted randomly, and sampling error would thus be introduced.

In order for the sample to be truly random, every member of the population to be studied must have an equal chance to be surveyed. If the method by which the people to be surveyed are chosen does not include all of the members of the population, then the survey will have *coverage error* because all of the people did not have an equal chance to participate. An example of coverage error is the use of magazine subscription lists to survey people on who will win an upcoming election; this provides an accurate portrayal of which candidate specific magazine subscribers will vote for, but not the population at large.

Another survey requirement that ensures an additional degree of accuracy is that the people who are chosen and respond to the survey have the same characteristics as those who are chosen but do not respond. Not only should people be chosen at random, but those who end up completing the survey must also be of a random group, thereby avoiding *nonresponse error*. An example of this error would be conducting a randomly selected mail-in survey on a population that is largely illiterate; one would expect to see a higher rate of returned surveys from the literate portion of the population, thus oversampling this population and yielding nonresponse error.

The basics of survey design require clarity on two questions: whether or not to use an interviewer, and the problem of open versus closed questions. The four most common methods of data collection involving a survey include the mail-in questionnaire, the telephone interview, a questionnaire conducted by an interviewer in the presence of a respondent, and the self-administered questionnaire.²² Use of the mail and telephone survey requires complete lists of the population from which a random sample can be drawn. Telephone and in-person surveys require superior enumerator skills compared to other methods.

²² Warwick, Donald and Charles Lininger, *The Sample Survey: Theory and Practice*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1975, p. 128.

Mail-In Survey

When conducting a mail-in questionnaire, surveyors take a randomly selected sample from a population list, mail an advance-notice letter, the questionnaire, and then follow-up if the survey is not returned within a reasonable timeframe. This survey method requires the least amount of human resources. Respondents fill out the survey themselves, so if the survey is written properly, there is no chance of the measurement error that can be introduced by an interviewer. Mail-in surveys are prone to coverage error because of the difficulty of obtaining completely accurate lists of the population to be sampled; lists are often out-of-date or certain people are not included, either by choice or because they do not subscribe to the service provided by the company collecting the list, for example a utility company. An additional error that is a problem for mail-in surveys is non-response. People have a chance to look over the survey before filling it out giving them a chance to reject it, or household members for whom the survey is not intended could respond, making the survey respondents different from the population at large. Because researchers are unable to know exactly who filled out the survey in the home, there is a possibility that the data results are invalid.

Advantages

- Mail surveys are among the least expensive.
- Mail surveys permit respondents to answer at their leisure and are not considered as intrusive as other kinds of interviews.

Disadvantages

- Mail surveys take time – several weeks or longer after mailing. In countries with unreliable mail systems, like Russia, it may take even longer.
- Responses to mail surveys are often low. The best response levels tend to be from well-educated people. Populations with low literacy levels are usually inaccessible with mail surveys.

Telephone Survey

Telephone surveys use the same randomly selected sampling technique of pre-existing lists, or they can be conducted by using random digit dialing machines which

access both listed and unlisted numbers. This survey method experiences, consequently, the same coverage error problem as mail-in surveys. Telephone surveying has an advantage over mail-in surveys because non-response errors can be reduced; the interviewer can insist on speaking with the randomly selected person to be surveyed. Additional drawbacks of telephone surveying include measurement error if the interviewer is not well versed in unbiased survey techniques and is unable to adequately articulate the questions.

Advantages

- People can be contacted faster and it is possible to skip questions in the survey based on answers to earlier questions.
- Randomization of sample is facilitated with random digit dialing.

Disadvantages

- In the U.S. many people are reluctant to answer phone interviews. In Russia, this is not as much of a problem. Rather, poor phone lines and inaccessible telephone lists make this method more problematic.
- Telephone surveys are best conducted between 6-9pm, when someone is sure to be home. This is a narrow window of time and ensures that the interviewer interrupts dinner or family time.

In-Person Interviews

In-person interviews, the predominant survey method prior to the 1970s, require far more researcher resources than mail-in and telephone surveying, but they have a distinct advantage as well. When adequate lists are not available or populations with adequate lists are not likely to respond randomly via the mail or telephone, face-to-face interviewing is ideal. Face-to-face interviewing can thus compensate for the problems that would arise surveying an illiterate population via the mail. Face-to-face interviewing suffers from the serious drawback, however, of measurement error. An inadequately trained interviewer can skew the entire survey by making the same error repeatedly, even if it is made consistently. Additionally, conducting a face-to-face interview can be very time-consuming and thus expensive—the interviewer must be present and give the interview to

the interviewee. Cost cutting by reducing the sample size can be a temptation, but this introduces basic sampling error, which will decrease the accuracy of the survey.

Advantages

- Ability to target a specific population.
- Permits interviewee with opportunity to see survey and ask questions.
- Sometimes longer interviews are tolerated.

Disadvantages

- In-person interviews are time intensive and more costly than other methods.
- Requires extensive staff training.
- It is easy to obtain a non-representative sample by either over or under sampling certain segments of the population.

Self-Administered Survey

A self-administered survey, during which questionnaires are delivered by hand to a randomly selected sample of the population, “combines the low labor cost of mail-in surveys with the personal contact of face-to-face interviews.”²³ Self-administered surveying is less prone than face-to-face interviews to measurement error because the interviewer is not actually conducting the survey. Another benefit to self-administered surveying is that a relatively small staff can collect a larger sample size than they would by interviewing people directly.

Advantages

- Allows for greater efficiency by combining mail approach with face-to-face interaction.
- Less prone to measurement error; uses smaller staff than face-to-face interviews.

²³ Salant, Priscilla and Don A. Dillman. How to Conduct Your Own Survey. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1994).

Disadvantages

- May not meet random sample requirements.
- Results may not be valid if there is a lot of talking amongst participants while they fill out the survey.

If an adequate list is unavailable, a technique called ‘area probability sampling frame’ can be used to generate randomness. This approach is limited to face-to-face and self-administered surveying. It involves sampling randomly selected, small geographic areas within the target area of the population. The surveyor must first decide what the target population is, map it, divide the map into relatively evenly distributed sectors, then attempt to randomly target those sectors. The most accurate method of doing this involves mapping residential structures within a community, choosing randomly selected sectors, and then targeting randomly selected households from within the structures.

In order to ensure the accuracy of survey results, sampling must be conducted randomly. Determining the appropriate sample size requires a balance between the resources available and the benefits of increasing the sample size. Large samples provide more accurate results than small ones, but the benefit is not as dramatic as many people expect. In other words, a sample of 100,000 provides estimates that are only about twice as precise as a sample of 2,000.²⁴ According to Salant and Dillman, the sample size depends on several variables, including how much sampling error can be tolerated, population size, how varied the population is, and the smallest subgroup within the sample for which estimates are needed.

One of the interesting results in sampling is that researchers need about the same sample size to make estimates, regardless of whether or not the population is two million like in Novosibirsk or 650,000 like in Irkutsk. According to Salant and Dillman, “Only when we are concerned with groups of less than several thousand does the sample size

²⁴ National Center for Education Statistics, available at <<http://nces.ed.gov/naal/faq/faqscoring.asp>>, accessed on May 16, 2003.

make a big difference.”²⁵ The key is that more diverse or variable populations, like those in Siberia, require larger sample sizes. Therefore, it is usually a good idea to take a conservative approach when it comes to sample sizes. In Siberia, we decided that the appropriate sample size from the Novosibirsk and Irkutsk Oblasts would be 500 surveys from each location. Of the total from each location 300 surveys were from the city, 100 were from the village, and 100 were small-business owners.

Though survey design appears quite complicated, some methods are more applicable than others. Despite the many ways of conducting a survey, very few of these, if any, would work in the regional Russian context.

²⁵ Salant and Dillman, “How to Conduct Your Own Survey,” p. 56.

CHAPTER III: Implementing the Survey in Russia

Buckley identifies four specific problems associated with conducting research in Russia. Communication heads the list, followed by ownership, training, and sampling. Even though she does not consider the center-periphery dilemma, most of her findings were validated by our field experience in Novosibirsk and Irkutsk. In addition to these four areas, we also noticed several other challenges, including the influence of local elites and the survey awareness of respondents. In this section I explain the rationale for choosing a self-administered survey, followed by a discussion of the obstacles to implementing rigorous, scientific research in Russia's regions.

During a brainstorm session the University of Washington research team contemplated how best to apply survey theory to Novosibirsk and Irkutsk. It quickly became apparent that attention needed to be given to how the survey would be implemented on the ground. For example, a telephone survey would entail locating accurate telephone lists and would require extremely proficient Russian on behalf of the interviewers. Accurate telephone lists are compounded by the increased use of cell-phones in Russia. Agence-France Press reports that cell-phone use more than doubled over the past year, with 18 million Russians connected to wireless cell-phone networks.²⁶ While a majority of cell-phone use is concentrated in Moscow and St. Petersburg, cell phone use has jumped from 3.1 to 6.4 percent in the country's other regions. One reason that cell-phone use has grown so quickly is the poor state of Russia's regular telephone infrastructure, where the poor connection quality is legendary.

Anecdotal observation in Siberia revealed concentrated cell-phone use among young adults and the emerging upper middle-class in the regional capital cities of Novosibirsk and Irkutsk. In many rural locations, we found that there were no telephone lines for individual households. In one village in the Irkutsk oblast, the only telephone was located at the central post-office. We noticed several people talking on cell-phones,

²⁶ Agence-France Presse, "Mobile Phone Use Doubles in Russia," December 26, 2002, accessed via Lexis - Nexis, April 18, 2003. According to the report 12-15 per cent of all Russians will use cell phones by the end of 2002.

however, and we could see a distant telecommunications tower. In other villages, however, there was no evidence of telephone lines at all. Despite the occasional bus connecting these villages with the regional capital, they were virtually isolated from the outside world. Faced with the complexities of poor regular telephone lines and increased cell-phone use, we determined that a telephone survey would not adequately ensure a random sample.

A mail-in survey would be much less time-intensive, but would require significantly more financial resources to pay for postage and logistical support to coordinate a return address and mailing. The Russian post-office system is notoriously slow and inefficient. Individual mail-boxes in Russia are also unreliable as they are frequently vandalized in the public housing projects that comprise most of the real-estate in large metropolitan cities. In the villages, the mail system is even less reliable. In addition, we expected that an extremely low return-rate, which would mean mailing out several thousand surveys in order to achieve our target numbers. The advantage, however, of a mail-survey is that it would have a better chance of obtaining a truly representative sample of the population. Nevertheless, it became apparent that the disadvantages heavily outweighed the advantages for this type of approach.

Warwick and Laninger note that one of the primary disadvantages of a self-administered survey is that it is dependent on literacy, education level and visual acuity.²⁷ This may be relevant for lesser-developed countries with low literacy rates, but Russia clearly falls into a different category. Literacy rates in Russia approach 100 per cent for ages 5-49 and education is state-funded and compulsory for the first 10 years. We encountered numerous individuals with two or more higher education degrees, many in the physical sciences. Perhaps more relevant to survey research in Russia is that respondents in self-administered questionnaires can and do look ahead, skip around, and compare their answers with those of others. This introduces sampling errors in the data. Because the proposed survey on micro-finance was complex and especially long, conducting the survey using an interviewer made the most sense given the circumstances.

²⁷ Warwick and Laninger, p. 129.

In-person interviews were deemed to be the most appropriate survey method for Novosibirsk and Irkutsk. The advantage to this method is that American students could readily participate and conduct the interviews themselves. Russia does not have legislation prohibiting foreign students from conducting research. We envisioned surveying along busy streets, parks, and in public areas, such as bus and train terminals, markets, and outside apartment complexes. We also expected to obtain a much higher response rate compared to a mail-in survey. The primary disadvantage of this method was the fact that it would not allow us to achieve a truly random survey of the population. Nonetheless, we planned to supplement our data with qualitative interviews. Russian student volunteers would also assist the American students with navigating the city, as well as the intricacies of conducting the survey in the Russian language.

Unexpected Obstacles

There were numerous unexpected obstacles during the implementation of our survey in Russia. These included obtaining a random sample, influence of local elite, and the local population's unfamiliarity with survey research.

Obtaining a Random Sample

In a country as large and diverse as Russia, sampling raises numerous problems. Small scale, single-issue surveys dominated most sociological surveys during the late Soviet period. Buckley notes that Soviet research relied almost exclusively on non-probability sampling methods.²⁸ Not surprisingly, ideology was the foremost factor as scholars had to make sure their research was officially acceptable. Soviet social science researchers were largely isolated from their colleagues in the west, and thus not able to participate in many of the most interesting methodological developments of random survey techniques. Researchers in Moscow and St. Petersburg appear to have overcome these problems, as evidenced by the high-quality surveys conducted by the ROMIR and VCIOM agencies. Problems still remain outside the center, however.

Buckley argues that new practices in survey research are yet to be institutionalized in Russia.²⁹ In Novosibirsk and Irkutsk our research partners were not strong on survey design, rigor and randomization. Some preferred to talk about theory and demonstrated a solid grasp of the Gallup principles, but in general, they preferred not to get involved in the hands-on side of the research. In an effort to save time for all of us, our partners suggested on several occasions that we could accomplish our work faster if they could just organize large auditoriums for us to survey. This practice continues to exist in the regions, apparently. Our emphasis in both cities was to establish standard sampling approaches and to illustrate the importance of randomization in the data collection process.

Most of our surveys were conducted through street interviews, although we did sample several large groups that had been arranged beforehand, including adult students at a continuing education center and small entrepreneurs at their businesses. The personal interview method permitted us to canvass large areas of both cities and villages. However, given the massive size of Novosibirsk and Irkutsk we were not able to canvass every single road or even every region. In one suburb region in southwest Novosibirsk, we were unable to find anyone who would fill out our survey for nearly four hours one day. It was much easier to sample in central areas with city parks, railroad stations, and public institutions and much more difficult to sample in the suburb locations that are characterized by massive housing complexes.

It is clear that we did not obtain a truly random sample of the population according to western survey standards in either Novosibirsk or Irkutsk. There are many reasons for this. Many of the middle-age people and seniors were suspicious about answering questions on the street, and as one of our student assistants, Irina Mitrofanovna, noted, “This is definitely a Soviet mentality.” While the police never once asked to see our official registration documents, numerous *babushkas* (old women) at the bazaars demanded them at the top of their voices and denounced us to anyone who would listen. If this happened, we would be lucky if anyone else would fill out the survey in that location.

²⁸ Buckley, p. 225

²⁹ Buckley, p. 230.

The most productive places to conduct our interviews were in public spaces, including parks, fountains, and even outdoor cafes where people had time and interest to fill out the survey. There was an abundance of young people in these locations and it was extremely easy to have them fill out the survey. Most of the parks were located in the center of Novosibirsk and Irkutsk. According to the best estimates, these are also the parts of the cities with the highest wealth concentrations, although suburban neighborhoods with single-family houses can now be found outside any large Russian city. In cities we actually had to stop asking respondents between the ages of 18-25 to fill out the survey in an attempt to even out the age distribution in our sample. When we tried to obtain a wider sample of the population by asking middle-aged people in other urban locations, we found that they either had no interest or little time to talk with us. The best time to target the adult populations was late afternoon and early evening when most people were finished with work and willing to spend a few minutes with us.

Sampling men between the ages of 30-45 years old was extremely difficult. In both the cities and rural locations, a majority of men in this category were busy at work. However, a large number were also either clearly inebriated or completely unwilling to participate. In the village of Leninsky located approximately 20 miles outside of Novosibirsk in a picturesque setting on the Ob River, we did not even see any men in this age category in the village. Men of working age in that village were all out in the fields cutting hay. At each house, a *babushka* would answer the door and when asked if her husband was around she would invariably indicate that he had died. On several occasions the *babushkas* invited us inside their houses, provided us with tea, and answered our questions. However, many also remarked that they were too old for micro-finance and that surveys were better left to the next generation, on whose shoulders Russia's development would fall.

According to the most recent data compiled by the Russian State Statistics Committee, the average life expectancy for Russian men is less than 59 years - 58 years

and 11 months - while that for Russian women is 72 years.³⁰ Demographic and health-care experts say that the chief factors behind the poor figures are alcohol abuse, psychological stress caused by economic uncertainty, widespread smoking, poor personal-safety practices, an unhealthy diet and a general lack of exercise. If men were working, they were employed doing physical labor in the fields or in factories near urban centers. During our visits to the villages, most of the men we encountered were not in any sort of condition to fill out the survey. The majority of the rural population consisted of elderly widows and young children. Not surprisingly, attempts to canvass villages led to a disproportionately high percentage of responses from the elderly. This complicates what can statistically be said about the demand and supply of finance in rural villages in the Novosibirsk and Irkutsk oblasts.

Men expressed much more skepticism about the survey. This skepticism was fueled by feelings that the United States was attempting to “buy-up” Siberia. One male respondent refused to fill out the survey because he thought that it would lead to more of an American presence in the region. This respondent passionately said that Americans should be in America, and Russians should be in Russia. Another male respondent in the village of Apoksino in the Novosibirsk Oblast refused to fill out the survey because another group had surveyed the village five years before. He noted that the promises of those surveyors to bring resources to the village had failed to materialize, and therefore, he would take no part in the survey. This problem was echoed elsewhere. Failed promises and hollow words on behalf of previous western researchers have sowed a great deal of skepticism in the rural population. Unfortunately, these realities present serious obstacles to researchers attempting to obtain a truly random sample of the local population.

³⁰ By comparison, the average life span for men in the United States is 73 years and for women 79 years. Male life expectancy in France and Germany is 74 years, while for women it is 82 and 80 years, respectively. Titova, Irina, “Russian Life Expectancy on Downward Trend,” *St. Petersburg Times*, January 17, 2003,

Influence of local elite

The question of ownership is an important factor in mitigating the negative influences of local elite. The local elite are those people who are in a position of some power to either help facilitate research, or who are important public leaders that may have influence or access to local resources that might be necessary to successfully complete the field research. Joint research projects with distinctly American research agendas are less likely to be positively received. Projects which have joint ownership and which can actually bring benefits to local communities can lead to tremendous opportunities.

As with any joint research project in Russia, fieldwork was facilitated by our local partners. In both Novosibirsk and Irkutsk, we were working with institutions of higher education. The Siberian Academy of Public Administration (SAPA) in Novosibirsk provides an interesting example of a fairly common practice for academic institutions following the collapse of the Soviet Union. SAPA was renamed in the early 1990s. Previously it was the primary government academy for members of the Communist Party in Siberia. Graduates continue to occupy distinguished positions in local and regional government throughout the region. While the name has changed, the personnel have not as most of the faculty just changed their political association to conform to the new democratic developments in Russia. While they had changed their official party membership and embraced democratic governance and transparent public administration, our contacts enjoyed numerous perquisites in the community. Access to prestigious *dachas* (summer cottages), travel, English language proficiency, and the Internet set them apart from much of the population we wanted to survey.

In hindsight it is clear that this association with SAPA in Novosibirsk tended to influence how our research was locally received. Several respondents asked why we were not working with Novosibirsk State University, one of the most prestigious universities in Russia. Our response to this was that SAPA was a better match with the Evans School of Public Affairs, a public administration program at the University of Washington. This

available at Johnson's Russia List, #14 – JRL 7023, at <<http://www.cdi.org/russia/johnson/7023-14.cfm>>, accessed on April 18, 2003.

distinction mattered little for local residents, who continued to associate our collaboration with SAPA as a partnership between elites in society. Many times this actually increased skepticism and made it more difficult to conduct our survey. The key point here is that researchers must be mindful of the baggage associated with their professional associations. While many institutions have direct Communist Party heritage, others have more institutional legacy and public prominence. This can affect the quality of survey research.

Our colleagues in Novosibirsk and Irkutsk helped to organize transportation, contacts with local officials and access to the population. Developing the survey, however, was a joint process, which took place during the six months prior to summer 2003. Throughout the development stage, many of our Russian colleagues suggested helpful ways to improve the survey. We shared numerous drafts with our Russian colleagues with the intention of developing a culturally sensitive survey. Via email and in face-to-face meetings we intensely debated the meaning and applicability of certain words and phrases in the survey and how they would be locally received in Novosibirsk and Irkutsk. This joint process also helped both the American and Russian scholars to communicate expectations associated with the research process.

One Russian specialist commented that our survey did not take into account the “mentality of Russian society.” She recommended that we place the questions relating to credit and loans at the end of the survey and change the wording of numerous questions. Her point was surprising to all of us, because we had worked so closely together to create an instrument that would be locally acceptable. Unlike many researchers whose survey instrument is developed in the United States or Europe, translated, and usually pre-tested on recent immigrants, our survey was a joint product, albeit reflecting the views and opinions of a younger generation of Russians. Part of the challenge that faces researchers in Russia is how to make sense of the differing interpretations of the Russian “mentality.” For some, the Soviet experience defines one’s outlook, while for others the formative experience is Russia’s experiment with market capitalism.

Another example of elite influence over survey implementation is drawn from our travels to numerous villages in the Novosibirsk and Irkutsk oblasts. In each village it is customary to make a courtesy call to the local administration in order to inform the mayor of one's presence and the purpose of our research. In the village of Lenninovo in the Novosibirsk oblast our initial contact led to a bias in sampling. Upon arrival in Lenninovo, the mayor appointed the Chief of the Social Services Department to be our personal guide. Despite our insistence on wanting to freely walk through the village to interview respondents in their homes or at the market, the social services chief said that he would personally oversee our research. He escorted us into his office and gave orders to have all of his staff complete the survey. Judging by the expression on their faces, most staff members were clearly annoyed at the interruption in their schedules. Without having time to give proper directions and because he insisted on providing a modicum of hospitality (vodka and chocolate in his office), we were unable to supervise the survey implementation. This was repeated again when the chief escorted us to the department of agriculture. Here, several groups of employees talked amongst themselves as they filled out the survey together. In the interest of preserving our sampling methodology standards, we were forced to exclude these samples from our survey.

Another example of how elite influence led to unexpected results took place at a local Novosibirsk job-training center. The "Sphera" center was located at the local Dom Officerov (Officer's Club) and provided job training and education to retired military personnel and referrals from the local unemployment agency. Natalia Fedorovna, the director of the center, permitted us to survey three evening groups of approximately twenty students each. We would not have had access to these groups without the personal contacts of one of the professors at the Siberian Academy for Public Administration. In this case, our personal contacts afforded us an opportunity we would otherwise not have had.

When conducting research in Russia's regions it is important to recognize how past Soviet bureaucratic practices continue to affect current efforts to conduct research. In reality, these practices may not have changed at all. This point has not been emphasized enough. As western specialists conducting quantitative research in Siberia, our challenge is

to get beyond the restrictions placed on access to local populations. New visa regulations and restrictions on travel mean that it will only become more difficult to conduct field research in Russia, but this work must continue. Our local contacts tried to steer us to their personal contacts, which made sense from their perspective. However, if we had only relied on their assistance, we would have had even less of a chance of obtaining a random sample of the population.

Survey Awareness³¹

Survey awareness remains one of the main obstacles to conducting quality research in Russia's regions. Awareness is affected by history, social context, and institutional legacies which structures how people think of information, trust, and the benefits of surveys. While it is not uncommon to see pollsters outside McDonald's on Tverskaya Street in central Moscow or on Lenin Street in Novosibirsk, it is uncommon to encounter researchers in Russia's villages. The villages remain idyllic and lacking in modernization. In a country as ethnically and regionally diverse as Russia, assuming that the local population will have an understanding or appreciation of research methodology can lead to problems in data collection. Continued collaboration through joint research projects is essential for exporting scientific research methodology to the periphery.

The unfamiliarity of survey research in rural Russia presented numerous challenges. Both Novosibirsk and Irkutsk oblasts lack a strong survey culture. This became apparent when respondents expressed cynicism over the utility of the survey, or when people hesitated to participate because they think though that was nothing in the survey for them.³² In these regions, well-trained interviewers are crucial to convince people to take the survey and to assuage their skepticism about the process.

Buckley finds that the standard practice for survey research is to provide training for interviewers. Seemingly, however, this does not always happen outside the center in

³¹ Please see Attachment 1 and 2 for the English and Russian versions of the survey instrument.

³² Bulmer, p. 157.

Russia.³³ None of the student volunteers we worked with in the field had ever conducted survey research. They had never had a class on survey design or methodology and were not well acquainted with the responsibilities of the interviewer. While the American team in Novosibirsk and Irkutsk provided basic interviewer training, this was clearly insufficient. On-the-job learning helped to refine delivery and the logistical issues of survey research, but it also tended to reinforce negative habits.

First, students routinely answered questions asked by respondents. Often the students tried to help the respondent by suggesting “correct” answers that they might chose. Others skipped over questions, assuming that the question did not apply to the respondent or that they would not answer it, either because of age or gender. Other shortcuts intended to increase the sample size involved student interviewers asking their friends to fill out the survey, or their relatives. Senior scholars at SAPA and BIBM casually permitted these activities in both locations. Second, students failed to keep appropriate records of non-response rates. These problems are likely due to a lack of survey training and unfamiliarity with survey methodology. The responsibility clearly rests on the western researcher to provide adequate training to all interviewers. Continued lack of attention to survey implementation methodology will perpetuate problems of data quality, efficiency, and research practices in Russia.

Low levels of survey awareness forced us to analyze how best to present our survey. In Novosibirsk the initial approach to conducting the survey was to ask people to read and fill out the survey individually. The idea was that this would allow the American and Russian researchers to ask additional people – as many as we had clipboards and surveys for – to fill out the survey and thereby maximize the number of surveys received during any one outing. However, this turned out to be a time-intensive process. Some respondents were not able to read well-enough to answer the questions, others took too much time and studied each question as if there was a hidden answer, and still others decided that the survey was too long after having started it and decided not to complete it.

³³ Buckley, p. 227.

It took approximately 15 minutes and sometimes a lot longer for respondents to answer the questions.

On the advice of our Russian partners, we experimented with reading the survey directly to the respondents and having them respond to oral questions. This method produced far more accurate results as respondents felt obliged to answer each question in the survey. The amount of time each survey took was reduced significantly from over fifteen minutes to approximately ten minutes. This time difference allowed us to honestly say in our introduction to people on the street that the survey would take a small amount of time. Reading surveys directly to respondents also had its drawbacks. For one, it made us rely more on our Russian student partners, who possessed superior (and native) Russian language skills. While some of the American student teams were able to use this method, others preferred to stick with the previous methodology or to focus where they could be in small-group interviews with the help of a Russian interpreter.

CHAPTER IV: Cross – Cultural Factors

There are significant cultural factors that complicate the direct transfer of western survey methodology to the Russian Federation. One important issue is language. A seemingly simple task such as translating a survey from English into Russian becomes much more complex as words can convey different meanings and subjective associations and seemingly basic questions can have different interpretations in the field.

A classic example in our micro-finance survey concerned the appropriate translation of the word “business.” Western economic vocabulary has become commonplace throughout Russia and terms like “business” and “businessman” are commonly used in popular print and television media. Yet, these terms have surprisingly different connotations in the Russian setting than they do in the United States. Russia’s experiment with shock therapy and market capitalism in the early – mid 1990s spawned a class of “New Russians” who operated mafia-style businesses. Many of these individuals used unscrupulous practices to extort money and resources from the government, as well as unsuspecting citizens. They spent their money excessively and helped to create a negative image of capitalism that remains intact today throughout much of Russia. The legacy of socialism and this new negative reaction towards excessive capitalism has resulted in a situation where Russians negatively associate the term “business” with shady financial practices.

It was essential for the researchers in our program to acknowledge the underlying meanings of words before implementing the survey. Instead of directly translating terms like “business” and “small-business” with their direct Russian cognates, we chose to use more neutral terms for entrepreneurial activity and small-industry so that we could convey the correct concept. As we developed the survey, each question had to be analyzed in a similar process. How would the question be interpreted locally? How would the wording of the question affect responses? Could we be sure that we knew how each question would be interpreted? Issues concerning formatting and the use of boxes, checks, and areas for open-ended questions were also of critical importance. Throughout the translation process,

we continually sought the advice of Russian students and partners. However, we found that even they did not always agree and therefore we were forced to make difficult choices.

For example, the first section of our survey asked basic demographic questions. One of the questions asked for marital status. We listed single, married, divorced and widowed as four options for respondents to choose from. From an American perspective, the question was laid out clearly and would have been easily filled out. Thinking that this question was straightforward, we decided to leave the same format for the question and just translate the words. It turned out that there was a great deal of confusion over which box to check as the boxes immediately preceded or followed each category. In hindsight, this question could have been better organized vertically, rather than horizontally. The difficulty experienced in filling out this question in Siberia may reflect general inexperience with survey research.

Another question asked “How long have you lived in your current location?” Many respondents filled this out with the following response: “All my life.” We did not consider the fact that Russians do not move nearly as frequently as Americans. It is not uncommon for someone to live in the same city and same residential building their entire life. A lack of adequate housing supply and the difficulty of obtaining a residence permit in the capital cities of Moscow and St. Petersburg makes it much more likely that people remain in their cities of birth. Therefore, the response, “all my life,” was perfectly logical in the regions of Siberia, but it was something we did not perceive prior to survey implementation.

Another cross-cultural factor that we had not adequately anticipated was confidentiality. While many people filled out the survey in its entirety, a considerable number refused to indicate their individual and family incomes. We asked several questions relating to income, asking respondents to provide us with exact income levels for individuals and a range of income levels for family (e.x. less than 1000 rubles, between 1000-2000 rubles, etc). The reasons why people did not wish to give their income levels ranged from fears that the tax police would obtain their surveys, not feeling comfortable sharing their income levels with strangers, and skepticism about the value of the survey in

general. We found the connection people made between their answers on our survey and the tax police particularly interesting. There are numerous hypotheses, which may explain this. One of the most plausible explanation is that people are evading their taxes. They may be misreporting their income on official statements in order to secure a lower tax burden. They feared that an honest response on our survey might make them susceptible to a violation of the law.

Differing ideas of Community, Civil Society and Social Capital

Another important cross-cultural factor that affected our research was a misunderstanding of civil society and social capital in Russia. Robert Putnam has written that membership in community associations, like those comprising bowling leagues, churches, and volunteer organizations, is an important indicator of social capital and participatory democracy in the United States.³⁴ The research on social capital has become part of the prevailing concepts of western civil society, which has been applied extensively around the globe through international development programs.

From a western perspective, civil society can be conceptualized as a system of groups or individual actors organized as a source of independent political or social power, outside of government.³⁵ Thomas Carothers argues, “Properly understood, civil society is a broader concept, encompassing all the organizations and associations that exist outside of the state (including political parties) and the market.”³⁶ Because western political tradition places singular importance on fostering citizen participation in local affairs, we wanted to measure levels of social capital and say something about civil society in Siberia. However, in hindsight, our questions were infused with an American perspective, validating the critique from our Russian colleagues that our survey instrument did not take into account the Russian mentality.

³⁴ Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon & Shuster, 2000.

³⁵ George Hudson, “Civil Society in Russia: Models and Prospects for Development,” *The Russian Review*, Vol. 62 (April 2003), p. 213.

³⁶ Thomas Carothers, “Civil Society,” *Foreign Policy*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, (Winter 1999-2000), accessed on-line at: <<http://www.strom.clemson.edu/becker/prtm320/Carothers.html>>., March 14, 2003, p. 2.

Russian scholars tend to see *grazhdanskoe obshchestvo* (civil society) through a different analytical framework. The prevailing opinion, encountered in discussion with local residents and articulated by Alexander Domrin, is that Russian civil society cannot function without the state.³⁷ In this sense democracy depends primarily on the establishment of strong political institutions, not necessarily an independent society. President Putin's current attempts to strengthen the federal bureaucracy are seen by many observers as a return to a more authoritarian form of government, which has been synonymous with Russia for over four centuries.³⁸

Several of our questions attempted to gauge membership in community organizations. We asked if people were members of religious, environmental, or charity and volunteer organizations. This question made sense from an American perspective, where there is an active and vibrant society and where it is clear what membership in an organization means. Many Russians said that the Orthodox Church is not an organization that people get membership in – rather it is something that defines Russian identity from birth, irrespective of whether people actually go to church or not. In this sense, to be Russian is to be Orthodox.

Very few respondents indicated that they were part of any organization, club, or association. Is this indicative of a lack of civil society? Perhaps, but one aspect that we failed to consider when designing this question was how the Soviet political experience affected membership in official associations. The Communist Party organized youth leagues and professional labor organizations and membership in them was often required in order to obtain promotion or obtain specific preference. With the dissolution of communism these organizations lost the core sustainable ideology and as a result people stopped participating in them. The disintegration of the command-economy also had a negative impact on factory-organized associations. As factories began to lay off more and

³⁷ Alexander Domrin, "Ten Years Later: Society, 'Civil Society,' and the Russian State," *The Russian Review*, Vol. 62 (April 2003), p. 201.

³⁸ See Nikolai Petro, "Policization versus Democratization: 20 Months of Putin's Federal Reform," PONARS Policy Memo No. 241, January 25, 2002, available at <<http://www.csis.org/ruseura/ponars/index.htm>>.

more people, clubs and associations that were organized through employment closed. This has led to a huge gap in the number of clubs and associations in Russia, but it does not necessarily reflect a lack of civil society per se.

Measuring social capital and civil society through questions about membership in groups may not be appropriate in Russia. Instead, we could have looked at perceptions of improvement in the state's ability to provide security and equal protection for all people under Russian law. People will participate in their community if they are safe and secure to do so and if their activities are not constantly monitored by security services. We could also have asked for the frequency people help each other or cook dinner and get together with friends. Or we could have asked if people know their neighbors. These questions may have provided a more accurate representation of social capital levels and the existence of civil society in Russia.

Discount Rate

A final note about cross-cultural factors affecting research outcomes relates to the last question we asked on our survey. The question was designed to estimate an individual's internal discount rate, or willingness to trade present consumption for future consumption. This question was driven by an intellectual desire to compare responses from other countries, including Vietnam, Brazil, and the United States. We decided to place this question at the end of the survey. By the time many respondents got to it they were tired and many were in a hurry to get on with their days. The question revealed some interesting cultural differences that are noteworthy. For example, Russians are very in-tune with local interest rates and can tell you accurately the short and long-term interest rates at local banks in the cities. They calculate their own personal discount rates in their heads based on the bank rates. Instead of offering approximate values for how much they might pay (in rubles), Russians preferred to answer this question with the percent of interest that they would pay. Many people became angry when we asked them to express their time preference. One man said, "I use percents, calculating the sum is your business."

The discount rate question was phrased in a way that asked for the amount someone would pay for a sum of money for one day, for three months, and for one year. Many people said that it would not be serious to take money for one day, whereas in Vietnam one day was a meaningful period. The Russians indicated that they would be able to get the money from family or friends, who would not charge interest. One elderly woman actually became visibly upset and started crying over the introduction of interest rates on borrowing between friends. When asked about how much they would pay to use the money for three months, numerous people asked which three months – apparently it makes a difference if those months are in the summer or winter. Economic activity in certain industries are cyclical – an obvious fact that had alluded us.

This question revealed a complex understanding of local capital markets and entrepreneurship. As scholars of Russia have observed throughout the centuries, there is no shortage of enterprising behavior in Russia, only varying degrees of government control over the profits of those activities. Not surprisingly talking to people outside the context of the quantitative survey was extremely informative. One woman, Nadezhda Latrygina operated a beauty salon and funneled the profits from her work to a non-profit that she managed, which provided care to victims of domestic violence. Nadezhda reported the difficulty of registering, working with local officials, and the lack of capital that was available to her to expand her activities. One of the most interesting aspects of our conversation with her was her comments about women and small business. She suggested that women have carried the weight of the country on their shoulders during the past ten years of transition. Women, she said, have tremendous capacity to develop small business. They just lack the start-up capital. She implied that most people's salaries go to groceries and clothing – daily essentials – and that few people have savings to devote to start-up capital for a business project. The Soviet legacy of “no-savings” and really small salaries is one apparent cause of the current capital deficit.

Another woman that we interviewed was a successful entrepreneur. She had been in business for ten years and expanded her activities to include several small companies. Working through the turbulent 1990s, she argued that she has had to develop personal

relationships with local bank officials in order to qualify for credit. By all standards she is well-off, taking home an average monthly salary of 14,000 rubles, or approximately \$500. One of the important insights she provided us was that business in Russia has settled down from the lawlessness that followed immediately after the Soviet Union dissolved. Her opinion was that this was in part due to the entrance of women into small business, especially since Russian women do not participate in the “old-boys club” of doing things. The culture of business ethics is slowly evolving and she predicted that over the next five years trade associations would develop that would systematize information on the reliability, profitability, and income statements from regional companies.

This discussion made clear that there are many people in Novosibirsk that can execute business plans, but that few individuals want the responsibility of making decisions. She explicitly stated that the old Soviet mentality has made people risk-adverse. She noted that new business owners were risk takers and that the only way to succeed was to take risks. Additionally, this female entrepreneur argued that mafia problems were concentrated on businesses that were having trouble – not with clean and honest businesses. She confirmed our suspicion that government continues to be the single largest impediment to business development in Russia, as business people are required to pay gratuities to bureaucrats for everything from product approval to travel authority and loan requests.

The Soviet mentality is slowly giving way to a more market oriented, self-help attitude in the regions. This is exemplified during an encounter with one man in his early 50s in a village in the Novosibirsk Oblast. Even though this man was socialized under the Soviet system, he readily acknowledged that each person in Russian society is responsible for improving their quality of life. When it came to the discount rate question, this man was able to answer it easily, like many other small business owners. Later in a post-survey discussion, he said that the biggest problem for Russia, and especially for the rural locations, was a lack of capital. If only he could obtain a small-loan to buy a tractor, he would be able to start making money. The difference in outlook was readily discernable when a few minutes later we interviewed a young, 26 year old woman who had no idea

about the role of credit and despaired that she had no hope for the future. It seemed odd that the older man had so quickly adapted, whereas the young woman had failed to grasp the changes that had occurred in society.

In terms of research, these anecdotes validate Kuechler's critique of the exportability of survey research abroad. Kuechler argues that at the very least, researchers need to combine quantitative and qualitative survey methods in non-Western regions of the world. The most interesting information we obtained during the summer came from qualitative surveys and interviews. The depth at which these conversations exposed the challenges and obstacles to small-business development in Siberia far exceeded the quantitative survey. In the case of Russia, this is an especially insightful recommendation.

Chapter V: Recommendations and Strategies

Survey research is a growth industry in Russia. Information provided by surveys has led to a profound increase in the understanding of the complex process involved in Russia's socio-economic transition. Buckley notes that initial information from collaborative projects between Russian and Western scholars illustrates that significant potential exists for sharing information and methodology.³⁹ Most of the resources and creative development of survey methodology is taking place in Moscow and St. Petersburg. It is still unclear, however, if Western survey research methodology can be exported to Russia's regions. Even though there is a well-educated cadre of Russian social scientists in numerous research institutes throughout the country, the challenges to the standard methodology are enormous, especially in Siberia with its diverse population, massive land area, and irregular communication patterns. The key is to develop appropriate methodology and research procedures that combine quantitative and qualitative techniques.

In order for survey research from Russia's periphery to be widely trusted and respected there are several important factors that must be addressed. The first issue is methodology. A paper, which utilizes survey research, must clearly address issues of sampling. As Buckley and others have noted, the Russian Federation is extremely heterogeneous. This makes it difficult to generalize results to the whole population from any sample. In our brief experience in Novosibirsk and Irkutsk we encountered ethnic minorities from the Caucasus, Buryatia, Tuva, the Altai Region and many other places. Much of the economy appears to function on a barter-basis and it is not uncommon for people to have several income sources in addition to odd jobs, such as evening taxi driver or weekend vegetable trader. Sampling is further complicated in villages where many of the men are inaccessible due to employment patterns and alcoholism. The telephone has yet to reach many villages, which are often seasonally inaccessible due to snow. It is essential for researchers to take account of these complexities in the structure and wording of their survey instruments, in their techniques for targeting certain populations, and in their approach to obtaining random sampling.

³⁹ Buckley, p. 225.

These challenges are further complicated by a different historical context in which survey methodology and sampling developed. Data was often used for strictly state purposes and there was little transparency involved in the process. In Russia, therefore, different procedures evolved for collecting data. These are apparent during visits to local villages when mayors become directly involved in research efforts or when local elites organized opportunities for to interview small business owners or adult students at continuing education centers.

At the center of the historical context is also the reception of survey research by the local population. Skepticism and a profound lack of trust in public institutions in Russia have created a deeply cynical and adversarial rural population. This is especially true for those who have weathered the Soviet demise and struggled through the transition period. It is essential for western researchers in Russia to be sympathetic to local realities of economy, poverty, and power. Russia today is a society with tremendous disparities in wealth and resources. Unfortunately this has actually worsened the conditions for sampling.

Communication is the second issue that must be addressed in collaborative Russian-American research. This is much more than obtaining a verbatim translation of the survey instrument. It consists in developing a survey instrument that is both accurately translated and appropriately contextualized. In developing the University of Washington-Siberian Academy of Public Administration-Baikal Institute of Business Management survey instrument, we repeatedly heard the critique that our approach to micro-finance was too simplistic. Many people suggested that our ruble sums were too small, indicating that the sums were more appropriate for Bangladesh than Russia. This was particularly surprising since we spent five months developing the survey instrument with our colleagues. It indicates more broadly that economic development is proceeding at a non-uniform pace throughout Russia. There is no consensus yet on the sums of money that is required to start a business in Russia. Western researchers would be wise to allow plenty of time for communicating with Russian colleagues prior to data collection. Addressing the

underlying assumptions and values associated with loaded terms like democracy, civil society, or business is critical to obtaining mutual understanding.

Having access to localized knowledge is essential for Western researchers. In our micro-finance research localized knowledge of credit rates, costs of establishing businesses, and average salary rates were essential to obtaining accurate information. In order to achieve this, it must be demonstrated that researchers work closely and over a long time period with Russian colleagues. This can come from several sources, including a significant amount of time spent in country, faculty and student exchange involving first-hand analysis of local conditions prior to research, and demonstration of appropriate pre-testing of the survey. In most cases, pre-tests will indicate problems with the assumptions underlying the survey and it will necessitate changes to numerous questions. In some cases, it will involve completely rewriting the survey and starting over. Researchers who document the ways in which they have adapted their survey to the pre-test findings are much more likely to have achieved more reliable results.

My purpose here has been to illustrate a number of the obstacles that exist at the present moment to quantitative and qualitative research in Russia's regions. Over time, these obstacles are likely to subside as more collaborative research projects specifically target areas outside the center. Any number of issues, ranging from bias and influence of local elite, difficulty of obtaining a truly random sample, and challenges brought about because of different conceptual definitions of terms like civil society, democracy, and capitalism, can affect the quality of research. Collaborative research projects, like those between the University of Washington, the Siberian Academy of Public Administration, and the Baikal Institute for Business Management, are important vehicles for sharing research methodology and providing opportunities for collaborative research. One can only imagine that data quality from Russia's regions will improve as a result.

ATTACHMENT 1: English version of Micro-finance Survey

Siberian Academy of Public Affairs – University of Washington
Research in Microfinance

Hello, we are students from the Siberian Academy of Public Affairs and the University of Washington.

Our purpose is to study people’s interest in obtaining small loans in order to start or expand their own business. What we have in mind are non-bank loan programs of organizations using a simplified loan procedure for microenterprises.

Filling out the questionnaire will take you 15 minutes. You may not ask us to explain unclear questions.

???? ?????? ????????? ?????????????? ? ??????????, ?.?. ?? ?? ?????? ???????????

???? ??????? ? ???.
????? ?????? ?????????? ??????, ?? ??????????? ????? ??????????
???????? ?? ??, ??? ??????? ???? ??????

- 1. Age _____
- 2. Sex M...() F...()
- 3. Nationality _____
- 4. Have you never been married...() Married ... () Divorced...() Widowed...()

- 5. Do you live in a:
 - City () Name _____
 - Town () Name _____
 - Village () Name _____
- 5?. How long have you lived there? _____
- 6. Do you belong to any voluntary organizations (Religious groups, environmental, charitable, etc.)
..... Yes() No()
 - 6a. If yes, which ones? _____
- 7. How many people live with you in your house or apartment (including yourself)? _____
 - 7?. Do you live with... (check all that apply)
 - Spouse ()
 - Parents ()
 - Grandparents ()
 - Children ()
 - Spouse of son or daughter ()
 - Grandchildren ()
 - Other _____
- 8. Do you have access to a:
 - Telephone Yes () No()
 - If yes, where? At home ... Yes() No()
 - In another place _____
 - Mobile Telephone Yes() No()
 - Computer Yes() No()
 - If yes, where? At home ... Yes() No()
 - In another place _____
 - E-Mail Yes() No()

If yes, where? At home Yes No

In another place _____

Internet Yes No

If yes, where? At home Yes No

In another place _____

9. What is the highest level of education you have attained?

Primary School

Some High School

High School

Specialized High School

Technical Vocational School

Some Higher Education

Higher Education

Advanced Degree

Other _____

10. Have you tried to obtain a loan in the past 12 months? Yes No

11. Have you obtained a loan in the past 12 months? Yes No

11a. If yes, from whom? (check all that apply)

Family

Friends

Bank

Pawnbroker

Loan Shark

Other _____

11b. If yes, what amount did you receive?

Less than 1000 ???

1000-2000 ???

2000-4000 ???

4000-8000 ???

8000-16000 ???

16000-24000 ???

24000-32000 ???

32000-40000 ???

40000-80000 ???

More than 80000 ???

11c. If yes, in what form was the loan? (check all that apply)

Cash (for more than 12 months)

Cash (for 3-12 months)

Cash (for less than 3 months)

Goods (food, clothing, etc.)

Services (auto repair, carpentry work, etc.)

Other (specify) _____

11d. If yes, for what did you use your loan?

To start a business

To expand a business

Other _____

12. Have you been turned down for a loan in the past 12 months? Yes No

12a. If so, who turned you down?

Family.....()

Friends.....()

Banks.....()

Pawnbroker.....()

Loanshark.....()

Other.....

How many banks?.....

13. Are you interested in obtaining a loan to start a new business or expand an existing one? Yes () No()

13a. If so, how much would you like to borrow?

Less than 1000 ???.....()

1000-2000 ???.....()

2000-4000 ???.....()

4000-8000 ???.....()

8000-16000 ???.....()

16000-24000 ???.....()

24000-32000 ???.....()

32000-40000 ???.....()

40000-80000 ???.....()

More than 80000 ???.....()

14. Why do people not want to start a business. What is your opinion?

	Strongly	Strongly	Somewhat	Somewhat
	Strongly	agree	agree	disagree
	Strongly	disagree		
No interest in business	().....	().....	().....	().....
Not enough professional training	().....	().....	().....	().....
Don't want to get into debt	().....	().....	().....	().....
Don't trust Russian legislation	().....	().....	().....	().....
Taxes are too high	().....	().....	().....	().....
Interest rates are too high	().....	().....	().....	().....
Could have problems with the mafia	().....	().....	().....	().....
Other.....				

15. The sources of your income are:

Wage/Salary.....Yes() No()

Unemployment.....Yes() No()

Pension.....Yes() No()

Other.....

16. If you have a job, how would you describe it? (check all that apply)

Self-employed.....()

Government.....()

Science or research.....()

Small company (10 people or less).....()

Large company (more than 10 people).....()

Other (specify).....

17. Is housekeeping your primary activity? Yes() No()

18. Do you have any other sources of income.....Yes() No()

- 18a. Say which ones _____
19. Which source provides you with the greatest income:
 Primary.....()
 Other.....()
20. How satisfied are you with the financial situation of your household:
 Very dissatisfied.....()
 Dissatisfied.....()
 Difficult to answer.....()
 Somewhat satisfied.....()
 Very satisfied.....()
21. What is your monthly income (salary, unemployment or pension):
 Less than 1000 ???.....()
 1000-2000 ???.....()
 2000-4000 ???.....()
 4000-8000 ???.....()
 8000-16000 ???.....()
 16000-24000 ???.....()
 24000-32000 ???.....()
 32000-40000 ???.....()
 40000-80000 ???.....()
 More than 80000 ???.....()
22. What is your monthly household income _____ rubles
23. Do you own your house or apartment?.....Yes() No()
24. In the last 12 months how often have your wage payments been late by more than 1 week
 Never...() Rarely...() Often...() Always...()
- 24?. In the last 12 months how often have your wage payments been late by more than 1 month?
 Never...() Rarely...() Often...() Always...()
25. If you received 30.000 rubles, what would you do with it? (check all that apply)
- Put it in a bank.....()
 Keep it in rubles.....()
 Keep it in foreign currency.....()
 Acquire property.....()
 Buy valuables (gold, silver, etc.).....()
 Other.....
25. Which of the statements below best describes your attitude toward risk (choose only one)
 One should be extremely careful about making changes in life.....()
 Caution is more important than risk-taking in order to be successful.....()
 It is difficult to answer.....()
 Risk-taking is more important than caution in order to be successful.....()
 You will never achieve anything in life unless you act boldly and take risks.....()
26. Your attitude toward the future (choose only one)
 Very pessimistic.....()
 Somewhat pessimistic.....()
 Difficult to say.....()

- Somewhat optimistic ()
 Very optimistic ()

Continued on the next page.

27. In each of the situations below, you are to choose one option. Choose the option that suits you best.

We will throw a coin

Situation 1:

1. Depending on whether you get heads or tails, you will receive 10,000 Rubles ()
 or
 2. If you get heads, you receive 20,000 Rubles, but if you get tails, you get nothing. ()

Situation 2:

- 1: Depending on whether you get heads or tails you receive 300.Rubles ()
 or
 2: If you get heads, you receive 450 Rubles, but if you get tails, you get nothing. ()

Situation 3:

- 1: If you get heads, you receive 900 Rubles, but if you get tails you should pay 30 rubles. ()
 or
 2: If you get heads, you receive 6000 Rubles, but if you get tails you should pay 4500 rubles ()

Imagine that you are able to receive a loan. How much are you willing to pay for it?

28. For a loan of 1500 rubles, for 1 year? 1500 rub. + _____ (interest in rubles) = _____
 29. For a loan of 1500 rubles, for 3 months? 1500 rub. + _____ (interest in rubles) = _____
 30. For a loan of 1500 rubles, for 1 day? 1500 rub. + _____ (interest in rubles) = _____
 31. For a loan of 6000 rubles, for 1 year? 6000 rub. + _____ (interest in rubles) = _____
 32. For a loan of 6000 rubles, for 3 months? 6000 rub. + _____ (interest in rubles) = _____
 33. For a loan of 6000 rubles, for 1 day? 6000 rub. + _____ (interest in rubles) = _____
 34. For a loan of 30000 rubles, for 1 year? 30000 rub. + _____ (interest in rubles) = _____
 35. For a loan of 30000 rubles, for 3 months? 30000 rub. + _____ (interest in rubles) = _____
 36. For a loan of 30000 rubles, for 1 day? 30000 rub. + _____ (interest in rubles) = _____

Small Business Supplement

1. What goods or services does your business provide? _____

2. Is your business seasonal? Yes() No()
 - 2a. If yes, during what time of year does your business operate?
Spring ()
Summer ()
Fall ()
Winter ()
3. Do you have any salaried workers? Yes() No()
4. If yes, how many? _____
5. Do you hire more people during different seasons?
 - 5a. If so, how many and in which season:
Spring _____
Summer _____
Fall _____
Winter _____
6. What is your gross monthly revenue (turnover)? rubles
7. Is your business registered? Yes() No()
8. How long did it take you to register your business?
No times ()
1 day-1 month ()
More than 1 month ()
9. Approximately what part of your entire income is spent on
Taxes %
On other shadow payments (gifts, bribes and others) %

Today's Date _____	Interviewer _____
Start Time _____	
End Time _____	
Small Business Owner: Yes () No ()	
City: _____	
Oblast: _____	
Region: _____	
Identifying Region of City _____	

???????? (??????, ???????, ? ?.) _____ ()
 ????????? (????-????, ????????????? ??????, ? ?.) _____ ()
 ?????? (????????) _____

11d. ??? ??, ?? ?? ?? ?? ?????????? ???????
 ?? ????????????? ??????? _____ ()
 ?? ????????????? ??????? _____ ()
 ?????? (????????) _____

12. ??????????? ?? ?? ? ??????? ?? ?????????? 12 ?????????? _____ ?? () ?? ()

12a. ??? ??, ?? ?? ?? ??????????
 ?????? _____ ()
 ?????? _____ ()
 ?????? _____ () ? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????????? _____
 ????????? _____ ()
 ????????? _____ ()
 ?????? (????????) _____

13. ??????????????? ?? ?? ? ?????????? ??????? ? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ??????????
 ???????????????? () ?? ()

13a. ??? ??, ?? ??????? ?? ?? ?????? ???????
 ? ??? 1000 ??? _____ ()
 1000-2000 ??? _____ ()
 2000-4000 ??? _____ ()
 4000-8000 ??? _____ ()
 8000-16000 ??? _____ ()
 16000-24000 ??? _____ ()
 24000-32000 ??? _____ ()
 32000-40000 ??? _____ ()
 40000-80000 ??? _____ ()
 ????? 80000 ??? _____ ()

14. ? ?????? ?????????, ?? ?? ?????????? ?????????? ?????????????? ????. ?????? ??????
 ????? ???????

	????????? ?????????	??????	??????	
	????????	????????	?????????	?????????
?? ?????????????? ?????????	_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()
????????????? ?????????????????? ???????	_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()
?? ?????? ?????? ? ??????	_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()
?? ?????????? ?????????????? ??????????????????	_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()
????????? ?????????? ??????	_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()
????????? ?????????? ?????????? ?? ???????	_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()
? ??? ???? ?????????? ? ??????	_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()
?????? (????????)	_____	_____	_____	_____

15. ??????????? ?????? ??????? ??????????
 ??????????? ?????? (????, ??????????) _____ ?? () ?? ()
 ??????? ?? ?????????????? _____ ?? () ?? ()
 ?????? _____ ?? () ?? ()
 ?????? (????????) _____

?????????? ?? ??????????? ?????? ??????????????

1. ????? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????????????? ?????? ?????????????? _____

2. ????????? ?? ?? ?????? ??????????.....??() ?? ()

2a. ????, ?? ? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????????? ??? ??????????????

?????.....()

????.....()

????.....()

????.....()

3. ? ?? ?????? ??????????..... ??() ?? ()

3a. ????, ?? ?????? ?? _____

4. ?? ?????????? ?????????????????? ?????????? ? ?????????? ??????????..... ??() ?? ()

4a. ????, ?? ?????? ? ?????????? ??????????

?????.....

???? _____

???? _____

???? _____

5. ? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??????????????.....???

6. ?????? ?????????????????? ?? ?????? ??????????????..... ??() ?? ()

7. ?????? ?????? ?? ?????????? ?? ?????????????? ?????? ??????????????

????????? ??????.....()

1 ?????-1 ??????.....()

????? 1 ??????.....()

8. ?????? ?????? ?????????????? ?????? (?????????) ?? ?????????????? ??:

????????? ???????% _____%

????????? ??????? (????????, ?????? ? ??????).....%

Today's Date _____
Interviewer _____
Start Time _____
End Time _____
Small Business Owner: Yes () No ()
City: _____
Oblast: _____
Region: _____
Identifying Region of City _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Buckley, Cynthia J., "Ideology, Methodology, and Context: Social Science Surveys in the Russian Federation," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 42, No. 2, (Oct. 1998), p. 223-236
2. Bulmer, Martin "The Problem of Exporting Social Survey Research," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Oct. 1998), p. 153-168.
3. Bulmer, Martin and Donald Warwick, eds., *Social Research in Developing Countries: Surveys and Censuses in the Third World*, Chichester, New York (1983).
4. Carothers, Thomas, "Civil Society," *Foreign Policy*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, (Winter 1999-2000), accessed on-line at:
<<http://www.strom.clemson.edu/becker/prtm320/Carothers.html>>., March 14, 2003, p. 2.
5. Domrin, Alexander "Ten Years Later: Society, 'Civil Society,' and the Russian State," *The Russian Review*, Vol. 62 (April 2003), p. 201.
6. George Hudson, "Civil Society in Russia: Models and Prospects for Development," *The Russian Review*, Vol. 62 (April 2003), p. 213.
7. Kuechler, Manfred "The Survey Method," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Oct. 1998), p. 178-200.
8. Louis, Victor and Jennifer, *The Complete Guide to the Soviet Union*, St. Martin's Press, New York, NY, 1980, available at:
<<http://www.utopiasprings.com/instnovo.htm>>, accessed on May 18, 2003.
9. Newby, Margaret, Sajeda Amin, Ian Diamond and Ruchira T. Naved, "Survey Experience Among Women in Bangladesh," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 2, No. 2, (Oct. 1998), p. 252.
10. Petro, Nikolai, "Policization versus Democratization: 20 Months of Putin's Federal Reform," PONARS Policy Memo No. 241, January 25, 2002, available at
<<http://www.csis.org/ruseura/ponars/index.htm>>.
11. Putnam, Robert *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon & Shuster, 2000.
12. Salant, Priscilla & Dillman, Don A. How to Conduct Your Own Survey. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1994).

13. Titova, Irina, "Russian Life Expectancy on Downward Trend," *St. Petersburg Times*, January 17, 2003, available at Johnson's Russia List, #14 – JRL 7023, at <<http://www.cdi.org/russia/johnson/7023-14.cfm>>, accessed on April 18, 2003
14. Warwick, Donald and Charles Lininger, *The Sample Survey: Theory and Practice*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1975, p. 128.