



ALL-RUSSIAN SURVEY OF CONSUMER FINANCE (WAVE 5)

Technical Report

2023

This technical report was prepared by LLC Demoskop.

The views expressed herein are solely those of the authors. The contents and findings of this report should not be construed or quoted in any publications as the official position of the Bank of Russia or an indication of its official policy or decisions. Any errors in this work are solely those of the authors.

All rights reserved. Any reproduction is permitted only with the authors' consent

Cover photo: Shutterstock/FOTODOM

Address: 12 Neglinnaya Street, Moscow, 107016

Tel.: +7 495 771 91 00, +7 495 621 64 65 (fax)

Bank of Russia website: www.cbr.ru

© Central Bank of the Russian Federation 2023

CONTENTS

1. Design of survey of consumer finance, Wave 5, 2022.....	3
2. General overview of original sample of Russian households	4
3. Principles of selecting and forming primary sampling units (PSUs).....	6
4. Principles for primary sampling units (PSUs).....	11
5. Principles for selection and formation of secondary and tertiary sampling units	11
6. Actual breakdown of household numbers by survey point. Benchmarking sample against original design.....	14
7. Structure and response rates	17
8. Description of weighing procedure and post-stratification weights.....	19
9. Adjustment of survey toolset.....	26
10. Organisation of field work and survey methodology	33
11. Monitoring of interviewers' field operations	36
12. Work package related to data entry (acceptance, numbering, encoding, input of questionnaires).....	38
13. Analysis based on interviewer reports	40
14. Analysis of questionnaires in terms of quality of completion.....	47
Conclusions. Prospects for follow-up surveys on this sample	54

1. Design of survey of consumer finance, Wave 5, 2022

The 2022 survey of household financial behaviour is a longitudinal survey. The terms refers to large-scale, time-consuming surveys that assume that the bulk of the sample in each wave is a panel, i.e., that the units of observation in this part of the sample (households in this case) remain the same as those selected for the first (basic) wave.

The longitudinal nature of the survey brings it undeniable advantages over periodic surveys spaced at intervals in which each wave is conducted on a new independent representative sample. This is enabled by the ability to investigate time changes occurring at specific (household or individual) levels, and it thereby significantly expands the range of issues that can be addressed. For example, in investigating the poverty problem, data obtained from regular surveys enable the measurement of time-dependent increases or decreases in the number of households with average per capita incomes below the subsistence level or of changes in the makeup of households in this group (aggregate data). However, they fail to help answer the question of how long an individual household has been in the poor group and measure the average time households remain in the group below the level of poverty. This is very important from the point of view of government programmes

to support the economically disadvantaged. This is one of multiple challenges of this type. The initial aim of this survey was to provide single-point estimates for each wave, in addition to the longitudinal estimates. This problem was solved by means of a special design for longitudinal surveys known as *split panel*. The split panel, a combination of single and panel samples in each survey wave, was proposed by Leslie Kish in 1987. The design is a series of single-point surveys in which the maximum possible share of units of the initial sample is kept unchanged in subsequent waves. Designs of this type are usually described as overlapping surveys and can be considered a version of a split panel. In this case, the study aims to obtain a sequence of single-point estimates while maintaining the possibility of longitudinal estimates for most of the original sample.

2. General overview of original sample of Russian households

To study household financial behaviour in our survey, we use the design (model) of a stratified, multi-stage, probabilistic, and territorially targeted sample.

The survey is based on a sample of households. A *household* is defined as people who live together at the same address and share income and expenses. Temporary residents (e.g. guests) who permanently reside elsewhere are not household members. Survey respondents were all members of a household aged 18 or older who stayed at the place of residence at the time of the survey.

Although the study involves the creation of a preliminary sample of households, the standard global practice in this case is the creation of a sample of dwellings (addresses) in which households live. This is explained by the fact that location-linked statistical information is available only about dwellings (more precisely, addresses), which enables a census and survey of households. Before the sample of households is collected, numbered lists of dwellings are composed so that there is only one household per dwelling in almost all cases. Under this condition, the resulting sample of dwellings is essentially tantamount to a sample of households.

Since the All-Russian sample is grounded in the territorial principle, the first stage involves selecting the primary territorial sampling unit or primary territorial unit (PSU). As a basis for the PSU, we select the administrative-territorial units lying at the core of the administrative-territorial division of the Russian constituent entities¹. The administrative-territorial units (ATUs) are grouped into 2,029 converted administrative-territorial units based on territorial attributes, which are primary sampling units. The PSUs are then grouped into 38 strata, mainly based on geographical factors and the level of urbanisation. When necessary, the ethnic component is used as the stratum-forming factor.

¹ The rationale for selecting administrative-territorial units as the basis for the primary sampling units (PSUs) and the rules for the creation of the PSUs are detailed in the 'Principles for selection and formation of primary sampling units (PSU)' section.

Similar to most nationwide sample surveys involving face-to-face interviews at respondents' places of residence, a number of remote and underpopulated areas of the Russian Federation are excluded from the sample for financial reasons.

Of the remaining areas, which account for 95.7% of the Russian population, the three largest populated areas are sampled as mandatory conglomerates: Moscow, Moscow Region, and Saint Petersburg. Because of their size, they each constitute a separate 'self-representing' stratum. The remainder – the converted administrative-territorial units – are grouped into 35 non-self-representing strata with approximately equal populations. This leads to a total of 38 strata. Then, by the *probability-proportional-to-size* (PPS) method, one area is selected from each non-self-representing stratum. This means that the probability that a certain area in a given stratum is chosen is directly proportional to the share of the area's population in the total population of the whole stratum.

Of the total target (planned) volume of the sample, 17.6% (of the total Russian population) are broken down into three self-representing strata. In accordance with the principles of PPS, the remaining households are evenly distributed among the converted administrative-territorial units, that is, the primary sampling units (PSUs), one in each of the 35 non-self-representing strata of approximately the same size.

Consistent with established practice, the absence of a consolidated list of households/dwellings for the 38 PSUs necessitates the introduction of an intermediate stage of selection. The population of each PSU is stratified into urban and rural substrata, and the volume of the target sample in a PSU is divided in proportion to the share of the population in each of these substrata. For example, if 40% of the population of a PSU live in rural areas, 40 out of 100 addresses (dwellings) are sampled from rural areas.

For both urban and rural households, the secondary sampling units (SSUs) are settlements. Urban settlements are stratified by population size, level of industrialisation, and remoteness from district centres. The volume of the sample is allocated in proportion to the population in each of these strata for urban settlements. Specific urban settlements are selected based on the *probability-proportional-to-size* method (PPS). Rural settlements are stratified only by two parameters: population and remoteness from district centres. Several administrative-territorial regions are additionally stratified by ethnic composition. The selection of rural settlements is governed by a procedure similar to that for urban settlements. The next sampling unit for rural settlements is the dwelling (address). *Household registers* serve as lists of dwellings in rural settlements.

For cities and small towns, there is a third sampling level. The tertiary sampling units (TSUs) in urban settlements are constituencies. Constituencies with widely varying residents are sampled

in proportion to population size. In the sampled constituencies, a list of dwellings is made through field surveys of their territories.

This is followed by the systematic selection of the required number of dwellings starting from a randomly sampled address in the list. If the surveyor determines that more than one household resides at an address, the list will include as many dwellings as there are households residing at the address.

In Wave 5 (2022), as throughout the previous waves, the survey covers the households of the original sample dwelling, regardless of whether these households have been polled in previous waves. If – in any wave – the household living at an address refuses to participate, the surveyor is obliged to repeat attempts at contact in subsequent waves up to the point of definitive refusal. If a household has moved, the new household residing at its address is polled at the time of the survey. If that household is also unavailable or refuses to take part in the survey, the original dwelling is replaced with another, selected by the same design, within the same survey area or settlement that has recorded the loss. This approach is called ‘repeated dwelling sampling’ and helps represent the general sample in every wave of the survey.

The gradual dropout of units in the original sample in longitudinal studies is a natural process known as attrition. As the volume of the original sample gradually declines, the households which exit need to be replaced to maintain the size of the target sample. Compared to the design of a fixed-panel longitudinal survey, this split-panel design enhances the longitudinal analysis by including households with shorter participation periods.

3. Principles of selecting and forming primary sampling units (PSUs)

The majority of territorial sample models are grounded in their multi-step nature, since the object of a territorial sample is the population (or part of it) residing in the surveyed territory. In Russia, there are no lists of people, households, or dwellings based on administrative-territorial divisions. Moreover, the use of such lists to generate a sample for a large territorial entity such as the Russian Federation as a whole or one of its constituent entities would make no practical sense. Respondents selected from this list would be scattered throughout the country, and a survey of such a sample would require huge costs with little theoretical rationale. In such cases, **multi-stage sampling** is used. The overall sample is naturally broken down into separate subsamples, or *clusters*, which serve as sampling units in the first step (stage) of sampling (primary sampling unit – PSU), with subsequent sampling of observation units taking place only in clusters that have been selected in the first step. Unlike the above-mentioned strata, the size of each cluster is relatively small, but the clusters themselves are numerous. The primary sampling units in a multi-stage probabilistic sample determine the first level of clustering of the observation units in the general sample. In

sampling theory, the main requirement for such intermediate sampling units (clusters) is that they be as heterogeneous as possible in terms of the properties under study.

In practice, this underlying, theoretically substantiated, requirement for the PSUs is complemented with several other requirements related to the particularities of conducting mass sociological surveys. In the selection of the territorial sample, we are guided by the following requirements for selecting the PSUs:

- 1) The PSUs should have clearly recorded geographical (territorial) boundaries. There must exist statistical materials appropriate for the creation of the sample.
- 2) There should be enough PSUs that the sampling error in the first stage is not too large.
- 3) The population of the PSUs should be large enough to enable a multi-year study based on the PSUs sampled. Sampling and, especially, the creation of an interview network are very costly if this condition is ignored in a study targeting the population of a sufficiently large territorial entity.
- 4) The distances in a PSU area should allow the interviewers to travel directly to the survey points.

What exactly does the second PSU requirement mean?

Let us consider the standard error in multi-stage sampling. Suppose we have a K-step sample. The population under study consists of N_1 units of the first stage, each of which contains N_2 units of the second stage, etc. Suppose also n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k units were sampled, respectively, in each stage of sample generation. Then, if simple random sampling was used at each stage, the population mean is an unbiased estimate of the average value for the general population with variance:

$$V(y) = (1-f_1) \cdot S_1^2 / n_1 + (1-f_2) \cdot S_2^2 / (n_1 \cdot n_2) + \dots + f_1 \cdot f_2 \cdot f_3 \cdot \dots \cdot (1-f_k) \cdot S_k^2 / (n_1 \cdot n_2 \cdot \dots \cdot n_k) \quad (3.1),$$

where S_i is the mean variance in the sampling unit of the i-th stage,

$f_i = n_i / N_i$ is the sample frequency at the i-th stage,

$1-f_i$ is the correction for the finiteness of the population at the i-

th stage. The unbiased estimate $V(y)$ for the sample is:

$$v(y) = (1-f_1) \cdot s_1^2 / n_1 + f_1 \cdot (1-f_2) \cdot s_2^2 / (n_1 \cdot n_2) + \dots + f_1 \cdot f_2 \cdot f_3 \cdot \dots \cdot (1-f_k) \cdot s_k^2 / (n_1 \cdot n_2 \cdot \dots \cdot n_k) \quad (3.2),$$

where s_i are sampling equivalents of S_i .

Formula (3.1) shows that if the sample size is fixed, each stage adds its share to the variance; that is, the fewer stages there are, the smaller the standard error. This in turn means that a two- or three-stage sample is the best from a theoretical point of view (a one-stage sample is impossible in the absence of the basis – a structured list of dwellings in Russia). The generally accepted value of the standard error is 10% of the mean-square deviation. Formula (3.2) shows that this condition is met when $n_1 > 100$.

The Russian Federation is divided into 89 constituent entities. The constituent entities in turn

are composed of 2,775 basic administrative-territorial units (including 1,868 districts ['rayons'], 579 cities of republican, regional, or district subordination, and 328 intracity areas and urban districts).

There are too few constituent entities to meet item 2 of the PSU requirements, and they are very large in territory and fail to meet item 4 of the PSU requirements to serve as the PSUs. In contrast, **the administrative-territorial units are almost ideal primary sampling units for the creation of a representative sample of households for Russia as a whole.**

The definition of an administrative-territorial unit is marked by two aspects that necessitate the merger of a number of units before the sample is generated. First, there are cities of federal, republican, or regional subordination within the boundaries of certain districts. State statistics treat such cities as independent administrative-territorial units. Since there are many such independent cities in Russia, they are included in the districts where they are geographically located. This ensures greater heterogeneity of the PSUs and thus improves the quality of the sample.

Further, large Russian cities are divided into districts. In accordance with standard sampling principles, such cities are treated as separate units in the sample. Therefore, as a result of the internal redistribution of the initial areas, the final list of primary sampling units consists of 2,029 modified administrative-territorial units (ATUs).

Intentionally excluded territories. A significant fraction of Russia's territory is remote areas with very low population densities. For example, the Evenk Autonomous District's population density is a mere one person per 30 sq km, while the Kamchatka Region's is one person per 1 sq km. A portion of such territories are pre-emptively excluded from the sample. Consequently, territories amounting to about 4.3% of the Russian population are withdrawn from the sample due to their low population densities, poor transport connections, and inappropriate surveying conditions.

Self-representing territories. The three constituent entities – Moscow, Moscow Region, and Saint Petersburg – are included in the sample automatically. These highly populated territorial entities are 'self-representing strata' in the stratification stage.

Stratification. The accuracy of the estimates is improved by means of the stratification of administrative-territorial units (PSUs) that are not excluded from the sample and are not self-representing territories.

First, 10 redesigned economic regions are generated (see Table 1). These regions are generated in such a way that each contains the whole number of strata of a given population. In this, changes to the boundaries of existing economic regions are kept to a minimum. These regions are then divided into strata according to population size in each modernised region to obtain strata of approximately equal size. For example, the Ural Region is divided into six and the Volga-Vyatka Region into three strata. Table 1 shows the ten regions and the number of strata in each.

Table 1. Ten modernised economic regions of Russian Federation (net of three self-representing and excluded territories)

No.	Region	Number of strata
1	NORTHERN REGION AND KOSTROMA REGION	2
2	North-Western Region	1
3	Central Region excl. Kostroma Region	4
4	Volga-Vyatka Region	3
5	Central Black Earth Region excl. southern Voronezh Region	2
6	Volga Region excl. Astrakhan and Penza Regions and Kalmykia	4
7	North Caucasus Region, Astrakhan Region, southern Voronezh Region, Kalmykia	5
8	Ural Region	6
9	West Siberian Region	4
10	East Siberian and Far Eastern Regions	4
Total		35

The full description of all strata is presented in Tables 2 and 3. The first three strata are the self-representative territorial entities. Strata 4–38 are non-self-representing entities. Importantly, although strata 4–38 have approximately the same populations (in accordance with the sample design), the number of PSUs in the strata varies significantly (see the right column). The corresponding number of strata is formed in each of the ten regions on the basis of the level of urbanisation. Geographical properties and the ethnic structure are also considered where they matter.

Table 2. Stratification of territory of Russian Federation: self-representing strata

No.	Self-representing strata
1	Saint Petersburg
2	Moscow
3	Moscow Region

Table 3. Stratification of territory of Russian Federation: non-self-representing strata

No.	Non-self-representing strata
4	NORTHERN REGION AND KOSTROMA REGION
	Urban population 87%
5	Urban population below 87%
6	NORTH-WESTERN REGION All districts of region
7	CENTRAL REGION (excl. Kostroma Region) North: Vladimir, Ivanovo, Tver, Smolensk, Yaroslavl Regions Urban population over 82%
8	Urban population below 82%
9	South Bryansk, Kaluga, Oryol, Ryazan, Tula Regions Urban population over 79%
10	Urban population below 79%
11	VOLGA-VYATKA REGION and Penza Region Regional centres and capitals of autonomies with populations over 300,000
12	Urban population over 55%
13	Urban population below 55%
14	CENTRAL BLACK-EARTH REGION (excl. southern Voronezh Region) Urban population over 75%
15	Urban population below 75%
16	VOLGA REGION (excl. Astrakhan, Penza Regions and Kalmykia) Kazan, Tatarstan
17	Regional centres with more than 900,000 residents (Volgograd, Samara, Saratov)
18	Urban population over 70%
19	Urban population below 70%
20	NORTH CAUCASUS REGION Astrakhan Region, southern Voronezh Region, Kalmykia, North Caucasus autonomous republics excl. Adygea
	Urban population over 95%
	Urban population 58–95%
	Urban population 36.5–58%
	Urban population below 36.5%

No.	Non-self-representing strata
	<p>URAL REGION</p> <p>25 Regional centres and capitals of autonomies</p> <p>26 (dual stratum)</p> <p>27 Share of Russians below 45%</p> <p>28 Urban population over 93%; Russians over 45%</p> <p>29 Urban population 67.5–93%; Russians over 45% Urban population under 67.5%;</p> <p>30 Russians over 45%</p>
	<p>WEST SIBERIAN REGION</p> <p>31 Novosibirsk, Omsk, Tomsk</p> <p>32 Urban population over 90%</p> <p>33 Urban population 57.5%–90%</p> <p>34 Urban population under 57.5%</p>
	<p>EAST SIBERIAN AND FAR EASTERN REGIONS</p> <p>35 Eastern Siberia: Urban population over 89%</p> <p>36 Far East: urban population over 84%</p> <p>37 Urban population 64.7–89% (E.S.); 64.7–84% (F.E.)</p> <p>38 Urban population below 64.7%</p>

4. Principles for primary sampling units (PSUs)

Probability sampling assumes that at least one PSU is selected from each stratum, which is why one PSU is selected in each non-self-representing stratum by the *probability-proportional-to-size* method. This means that the greater the share of the population of the PSU is in the total population of a given stratum, the stronger the chance that the PSU will be selected.

5. Principles for selection and formation of secondary and tertiary sampling units

The sample may skip the third stage depending on the type of PSU.

<p>A PSU consists of one city.</p>	<p>The secondary sampling units (SSUs) are constituencies. Specific constituencies are selected by simple mechanical sampling, with a fixed step, from the corresponding list of constituencies of the city.</p> <p>Participating households are identified in sampled constituencies. To this end, the next step is to use the lists of dwellings available for the constituencies, which are checked by means of a field survey. Dwellings are sampled from the verified list (via simple mechanical sampling with a fixed step).</p> <p>If the field survey finds that there is more than one household in a dwelling, the interviewer randomly selects one of them to be included in the sample of households.</p>
<p>PSUs are cities, towns, and urban-type and rural-type settlements.</p>	<p>With this PSU structure, all the three types of settlements are secondary sampling units (SSUs).</p> <p>Initially, the population is divided by size into urban and rural strata. The sample of households is distributed in proportion to their shares.</p> <p>Specific cities and urban-type settlements (SSUs) are selected from the list of cities and urban-type settlements by mechanical proportional-to-size sampling.</p> <p>For each urban settlement selected, a third stage of sampling is run to select a constituency, which becomes the tertiary sampling unit (TSU).</p>

	<p>Specific constituencies are selected by simple mechanical sampling, with a fixed step, from the corresponding list of constituencies of the city.</p> <p>Participating households are identified in the sampled constituencies. To this end, the next step is to use the lists of dwellings available to constituencies, which are checked by means of a field survey. Dwellings are sampled from the verified list through a simple mechanical sample with a fixed step.</p> <p>If the field survey finds that there is more than one household in a dwelling, the interviewer randomly selects one of them to be included in the sample of households.</p> <p>Specific rural-type settlements (SSUs) are selected from the list of rural-type settlements through mechanical proportional-to-size sampling.</p> <p>Rural settlements do not have TSUs because the households are sampled according to the household register covering the entire rural-type settlement. The list in the rural household register is checked by means of a field survey. Dwellings are sampled from the verified list by simple mechanical sampling with a fixed step.</p>
--	--

The design of the original sample ensures the representativeness of the general populations of households and of respondents aged 18 years and older for individual Russian population groups (if their number is sufficient in relation to the sample size) which are usually of interest to researchers, such as those living in a city or village, or in cities of different population size, etc.

The sample is not representative:

- of regions of the Russian Federation since the selection of administrative-territorial units is intended to represent a stratum rather than the stratum's individual regions where specific (ATUs) are selected;**
- of individuals and households in the upper income quintile, which is essentially**

unrepresented in the sample population of mass surveys. A special survey should be conducted to capture it and include it in the sample.

6. Actual breakdown of household numbers by survey point. Benchmarking sample against original design

According to the agreement for consulting services, in Wave 5 of the survey in 2022, consistent with the 2013-2020 waves, the target volume of sampling was 6,000 households. The sample included the addresses of all households that participated in the 2020 survey. In addition, it was expected that some of the previously surveyed households would be unable to participate in 2022. Therefore, the addresses of those who did not participate in the 2020 survey were added to the addresses of the households who participated in 2020 but had previously not participated (in 2018, 2015, or 2013). For the regions where the largest losses were previously reported, a sufficient number of new addresses were added to the sample. In effect, that number was sufficient to take the total number of residents to at least 6,000 households.

A total of 8,502 dwellings were visited in 2022 for survey purposes. The new addresses were added in such a way as to survey the target number of households in each region and settlement. The new addresses were selected by exactly the same procedure as that used to sample addresses in the previous waves. This ensured that the sample remained representative of the total population of all Russian households at the time of Wave 5. Adding new addresses to set off the loss of previously surveyed households is a standard procedure in longitudinal surveys, with a dual objective: a) to represent the general population at the time of each wave of the survey; and b) the use of the panel part of the sample (which must be of sufficient size) to assess the changes between waves both in the general population and in subcomponents of it, as well as in individual units of observation (in this case, households and their members).

Both of these challenges can be addressed thanks to the size and structure of the sample in Wave 5 of the survey. A representative sample of 6,081 households was formed based on the results of the interviews. Of these, 4,915 households were re-interviewed following the 2020 survey, giving a response rate of households previously surveyed in 2020 of 81.8%.

This accessibility of panel units of observation for this type of nationwide household survey (a survey with a large questionnaire with many sensitive questions and a sufficiently long interval between interviews (two years)) is quite high compared to surveys with similar characteristics around the world.

Table 4 presents detailed data on the sizes of the target samples, the number of addresses visited, and the households actually surveyed by survey point.

Table 4. Number of target sample households, number of addresses visited, and number of households actually surveyed by primary sample unit (survey point)

Stratum number	Primary sampling units (PSUs)	Planned (target) sample volume in stratum	Number of households surveyed	Number of addresses visited
1	2	3	4	5
1	Saint Petersburg	221	224	332
2	Moscow	519	539	896
3	Moscow Region	314	326	510
4	Republic of Komi: Urban Settlement 1	141	145	219
5	Republic of Komi: Urban Settlement 2	142	149	732
6	Leningrad Region: Urban Settlement 1	141	141	213
7	Smolensk Region: Urban Settlement 1	141	142	228
8	Tver Region; Urban Settlement 1	141	143	163
9	Tula Region: Urban Settlement 1	141	143	183
10	Kaluga Region: Urban Settlement 1	141	140	189
11	Nizhny Novgorod Region: Urban Settlement 1	141	142	151
12	Republic of Chuvashia: Urban Settlement 1	142	143	186
13	Penza Region: Urban Settlement 1	141	142	146
14	Lipetsk Region: Urban Settlement 1	141	142	147
15	Tambov Region: Urban Settlement 1	141	143	170
16	Republic of Tatarstan: Urban Settlement 1	141	142	168
17	Saratov Region: Urban Settlement 1	141	142	185
18	Saratov Region: Urban Settlement 2	141	139	181
19	Volgograd Region: Urban Settlement 1	141	145	173

20	Kabardino-Balkarian Republic: Urban Settlement 1	142	143	143
21	Rostov Region: Urban Settlement 1	141	143	153
22	Krasnodar Territory: Urban Settlement 1	141	142	198
23	Stavropol Territory: Urban Settlement 1	141	143	187
24	Krasnodar Territory: Urban Settlement 2	142	143	142
25	Chelyabinsk Region: Urban Settlement 1	141	143	225
26	Kurgan Region: Urban Settlement 1	142	142	194
27	Udmurt Republic: Urban Settlement 1	141	142	192
28	Orenburg Region: Urban Settlement 1	142	143	147
29	Perm Territory: Urban Settlement 1	142	142	147
30	Chelyabinsk Region: Urban Settlement 2	141	142	155
31	Tomsk Region: Urban Settlement 1	142	144	192
32	Novosibirsk Region: Urban Settlement 1	142	143	177
33	Altai Territory: Urban Settlement 1	141	143	213
34	Altai Territory: Urban Settlement 2	141	142	189
35	Krasnoyarsk Territory: Urban Settlement 1	142	143	178
36	Primorsky Territory: Urban Settlement 1	141	142	178
37	Krasnoyarsk Territory: Urban Settlement 2	141	142	154
38	Amur Region: Urban Settlement 1	142	142	166
Total		6,000	6,081	8,502

Note: In order to anonymise the data in the published report, the settlements in each region have been replaced with symbols of the type ‘Settlement X’.

Column 4 in Table 4 shows that the actual breakdown of the sample by survey point is very close to the target. Column 5 in Table 4 shows the total number of addresses visited during the

survey (of both households previously interviewed and new addresses, that is, all including the addresses where surveying was impossible). This gives an idea of the response rates in each region.

7. Structure and response rates

Non-response is a case in which it was impossible to obtain information in the course of the survey from a unit of observation in the initial sample. These are units of observation which, for one reason or another, failed to participate in the survey and are labelled 'inaccessible'. The 'response rate' is an indicator that reflects the calculated proportion of all accessible units of observation from which information was obtained out of the number of units of observation from which information was intended to be obtained. This is the most common of all current indicators, covering all cases of inaccessibility (non-response). The response rate calculations exclude what are called **illegitimate dwellings**, that is, premises that happened to be non-residential at the time of the survey. These are addresses where it was impossible to conduct the survey due to, for example, destroyed, demolished, or depopulated homes. They also include cases in which premises are occupied by businesses, government bodies, or other organisations. Since the survey is conducted in Russian, illegitimate dwellings also include the addresses of those who do not speak Russian.

To quantify the individual aspects of inaccessibility, other indicators of inaccessible units of observation are calculated: the share of refusals, the share of failures to make contact, the share of those unable to participate, etc. The phenomenon of inaccessibility is thus not homogeneous. Total inaccessibility includes the following cases:

- A) it is impossible to establish contact or access the unit of observation²;
- B) the participant refuses to participate in the survey;
- C) the household or respondent is unable to participate in the survey.

These three types of non-response correspond to the three types of inaccessible units of observation:

- a) inaccessible households or respondents – those that could not be contacted;
- b) households or respondents who refused to participate in the survey;
- c) those unable to participate in the survey: these are mainly respondents with physical or mental deviations that complicate or preclude participation (deafness, blindness, etc.), those who were temporarily sick or intoxicated, and those who do not speak the language of the survey.

The results of the survey show that the response rate in the whole sample population for all regions was 71.5%.

In 2022, In addition to the 4,915 households re-surveyed after participation in 2020, another 76 families were interviewed who had participated in at least one survey between 2013 and 2018

² The 'unit of observation' in mass surveys is either a household or an individual respondent. In assessing the response rate of the target sample for this survey, the unit of observation is a household residing at an address in the sample.

but missed the 2020 survey. Another 1,090 families were interviewed in 2022 for the first time.

The percentage of replacements in Wave 5 is 18.2% of households compared to the previous wave (2020). As mentioned above, 81.8% of families who participated in 2020 were accessible in 2022.

The addresses of the households **who did not** participate in the 2020 wave were significantly less accessible: the survey successfully covered only 46.8% of the addresses obtained in 2022 to top up the sample. That is, 1,116 families were interviewed based on an additional 2,493 addresses. The probability of re-surveying those who have previously been interviewed is always higher. The higher response rates of previously interviewed respondents are attributable to, among other things, the positive experience of participation in the survey and the contact established with the interviewer during the previous visits (where possible, the same interviewer works with the each family in the different waves).

As usual, the response rates vary significantly among the primary sampling units of different types. Traditionally, lower response rates are observed in urban settlements, and especially in large cities. The higher mobility of the population and the higher number of refusals to participate there resulted in increased losses of 2022 respondents, so more households were needed for primary interviews to set off the losses. The lower response rates in large cities can therefore be attributed to both causes.

Table 5 presents the reasons for non-response by the households in the sample:

Table 5. Reasons for household non-response included in sample

Reasons	Number of dwellings	% of all inaccessible units	% of legitimate units
Non-residential premises	94	3.9%	
Flat (house) uninhabited at the moment	117	4.8%	
Three visits fell short (door locked, access blocked by security systems, etc.)	40	1.7%	
Residents do not speak Russian	36	1.5%	
All three visits failed to find residents at home	737	30.4%	34.5%
Residents refused to open door and engage in conversation all three visits	25	1.0%	1.2%
Interview impossible due to illness (temporary illness such as flu)	74	3.1%	3.5%

Interview impossible due to disability, deafness, etc.	42	1.7%	2.0%
All three visits find no adults at home	7	0.3%	0.3%
Residents permanently impaired ³	11	0.5%	0.5%
Family absent during entire survey period (business trip, in hospital)	124	5.1%	5.8%
Refusal to participate in survey	1,086	44.9%	50.9%
Others	28	1.2%	1.3%
Total non-participants	2,421		
Total participants	6,081		
Total addresses obtained	8,502	100.0%	
Of these, illegitimate dwellings	287		
Legitimate dwellings	8,215		100.0%

Thus, **the response rate (legitimate households who were interviewed) was 74.0% in the 2022 survey.**

According to Table 5, the main reasons for household non-response were failures to contact (40% of all cases of inaccessible legitimate households) and households' refusals to participate in the survey (51% of cases of inaccessibility). There are a variety of circumstances in which it is impossible to contact a household: the adults are away, the family is absent for the duration of the survey, etc., but the vast majority of cases of non-contact involved the absence of a household member on all the three visits by the interviewer.

The inability of household members to participate in the survey, including due to illness, was the reason for non-participation in 6% of non-response cases.

8. Description of weighing procedure and post-stratification weights

In designing a sample for sociological surveys, the aim is to ensure that each of the units of observation stands an equal chance of being included in the sample. That is, the sample should be formed in such a way that every household of the general population has an equal chance of being selected for the sample population. However, in conducting a nationwide survey based on face-to-face interviews, it is impossible to ensure the ideally equal probability of each household being selected, for a number of reasons. Before the study, it is impossible to provide an exact estimate of the dwellings in each constituency or, even more so, to predict the response rate in each constituency. This information becomes known after the survey. Calculations after the survey show

³ This also includes safety concerns for the interviewer (for example, the mentally ill, those addicted to drink/drugs, or residents behaving aggressively).

how the probability of a dwelling being selected in the sample varies across constituencies.

Even in the case of the most ideal sample design, due to differences in the response rates of types of observation unit (for example, different demographic groups) at different places of the survey, the real sample in mass sample surveys is broken down by the attributes under study, which slightly deviate from those in the general population. If the breakdowns by these attributes are known for the general population (for example, if these data are collected in a complete census), the sample can be ‘adjusted’, that is, re-weighted by the data for the general population. Post-stratification weights are used for such re-weighting. These are specially calculated coefficients for the analysis of the sample data to bring the data of the sample population, in certain parameters, into alignment with the previously known data for the general population. In the All-Russian survey of 2022, the data for the general population are the data of the 2020–2021 census of the Russian Federation (for the sample population of individuals) and the 2010 census of the population of the Russian Federation (for the sample population of households). The sample data were prepared when household size data from the 2021 census were unavailable, so the 2010 census data were used to calculate the post-stratification weights for households.

The post-stratification weights are the multipliers by which the share of observations in each group in the sample population must be multiplied to obtain the share of this group in the total population. The post-stratification weight for each group of observations is calculated as the quotient of the share of the group in the census data and the number of observations of the group in the sample population:

$$W_i = \frac{N_i}{n_i} \quad (1)$$

where W_i is the post-stratification weight for the i -th group,

N_i is the number of members of the i -th group in the general population, and

n_i is the number of respondents surveyed in the i -th group.

Post-stratification weights can be calculated for any attributes of a sample population that have distributions in the general population. In this, it is necessary to understand that the weighing of the sample is a method to correct information and not to obtain new information.

The weights for individual respondents calculated for the 2022 database bring the sample population into alignment with the 2020–2021 census data according to a multi-dimensional distribution by the most commonly used parameters: type of settlement (urban and rural population), gender, and age group.

For households participating in the 2022 survey, the post-stratification weights are calculated in order to establish a correspondence between the sample distribution and the 2010 census data on household size and type of settlement (urban or rural).

Depending on the objectives of analysis, it may be advisable to calculate other post-stratification weights that adjust the breakdown of the sample for other pre-decided indicators. Examples of post-stratification weights calculated for these indicators for households and individuals in the 2022 survey of financial behaviour are presented in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6. Post-stratification weights for households by size and type of settlement

Settlement type	Household size (persons)	2010 census data	2010 census data, %	Number of households surveyed	Percentage (%) of households surveyed	Post-stratification weights
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Urban area	1	10,812,229	19.82	1,143	18.80	1.05430109
	2	11,914,718	21.84	1,476	24.27	0.89969035
	3	9,658,220	17.70	971	15.97	1.10859653
	4	5,830,108	10.69	632	10.39	1.02814691
	5+	3,025,001	5.54	344	5.66	0.98008272
	Total	41,240,276	75.59	4,566	75.09	
Rural area	1	3,206,525	5.88	345	5.67	1.03588415
	2	3,649,150	6.69	519	8.53	0.78364616
	3	2,625,838	4.81	270	4.44	1.08392645
	4	2,077,298	3.81	210	3.45	1.10249127
	5+	1,761,540	3.23	171	2.81	1.14813260
	Total	13,320,351	24.41	1,515	24.91	
Total		54,560,627	100.00	6,081	100.00	

Table 7. Post-stratification weights for groups of individuals by gender, age, and settlement type

Settlement type	Gender	Age	2021 census data	2021 census data, %	Number of respondents	Respondents as % of total respondents	Post-stratification weights
1	2	3	4		6	7	8
Urban area	Male	18–29	7,223,373	6.0	662	5.44	1.11144355
		30–44	13,748,601	11.5	1,192	9.80	1.17486410
		45–59	9,931,567	8.3	910	7.48	1.11168505
		60+	9,312,718	7.8	949	7.80	0.99957554
		Total	40,216,259	33.7	3,713	30.53	
	Female	18–29	7,070,772	5.9	693	5.70	1.03929537
		30–44	14,787,631	12.4	1,363	11.21	1.10511667
		45–59	11,674,563	9.8	1,271	10.45	0.93562208
		60+	16,237,130	13.6	1,900	15.62	0.87048451
		Total	49,770,096	41.7	5,227	42.98	
	Total		89,986,355	75.4		73.51	

Rural area	Male	18–29	2,345,452	2.0	189	1.55	1.26406688
		30–44	4,270,074	3.6	352	2.89	1.23565753
		45–59	3,755,943	3.1	433	3.56	0.88356088
		60+	3,590,709	3.0	415	3.41	0.88132785
		Total	13,962,178	11.7	1,389	11.42	
	Female	18–29	2,119,748	1.8	223	1.83	0.96824395
		30–44	4,048,643	3.4	418	3.44	0.98659425
		45–59	3,931,618	3.3	555	4.56	0.72157871
		60+	5,350,164	4.5	637	5.24	0.85552567
		Total	15,450,173	12.9	1,833	15.07	
	Total	29,412,351	24.6	3,222	26.49		
Total	119,398,706	100.00	12,162	100.00%			

The final post-stratification weights for the resulting sample are presented in column 7 of Table 6 and in column 8 of Table 7. They allow the sample to be distributed by selected characteristics observed in the general population in the 2020–2021 census data for individuals and in the 2010 census data for households. A post-stratification weight above one shows insufficient representation of the group in the sample. Vice versa, a coefficient below one indicates the overrepresentation of the corresponding group.

According to the data in Table 6, the sample population of households surveyed in 2022 is very close to the general population surveyed in the 2010 census in terms of place of residence and family size. At the same time, the share of two-member families among respondents in 2022 is slightly higher than in the general population. This is especially evident in rural areas. Large families (five or more people) from rural areas are represented a little less than would be expected from the population sample. These trends have continued throughout the 2013, 2015, 2018 and 2020 surveys, considering that this survey is longitudinal.

According to Table 7, men aged 18–44 from rural areas are the most underrepresented respondents. At the same time, men aged 45 or older from rural areas are slightly overrepresented in the sample population. In the same manner, there were slightly more women aged 45 or older in rural areas surveyed than needed. Overall, the rural population is 2% greater in the sample population than in the general population according to the 2022 census. Two factors explain this. The first is the priority for previously surveyed respondents. In addition, respondents in rural settlements are more accessible and more willing to continue participating in the survey. Rural areas are therefore marked by few replacement families, and the lack of replacements prevents the reversal of the aging of the large stable sample population. In cities, the share of household replacements is always significantly higher, so there is a higher chance that a drop-out household is replaced with a younger one. In addition, in calculating the target figures for the number of families surveyed in 2022 – and therefore the number of individuals – the 2010 census data were used for each settlement (the 2022 census data were unpublished at the time). The shortage of rural residents compared with 2010 is only 1.1%. The relative predominance of older ages is also undoubtedly due to the longitudinal nature of the survey: given that more than 80% of respondents are families that have previously taken part, it is clear that they are chiefly responsible for the sex and age structure of the sample population. There are few replacement families, and they also have representatives of the older generations among them. There are few households without older people. Such households are more mobile, less accessible, and less willing to be interviewed. This is the factor behind the permanent shortage of younger ages in longitudinal surveys of households.

At the same time, the post-stratification weights demonstrate that there are no significant gender or age skews in the sample population: the largest post-stratification weight is 1.26 and the smallest is 0.72. The post-stratification weights for more than 75% of individual observations are

between 0.87 and 1.11, and they are between 0.87 and 1.18 for more than 85% of observations.

The weighting procedure, which is not obligatory in the analysis of survey data, may be useful in the analysis of a complete array, when it is necessary to ensure that the sample data exactly match the general population in the attributes which are used to calculate the post-stratification weights.

9. Adjustment of survey toolset

The survey toolset consists of two main questionnaires: The Household Questionnaire (Appendix 1) and the Individual Questionnaire (Appendix 2) for members of surveyed households aged 18+, and several supporting tools. The Household and Individual questionnaires were substantially redesigned, entailing significant adjustments to all supporting tools. For Wave 5 of the household survey, major changes were made to the cards in both questionnaires (Appendices 10 and 11) and to the instructions for interviewers (Appendices 3 and 9), operator supervisors (Appendix 14), and operators (Appendices 5–7).

Corrections to questionnaires

The questionnaires did not change very much during the first four waves. They were revised to add a small number of new questions or to re-word certain previous questions. The need for change was determined based on an analysis of the previous waves and the new issues. However, the basic content and structure of the questionnaires remained unchanged.

To understand the scale of transformation of the questionnaires for Wave 5, let us consider some examples of changes in the sections and modules of the two questionnaires.

The household questionnaire throughout the previous waves included the following sections: ‘Household Information’, ‘Housing Conditions’, ‘Other Properties’, ‘Real Estate Loans’, ‘Income’, and ‘Spending’. Although all of these sections, with the exception of the last, technically remained in this wave, their content and structure were significantly revised. The modules of questions included in these sections were revised content-wise together with the sets of questions in these modules, and the location structure of the question modules and the structure of the questions within the modules were both changed.

‘Housing Conditions’ section

- One question in the beginning of the section on the origin of title to housing was changed. The ‘property exchange’ and ‘privatised cooperative flat’ response options were deleted, and the two separate ‘purchased’ and ‘built’ options were combined into one: ‘purchased or built’. This resulted in the merger of the ‘Questions for those who bought a home before 1998’ and ‘Questions for those who built a house after 1998’ modules. This is an example of how a change in one question can affect

the structure of an entire module. In addition, new questions were added to this combined module to expand information on the sources of funds for home purchase or construction.

- The ‘Real Estate Loans’ module, in line with the Customer’s goal of obtaining complete information not about the largest mortgage loan taken, as in previous waves, but about the loan with the largest outstanding balance, included a new filter question on the number of outstanding loans. This resulted in a new transition scheme in the module, but it allowed the goal to be attained.
- The questions for home owners about insurance and real estate loans for purchase or construction were deleted, and a set of questions about plans to buy or build a home was added. A set of questions about such plans, similar in content, was also added for those who do not live in their own homes.

‘Other Properties’ section

- This section retained its former structure of modules: ‘Flats’, ‘Houses’, ‘Land Plots without Houses’, and ‘Garages’. In the current wave, in contrast with previous waves, filters were added to each module to ask only questions about Properties located in Russia. For each module (property type), questions were added about the region in which the property is located (in the region of residence or otherwise) and about how the household uses it.
- As before, the current wave asked basic questions about other real estate for each of the properties the respondent mentions and recorded the responses in table form. However, the order of the questions for each property type was brought into line with the new order of the housing questions in the ‘Housing Conditions’ section. There were new questions about the sources of funds for the purchase or construction of real estate assets, and the housing loan and housing insurance questions were dropped.
- However, the table form for loan questions was completely removed from the section. In the current wave, the questions about loans for each property type were removed from the table and asked only about loans outstanding at the time of the survey. If a household has several loans for several properties of the same type, the questions are asked only about the loan with the largest outstanding balance.

‘Income’ section

- The list of sources of household income in the current wave was significantly expanded to add investment tax deductions and entrepreneurial income. As regards sources of income, which may be both regular and transitory, questions about the frequency of payments were added.
- There was a new set of questions about household income, which was previously calculated based on answers to the individual questionnaires, namely, questions on total household income for the last 12 months.

- A significant change in the current wave is the replacement of the time period ‘over the last 30 days’ with ‘over the last month’. This applies to a large number of questions in the ‘Income’ section: about the receipt of pensions, scholarships, social payments, help from relatives, etc.

‘Spending’ section

- Based on an analysis of the answers to the text question about other spending in previous waves, 11 new questions about spending on goods and services were added to the ‘Spending’ section. Several questions were dropped, such as those on fuel costs, on postal and telegraph services, on the purchase of securities, and on charity.
- The time intervals were also changed in the ‘Spending’ section similarly to the Income section: ‘for the last 30 days’ was changed to ‘for the last month’, and ‘for the last 12 months’ was changed to ‘for the last year’.

A total of 272 questions from the Wave 4 Household Questionnaire were removed, and 69 questions were reworded. There were 141 new questions added to this wave’s Household Questionnaire.

The Individual Questionnaire for the current wave was reworked even more significantly. In previous waves, there were seven sections in **the Individual Questionnaire**: ‘General Information’, ‘Primary Occupation’, ‘Decision Making’, ‘Financial Assets’, ‘Vehicles’, ‘Financial Literacy’, and ‘Interviewer Comments’. There were eight sections in the current wave: ‘General Information’, ‘Primary Occupation’, ‘Financial Assets’, ‘Financial Liabilities’, ‘Vehicles’, ‘Financial Literacy’, ‘Financial Health’, and ‘Financial Inclusion’.

‘Decision Making’ section

- The ‘Decision Making’ section was deleted from the current wave. The question on marital status, which was previously part of this section, was put into the ‘General information’ section. The eight questions concerning respondents’ financial behaviour were put into the ‘Primary Occupation’ section.

‘Financial Assets’ section

- Significant adjustments were made to the ‘Financial Assets’ section in the current wave. In previous waves, the section included 15 modules: ‘Shares, Bonds, and Bank-Managed Mutual Funds’, ‘Shares in Mutual Funds’, ‘Savings in Non-Governmental Pension Funds’, ‘Voluntary Pension Savings Policies’, ‘Insurance Policies’, ‘Loans’, ‘Credit Cards’, ‘Educational Loans’, ‘Pawnshop Loans’, ‘Consumer Loans except for Credit Card Loans, Real Estate Loans, Auto Loans, and Targeted Educational Loans’, ‘Accounts and Deposits’, ‘Metal Bank Accounts’, ‘Accounts in Electronic Payment Systems’, ‘Debts to Individuals’, ‘Cash Savings’, and ‘Maternity Capital’.

- In the current wave, questions about bank-managed mutual funds were removed from the ‘Shares and Bonds’ module, the ‘Educational Loans’ and ‘Maternity Capital’ modules were completely removed, the cryptocurrency questions were combined into a separate module and supplemented with new questions, and a new module of questions was added (‘Payment Instruments In Use’).
- The ‘Loans’, ‘Credit Cards’, and ‘Debts to Individuals’ modules were moved to the new ‘Financial Liabilities’ section. The pawnshop loans module was also moved there and supplemented with questions about microfinance companies. The ‘Financial Obligations’ section also incorporated the ‘Consumer Loans’ module.
- In the ‘Vehicles’ section, the questions about the brand and model of vehicles owned by respondents, the date of auto loan issuance, and the bank that issued the loan were dropped.
- The ‘Financial Literacy’ section was supplemented with a large number of new questions. Two new sections were added to the Individual Questionnaire: ‘Financial Health’ and ‘Financial Inclusion’.
- In the current wave, the Individual Questionnaire was expanded with more than ten new questions with judgments. There were almost no judgments in previous waves, and the overwhelming number of questions were factual in nature. Questions U3, U4, and U5 from the ‘General Information’, section about respondents’ views of the current economic situation, of prospects for the next five years, and an assessment of the economic conditions two years ago are examples of judgment questions. In the ‘Primary Occupation’ section, judgment questions include questions K72, K73, K74, and K75, which deal with changes in the prices of food, non-food products, and services. The whole new ‘Financial Health’ section consists of questions to which respondents respond with assessments of various aspects of their financial condition.

A total of 284 new questions were added to the Individual Questionnaire in the current wave. There were 188 questions deleted from the previous version of the questionnaire, and 24 questions were reworded.

Transition schemes in the questionnaires

New questions were added to the sets of questions and old questions were deleted, resulting in the reformatting of sections and their question modules, and this made it necessary to change the transition scheme.

- A number of the old transitions disappeared, as did the questions initiating the transition. For example, the Household Questionnaire dropped the module of questions about borrower life insurance related to housing loans. Four of the six questions in this model initiated transitions. All of these transitions have been removed from the current wave's Household Questionnaire. Nine Maternity Capital questions have been removed from the Individual Questionnaire. Five of these questions triggered transitions, which were also removed with the questions.
- For interviewer convenience, the questionnaires are sequentially numbered within the sections. The questions were renumbered after the questionnaires were finalised. Almost all of the old questions were assigned new numbers in the current wave, and this resulted in a change in the numbers of the questions to which the transition occurs. For example, the Household Questionnaire retained the question 'Does the household have outstanding bills for housing or utilities?'. In previous waves, this was question O11. Those without outstanding bills were instructed to move on to question O13. In the current wave, the question about outstanding bills is question number O7, with a transition to question O9. The current wave's Individual Questionnaire retains several old questions about currency purchases. In previous waves, these questions were in the 'Decision Making' section under numbers M22, M23, and M24. Respondents who did not buy currency proceeded from M22 to M24. In the current wave, these questions have been moved to the 'Primary Occupation' section, where they are assigned numbers K69, K70, and K71. Those who do not buy currency move from K69 to K71.
- Several of the new questions in this wave also initiate transitions. For example, a module of questions for those do not live in their own homes has been added to the Household Questionnaire. These are questions A42–A46. Having answered Question A42, respondents who do not plan to buy or build a home go to question A47. This is a new transition from a new question. In the Individual Questionnaire, the 'Financial Assets' section has been supplemented with the new 'Financial Instruments in Use' module (questions P10.1–P10.13). There is one new direct transition in this module

from Question P10.3 to Question P10.7, and questions P10.6, P10.10, and P10.11 indicate the direction of the transitions. The latter questions serve as filters for the questions (in the interviewer’s instructions for these questions).

Examples of various changes in the content and structure of the sections and modules of the Household and Individual questionnaires can illustrate the scale of the transformation needed to prepare the Wave 5 Questionnaires.

Correction of support data tools (cards and interviewer instructions)

Cards

Consistently with the changes to the questions, significant changes were made to both the number of the cards used as sets of options for responses to the closed questions and to the content of the questions.

The 2020 **Household Questionnaire** included 11 cards, while the 2022 questionnaire included 15 cards. Of these, only 6 cards are fully identical to cards from 2020.

The **2020 Individual Questionnaire**, included 46 cards, while the 2022 questionnaire included 62. Of these, only 28 cards are fully identical to cards from 2020.

The increase in the number of cards for the 2022 questionnaires led to the need to group them in two booklets instead of one as in previous waves.

Interviewer instructions

Although many new questions were added in 2022, the methods of handling them were familiar to the interviewers. The interviewer instructions were therefore updated only for a handful of content-related issues, such as new terms.

Detailed clarifications were made to questions **M2. and M3.–M5.** of the new ‘Financial Inclusion’ section.

Question M2.:

M2 Please specify which of the payment devices below are installed in your residential area.

	Yes	No	<i>DIFFICULT TO ANSWER</i>	<i>REFUSAL</i>
1. ATMs.....	1.....	2.....	7.....	8
2. Terminals for payment with bank cards				
at points of sale.....	1.....	2.....	7.....	8
3. Cash-<u>only</u> payment terminals.....	1.....	2.....	7.....	8

Comment on Question **M2.**:

Terminals for payment with bank cards at points of sale. These are devices for non-cash payments used, for example, at cash registers in shops/pharmacies, etc. (using plastic cards or smartphones).

Payment terminals accepting only cash.

These are not ATMs but devices marked

‘Cash only’. These are used, for example, to pay for car parking, to top up e-wallets, etc.

Questions M3.–M5:

M3 It is possible or impossible in your residential area to make the following transactions without an internet connection?

	Possible	Impossible	<i>DIFFICULT TO ANSWER</i>	<i>REFUSAL</i>
1. Open a deposit	1.....	2.....	7.....	8.....
2. Obtain a loan.....	1.....	2.....	7.....	8.....
3. Pay bills for services, including via money transfers.....	1.....	2.....	7.....	8.....
4. Insure a flat, car, or life.....	1.....	2.....	7.....	8.....
5. Obtain a microloan.....	1.....	2.....	7.....	8.....

M4. [IF THE RESPONDENT DOES NOT USE THE INTERNET, THAT IS, IN QUESTION U16., P. 4. THEY HAVE MARKED ‘2’: GO TO **M6. P. 78**]

Which financial products or services can be obtained with an internet connection?

	Possible	Impossible	<i>DIFFICULT TO ANSWER</i>	<i>REFUSAL</i>
1. Open a deposit.....	1.....	2.....	7.....	8.....
2. Obtain a loan	1.....	2.....	7.....	8.....
3. Pay bills for services, including via money transfers.....	1.....	2.....	7.....	8.....
4. Insure a flat, car, or life.....	1.....	2.....	7.....	8.....
5. Obtain a microloan.....	1.....	2.....	7.....	8.....

M5. [**INTERVIEWER!** IF THE RESPONDENT CANNOT GET ANYTHING VIA AN INTERNET CONNECTION, I.E., IN QUESTION M4. ON P. 77 THE ANSWER ‘1’ IS NEVER NOTED, GO TO QUESTION M6.]

Are you comfortable using the internet to obtain these products or services?

Yes.....	1
No.....	2
<i>DIFFICULT TO ANSWER</i>	7
<i>REFUSAL</i>	8

Comment on questions **M3.–M5:**

A person who can use the services listed in **M3. and M4.** but does not personally use these services via the Internet must answer **M5.** There may be respondents who use the Internet but do not do anything related to banking listed in **M4.**, because, for example, they are afraid to use ATMs or home/mobile internet and prefer to visit the bank or insurance company. This question is specifically about comfort.

10. Organisation of field work and survey methodology

Printed survey documents were sent to the target regions: Household and Individual questionnaires, as well as all supporting documents, including card booklets for each questionnaire, instructions, the lists of sampled addresses with full details of street names, and building and flat numbers where household members were to be interviewed. The Household Composition Form was attached to each address at which the household was interviewed previously. This form listed all members of the previously interviewed family by name.

Thanks to the interviewer's extensive experience in large-scale surveys of the population with All-Russian samples, highly competent employees, and in-depth pre-field preparation, the interviewers' work operated smoothly and included several stages:

- Receipt of notification of field work;
- Briefing and training interviews (instructive lectures);
- Field work in line with the Instructions;
- Review and submission of completed questionnaires, completion of reporting documents.

The main difficulties that the interviewers faced during the field phase fall into two categories:

- difficulties accessing a household;
- difficulties completing questionnaires in a household.

The Instructions required each interviewer to visit exactly the addresses listed in the sampled address list and to find the right households there. This requirement was most difficult to meet in big cities.

When working through the address sample, the interviewers had to visit a large enough number of addresses to catch a household member at home and establish initial contact. The interviewers were asked to carry out 'intelligence' work in parallel, since they were already in the building where the households in the sample lived. If nobody could be caught at an address, the interviewers were to immediately ask the neighbours whether anyone currently resided at the address. If not, to save time finding the right household, the interviewers did not need to revisit the address. If yes, they were supposed to ask the neighbours to pass someone of the household a written invitation to participate in the survey.

As a result, in large urban settlements, **on average**, the interviewers had to visit an address three times, and often many more times, to establish contact with a household from the address list. In rural settlements and small urban settlements, the occurrence was one to two times.

The survey conditions required that the interview be held with all household members 18 years or older residing at the address. This triggered some other difficulties, as individual household members could be away at the time of the visit, they might refuse to participate in the

survey, etc. The difficulty for the interviewer was that it was only possible to catch certain potential respondents late in the evening or at weekends if they were away from the home working or studying late. It was more convenient for the interviewers to visit addresses in the afternoon or early evening, when it is safe to walk around the area and there is a good chance of catching non-workers at home. The problem was solved as follows: since weekly updates about the ongoing interviews were submitted to Moscow and the dates and times of interviews and the number of completed questionnaires could be monitored, the regional coordinators in Moscow made contact with the supervisors of the interviewers who shunned evening activities (which could lead to biases in the sample). The supervisors were asked to encourage such interviewers to visit addresses in the evenings through incentives or penalties. For safety reasons, interviewers were recommended to work in pairs if it was possible, to inform households of the details of their subsequent routes, including addresses and phone numbers, and to have relatives or acquaintances accompany them to the places of the survey during the hours of darkness. The results show that the interviewers were not exposed to threats to life or health during the survey.

Megacities proved the most challenging environment of all for interviewers. Megacities were marked with lower response rates due to refusals to participate in the interview due to busy hours at work or at home, the lack of free time, and the unwillingness to discuss finances with strangers or to let anyone in. In such cases, additional addresses were sent to the regions, and it was proposed that the regional group's office be selected as the place to interview individual household members.

As the practice of 'face-to-face' interviews shows, retirement-age women are more willing than others to establish contact with the interviewer. This is attributable to the greater free time they have to communicate and to the fact that social organisations are generally uninterested in their opinions, although their levels of education and ability to reflect on reality are quite good. They are potentially willing to participate in the survey, but current crime rates, constantly reported in the media, make them scared of unexpected visitors to their homes and flats. The difficulties the interviewers had in establishing contact with this population group were addressed in different ways. For example, in some major cities, the interviewer's previous experience was used on visits, and non-respondents were invited to the interviewer's regional group's office. Evidence dismisses earlier doubts about respondents' sincerity when the survey is held in an official environment. For some categories of potential respondents, it is easier to leave home for a time to participate in a survey than it is to let an interviewer in. These respondents found the arrangement more convenient, as they did not feel a need to tidy up in anticipation of the interviewer and did not feel sorry if they had failed to do so. They also thought that it was a safer arrangement than if a stranger had to be let in. Certainly, the introduction of changes to the conduct of the surveys required additional funding for the regional group to rent additional premises for interviews.

On the understanding that the crime rates in certain regions might lead to more refusals, the Bank of Russia issued a letter to local authorities in the preparation stage with details of the subject and timing of the survey. That made a positive difference on survey arrangements.

Due to the careful training of the interviewers, there were overall no problems of incorrectly completed questionnaires.

The theoretical part of the training session included an explanation of the psychological characteristics of potential respondent groups, a description of the allowable options to clarify the questions (the main requirement being ‘repeat the question but do not rephrase it in your own words’), and training in communication skills. This is why, despite the complexity of the topics in the survey and the duration of the survey procedures, the vast majority of respondents welcomed the interviewer to the family and answered all questions in the questionnaire.

The survey was based on a face-to face (interviewer and respondent) method. Conducted at the place of residence, the interviews involved a number of factors that may have negatively affected the quality of the respondents' responses. Interviewers were supposed to eliminate or minimise their impact:

For example, they were supposed to take the training sessions associated with the survey into account. Quite often, interviewers had to obtain consent to the survey and conduct an interview without pre-arranging a time. Such ‘unexpected’ surveys, if they interrupted any classes of respondents, could be accompanied by breaks (various daily chores, time with children, watching television, etc.). If a respondent systematically disengaged themselves from the conversation, the interviewer suggested rescheduling to a more convenient time.

Another factor to consider was the psychological background of the survey. The survey was not recommended in situations of acute conflict (if there was a family quarrel, if the respondent or a family member was intoxicated, etc.). If the survey could not be rescheduled and the questionnaire had to be completed under adverse emotional or psychological conditions, the interviewer had to mention this circumstance in the Interviewer Comments section.

For each address in the sample, one Household Questionnaire for the household as a whole and Individual Questionnaires for each member of the household aged 18 or older were completed.

The Household Questionnaire was completed by interviewing the family member who had the most complete information on their income, spending, and other financial aspects. At the same time, other family members were allowed or in certain cases welcomed to join the conversation if, in a certain area, another household member turned out to be more knowledgeable than the main respondent. Interviewers were given special stickers to mark questions which were beyond the competence of the main respondent. In the same place, the interviewer was also to record the name and patronymic of the family member who had such information and a time the interviewer could meet them if they were not at home for the main survey interview.

Conversely, the individual questionnaires were to be completed solely by conversation between the interviewer and the respondent, with no third-party intervention and, Ideally, in a separate room. If a third person in the room attempted to answer questionnaire questions in place of the respondent, the interviewer was to explain that it was necessary to record only the respondent's opinion in the questionnaire, but that the interviewer would definitely speak to the other person and complete a questionnaire a little later so that the person would be able to express their opinion on the issue.

11. Monitoring of interviewers' field operations

Monitoring the work of the interviewers was an important stage of the survey. Even though the training of interviewers engaged in field operations is emphasised (classes in small groups, an individual approach in training, etc.) and although researchers trust most people they have been working with for many years, monitoring interviewers is essential because cases of negligence or a lack of professionalism, however rare, can undermine all preparation efforts. The purpose of control is to assess how interviewers meet all the requirements for finding the right household, interviewing household members, and conducting interviews.

The sampling control procedure covered 25% of the total sample. Telephone monitoring was used for 15%, and monitoring of personal visits was used for 10%. Personal visits were used to check the addresses of interviewers who had an insufficient number of telephone numbers in relation to productive addresses.

Supervisors for the personal visits were engaged at the places of survey. Supervisors for telephone calls were engaged both in Moscow and other settlements. Both groups received training.

First, supervisors were instructed that, in addition to ensuring that the interviews took the correct course, their main task was to maintain subsequent contact with the respondents. This meant being the most agreeable in communication. The supervisor was supposed to convince the respondent through their behaviour throughout their communication that the visit was evidence that the interviewer was very seriously concerned with the results and that the monitoring procedure was not meant to find the interviewer guilty of a violation but to ensure that the information obtained was reliable. Supervisors were given IDs for personal visits.

Most of the violations detected by supervisors were rectified in the course of the field work or immediately after the end of the field stage.

The control procedure targeted the following areas:

1. Whether the interviewer visited the address.
2. Whether the household survey took place.
3. Whether every household member over the age of 18 was interviewed.

4. Whether every household member over the age of 18 answered the questions themselves in the presence of the interviewer, whether they completed the questionnaire themselves without the interviewer, or whether anyone else answered for the household member.
5. The duration of the survey.
6. Whether the respondent was paid for the survey, and, if so, what amount.
7. A telephone check was made to confirm that the household address corresponded with the address in the address list sent to the region.

Many supervisors had to make multiple visits to make their checks through personal communication. If there was a single negative result against a position to be checked, up to half the households surveyed by the interviewer were checked. Very serious violations would involve the complete monitoring of the interviewer's work, but no such cases were registered. Households' attitude towards the checks was overall friendly.

Household members understood the need for the supervisors' visits, treated them respectfully, and realised that the pollsters were serious about their work and the quality of the incoming information. In a number of cases, respondents who pollsters failed to catch at home telephoned the supervisor (via the number that was provided) and answered the questions of the control questionnaire.

The results of the checks were as follows:

There was only one case in which a person answered on the phone that he had never been contacted about the survey. According to the supervisor, the man she spoke to was not sober and said that his wife was in hospital and that he would call the police. When the supervisor replied that she was ready to talk to the policeman, the man hung up.

In all cases in which a visit to the address took place, the survey was completed.

All respondents aged 18 years or older were asked to be interviewed, except when they were absolutely unavailable (in hospital, on a business trip, etc.), and this fact was mentioned in the card of the household questionnaire. If anyone in the household was very busy, the interviewers attempted to agree on a convenient meeting time. They did sometimes give in to temptation and completed the questionnaire by interviewing a mother, wife, or another close relative claiming that they knew everything about the hard-to-reach household member. The checks established that there were at least eight such cases. In five of them, the supervisors managed to convince the family member that the interview had to be conducted directly with the correct respondent. The interviewers were therefore able to agree on a time and complete new questionnaires according to the rules. The old questionnaires were removed from the array. In three cases, the questionnaires completed by other family members on behalf of the respondents were deleted.

The most difficult thing was controlling the duration of the survey, given that people had a very vague understanding of it. In most cases, the duration of the interview on the cover of the questionnaire was consistent with the duration respondents mentioned. Sometimes, the respondent

claimed to have been interviewed for at least two hours, while the interviewer noted a time of 45–50 minutes. In three cases, respondents mentioned very short conversation times (10–15 minutes) because they were too busy. The interviewers had to repeat the interviews for two such questionnaires and conduct full surveys, and they had to remove one such questionnaire from the array.

The money for the survey was always paid and all the amounts coincided. Two addresses were specified in the telephone survey.

12. Work package related to data entry (acceptance, numbering, encoding, input of questionnaires)

Receipt of questionnaires

According to the ‘Instructions for the Input of Questionnaires’ (Appendix 8), the following checks were conducted:

- a. whether the selection of respondents in the household was correct: all members aged 18 and older were to be interviewed
- b. with regard to the cover sheets of the questionnaires and the lists of addresses for the survey, whether they were correctly and fully completed
- c. how well the household composition cards were completed in the household questionnaire

Once the receipt of questionnaires for each region was over, the household questionnaires and individual questionnaires were calculated.

Numbering and encoding of questionnaires

In accordance with the ‘Numbering and Encoding Instructions’ (Appendix 4),

- d. the household questionnaires in each settlement were sorted to arrange the family numbers in ascending order.
- e. All the household questionnaires in each region were numbered.
- f. The number on the cover of the household questionnaire was filled based on the codes of the settlement and the family number.
- g. With regard to household cards, they were checked to confirm the correctness of the numbering of household members in the individual questionnaires, their genders, and their years of birth. After the check, each individual questionnaire was numbered.
- h. The open and semi-open questions of the individual questionnaire were coded. Each of these questions was assigned a codifier.

The questionnaires were then submitted for input.

Input of questionnaires

In accordance with the ‘Data Entry Instructions’, all the available information was transferred from paper to an electronic file:

For each of the two questionnaires, a specific input program was created with ‘Data Entry Instructions’ (basic input rules, difficulties, and special input conditions).

- i. All the operators took a training course and thereafter two tests for each of the questionnaires, which resulted in a comprehensive assessment of potential employees in terms of quality and speed.
- j. The ‘double entry’ option was implemented for the data in the paper questionnaires.

In the first entry, the operator transferred from the questionnaires to the computer all responses marked by the interviewer: digital and textual information, as well as interviewer notes in special text variables.

In the second entry, a check was made of the primary input data from the questionnaires. In cases of discrepancies between the data entered the first time and the second time, a message appeared on the screen showing the two conflicting values so that the second input operator could choose the one consistent with the information on the paper questionnaire. The second entry helped reduce the number of random and systematic errors.

Data cleansing

Logical errors in the file were detected and removed in the data cleansing stage, after the files were re-entered.

First, the developers created forms modelled after the logic of the questionnaires, i.e., forms reflecting all the logical interrelations of the questions. They were to ensure the correctness of the transitions in the questionnaires. Then the program checked the interrelationships of the questions about dates, income and spending, etc. It also specified conditions for the ranks of the variables, highlighting variable values that were too large or too small.

In entering the data, the operators did not enter responses with interviewer notes, so data cleansing involved the in-depth analysis of such field records. The cleansing operator had to decide how a record could be interpreted to capture it as a response code. In complex cases, the interpretation process evolved into a discussion of recording options. Ultimately, in some cases, codes for the variable were added.

When working with the file, the operator ‘cleansed’ each questionnaire separately. The screen displayed all logically broken relationships and ranks. The task of the operator was, first, to compare the values in the file and in the questionnaire and then to decide on how to handle the

variable. The variable could be changed if it was possible to check it against other values and relate it to the field records.

A special form of .doc file was used to record all changes in the data file. The form included the number of questionnaires and rules or ranks (rule/range), indicated the value in the file and what it was changed to, and explained the reason for change.

13. Analysis based on interviewer reports

Judging by the table containing data on the presence of outsiders at the time the individual questionnaire was being completed, there was an outsider present in almost one third of cases (30.6%).

However, the influence of third parties was generally insignificant. Those present did not help respondents at all in 75.6% of cases, helped very little in 14.8% of cases, helped to some extent in 6.9% of cases, and less than two percent helped to a large extent.

Only 0.2% of respondents disliked the fact of the survey. Only 2.1% were impatient and uneasy about the interview. Most respondents, 76.8%, were friendly and interested in the questionnaire. Others' attitude towards the interviewer visit was neutral.

A mere 2% of respondents were rather nervous during the interview, with about 10% showing discomfort only at certain points of the survey. Most respondents – almost 86.2% – felt relaxed during the interview, which had a positive impact on the reliability and quality of the incoming information.

The interviewers found the respondents to be very quick-witted. It is notable that 81.7% of respondents understood the questions well, and 13.8% understood them very well.

The majority of older respondents (70+ years of age) had difficulty understanding technical terms and expressions.

This is another important point. On average, it was difficult to detect any differences between the urban and rural populations in their attitude towards the survey and perception of financial terms, while the age factor in this attitude and perception was a noticeably more impactful factor. The 70+ age category was difficult to work with for interviewers.

Overall, in about 3% of cases, the interviewers experienced difficulties with how respondents understood questions. Almost 15% of respondents aged 70 or older showed misunderstanding.

Importantly, the household questionnaire was generally easier for respondents than the individual questionnaire.

According to the interviewers, the questions that were most difficult psychologically for the respondents can be divided into four groups:

The first includes 'Financial Literacy' questions in the form of tests. The inability of

respondents to cope with economic tasks caused irritation, embarrassment, and a loss of confidence. It was only thanks to the competence of the interviewers that the interviews continued.

The second group of questions includes those using unfamiliar terms.

The third group consists of questions related to bank deposits.

The fourth group includes questions about respondents’ attitudes and behaviour in the financial sphere.

The most difficult questions were those in the ‘Financial Literacy’ section, and of such questions, those in the form of tests were especially difficult. The interviewers noted that they were difficult for the maximum number of respondents. Of the 28 questions in the section, 20 proved difficult, and seven of them were among the top ten most difficult questions.

The most difficult question was Question T24 (pe_t17)⁴:

T24. Imagine that a year ago, you deposited money into an account with an annual interest rate of 8%, while the annual inflation was 10%. Do you think that you can now buy more, less, or as many goods and services as one year ago with the money in your account?

[INTERVIEWER! GIVE RESPONDENT CARD B_44]

- MORE THAN A YEAR AGO* 1
- EXACTLY THE SAME* 2
- LESS THAN A YEAR AGO*..... 3
- DIFFICULT TO ANSWER*..... 4

The breakdown of responses is as follows:

Pe_t17 Imagine that a year ago, you deposited money into an account with an annual interest rate of 8%, and inflation was 10%. Can the money in your account now buy, on average, more, fewer, or as many goods and services as one year ago?

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Accrued percentage
1 MORE THAN ONE YEAR AGO	1,230	10.1	10.1	10.1
2 EXACTLY THE SAME	1,916	15.7	15.7	25.9
3 FEWER THAN ONE YEAR AGO	7,149	58.8	58.8	84.6
Valid 99,999,997 DIFFICULT TO ANSWER	1,857	15.3	15.3	99.9
99,999,999 NO ANSWER	16	0.1	0.1	100.0
Total	12,168	100.0	100.0	

The breakdown shows that almost two thousand people – more than 15% of respondents – found it difficult to answer this question.

This question is followed by question T25 (pe_t33):

T25. Suppose that your income will double in 2022, but so will prices for all goods and services. Do you think you will be able to buy more, fewer, or as many goods and services as in 2021?

[INTERVIEWER! GIVE RESPONDENT CARD B_45]

- MORE THAN IN 2021* 1

⁴ The question numbers from the data file are shown in parentheses.

<i>EXACTLY THE SAME</i>	2
<i>FEWER THAN IN 2021</i>	3
<i>DIFFICULT TO ANSWER</i>	4

Pe_t33 Suppose that your income will double in 2022, but so will prices for all goods and services. Do you think you will be able to buy more, fewer, or as many goods and services as in 2021?

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Accrued percentage
1 MORE THAN IN 2021	746	6.1	6.1	6.1
2 EXACTLY THE SAME	6,705	55.1	55.1	61.2
3 LESS THAN IN 2021	3,014	24.8	24.8	86.0
Valid 99,999,997 DIFFICULT TO ANSWER	1,687	13.9	13.9	99.9
99,999,999 NO ANSWER	16	0.1	0.1	100.0
Total	12,168	100.0	100.0	

More than 1,500 respondents – almost 14% – found it difficult to answer.

Question T22 came third among the most difficult questions. (pe_t7):

T22. Now, several questions in the form of a test. When answering the questions, do not be afraid to make a mistake: think, and choose the answer that you think is most probable.

Suppose that you deposit RUB 100,000 with a bank for two years at 8% per annum. How much money will there be in your account in two years if you do not withdraw any money or top up your account?

[INTERVIEWER! GIVE RESPONDENT CARD B_42]

<i>MORE THAN RUB 108,000</i>	1
<i>EXACTLY RUB 108,000</i>	2
<i>LESS THAN RUB 108,000</i>	3
<i>DIFFICULT TO ANSWER</i>	4

Pe_t7 Suppose you put RUB 100,000 in a bank account for two years at 8% per year. How much money will there be in your account in two years if you do not withdraw any money or top up your account?

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Accrued percentage
1 MORE THAN RUB 108,000	8,862	72.8	72.8	72.8
2 EXACTLY RUB 108,000	1,464	12.0	12.0	84.9
3, LESS THAN RUB 108,000	331	2.7	2.7	87.6
Valid 99,999,997 DIFFICULT TO ANSWER	1,500	12.3	12.3	99.9
99,999,999 NO ANSWER	11	0.1	0.1	100.0
Total	12,168	100.0	100.0	

Of the tests, question T23 came in fourth, with 47 votes. (pe_t8).

T23. Suppose you deposit RUB 100,000 with a bank for five years at 10% per annum. Interest will accrue each year and be added to the principal of the deposit. How much money will there be in your account in five years if you keep both the principal and the accrued interest in your account?

[INTERVIEWER! GIVE RESPONDENT CARD B_43]

- MORE THAN RUB 150,000..... 1
- EXACTLY RUB 150,000 2
- LESS THAN RUB 150,000..... 3
- DIFFICULT TO ANSWER..... 4

Pe_t8 Suppose you deposit RUB 100,000 with a bank for five years at 10% per year. How much money will there be in your account in five years if you keep both the principal and the accrued interest in your account?

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Accrued percentage
1 MORE THAN RUB 150,000	6,947	57.1	57.1	57.1
2 EXACTLY RUB 150,000	3,015	24.8	24.8	81.9
3 LESS THAN RUB 150,000	548	4.5	4.5	86.4
Valid 99,999,997 DIFFICULT TO ANSWER	1,647	13.5	13.5	99.9
99,999,999 NO ANSWER	11	0.1	0.1	100.0
Total	12,168	100.0	100.0	

Question T26, with 21 votes, came in fifth. (pe_t11).

T26. Suppose you saw the same television set on sale in two stores. Its original price in each of the stores was RUB 10,000.

One store offers a discount of RUB 1,500 off the original price, while the other store offers 10% off. Which is the better deal – the discount of RUB 1,500 or of 10%?

[INTERVIEWER! GIVE RESPONDENT CARD B_46]

- DISCOUNT OF RUB 1,500..... 1
- DISCOUNT OF 10% 2
- DIFFICULT TO ANSWER..... 3

pe_t11 Suppose you saw a television set of the same model in two stores.

Its original price in each of the stores was RUB 10,000. One store offers a discount of RUB 1,500, while the other offers 10%. Which is the better deal?

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Accrued percentage
1 DISCOUNT OF RUB 1,500	9,932	81.6	81.6	81.6
2 DISCOUNT OF 10 %	817	6.7	6.7	88.3
Valid 99,999,997 DIFFICULT TO ANSWER	1,400	11.5	11.5	99.8
99,999,999 NO ANSWER	19	0.2	0.2	100.0
Total	12,168	100.0	100.0	

The second group of questions included those with unfamiliar terms. The respondents often found several of these questions more difficult to answer than those of the first group. However, acknowledging this was more

acceptable to them than admitting an inability to solve the problem.

The most difficult question in this group was T5. (t18). The interviewers noted difficulty in 63 cases.

T5. Please tell me what you think the term ‘key rate’ means. Select one answer.

[INTERVIEWER! GIVE RESPONDENT CARD B_56]

- CENTRAL BANK INTEREST RATE* 1
- INTERBANK INTEREST RATE* 2
- BANKS’ INTEREST RATE ON CONSUMER LOANS*..... 3
- INTEREST RATE ON HOUSEHOLD DEPOSITS*..... 4
- DIFFICULT TO ANSWER*..... 7
- REFUSAL*..... 8

pe_t18 What do you think the term ‘key rate’ means?

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Accrued percentage
Valid				
1 CENTRAL BANK INTEREST RATE	7,853	64.5	64.5	64.5
2 INTERBANK INTEREST RATE	373	3.1	3.1	67.6
3 BANKS’ INTEREST RATE ON CONSUMER LOANS	617	5.1	5.1	72.7
4 INTEREST RATE ON HOUSEHOLD DEPOSITS	359	3.0	3.0	75.6
99,999,997 DIFFICULT TO ANSWER	2,906	23.9	23.9	99.5
99,999,998 REFUSED TO ANSWER	51	0.4	0.4	99.9
999,99,999 NO ANSWER	9	0.1	0.1	100.0
Total	12,168	100.0	100.0	

Although almost three thousand people found it difficult to answer – almost a quarter of those polled – this is slightly less than the total number of those finding it difficult to answer the two most difficult questions of the first group.

The interviewers found Question P8.1 (pe_p12_1) to be the second most difficult in this group:

P8.1. Do you have personal accounts on electronic payment systems such as YooMoney, PayPal, Kiwi, WebMoney, or the like?

- Yes 1
- No 2 ⇒ [GO TO P9.1. PAGE 44]
- DOES NOT KNOW WHAT IT IS* 6 ⇒ [GO TO P9.1. PAGE 44]
- DIFFICULT TO ANSWER*..... 7 ⇒ [GO TO P9.1. PAGE 44]
- REFUSAL*..... 8 ⇒ [GO TO P9.1. PAGE 44]

pe_p12_1 Do you have personal accounts on electronic payment systems such as YooMoney, PayPal, Kiwi, WebMoney, or the like?

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Accrued percentage
1 Yes	192	1.6	1.6	1.6
2 No	8,816	72.5	72.5	74.0
99,999,996 DOES NOT KNOW WHAT IT IS	3,132	25.7	25.7	99.8
Valid 99,999,997 DIFFICULT TO ANSWER	6	0.0	0.0	99.8
99,999,998 REFUSED TO ANSWER	8	0.1	0.1	99.9
99,999,999 NO ANSWER	14	0.1	0.1	100.0
Total	12,168	100.0	100.0	

Although very few found it difficult to answer, almost 26% of respondents did not know what the question was about.

Question P2.1 was also found difficult by interviewers. The number of people who did not know the subject matter was even more than in the case of the previous question – more than one third of those surveyed.

P2.1. Do you personally own shares in unit investment funds?

- Yes 1
- No 2 ⇒ [GO TO P2.7. PAGE 24]
- DOES NOT KNOW WHAT IT IS* 6 ⇒ [GO TO P3.1. PAGE 25]
- DIFFICULT TO ANSWER*..... 7 ⇒ [GO TO P3.1. PAGE 25]
- REFUSAL*..... 8 ⇒ [GO TO P3.1. PAGE 25]

pe_p2_1 Do you personally own shares in unit investment funds?

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Accrued percentage
1 Yes	36	0.3	0.3	0.3
2 No	7,768	63.8	63.8	64.1
99,999,996 DOES NOT KNOW WHAT IT IS	4,343	35.7	35.7	99.8
Valid 99,999,997 DIFFICULT TO ANSWER	7	0.1	0.1	99.9
99,999,998 REFUSED TO ANSWER	9	0.1	0.1	100.0
99,999,999 NO ANSWER	5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Total	12,168	100.0	100.0	

The third group is composed of questions about bank deposits. The most difficult questions were T2. (pe_t2_1) and T3. (pe_t3).

T2. Which of the items listed do you think are covered by the state deposit insurance system?

[INTERVIEWER! PASS CARD B_38 AND MARK ALL OF RESPONDENT’S ANSWERS]

- ALL TYPES OF HOUSEHOLD DEPOSITS WITH FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (BANKS, INSURANCE COMPANIES, INVESTMENT FUNDS, ETC.)* 1
- INVESTMENTS IN SHARES OF RUSSIAN COMPANIES*..... 2
- INVESTMENTS IN UNIT INVESTMENTS FUNDS* 3

<i>BANK DEPOSITS</i>	4
<i>EQUITY INVESTMENTS IN REAL ESTATE</i>	5
<i>NONE OF THE ABOVE</i>	6
<i>DIFFICULT TO ANSWER</i>	7
<i>REFUSAL</i>	8

Pe_t2_1 Which of the following is insured by the state deposit insurance system? HOUSEHOLD DEPOSITS IN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS OF ALL TYPES (BANKS, INSURANCE COMPANIES, INVESTMENT FUNDS, ETC.)

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Accrued percentage
	1 HOUSEHOLD DEPOSITS IN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS OF ALL TYPES	2,541	20.9	50.0	50.0
Valid	99,999,997 DIFFICULT TO ANSWER	2,465	20.3	48.5	98.5
	99,999,998 REFUSED TO ANSWER	66	0.5	1.3	99.8
	99,999,999 NO ANSWER	9	0.1	0.2	100.0
	Total	5,081	41.8	100.0	
Skipped	Systemically skipped	7,087	58.2		
Total		12,168	100.0		

T3. What is the maximum fully insured deposit amount in a Russian bank?

CORRECT ANSWER (1 MILLION 400 THOUSAND RUBLES) 1

WRONG ANSWER..... 2

DIFFICULT TO ANSWER..... 7

REFUSAL 8

Pe_t3 What is the maximum deposit amount in a Russian bank that is fully insured by the state?

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Accrued percentage
	1 CORRECT ANSWER (1 MILLION 400 THOUSAND RUBLES)	5,315	43.7	43.7	43.7
Valid	2 WRONG ANSWER	3,400	27.9	27.9	71.6
	99,999,997 DIFFICULT TO ANSWER	3,360	27.6	27.6	99.2
	99,999,998 REFUSED TO ANSWER	60	0.5	0.5	99.7
	99,999,999 NO ANSWER	33	0.3	0.3	100.0
Total		12,168	100.0	100.0	

Pe_t20 Do you think that, compared to two years ago, loan rates have become lower, remained unchanged, or become higher?

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Accrued percentage
Valid	1 DECREASED	309	2.5	19.6	19.6
	2 NO CHANGE	160	1.3	10.1	29.7
	3 INCREASED	1,077	8.9	68.3	98.0
	99,999,997 DIFFICULT TO ANSWER	27	0.2	1.7	99.7
	99,999,999 NO ANSWER	5	0.0	0.3	100.0
	Total	1,578	13.0	100.0	
Skipped	Systemically passed	10,590	87.0		
Total		12,168	100.0		

The fourth group includes questions about respondents' attitudes and behaviour in the financial sphere.

The most difficult question of this group was T4. (pe_t4):

T4. Select the statement that you think is correct.

How are risks and returns associated when investing in bank accounts, stocks, bonds, etc.?

INTERVIEWER! GIVE RESPONDENT CARD B_33]

THE LOWER THE RISK, THE HIGHER THE RETURN 1

THE HIGHER THE RISK, THE HIGHER THE RETURN 2

RISK AND RETURN ARE NOT CORRELATED 3

DIFFICULT TO ANSWER..... 7

14. Analysis of questionnaires in terms of quality of completion

There were 6,081 household questionnaires received. Question D9 proved the most difficult, having been skipped in 47.8% of answers. This is probably due to its incorrect (unusual for interviewers) placement. It would probably have been better placed in the Income section.

Question O22 also caused a certain amount of misunderstanding. The question is about the interest rate at which respondents would be ready to put money in a savings account or deposit and thus postpone a large planned purchase. It was difficult to answer for 37.2% of respondents, with rates of 50%, 70%, 100%, and even 250% mentioned.

There was also a problem with the differently coded monetary ranges in the different waves. Card C_2 changed in 2020. In the first three waves, position 22 was the last of those in rubles and all positions starting from 23 were in dollars. In the fourth wave, another position was added to the rubles. In the fifth wave, the number of positions in all money cards in the Household Questionnaire was increased. There were no problems handling the files of the different waves. When the common base was being created, it turned out that position 23 in one case could mean

‘RUB 220,000 or more’, while in the other it could mean ‘up to \$60’. It was therefore decided to supplement the names of the variables where the answer encodings changed: *_d* (for Wave D questions) and *_e* (for Wave E questions). For example, there are three versions of variable o20n: a simple o20n, o20n_d, and o20n_e.

Individual questionnaires

Out of 12,168 individual questionnaires, 12,129 (99.7% of all those received in the course of the survey) were completed in line with their technical requirements. There were only two mostly blank questionnaires. There were 37 questionnaires which skipped at least one section.

In one questionnaire, all the questions on pages 17–80 (from page 17 to the end of the questionnaire) were skipped.

In another, the questions on pages 18–77 were skipped.

In six questionnaires, the interviewer did not ask the questions from pages 5–21; in 15 questionnaires, the questions from pages 10–21 were skipped; in one questionnaire, the questions from pages 11–21 were skipped; in two, pages 12–21 were skipped; in one, pages 17–21 were skipped; and in another one, page 17 was skipped. That is, the questions most affected in the 26 questionnaires were: pages 5–8

‘Primary Occupation’, pages 9–11 ‘Questions Only for Individual Entrepreneurs’, pages 12–15 ‘Questions Only for Non-Workers’, and pages 15–21 ‘Questions for Non-Workers of Working Age’. In one of the above questionnaires, the questions on pages 30–41 of the ‘Accounts and Deposits’ section were not asked. The same section was skipped in whole or in part in five other questionnaires, one of which also missed the ‘Metal Bank Accounts’ section on page 42. In one questionnaire, the ‘Financial Literacy’ questions on pages 70–73 were not asked. The data file shows ‘99999999’ – ‘NO ANSWER’ in the fields of skipped questions.

Clarity of questionnaires for respondents and recommendations for improvement

Despite the training and the available instructions, a number of questions arose among the interviewers in the course of the field work. They are presented below, alongside the answers to them.

Household Questionnaire,

Question 1

Page 8, Question A12.

QUESTIONS FOR THOSE WHO BOUGHT OR BUILT A HOME AFTER 1998

A12. [INTERVIEWER! GO BACK TO QUESTION A7. P.7: SEE THE RESPONDENT’S ANSWER AND MAKE THE APPROPRIATE MARK BELOW:

HOME PURCHASED OR BUILT IN 1998 OR LATER..I

It is not clear from the instructions how those who privatised, inherited, or received a home as a gift should proceed. There is no previous mention of a transition for them.

Response: Please note the interviewer instructions on page 19:

‘Those who privatised a home inherited or received one as a gift go to **Question A36. on page 12.**’

In the future, the instructions should probably be included in the questionnaire: [SEE QUESTION A8. IF A HOME WAS NOT PURCHASED/PRIVATISED, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION A 36. ON P. 1]

Question 2

In Question H2., is answer option 96 (‘there is no such income’) necessary, such as if there are pensioners in the family?

H2. Now let us discuss your household income.

How much money after tax and other deductions do all members of your household receive each month from principal and additional places of work?

[INTERVIEWER! IF A RESPONDENT STRUGGLES OR REFUSES TO RESPOND, PLEASE SHOW THEM CARD C_2 AND ASK THEM TO GIVE YOU A ROUGH ESTIMATE OF THE AMOUNT]

_____ RUB	OR	_ _ NUMBER FROM THE CARD
-----------	----	---------------------------

DIFFICULT TO ANSWER.....997

REFUSAL998

Response: In this case, the field mark ‘no such income’ is sufficient.

Individual questionnaire

The interviewers had no issues with the individual questionnaire. However, there were issues when questionnaire data were input and cleansed.

Input and cleansing issues

1. In 2022, Question P1.1. on page 21 did not include shares in the company that employs the respondent.

Question of the 2020 questionnaire:

P1.1. Now let us discuss various financial services. Do you personally own shares?

Question of the 2022 questionnaire:

P1.1. Now let us discuss your financial assets.

Do you personally own shares of companies? Do not include the shares of companies at which you work.

- Yes 1
- No 2 ⇒ [GO TO P1.6. PAGE 22]
- DOES NOT KNOW WHAT IT IS 6 ⇒ [GO TO P1.7. PAGE 22]
- DIFFICULT TO ANSWER..... 7 ⇒ [GO TO P1.7. PAGE 22]
- REFUSAL..... 8 ⇒ [GO TO P1.7. PAGE 22]

Question P1.2. remained the same as in 2020:

P1.2. How did you purchase these shares?

[INTERVIEWER! PASS RESPONDENT CARD B_19 AND MARK ALL ANSWERS]

- BOUGHT THROUGH A SPECIALIST COMPANY..... 01
- BOUGHT DIRECTLY FROM OWNER 02
- BOUGHT FROM ANOTHER PERSON OR ENTITY 03
- RECEIVED IN VOUCHER PRIVATISATION 04
- RECEIVED AS EMPLOYEE OF COMPANY WHEN IT WAS PRIVATISED – WITHOUT VOUCHER..... 05**
- RECEIVED FROM EMPLOYER AS SALARY OR BONUS..... 06**
- INHERITED 07
- RECEIVED AS GIFT 08
- OTHER (SPECIFY) **[INTERVIEWER! WRITE:]** 09
-
- DIFFICULT TO ANSWER 97
- REFUSAL..... 98

There are 24 responses in the file indicating that shares were received while the respondent acted ‘as an employee of the company being privatised, and without a voucher’ (22) and ‘from employer as a salary or bonus’ (2). It is unknown how many others included shares in their companies, since they could have bought them themselves or received them as gifts (as employees).

Pep1_2a_5 How did you purchase these shares? RECEIVED AS EMPLOYEE OF COMPANY WHEN IT WAS PRIVATISED – WITHOUT VOUCHER

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Accrued percentage
Valid	5 RECEIVED AS EMPLOYEE OF COMPANY WHEN IT WAS PRIVATISED - WITHOUT A VOUCHER	22	0.2	100.0	100.0
Skipped	Systemically passed	12,146	99.8		
Total		12,168	100.0		

Pep1_2a_6 How did you purchase these shares? RECEIVED FROM EMPLOYER AS SALARY OR BONUS

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Accrued Percentage
Valid	6 RECEIVED FROM EMPLOYER AS SALARY OR BONUS	2	0.0	100.0	100.0
Skipped	Systemically passed	12,166	100.0		
Total		12,168	100.0		

In the future, Question P1.1. should be restored to the 2020 wording; alternatively, Question P1.2. should be corrected, for example, by removing answer options 5 and 6.

2. In Question P1.3 on p. 22, judging by the frequency table, respondents own shares in between one and fifty companies.

P1.3. How many companies do you have shares in?

_____ COMPANIES

DIFFICULT TO ANSWER.....97

REFUSAL.....98

Pe_p1_3a How many companies do you have shares in?

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Accrued percentage
Valid	1	75	0.6	51.0
	2	13	0.1	8.8
	3	9	0.1	6.1
	4	4	0.0	2.7
	5	11	0.1	7.5
	6	3	0.0	2.0
	7	3	0.0	2.0
	8	3	0.0	2.0
	9	1	0.0	0.7
	10	4	0.0	2.7
	from 11 to 50	15	0.0	10.4
	9999997 DIFFICULT TO ANSWER	5	0.0	3.4
	9999998 REFUSED TO ANSWER	1	0.0	0.7
	Total	147	1.2	100.0
Skipped	Systemically passed	12,021	98.8	
Total		12,168	100.0	

The data cleansing operators were confused by answers of 10–50 where the question was about the number of companies, but the result seemed to be about the number of shares. They were unable to fix the problem.

They calculated the number of companies whose shares respondents said they had, broken down by the way they were acquired.

Almost all major purchases were made through specialist companies. Only one person bought shares in 50 businesses from an individual, while another bought shares in 15 directly from the owners. That is theoretically possible. It is strange, however, that one person received shares in 10 businesses as an employee of a company being privatised, and without vouchers. In this latter case, it seems that the operators were right: the answer was really about the number of shares.

Therefore, another question may be included in the next wave:

P1.3a. How many shares in various companies do you have?

_____ *SHARES*

DIFFICULT TO ANSWER.....97

REFUSAL.....98

- In Question P6.14. on page 34, the data cleansing operators thought that many respondents were referring to their annual spending, rather than their monthly spending, probably being misguided by

the wording ‘(In the last 12 months) how much on average per month...’. People may understand that to mean ‘over the past 12 months’.

P6.14. (In the last 12 months) how much did you personally spend per month on average via (this card/all cards linked to this account)?
Please specify the amount in rubles.

Maybe the question should be slightly reworded by changing the word order:

P6.14. In the last 12 months, what was your average monthly spending on (this card/all cards opened for this account)?
Please specify the amount in rubles.

4. Section 8. ‘Accounts on electronic payment systems’, pages 42–44.

P8.1. Do you have personal accounts on electronic payment systems such as YooMoney, PayPal, Kiwi, WebMoney, or the like?

In the course of data cleansing, about 10 cases were found in which people were confused and included MIR (it is also a payment system, after all) and several brokerage sites that were irrelevant. In the future, perhaps ‘the like‘ should be specified?

5. ‘Consumer Loans section’, pages 60–63. Loans to buy property, vehicles, etc. were not meant to be included here. However, the data cleansing operators found that respondents nevertheless thought that such loans belonged here. Loans to buy vehicles which were also included in the ‘Vehicles‘ section were removed. Other loans to buy vehicles remained.

6. The cleansing operators reported difficulties in handling Question E12 on page 67 of the ‘Vehicles‘ section.

E12. Whom was this loan issued to?

[INTERVIEWER! RECORD NUMBER FROM CARD D/X]

HOUSEHOLD MEMBER NO

NOT FOR HOUSEHOLD MEMBER..... 96

DIFFICULT TO ANSWER..... 97

REFUSAL..... 98

The loan may have been issued to a person who is no longer a member of the household. The operators did not correct for this. A person who is no longer a household member but is still included in the card is left as is in the questionnaire (i.e., the number of a real person).

7. Question C3.4, page 60,

C3.4. What is the loan rate? If there are several outstanding loans, specify the minimum rate.

_____	<i>PERCENT</i>
<i>DIFFICULT TO ANSWER</i>	997
<i>REFUSAL</i>	998

The interest on loans from pawnshops or microfinance companies ranged between 1 and 720. Interest on these loans is calculated as per diem interest, but (as is clear from web advertisements) monthly and annual rates are also sometimes shown. It is therefore difficult to see exactly what respondents meant, and it is difficult to make corrections. It might be a safe assumption that 1–2% is per diem, 30–60% looks like per month, and *more than 100%* is most likely per year.

It may make sense to complement this question with another one about loan maturity.

Conclusions. Prospects for follow-up surveys on this sample

Overall, it does seem feasible to conduct follow-up surveys on this sample. The respondents provided almost two thousand contact phone numbers and email addresses, along with almost five thousand names of people to be contacted if the family interviewed intends to move. The interviewers also documented the respondents' comments: 'Do come again', 'Come to us again', and 'This was interesting'.