

行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫 期中進度報告

「全球民主動態調查」計畫--「亞洲民主動態調查」：民主、治理與發展計畫(2/3) 期中進度報告(精簡版)

計畫類別：整合型
計畫編號：NSC 95-2420-H-002-003-
執行期間：95年04月01日至96年03月31日
執行單位：國立臺灣大學政治學系暨研究所

計畫主持人：朱雲漢
共同主持人：胡佛、張佑宗、胡克威、黃旻華、洪永泰
徐火炎、傅仰止、石之瑜

報告附件：國際合作計畫研究心得報告

處理方式：本計畫可公開查詢

中華民國 96年02月15日

目 錄

一、計畫緣起	2
二、計畫中文摘要	3
三、計畫英文摘要	5
四、本年度研究成果	7
(一) 台灣調查計畫資料檢誤與初步分析完成.....	7
(二) 菲律賓調查計畫.....	7
(三) 泰國調查計畫.....	8
(四) 蒙古調查計畫.....	8
五、「亞洲民主動態調查計畫」年度工作記事.....	9
附錄一 台灣調查執行報告.....	18
附錄二 菲律賓調查執行報告.....	36
附錄三 泰國調查執行報告.....	49
附錄四 蒙古調查執行報告.....	61
附錄五 印尼調查執行報告.....	70
附錄六 新加坡調查執行報告.....	96

一、計畫緣起

「亞洲民主動態調查」(Asian Barometer Survey)之前身為「東亞民主動態調查」(East Asia Barometer Survey)。「東亞民主動態調查」源自教育部大學追求卓越計畫「東亞民主化與價值變遷比較研究」，該計畫匯聚了來自亞洲與歐美地區三十多位資深學者，於2000年正式啟動。「東亞民主動態調查」的第一波比較調查研究涵蓋的範圍包括日本、韓國、台灣、蒙古、中國大陸、香港、菲律賓、與泰國。「東亞民主動態調查」於2003年12月與「南亞民主現況調查」整合為「亞洲民主動態調查」，以「民主、治理與發展」作為這個跨國合作研究團隊的核心議題。目前來自印尼、越南、高棉、新加坡等研究團隊將參與下一波的調查計畫。加上南亞團隊所結合的印度、巴基斯坦、孟加拉、斯里蘭卡與尼泊爾五國隊伍，下一波「亞洲民主動態調查」將至少涵蓋十七個亞洲國家（與地區），包括了本地區所有重要的新興民主國家與轉型社會；不但容納了全球百分之四十八的人口，也同時跨越：儒家文化、基督教、回教、印度教以及佛教文明等五大文化體系。

「東亞民主動態調查」與「拉丁美洲民主動態調查」、「非洲民主動態調查」、以及「新歐洲民主動態調查」等四個區域大型調查計畫，在2001年7月於維也納共同成立「全球民主動態調查」(Global Barometer Surveys)，成為一個涵蓋六十多個新興民主國家與轉型社會的全球性民主化研究策略聯盟。亞洲民主動態調查將在此全球合作架構下，推動與其他三個區域計畫間的資料交換、跨區域比較分析，以及協調未來的全球同步調查。

二、計畫中文摘要

「亞洲民主動態調查」(Asian Barometer Survey)將發展成為一個以「民主、治理、與發展」為研究主軸的區域性國際學術合作組織。擴大後的「亞洲民主動態調查」涵蓋十七個以上的亞洲國家(與地區)，包括了本地區所有重要的新興民主國家與轉型社會。

其主要的研究任務有四：

- (一) 定期在亞洲各國針對公民的對於民主、治理與發展的評估與態度，進行同步的社會調查研究，並定期發表研究報告與舉辦國際學術活動；
- (二) 為亞洲開發中國家培養社會調查研究、民主化研究以及相關領域人才，並逐漸凝聚亞洲地區的民主研究學術社群；
- (三) 建立亞洲民主動態調查數位資料庫供學術界、政府機關、國際組織、民主支援機構、市民社會團體、新聞媒體等各界使用，全面發揮知識推廣功能；
- (四) 協同「全球民主動態調查」計畫，收集與建構全球範圍的民主發展與治理品質指標，並定期與「國際民主與選舉支援機構」以及「聯合國開發總署」等政府間國際組織合作發表權威性的調查研究報告。

本計畫對亞洲的民主轉型、鞏固與運作的經驗進行系統性研究，對比較政治理論的四個典範：「現代化/後現代化理論」、「新制度論」、「政治文化理論」，以及「理性選擇理論」均深具挑戰性。亞洲的民主經驗可對上述研究典範提供重要的理論檢證機會，也提供了亞洲學者與歐美學者在理論對話上的重要契機。本計畫將從亞洲民主化的特殊經驗出發，以及從全球民主化研究的理論視野出發，來探索民主發展、治理品質與發展三者個關係。尤其側重在快速經社變遷下傳統亞洲價值(Asian values)對於民主轉型與鞏固的作用，威權體制的歷史經驗以及亞洲特殊之社會資本結構對於民主治理品質的影響。

向國科會提出的三年計畫由一個主計畫、三個子計畫所組成。三個子計畫分別

為「台灣地區調查計畫」、「大陸地區調查計畫」以及「研究方法與資料庫計畫」。主計畫將承擔起「亞洲民主動態調查」計畫營運總部之功能，負責領導與協調十七個亞洲地區研究團隊，以及協同拉美、非洲、新歐洲三個區域計畫在「全球民主動態調查」架構下的研究合作。「研究方法與資料庫計畫」子計畫負責跨國調查計畫研究程序與品質的總控管，以及數位資料庫暨計畫網站的建構與維持，並為部分研究條件較弱的國家提供技術支援。

本計畫目前已經發表十九篇論文刊登於重要國際學術期刊，三十三篇專題研究報告。應邀於國際組織與國際學術會議發表專題報告或發表論文二十四次，自行舉辦大型國際學術會議三次，共發表會議論文四十二篇，目前正集中力量推動三本系列專書的集體寫作計畫，並與牛津大學出版社接洽出版事宜。過去六年多此一計畫受到各國相關研究機構的高度重視，計劃共同總主持人曾受邀前往世界銀行、歐盟總部、美國國際開發總署、美國國務院、瑞典發展援助總署、國際民主與選舉支援機構、東京大學、牛津大學、哈佛大學、史坦福大學、密西根州立大學、奧地利「高等研究院」(IAS)、瑞典 Uppsala 大學、德國 Mannheim 大學、國立新加坡大學等機構發表專題報告。同時，東亞計畫的各國參與學者，多次於美國政治學會年會、國際政治學會年會，以及亞洲學會年會合組專題討論會，聯合發表研究成果，且在 2003 年時成為「民主研究機構網路」(Network of Democracy Research Institutes, NDRI) 此全球性學術組織的正式會員，並由聯合國教科文組織「社會科學國際理事會」(International Social Science Council, UNESCO) 評定為全球重要大型調查資料計畫之一。

關鍵詞：亞洲民主動態調查、民主、治理、發展、全球民主動態調查。

三、計畫英文摘要

The Asian Barometer Survey (ABS) grows out of the Comparative Survey of Democratization and Value Changes in East Asia Project (also known as East Asia Barometer), which was launched in mid-2000 and funded by the MOE-NSC Program for Promoting Academic Excellence of University. The East Asia Barometer (EABS) is currently headquartered at NTU and under the co-directorship of Profs. Fu Hu and Yun-han Chu. In organizing its first-wave survey (2001-2003), EABS brought together eight country teams and more than thirty leading scholars from across the region and the United States. Since its founding, the EABS Project has been increasingly recognized as the region's first systematic and most careful comparative survey of attitudes and orientations toward political regime, democracy, governance, and economic reform.

In addition, in July 2001, the EABS joined with three partner projects -- New Europe Barometer, Latinobarometro and Afrobarometer - in a path-breathing effort to launch Global Barometer Surveys (GBS), a global consortium of comparative survey across emerging democracies and transitional societies.

The EABS is now becoming a true pan-Asia survey research initiative. New collaborative teams from Indonesia, Singapore, Cambodia and Vietnam are joining the EABS as the project enters its second phase (2004-2008). Also, the Survey of the State of Democracy in South Asia, under the leadership of Yogendra Yadav of the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (in New Delhi) is collaborating with the EABS for the creation of a more inclusive regional survey network under the new identity of Asian Barometer Survey.

The recent enlargement will enable the ABS to examine more comprehensively how variation in the trajectory of regime transition, macro-level properties of political systems, and the lingering influence of traditional culture mediates the impact of modernization and globalization on value change, influence the acquisition of democratic value-orientations and democratic legitimacy, and otherwise shape the ways citizens evaluate their political system and process. In particular, the project can investigate the extent to which traditional values inherited by Asian societies constrain and/or facilitate the acquisition of democratic values and shape the patterns of civic attitudes across the five major civilizations of the world - the Christian, the Muslim, the Confucian, the Buddhist and the Hindu, an ambitious intellectual exercise that has never been done before anywhere.

The Main Project being submitted to the NSC will carry out the following major research activities: developing a revised common research framework; designing a newer version of the

core questionnaire; formulating standardized measurement instruments, coding schemes and research methodologies for the second-wave survey; coordinating the pre-testing and main survey schedule; enforcing the data-archiving and data-sharing rules; and organizing the data-analyzing activities and collective publication projects. The Main Project will coordinate all these collaborative research activities through organizing project workshops and mutual site visits, in addition to managing a constant flow of Internet communication. The main project will have three sub-projects under its direct supervision: the Asian Barometer Survey in Taiwan, the Asian Barometer Survey in Mainland China, and the Survey Methodology and Data Base Sub-Projects.

After this enlargement, the ABS will also become the most significant link in the global network as it will cover more than 48% of the world population. Also, during its next-round regional survey (2005-2006), the ABS will coordinate its research agenda, survey instruments and fieldwork schedule with the three partner regional barometers under the auspices of GBS. It will retain some of its distinctive survey instruments addressing the region's own research agenda; at the same time, it will perform its role as the region's partner project of the GBS in the creation of an unprecedented global database for citizen's views and attitudes toward democracy, governance and development.

Keywords: Asian Barometer Survey, East Asia Barometer, political regime, democracy, governance, economic reform.

四、本年度研究成果

(一) 台灣調查計畫資料檢誤與初步分析完成

台灣地區調查計畫為「亞洲民主動態調查計畫」的分項子計畫，負責台灣地區的調查研究，嘗試就台灣地區的發展狀況，透過實證分析資料回答上述的核心研究議題。台灣地區調查計畫由 2005 年 4 月 1 日至 2006 年 3 月 31 日執行完成。為使台灣地區調查計畫順利進行，並減少調查上的誤差與困難，故進行「前測訪問」與「正式訪問」之兩階段調查。透過前測訪問的實地調查，可預視正式訪問時可能有的困難，檢討問卷設計與修正問卷題目，將中文問卷定稿，並透過前測訪問培養專業及有經驗之督導人員，以利正式訪問之調查協助。前測訪問與正式訪問之內容分述如下。

1. 前測訪問調查

前測訪問調查之執行時間為 2005 年 7 月 20 日至 8 月 31 日，面訪時間為 2005 年 8 月 9 日至 8 月 16 日。總樣本數共計 486 份，成功樣本為 148 份，失敗樣本為 338 份，成功率為 30.45%。

2. 正式訪問調查

訪問調查之執行時間為 2005 年 9 月 1 日至 2006 年 7 月 31 日，面訪時間為 2006 年 1 月 14 日至 3 月 31 日。訪訓分為兩場次(台大、成大)，時間為 2006 年 1 月 14 日與 15 日。此次調查抽出 134 個村里，總樣本數為 4476 份，預計成功樣本為 1492 份，預計成功率為三成。

3. 問卷資料檢誤與初步統計分析

問卷資料檢誤工作完成時間為 2006 年 4 月 25 到 2006 年 7 月 30 日，台灣調查執行報告請見附錄一。

(二) 菲律賓調查計畫

菲律賓調查計畫執行時間為 2005 年 10 月 1 日至 2006 年 2 月 28 日，訪問執行時間為 2005 年 11 月 25 日至 2005 年 12 月 5 日，成功份數共計 1200 份，問卷資料

檢誤工作完成時間為 2006 年 6 月 15 到 2006 年 8 月 10 日。菲律賓地區調查執行報告請見附錄二。

(三) 泰國調查計畫

泰國調查計畫執行時間為 2006 年 4 月 10 日至 2006 年 8 月 31 日，訪問執行時間為 2006 年 4 月 15 日至 2006 年 5 月 10 日，成功份數共計 1546 份，問卷資料檢誤工作完成時間為 2006 年 8 月 15 到 2006 年 10 月 30 日。泰國調查執行報告請見附錄三。

(四) 蒙古調查計畫

蒙古調查計畫執行時間為 2006 年 4 月 18 日至 2006 年 8 月 31 日，訪問執行時間為 2006 年 5 月 1 日至 2006 年 5 月 31 日，成功份數共計 1210 份，問卷資料檢誤工作完成時間為 2006 年 7 月 15 到 2006 年 9 月 10 日。蒙古調查執行報告請見附錄四。

五、「亞洲民主動態調查計畫」年度工作記事

「亞洲民主動態調查計畫」			
日期	事項	內容	備註
3/2/05	計畫內部會議	(1)參與者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授與計畫助理。 (2)擬議計畫本年度工作事項與未來方向。 (3)討論大陸地區調查之抽樣事宜。	
3/3/05	「亞洲民主動態調查網站」籌畫會議	「亞洲民主動態調查網站」之網頁設計與網站架設討論。	
3/8/05	大陸地區調查計畫抽樣討論會議	「大陸地區調查計畫」抽樣設計與抽樣架構之討論。	
3/9/05～ 3/16/05	大陸地區調查計畫— 抽樣設計規劃	大陸地區調查計畫之抽樣設計與抽樣執行細節討論。	
4/1/05	聘僱計畫專任與兼任助理	(1) 國科會計畫：2 專任與 2 兼任人員。 (2) 中研院政治所年度計畫：5 兼任人員。	
4/18/05	國內工作會議— 台灣地區調查計畫小組開會	(1)初步規劃台灣地區調查事宜。 (2)研擬規劃第一次規劃會議注意事項。	
4/29/05～ 5/1/05	第一次規劃會議(4/29-5/1)	(1)此次會議為期 3 天，於台大立德尊賢會館。 (2)國內外計畫主持人與各國學者等共計 19 人參與。 (3)會中籌備「亞洲民主動態調查」之跨國調查計畫研擬。 (4)會中檢討先前 2001 年「東亞民主化與價值變遷：比較調查研究」之共同問卷，並草擬本次調查之英文共同問卷。 (5)整合跨國調查內部之執行細節，與討論抽樣方法。	
5/12/05	亞洲民主動態調查網站架構與網頁初步完成	網址： http://www.asianbarometer.org/	

日期	事項	內容	備註
5/19/05	討論與修訂英文共同問卷(I)	(1) 國內計畫主持人針對規劃會議後，擬定的英文共同問卷進行討論與修正。 (2) 參與者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授、胡克威教授、徐火炎教授、傅仰止教授、黃旻華教授。	
5/25/05	討論與修訂英文共同問卷(II)	(1) 國內計畫主持人針對規劃會議後，擬定的英文共同問卷進行討論與修正。 (2) 與會者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授、胡克威教授、徐火炎教授、傅仰止教授、黃旻華教授。	
6/3/05	討論與修訂英文共同問卷(III)	(1) 國內計畫主持人針對規劃會議後，擬定的英文共同問卷進行討論與修正。 (2) 與會者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授、徐火炎教授、傅仰止教授、黃旻華教授。	
6/6/05	台灣地區調查計畫— 修訂中文問卷初稿會議(I)	(1) 國內計畫主持人針對規劃會議後，擬定的英文共同問卷進行討論與修正。 (2) 參照英文共同問卷，研擬台灣地區調查計畫之中文問卷初稿。 (3) 與會者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授、徐火炎教授、胡克威教授、傅仰止教授、黃旻華教授。	
6/15/05	台灣地區調查計畫— 修訂中文問卷初稿會議(II)	(1) 參照英文共同問卷，研擬台灣地區調查計畫之中文問卷初稿。 (2) 與會者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授、徐火炎教授、胡克威教授、傅仰止教授、黃旻華教授。	
6/16/05~ 6/24/05	大陸地區調查計畫— 第一階段「縣區」抽樣完成	(1) 抽樣設計為四階段 PPS (Probability Proportional to Size) 抽樣。 (2) 將大陸地區分成東部、中部與西部地方，共抽出三套樣本。 (3) 東部地方共 700 個縣區，抽出 46 個中選縣區。中部地方共 1024 個縣區，抽出 52 個中選縣區。西部地方共 893 個縣區，抽出 32 個中選縣區。	

日期	事項	內容	備註
6/29/05	台灣地區調查計畫— 修訂中文問卷初稿會議(III)	(1)參照英文共同問卷，研擬台灣地區調查計畫之中文問卷初稿。 (2)與會者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授、徐火炎教授、胡克威教授、傅仰止教授、黃旻華教授。	
7/7/05～ 7/9/05	第二次規劃會議之會前籌備會議	國外計畫共同主持人 Don Shin 學者來台，討論英文共同問卷與協助參與定稿會議之籌備事項。	
7/12/05～ 7/24/05	大陸地區調查計畫—籌備工作。	(1)計畫主持人朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授與黃旻華教授，赴大陸籌備相關大陸地區調查事宜。 (2)討論大陸地區抽樣方法。 (3)調查訪問執行商議。 (4)協助督導、訪員培訓等相關事宜。	
7/18/05～ 7/29/05	大陸地區調查計畫— 第二階段「鄉鎮街道」抽樣完成	東部、中部與西部地方等 120 個縣區中，每個縣區抽出 2 個鄉鎮街道。	
7/29/05	台灣地區調查計畫— 中文問卷定稿與前測執行籌備工作。	(1)與會者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授、徐火炎教授、胡克威教授、傅仰止教授、黃旻華教授。 (2)修訂中文前測問卷之定稿。 (3)台灣地區前測調查執行之相關事宜討論。	
8/3/05	台灣地區調查計畫— 前測訪問之認知預試訪問執行	(1)與會者：計畫主持人朱雲漢教授、傅仰止教授與張佑宗教授等，與資深督導、3 位受訪者參與。 (2)透過訪問受訪者的過程，以檢討問卷設計及訪問執行。	
8/5/05	大陸地區調查計畫— 第三階段村居委員會抽樣完成 (第一部分)	完成北京市、河北省、山東省、山西省、內蒙古自治區、遼寧省、吉林省、黑龍江省等地區抽樣。	
8/8/05	大陸地區調查計畫— 農村擴大樣本抽樣方法討論	(1)與會者：計畫主持人洪永泰教授、張佑宗老師與助理。 (2)針對大陸地區調查之抽樣設計與抽樣架構進行討論與檢討。	

日期	事項	內容	備註
8/8/05	台灣地區調查計畫— 前測訪問之訪員訓練會議	(1) 與會者：計畫主持人朱雲漢教授、徐火炎教授與張佑宗教授，助理及 19 位訪員，共計 24 位人員參與訪員訓練。 (2) 計畫簡介與問卷內容講解。 (3) 訪問技巧與面訪注意事項解說。	
8/9/05～ 8/16/05	台灣地區調查計畫— 前測問卷訪問階段執行	(1) 為期 10 天，共計 19 位訪員參與。 (2) 於全台灣北、中、南、東地區，共計 28 個村里進行問卷面訪。	
8/14/05～ 8/16/05	大陸地區調查計畫— 第三階段村居委員會抽樣完成 (第二部分)	完成上海市、山東省、安徽省、江蘇省、浙江省、江西省、河南省、湖北省與湖南省等地區抽樣。	
8/17/05～ 8/19/05	台灣地區調查計畫— 前測問卷過回收與過錄(cording) 工作執行	彙整 148 份前測問卷與過錄。	
8/19/05	台灣地區調查計畫— 前測訪問工作檢討會議	(1) 與會者：計畫主持人朱雲漢教授、傅仰止教授、徐火炎教授、張佑宗教授、助理與訪員共計 18 位人員參與。 (2) 執行調查之訪問情形討論。 (3) 問卷設計檢討。	
8/17/05～ 8/22/05	大陸地區調查— 第三階段村居委員會抽樣完成 (第三部分)	完成天津市、廣西省、廣東省、雲南省、福建省、貴州省、四川省、青海省、重慶市陝西省、新疆、寧夏等地區抽樣。	
8/22/05～ 8/24/05	台灣地區調查計畫— 前測訪問問卷輸入(key in)工作 執行	總計 486 個樣本，成功樣本共計 148 份，失敗樣本共計 338 份，成功率 30.45%。	
8/24/05～ 8/26/05	台灣地區調查計畫— 前測訪問調查之結果分析完成	提供台灣地區調查計畫正式訪問之參考依據。	

日期	事項	內容	備註
9/1/05～ 9/3/05	第二次規劃會議之定稿會議	(1) 參與人員 <u>Asian Barometer</u> : Larry Diamond、Yun-han Chu、Andrew Nathan、Doh Shin、Sandeep Shastri、(representative of the South Asian team)、Tse-hsin Chen (assistant) <u>Other barometer surveys</u> : Marta Lagos (Latinobarometro)、Mike Bratton (Afrobarometer)，於美國華盛頓舉行。 (2) 檢視與擬定第一次規劃會議訂定之英文共同問卷，並與其他各國學者商議各國研究調查之執行細節等事項。 (3) 討論各國調查執行細節。	
9/7/05	計畫內部會議	(1) 商擬資料釋出公告 (2) 菲律賓計畫委外招標事宜 (3) Global Website 設置 (4) 共同問卷修正 (5) 與會者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授。	
9/20/05	計畫內部會議	(1) 菲律賓計畫委外招標事宜—議價文件商議、招標方式討論等。 (2) Asian Website 與 Global Website 網站修改與建構討論。 (3) 與會者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授、計畫助理群。	
10/5/05	台灣地區調查計畫— 中文問卷初稿會議	(1) 與會者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授、徐火炎教授、傅仰止教授與王鼎銘教授。 (2) 中文問卷題目討論與修改。	
10/12/05	計畫資料庫會議	(1) 與會者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授與胡克威教授。 (2) 研擬計畫之動態資料庫設置。	
10/18/05	台灣地區調查計畫— 中文問卷初稿會議	(1) 與會者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授、徐火炎教授、胡克威教授、傅仰止教授、王鼎銘教授、黃旻華教授。 (2) 中文問卷題目討論與修改	

日期	事項	內容	備註
10/20/05 ~ 11/10/05	菲律賓地區調查計畫之籌備工作	計畫主持人朱雲漢教授與國外共同主持人(菲律賓地區)Linda Luz Guerrero 討論與擬議。	
11/25/05~ 12/5/05	菲律賓地區調查計畫— 開始執行	預計成功樣本 1200 份。	
11/27/05	台灣地區調查計畫— 第一次督導訓練會議	(1)與會者：朱雲漢老師、張佑宗教授、徐火炎教授、傅仰止教授。 (2)計畫內容簡介、問卷內容解說、調查基本程序與督導工作守則。 (3)培訓 30 名督導參與此次面訪訪問。	
12/12/06	台灣地區調查計畫— 抽樣工作討論	至中研院調研室討論樣本台灣地區樣本設計與抽樣細節。	
12/18/06	台灣地區調查計畫— 第二次督導訓練會議	(1)與會者：朱雲漢老師與張佑宗教授，助理與督導共計 30 人。 (2)培訓 30 名督導參與此次面訪訪問。 (3)檢討問卷問題、內容解說與督導工作守則。 (4)督導區域與工作分配。	
1/5/06	台灣地區調查計畫— 中文問卷定稿會議	(1)與會者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授、徐火炎教授、傅仰止教授、王鼎銘教授、黃旻華教授。 (2)中文問卷題目討論與修改。 (3)中文問卷定稿。 (4)台灣地區面訪調查執行細節討論，與告像行政事項。	
1/7/06~ 1/11/06	泰國地區調查計畫— 執行研擬與籌備	(1)計畫主持人朱雲漢教授、洪永泰教授與張佑宗教授等赴泰國 KPI 機構。 (2)商討泰國地區調查計畫執行細節。 (3)抽樣架構、樣本、面訪執行細節與行政工作。 (4)調查人員安排與調查契約簽訂事宜。	
1/14/06	台灣地區調查計畫— 台大訪員訓練會議	(1)與會者：朱雲漢教授、張佑宗教授、徐火炎教授、傅仰止教授、王鼎銘教授與黃旻華教授，督導 20 人，訪員約 100 人，共計約 126 人參與。 (2)講解調查計畫與訪員培訓工作。	

日期	事項	內容	備註
1/15/06	台灣地區調查計畫— 成大訪員訓練會議	(1)與會者：徐火炎教授、張佑宗教授、 王鼎銘教授與黃旻華教授，督導 16 人，訪員約 50 人，共計約 70 人參與。 (2)講解調查計畫與訪員培訓工作。	
1/14/06~ 2/15/06	台灣地區調查計畫— 正式訪問開始	共計 38 個督導，134 個訪員執行。	
1/17/06~ 1/19/06	新加坡地區調查計畫— 執行研擬與籌備	(1)計畫主持人朱雲漢教授與張佑宗教 授等赴新加坡，與新加坡團隊籌備調 查。 (2)商討新加坡地區調查計畫執行細節。 (3)抽樣架構、樣本、面訪執行細節與行 政工作。 (4)調查人員安排與調查契約簽訂事宜。	
1/24/06	台灣地區調查計畫— 大台北地區、桃竹苗地區、宜花 東地區 第一次督導會報	(1)與會者：張佑宗教授與 12 名督導。 (2)各區訪員訪問狀況。 (3)各區訪問進度與執行報告。	
1/25/06	台灣地區調查計畫— 中彰投地區 第一次督導會報	(1)與會者：陳仁海教授與 7 名督導。 (2)各區訪員訪問狀況。 (3)各區訪問進度與執行報告。	
1/26/06	台灣地區調查計畫— 雲嘉南地區 第一次督導會報	(1)與會者：張佑宗教授、蔡昌言教授與 6 名督導。 (2)各區訪員訪問狀況。 (3)各區訪問進度與執行報告。	
2/7/06	台灣地區調查計畫— 各區第二次督導會報	(1)於台北、台中、嘉義、高雄舉行督導 會報。 (2)訪問進度與訪問狀況報告。 (3)各區完成率在 7 成上下。	
2/16/06	全球民主動態調查網站(Global Barometer Website)首頁試掛運作	提供全球民主動態調查下的各國團隊參 考並提出建議。	
3/2/06~ 3/20/06	台灣地區調查計畫— 再測訪問	面訪調查之再測工作，檢查問卷品質及 評估調查的信度與效度。	
4/12/06	泰國調查計畫— 調查招標事宜	辦理泰國調查相關事宜與調查招標	
4/15/06~ 5/10/06	泰國調查計畫完成	完成泰國地區面訪調查工作，成功樣本 為 1546 份。	

日期	事項	內容	備註
4/15/06	台灣地區調查計畫— 歸類會議	(1) 問卷檢討、訪問心得 (2) 督導	
4/18/06	蒙古調查計畫— 調查招標事宜	辦理蒙古調查相關事宜與調查招標	
4/21/06	台灣地區調查計畫— 內部歸類會議(I)	處理調查問卷答項及開放題答案，歸併 資料與數據整理。	
4/24/06	台灣地區調查計畫— 內部歸類會議(II)	處理調查問卷答項及開放題答案，歸併 資料與數據整理。	
5/1/06~ 5/31/06	蒙古調查計畫完成	完成蒙古的地區面訪調查工作，成功 樣本為 1210 份。	
6/15/06~ 8/10/06	菲律賓調查資料整理	數據資料整理與建立，初步統計分析。	
7/15/06~ 9/10/06	蒙古調查資料整理	數據資料整理與建立，初步統計分析。	
8/15/06~ 10/30/06	泰國調查資料整理	數據資料整理與建立，初步統計分析。	
9/8/06	榮獲臺灣大學「優勢重點領域拔 尖計畫」調查經費補助		
10/23/06~ 10/24/06	計畫主持人朱雲漢教授參加美國 華盛頓「全球民主動態調查計畫」 之工作會議	工作會議議程如下：討論全球民主動態 調查的網站設計、給美國國務院以及全 國情報委員會 (NIC) 官員進行研究成 果簡報並進行圓桌討論、與「民主季刊」 (Journal of Democracy) 主編討論明年 (97 年) 民主動態調查專輯的寫作計畫、 與世界銀行官員會談研究合作事宜等事 項。	
11/22/06~ 11/25/06	受南京大學人文社會科學高級研 究院邀請，赴南京大學參訪交流。	計畫主持人朱雲漢教授與台大人文社會 高等研究院代表一同前往南京大學，與 其人文社會高等研究院，進行深度的學 術交流與意見交換。	
11/15/06~ 11/29/06	印尼調查計畫完成	完成印尼的地區面訪調查工作，成功樣 本為 1600 份。	
8/12/06~ 12/22/06	新加坡調查計畫完成	完成新加坡的地區面訪調查工作，成功 樣本為 1000 份。	
12/23/06~ 12/26/06	赴越南協助研究調查進行	協助越南研究隊伍執行其地區調查工 作，強化其研究方法的訓練。	
1/10/07~ 2/16/07	印尼調查資料整理	數據資料整理與建立，初步統計分析。	

1/15/07～ 2/16/07	新加坡調查資料整理	數據資料整理與建立，初步統計分析。	
---------------------	-----------	-------------------	--

附錄一 台灣調查執行報告

Asian Barometer 2006 Survey TECHNICAL REPORT (TAIWAN)

「亞洲民主動態調查：民主、發展與治理—台灣地區調查研究」計畫
(Asian Barometer Survey of Democracy, Governance and Development: Taiwan Survey)

一、訪問區域

以台灣省為訪問地區，以民主化相關論題為研究主軸，對於台灣省民眾在不同環境條件下的政治認知、態度、評估與行為，作一完善的資料蒐集。

二、執行期間

計畫執行：2005.04.01~2007.03.31

訪問執行：2006.01.14~2006.02.15

三、母群定義

亞洲民主動態調查的台灣區計畫實際進行訪問的對象以戶籍設於台灣，年齡在二十歲以上具有選舉權的公民作為此次調查訪問的母群體，並採用訪員面對面訪問(face to face interview)受訪者的方式蒐集資料。本於研究執行單位過去許多的全國性訪問研究之執行經驗，本次「亞洲民主動態調查台灣區計畫」採用內政部戶籍登記的資料與地址，作為本次調查研究的底冊。不過，並不包括軍事單位、醫院、療養院、學校、職訓中心、宿舍、看守所及監獄之居民。

四、抽樣方法

(一) 正選樣本抽樣方法及過程

步驟一：人文區位變數

「亞洲民主動態調查台灣區計畫」雖然著重於台灣民眾之民主價值與政治態度的研究主軸，但在鄉鎮市層級的劃分方法上仍然採取常態性原則，僅依據現代化程度進行鄉鎮市區層級的劃分，而不考慮個別鄉鎮市政治特徵與政黨認同上的差異性。本研究引用資料是由各縣市統計要覽所提供之民國九十三年各鄉鎮市區人文區位資料，從中挑選下列十四項變數作為抽樣分層之依據。¹

- 1.人口密度
- 2.大專畢業以上人口比例
- 3.農漁戶數比例
- 4.工廠登記家數

¹ 資料來源為各縣市主計室最新出版的統計要覽。

- 5.自來水普及率
- 6.稅課（決算）收入/人口
- 7.歲計（決算）支出/人口
- 8.教科文支出/人口
- 9.人口/醫生
- 10.六十五歲以上人口比例
- 11.遷入人口比例
- 12.遷出人口比例
- 13.人口流動比例（遷出人口+遷入人口/總人口）
- 14.青壯年人口比例（二十歲至三十九歲）

部分縣市之人文區位資料，僅以總體數據呈現，因此為了解決資料缺漏問題，平均值帶入。此外，未列各鄉鎮市最新更新數據者，以最近可得之的資料取代。

步驟二：因素分析

為了簡化十四個變數，採用因素分析法萃取其共同因子。因素分析（Factor Analysis），是從眾多的相關變項中抽取若干共同的因素，目的是使複雜的具體情況得以簡化。在此所使用的方法乃是主成分分析（Principal Component Analysis），於應用主成分分析法時，先將每個變項的數值變換成標準值。下列則呈現因素分析後的結果。

表一 因素共通值

變 數	共通值
人口密度	.142
專科%	.705
農漁戶%	.355
工廠家數	.513
自來水普及率	.539
總收入/人口	.949
總支出/人口	.951
教科文支出/人口	.913
人口/醫生	.371
65 歲以上%	.888
遷入%	.873
遷出%	.782
人口流動%	.985
20-39 歲%	.824

表二 因子之固有特徵值與總解釋變異量

成分	因子負荷量		
	固有特徵值	變異量	累計變異量
1	3.772	26.941	26.941
2	2.956	21.116	48.057
3	1.891	13.507	61.564
4	1.171	7.828	69.928

將變數投入進行因素分析，並依照 Kaiser 法決定從這十四個人文區位變數中，所萃取的因子中保留四個因子。

表三 因子與變數之相關矩陣

變數	因子			
	因子一	因子二	因子三	因子四
人口密度	.039	-.004	-.002	.375
專科%	-.233	.357	.377	.617
農漁戶%	-.073	.077	-.040	-.585
工廠家數	-.191	.095	.588	.348
自來水普及率	-.214	.200	.051	.672
稅課收入/人口	.958	.177	.013	-.026
歲出決算/人口	.967	.098	.030	.079
教科文支出/人口	.936	.148	.070	.103
人口/醫生	-.125	.031	-.398	-.443
65歲以上%	-.063	-.096	-.921	-.161
遷入%	.015	.912	.060	.191
遷出%	.334	.804	.060	-.147
人口流動%	.162	.975	.067	.060
20-39歲%	.149	.025	.881	-.159

從第一個因子與變數的相關矩陣來看，主要與歲入人口百分比、歲出流動百分比以及每人教科文支出金額呈現非常高的正相關，值都在0.936以上；而與其他現代化與人文區為變項的關連性則不大，因此，顯然第一個因子與政府財政收支有關，且最具明顯的解釋力，因為第一個因子的總因子負荷量（Eigenvalue）最高為3.722，解釋的變異量為26.941%，因此我們或許可以把因子一命名為「政府收支」的因子。從第二個因子與變數的相關矩陣來看，與人口遷出、遷入以及人口流動

等變項成正相關，因素負荷量皆達0.804以上。顯然與人口流動具有密切關係，可稱之為「人口流動」因子。總因子負荷量為2.956，解釋變異量為21.116%。第三個因子與65歲以上人口百分比成高度負相關，值為-0.921；但與青年人（20至39歲）人口百分比成負相關，因素負荷量值更達0.881。總因子負荷量為1.891，解釋變異量為13.507%，顯然第三因子與青年人口比例相關，可稱為「勞動力人口」因子。第四個因子則與專科教育人口數和自來水普及率成正相關，因素負荷量值至少達0.617。總因子負荷量為1.171，解釋變異量為7.08%。顯然第四因子與都市化程度密切相關，可稱為「都市化」因子。總計「政府收支」、「人口流動」、「勞動力人口」與「都市化程度」這四個因子的總解釋變異量為69.928%。所萃取出之四個因子相當程度能夠代替原有的十四個變數並彰顯其特質。

步驟三：集群分析

萃取出「政府收支」、「人口流動」、「勞動力人口」與「都市化程度」這四個因子後，利用這四個因子進行鄉鎮市區的集群分析以便進行分層。集群分析的主要目的是要將基層鄉鎮市區單位依其經濟、社會特性予以分類，以「物以類聚」原則，期使同群之內同質性愈大愈好，不同群之間均數差異愈大愈好。也就是利用集群方法進行分層抽樣（stratified samples）的功能。因為分層可以增加估計變數的精準性。（Floyd J. Flower, Jr., 1993）進行集群分層抽樣的原因是希望在抽樣過程中，具有一定抽樣架構下的所產生的樣本要比簡單隨機抽樣，更能反映母體特性，也就是分層抽樣的主要目的。

而於進行集群分析前，由於考量現代化、都市化狀況、地區特性與執行難易度，故直接將大台北地區（台北市十二個行政區加台北縣六個縣轄市，共十八個行政區）與大高雄地區（高雄市十一個行政區加高雄縣鳳山市，共十二個行政區）從台灣地區三百五十八個鄉鎮市區中予以排除，所以最後進入集群分析的鄉鎮市區共有三百二十八個。集群分析使用的變數是利用因素分析中的主成分分析法所萃取出之四個主要因子。因為包含的鄉鎮市區有三百二十八個，若利用 CLUSTER 指令進行集群分析時工作量可能過大，故改以 QUICK CLUSTER 指令執行。利用主成分分析所萃取出之四個因子進行集群分析後，共嘗試將所有鄉鎮市區分成十三組至十五組的集群，再考量樣本數分配與分散原則後，將鄉鎮市區數過少的組利用手動方式併進因素值相近之組，最後將台灣地區三百二十八個鄉鎮依照人文區位特徵分成八個集群。所得八個集群之主成分交叉表如表四：

表四 七個集群與四個因子的交叉列表

集 群		政府收支	人口流動	勞動力人口	都市化程度	總數
第一集群	平均數	-0.3788	-0.4059	0.9793	0.6369	58
	標準差	0.2555	0.4765	0.5975	0.4207	
第二集群	平均數	1.7341	0.0507	-0.3669	0.7016	19
	標準差	2.3798	1.2582	0.6485	1.3651	

第三集群	平均數	-0.1905	1.5013	0.8781	0.7429	37
	標準差	0.5487	0.6471	0.7232	0.5546	
第四集群	平均數	0.8710	-0.2716	0.7461	-1.1460	36
	標準差	1.5846	0.7240	0.5260	0.5338	
第五集群	平均數	-0.4555	1.3526	-1.3422	0.2872	24
	標準差	0.3390	0.6008	0.7712	0.5656	
第六集群	平均數	-0.1767	-0.8709	-0.1731	0.0372	68
	標準差	0.2309	0.2959	0.3909	0.4931	
第七集群	平均數	-0.1807	0.4850	-0.2906	-1.1965	43
	標準差	0.5083	0.7275	0.6609	1.2260	
第八集群	平均數	-0.1059	-0.4018	-1.2254	0.1284	43
	標準差	0.2396	0.4176	0.4375	0.5019	

除上述八組集群外，再加上原先被排除的大台北地區（歸為第九群）與大高雄地區（歸為第十群），完成將台灣地區所有鄉鎮市區分成十個集群分層的工作。原則上同層之內同質性最大，不同層之間差異量最大。同時，為兼顧地理區域代表性，在抽取鄉鎮時也就六大地理區域（北北基宜、桃竹苗、中彰投、雲嘉南、高高屏澎和花東）之 20 歲以上人口比例進行比對，以抽出最接近地理區域成年人口比例之鄉鎮市區組合。

決定各層樣本分配，以鄉鎮市區為單位，依照各集群分層人口佔總數之百分比等比例分配樣本，以「抽取率與單位大小成比例」(Probabilities Proportional to Size; PPS) 之原則，以選舉人數計算出該層應抽取的樣本數，同時依實際作業之需要，以每個村里抽取 8-14 人為標準，將各層人數稍作調整並計算出各層應抽出之鄉鎮市區數、村里數及鄰數，最後各集群分層人口數與預定樣本數。

分層抽樣，決定各集群分層樣本分配後，進行各集群分層的獨立抽樣，各層以等距抽樣法抽出鄉鎮市區，依各層人口比例分配第一抽出單位數量 (Primary Sampling Unit, PSU, 鄉鎮市區)，將層內鄉鎮市區依照民進黨得票率多寡排列，抽出各層應有之鄉鎮。

於抽出第一階段的鄉鎮市區後，依同樣的程序與方法再進行村里（鄉利用村、鎮市利用里為第二抽出單位，Secondary Sampling Unit, SSU）的抽樣。於抽出村或里後，最後再進行訪問樣本（人為第三抽出單位）的抽樣。第三階段（人）的抽樣；大台北地區與大高雄地區為了使調查地區平均分佈，不以「區」為第一抽出單位，僅進行兩階段抽樣，不同以往 TEDS2001 調查方式的是，從大台北地區與大高雄地區中直接抽「里」，其次從抽中的里中再抽出人。各階段各單位抽樣的原則，採取抽取率與單位大小成比例的方式進行，使得每個人的抽取率保持相等，每個人都有相等的中選機率。

在實際執行抽出受訪者的部分，本次調查研究的母體資料來源為內政部戶籍資料檔，委由中研院資訊中心代為讀取磁帶之戶籍資料。以戶籍資料為抽樣清冊，再委由中研院調查研究室執行實際抽出受訪者，並提供相關抽樣架構說明。依照「抽取率與單位大小成比例」抽樣方法，總計應抽出 4476 個樣本，並檢定其樣本代表性，分別就母群結構之性別、年齡作檢定，抽出樣本後，再交給經過訪員訓練後的訪員進行訪問。

(二) 抽樣架構

各縣市政府出版之統計要覽，提供縣市內各鄉鎮市完整之人口區為資料，本調查予以整合後，對全國各鄉鎮市人文區位資料進行抽樣分層，共分成 10 層，以正選樣本數為基礎，再採用「多階段抽樣法」抽出受訪者。以各縣市最新更新的人口普查資料為基準，計算民國 93 年各層之成年人口數比例，決定各層預計完成之成功樣本數。決定各層所需完成之成功樣本數後，在第一層到第八層，採用「三階段抽樣法」，即第一階段抽出鄉鎮市，第二階段抽出里，第三階段抽出受訪者。而在考量各行政區之性質及實際訪問執行之可行性後，以每一里至少成功樣本 8-14 人為原則。至於大台北地區（第九層）和大高雄地區（第十層）則是採用「兩階段抽樣法」，即第一階段抽出里，第二階段則抽出受訪者，每一里預計樣本數皆為 12 人，抽出正選樣本為 36 人。確認各分層的抽出里數後，最終確定抽出 4476 人，其抽樣架構表如表五。

表五 抽樣架構表

層別	鄉鎮市區數	選舉人數	%	預定樣本數	抽中鄉鎮市數	抽中里數	每里樣本數	正選樣本數	合計預抽樣本數
第一層	58	4244034	25.8%	387	16	2	12	36	1152
第二層	19	604275	3.7%	55	2	2	14	42	168
第三層	37	2735003	16.6%	249	12	2	10	30	720
第四層	36	348616	2.1%	32	2	2	8	24	96
第五層	24	436008	2.6%	40	2	2	10	30	120
第六層	68	1760624	10.7%	160	6	2	13	39	468
第七層	43	643342	3.9%	59	4	2	8	24	192
第八層	43	694589	4.2%	63	4	2	8	24	192
第九層	18	3628805	22.1%	331		28	12	36	1008
第十層	12	1359791	8.3%	124		10	12	36	360
合計	358	16455087	100.0%	1500					4476

換言之，第一層到第八層預計訪問數為「抽中鄉鎮市數*抽中村里數*每里樣本數」；第九層及第十層預計訪問數為「抽中村里數*每里樣本數」。十層總計共為 1492，因擴大樣本數至三倍，故抽取 4476 個樣本數。利用行政院內政部提供之民國 93 年度人口統計資料進行樣本代表性檢定(goodness of fit)，以查核抽出樣本的個人人口特徵分佈是否與母體資料一致，檢定項目包括性別、年齡、年齡*性別五分組，茲將檢定結果列述如表六：

表六 樣本代表性檢定

項目	類別	樣本	期望值	卡方值	p 值
性別					
	男	2237	2258.7	0.421	0.517
	女	2239	2217.3		
年齡					
	20-29 歲	1003	1014.9	0.702	0.951
	30-39 歲	954	958.9		
	40-49 歲	990	983.1		
	50-59 歲	697	705.1		
	60 歲以上	832	814.0		
性別*年齡					
	男 20-29 歲	506	519.0	3.626	0.934
	男 30-39 歲	494	485.2		
	男 40-49 歲	480	496.3		
	男 50-59 歲	352	352.0		
	男 60 歲以上	405	406.2		
	女 20-29 歲	497	495.9		
	女 30-39 歲	460	473.8		
	女 40-49 歲	510	486.7		
	女 50-59 歲	345	353.1		
	女 60 歲以上	427	407.8		

(三) 擴大樣本抽樣程序

雖然我們嚴格的要求訪員在所給予的既有樣本數中就完成該區域基本要求的樣本數，但是部分地區由於成功率實在偏低，且經由督導親自確認所有失敗樣本實為無法完成之樣本後，依據上述的抽樣過程，斟酌再給予訪員每里預計完成的新份數、或者擴大 2-3 倍，使各區域皆達基本要求的樣本數（請參見表七）。總成功樣本數為 1587，比原先預定之 1492 個樣本總計膨脹了 95 個成功樣本。

表七 抽出行政里一覽表

層別	中選鄉鎮	村里編碼	中選村里	樣本數	擴大加抽 樣本
第一層	0402 新竹縣 竹東鎮	10004020019	二重里	36	
		10004020010	竹東里	36	
	0302 桃園縣 中壢市	10003020008	自強里	36	12
		10003020069	德義里	36	12
	0110 台北縣 淡水鎮	10001100018	竹圍里	36	
		10001100021	竿蓁里	36	12
	0803 南投縣 草屯鎮	10008030002	炎峰里	36	
		10008030009	碧峰里	36	
	0701 彰化縣 彰化市	10007010047	延平里	36	
		10007010043	西安里	36	
	0201 宜蘭縣 宜蘭市	10002010038	思源里	36	
		10002010022	菜園里	36	
	0604 台中縣 清水鎮	10006040012	臨江里	36	
		10006040027	橋頭里	36	
	2102 台南市 南區	10021020029	大林里	36	12
		10021020033	再興里	36	12
	0309 桃園縣 龍潭鄉	10003090030	建林村	36	
		10003090001	黃唐村	36	12
	0308 桃園縣 八德市	10003080025	大華里	36	12
		10003080034	大竹里	36	
	0301 桃園縣 桃園市	10003010049	中寧里	36	12
		10003010019	西門里	36	12
	0710 彰化縣 員林鎮	10007100018	三和里	36	
		10007100010	惠來里	36	
	0609 台中縣 潭子鄉	10006090004	福仁村	36	
		10006090011	嘉仁村	36	
	0901 雲林縣 斗六市	10009010033	鎮西里	36	12
		10009010025	湖山里	36	12
	0715 彰化縣 埔心鄉	10007150019	埤霞村	36	
		10007150008	太平村	36	
	1218 高雄縣 梓官鄉	10012180016	典寶村	36	12
		10012180012	大舍村	36	12
第二層	1705 基隆市 中山區	10017050014	仙洞里	42	42
		10017050011	通明里	42	42
	1803 新竹市 香山區	10018030011	香村里	42	42

		10018030002	虎山里	42	42
第三層	1801 新竹市 東區	10018010040	千甲里	30	
		10018010038	前溪里	30	10
	1905 台中市 北區	10019050039	錦祥里	30	
		10019050032	建興里	30	10
	1907 台中市 南屯區	10019070026	三義里	30	
		10019070016	大同里	30	10
	2101 台南市 東區	10021010042	崇德里	30	
		10021010050	崇信里	30	
	2104 台南市 北區	10021040013	大仁里	30	
		10021040020	延平里	30	
	1207 高雄縣 鳥松鄉	10012070003	大華村	30	
		10012070007	華美村	30	
	0310 桃園縣 平鎮市	10003100017	龍恩里	30	
		10003100034	廣仁里	30	
	1908 台中市 北屯區	10019080025	新平里	30	
		10019080033	松勇里	30	
	1904 台中市 西區	10019040028	土庫里	30	
		10019040030	公益里	30	
	2001 嘉義市 東區	10020010036	後庄里	30	
		10020010032	神農里	30	10
第四層	1203 高雄縣 大寮鄉	10012030024	光武村	30	
		10012030009	中庄村	30	
	1120 台南縣 新市鄉	10011200002	新和村	30	
		10011200010	港墘村	30	
第五層	1330 屏東縣 來義鄉	10013300006	望嘉村	24	
		10013300007	南和村	24	
	0709 彰化縣 芬園鄉	10007090002	大埔村	24	
		10007090007	芬園村	24	
第六層	1704 基隆市 仁愛區	10017040029	光華里	30	
		10017040013	吉仁里	30	10
	1111 台南縣 大內鄉	10011110008	環湖村	30	
		10011110003	石城村	30	
第六層	0513 苗栗縣 三義鄉	10005130001	廣盛村	39	
		10005130004	勝興村	39	
	0802 南投縣 埔里鎮	10008020033	泰安里	39	
		10008020003	西門里	39	13

	0503 苗栗縣 通霄鎮	10005030002	通西里	39	13
		10005030003	平元里	39	
	0804 南投縣 竹山鎮	10008040004	雲林里	39	
		10008040015	山崇里	39	
	1219 高雄縣 旗山鎮	10012190025	廣福里	39	
		10012190019	三協里	39	
	0908 雲林縣 大埤鄉	10009080001	北和村	39	13
	10009080004	松竹村	39		
第七層	1508 花蓮縣 豐濱鄉	10015080003	磯崎村	24	
		10015080001	豐濱村	24	
	0403 新竹縣 新埔鎮	10004030008	新埔里	24	
		10004030001	內立里	24	
	1325 屏東縣 枋山鄉	10013250001	枋山村	24	8
		10013250002	加祿村	24	8
	0209 宜蘭縣 五結鄉	10002090009	大吉村	24	
	10002090010	協和村	24		
第八層	0508 苗栗縣 大湖鄉	10005080006	大寮村	24	8
		10005080011	栗林村	24	8
	0808 南投縣 中寮鄉	10008080006	永平村	24	
		10008080007	復興村	24	8
	1002 嘉義縣 朴子市	10010020017	大葛里	24	
		10010020022	炭後里	24	
	1007 嘉義縣 新港鄉	10010070017	中洋村	24	8
	10010070021	南港村	24	8	
第九層	6311 台北市 士林區	63000110004	福德里	36	36
		63000110003	福林里	36	36
		63000110034	蘭雅里	36	36
	6306 台北市 大同區	63000060004	建泰里	36	36
	6303 台北市 大安區	63000030037	群英里	36	36
		63000030053	敦煌里	36	36
	6304 台北市 中山區	63000040027	下埤里	36	12
	6305 台北市 中正區	63000050014	忠勤里	36	36
	6310 台北市 內湖區	63000100020	瑞陽里	36	12
		63000100011	紫星里	36	12
	6301 台北市 松山區	63000010008	富泰里	36	36
	6302 台北市 信義區	63000020036	雙和里	36	
	6307 台北市 萬華區	63000070007	富民里	36	36

	6312 台北市 北投區	63000120022	中央里	36	12
	0102 台北縣 三重市	10001020007	成功里	36	12
		10001020116	立德里	36	12
	0103 台北縣 中和市	10001030051	景文里	36	
		10001030063	瑞穗里	36	12
		10001030090	冠穗里	36	12
	0104 台北縣 永和市	10001040008	民治里	36	36
		10001040053	正興里	36	12
	0101 台北縣 板橋市	10001010115	民安里	36	12
		10001010110	後埔里	36	
		10001010119	建國里	36	12
		10001010062	永安里	36	12
	0106 台北縣 新店市	10001060058	寶福里	36	36
	0105 台北縣 新莊市	10001050033	民安里	36	12
		10001050051	龍鳳里	36	36
第十層	6405 高雄市 三民區	64000052042	安康里	36	12
		64000052018	寶泰里	36	
	6411 高雄市 小港區	64000110012	二苓里	36	
		64000110033	鳳鳴里	36	
	6408 高雄市 苓雅區	64000080061	正大里	36	12
		64000080047	林靖里	36	12
	6404 高雄市 楠梓區	64000040028	慶昌里	36	
	6402 高雄市 鼓山區	64000020014	厚生里	36	12
		64000020010	龍井里	36	12
		1201 高雄縣 鳳山市	10012011042	曹公里	36

(四) 再測信度樣本抽樣程序

本次調查訪問為針對問卷內容進行效度及信度的測量，故在訪問結束後，從已訪問成功的受訪者中抽出一定額度的樣本來進行再測信度訪問。而再測信度的訪問預計完成訪問成功樣本數的一成五，樣本分配情形如下表八所示。

再測信度樣本的抽樣方式，以各鄉鎮市為抽樣單位，依據各行政區第一階段訪問成功數的一成五作為再測信度的預計成功數，並採用「系統抽樣法」抽出受訪者。

由於再測信度的訪問也同樣會遭遇到訪問失敗的情形，因此在抽出第一套正選的再測信度樣本之外，不足額的部分再從剩下未被抽中之他成功樣本中遞補，以供再測信度訪問失敗時遞補之用。

表八 再測樣本分配一覽表

鄉鎮市區	村里數	成功問卷	成功問卷*0.15	再測完成數
大台北地區				
基隆市 仁愛區	2	20	3.0	3
基隆市 中山區	2	26	3.9	4
台北縣 永和市	2	24	3.6	4
台北縣 中和市	3	36	5.4	5
台北縣 新店市	1	11	1.7	2
台北縣 三重市	2	27	4.1	4
台北縣 新莊市	2	25	3.8	4
台北縣 淡水鎮	2	23	3.5	3
台北縣 板橋市	4	48	7.2	7
台北市 大安區	2	25	3.8	4
台北市 中正區	1	12	1.8	2
台北市 信義區	1	12	1.8	2
台北市 萬華區	1	12	1.8	2
台北市 士林區	3	34	5.1	5
台北市 北投區	1	12	1.8	2
台北市 大同區	1	12	1.8	2
台北市 內湖區	2	23	3.5	3
台北市 松山區	1	8	1.2	1
台北市 中山區	1	12	1.8	2
桃竹苗地區				
桃園縣 龍潭鄉	2	27	4.1	5
桃園縣 八德市	2	29	4.4	4
桃園縣 桃園市	2	23	3.5	3
桃園縣 中壢市	2	24	3.6	4
桃園縣 平鎮市	2	20	3.0	3
新竹市 香山區	2	28	4.2	4
新竹市 東區	2	21	3.2	3
新竹縣 竹東鎮	2	25	3.8	4
新竹縣 新埔鎮	2	26	3.9	4
苗栗縣 三義鄉	2	29	4.4	4
苗栗縣 大湖鄉	2	16	2.4	2
苗栗縣 通霄鎮	2	25	3.8	4
中彰投地區				
台中市 北屯區	2	23	3.5	3

台中市 北區	2	20	3.0	3
台中市 南屯區	2	21	3.2	3
台中市 西區	2	20	3.0	3
台中縣 潭子鄉	2	32	4.8	5
台中縣 清水鎮	2	30	4.5	5
彰化縣 芬園鄉	2	17	2.6	3
彰化縣 員林鎮	2	24	3.6	4
彰化縣 彰化市	2	24	3.6	4
彰化縣 埔心鄉	2	32	4.8	5
南投縣 草屯鎮	2	28	4.2	5
南投縣 埔里鎮	2	27	4.1	4
南投縣 中寮鄉	2	17	2.6	3
南投縣 竹山鎮	2	31	4.7	5
雲嘉南地區				
雲林縣 斗六市	2	25	3.8	4
雲林縣 大埤鄉	2	26	3.9	4
嘉義縣 朴子市	2	17	2.6	3
嘉義縣 新港鄉	2	16	2.4	2
嘉義市 東區	2	21	3.2	3
台南縣 新市鄉	2	27	4.1	4
台南縣 大內鄉	2	29	4.4	4
台南市 北區	2	22	3.3	3
台南市 南區	2	23	3.5	3
台南市 東區	2	21	3.2	3
高高屏地區				
高雄市 鼓山區	2	23	3.5	3
高雄市 小港區	2	27	4.1	4
高雄市 三民區	2	20	3.0	3
高雄市 苓雅區	2	22	3.3	3
高雄市 楠梓區	1	12	1.8	2
高雄縣 梓官鄉	2	24	3.6	4
高雄縣 旗山鎮	2	27	4.1	4
高雄縣 大寮鄉	2	19	2.9	3
高雄縣 鳳山市	1	12	1.8	2
屏東縣 來義鄉	2	19	2.9	3
屏東縣 枋山鄉	2	17	2.6	3
高雄縣 鳥松鄉	2	20	3.0	3

宜花東地區				
宜蘭縣 宜蘭市	2	30	4.5	5
宜蘭縣 五結鄉	2	26	3.9	4
花蓮縣 豐濱鄉	2	21	3.2	3
總計		1587		242

五、執行過程

(一) 訪問進行前之籌備階段

1. 問卷的討論與底定

問卷是調查案的重心，所有資源投入最重要的中介工具就是問卷，透過問卷研究人員能夠瞭解民眾態度的分佈並印證理論。

2. 問卷前測(pre-test)

由於問卷的討論均在會議室中進行，為了避免實際執行的落差，因此需要前測，以測試在實際訪問過程中，問卷是否有題意不清、語句過於艱澀、選項不全、跳題邏輯有誤、版面設計與台語表達不易等問題發生，並估計完成一份問卷的時間，以作為題目最後修訂的參考。

其後，針對前測所遭遇的特殊狀況及對問卷語詞的意見進行交流，進而討論問卷語詞的修改，且對語句予以潤飾與台語補充。問卷經由前測後，綜合各種修正題目的意見，最後將版面修正至最理想狀態，讓訪員進行訪問時不會發生漏問或錯問的情況。

3. 督導及訪員訓練

(1) 督導訓練：

- a、共舉行兩次，每次一天。
- b、熟悉計畫執行與計畫相關人員。
- c、前測問卷執行。
- d、提供問卷修改建議。

(2) 訪員訓練：

- a、分區（台北、台南）辦理訪員訓練，每區一天。
- b、確定所屬訪員、分配訪問村里。
- c、提醒訪員注意事項。
- d、帶領訪員進行問卷模擬演練。

(二) 訪問進行期間

1. 提供訪員相關協助

共有 36 位督導負責提供六大區域（大台北、桃竹苗、中彰投、雲嘉南、高高屏、宜花）訪員相關之協助。

2. 控制訪問進度

部份訪問區域進度落後時，適時調整人力的調派。

3. 失敗樣本與成功問卷複查

督導針對訪問成功問卷及失敗樣本進行複查的工作，以確保訪問的品質。

4. 再測

正式問卷訪問結束後，抽取成功問卷之百分之十五進行再測，再測的目的是為了作問卷的信度檢定。為避免太叨擾受訪者，題目較正式問卷少許多，此外，為避免相同訪員所造成的同質性答案，對同一個受訪者，再測訪員不能與正式訪員為同一人。

(三) 訪問執行後的資料處理階段

包括問卷過錄、資料輸入、檢誤與加權。資料輸入的工作結束，在進行基本的整理、除錯、比對資料筆數後，由計畫參與老師與督導群舉行歸類會議，將開放題與有特殊答案的題目提交討論或進行「重新歸類」(recode)，當歸類確定後，便可進行各式資料的檢誤工作，將邏輯不合、答題錯誤的部分予以改正，並針對封面與問卷進行交叉除錯。檢誤告一段落，繼而進行調查資料的加權工作，針對性別、年齡、教育程度與地理區域四個變數，採用 raking 法加權，直至檢定結果符合母群的分佈狀況為止。

六、加權步驟

訪問得到的成功樣本結構是否與母體一致？以下將就受訪者的人口特徵來檢定訪問成功的樣本是否具有代表性。欲檢定之人口特徵包括性別、年齡、教育程度與地理區域，母體參數根據內政部台閩地區的人口統計資料（民國九十四年）。

表九 樣本代表性檢定：性別（加權前）

	樣本		母體	檢定結果
	次數	百分比	百分比	
男	797	50.2	50.3	卡方值=0.004 p>0.05 樣本與母體一致
女	790	49.8	49.7	
合計	1587	100.0	100.0	

表十 樣本代表性檢定：年齡（加權前）

	樣本		母體	檢定結果
	次數	百分比	百分比	
20 至 29 歲	327	20.6	22.9	卡方值=13.453 p<0.05 樣本與母體不一致
30 至 39 歲	318	20.0	21.6	
40 至 49 歲	346	21.8	22.1	
50 至 59 歲	274	17.3	15.8	
60 歲及以上	322	20.3	17.7	
合計	1587	100.0	100.0	

表十一 樣本代表性檢定：教育程度（加權前）

	樣本		母體	檢定結果
	次數	百分比	百分比	
小學及以下	394	24.9	23.0	卡方值=11.112 p<0.05 樣本與母體不一致
國、初中	216	13.6	16.5	
高中、職	513	32.4	32.6	
專科	208	13.1	12.6	
大學及以上	254	16.0	15.3	
合計	1585	100.0	100.0	

表十二 樣本代表性檢定：地理區域（加權前）

	樣本		母體	檢定結果
	次數	百分比	百分比	
北北基宜	458	28.9	32.2	卡方值=47.042 p<0.05 樣本與母體不一致
桃竹苗	293	18.5	14.1	
中彰投	346	21.8	19.0	
雲嘉南	227	14.3	15.3	
高高屏澎	242	15.2	16.8	
花東	21	1.3	2.6	
合計	1587	100.0	100.0	

由表九~表十二的樣本代表性檢定顯示，成功樣本中只有性別結構與母體一致，而年齡、教育程度和地理區域的樣本結構，則與母體不一致。為了使樣本結構符合母體，本研究對樣本的分佈特性使用變數反覆加權法（raking）進行加權。結果如表十三~表十六。

表十三 樣本代表性檢定：性別（加權後）

	樣本		母體	檢定結果
	次數	百分比	百分比	

男	809	50.3	50.3	卡方值=0.000 p>0.05 樣本與母體一致
女	799	49.7	49.7	
合計	1608	100.0	100.0	

表十四 樣本代表性檢定：年齡（加權後）

	樣本		母體	檢定結果
	次數	百分比	百分比	
20 至 29 歲	351	22.4	22.9	卡方值=0.305 p>0.05 樣本與母體一致
30 至 39 歲	338	21.5	21.6	
40 至 49 歲	353	22.5	22.1	
50 至 59 歲	248	15.8	15.8	
60 歲及以上	280	17.8	17.7	
合計	1570	100.0	100.0	

表十五 樣本代表性檢定：教育程度（加權後）

	樣本		母體	檢定結果
	次數	百分比	百分比	
小學及以下	361	22.8	23.0	卡方值=0.387 p>0.05 樣本與母體一致
國、初中	268	17.0	16.5	
高中、職	513	32.4	32.6	
專科	194	12.3	12.6	
大學及以上	245	15.5	15.3	
合計	1581	100.0	100.0	

表十六 樣本代表性檢定：地理區域（加權後）

	樣本		母體	檢定結果
	次數	百分比	百分比	
北北基宜	504	31.6	32.2	卡方值=1.359 p>0.05 樣本與母體一致
桃竹苗	236	14.8	14.1	
中彰投	313	19.6	19.0	
雲嘉南	238	14.9	15.3	
高高屏澎	264	16.6	16.8	
花東	40	2.5	2.6	
合計	1595	100.0	100.0	

附錄二 菲律賓調查執行報告

TECHNICAL REPORT (Philippines) November 25-December 5, 2005

1. Location

The **Asian Barometer 2005 Survey** covered the entire Philippines and had four major study areas: National Capital Region (NCR), Balance Luzon (outside NCR), Visayas and Mindanao.

2. Timetable

Fieldwork:

National Capital Region	-	November 25-December 5, 2005
Balance Luzon	-	November 25-December 5, 2005
Visayas	-	November 25-December 2, 2005
Mindanao	-	November 25-December 1, 2005

3. Respondents

Data was gathered through face-to-face interviews of voting-age adults (18 years old and above). It asked a host of questions about political, social and economic issues, some undertaken as regular indicators monitored over time and others reflective of current concerns as well as specific personal information. It also obtained information and background characteristics about the household, the household head and family members.

4. Sampling Method

Sample Sizes and Error Margins. An indicator of data quality is the standard error of the estimate, on which the margin for sampling error is based. As survey statistics are mostly proportions, the key measure of data precision is the standard error of a proportion taken from a sample. It is computed as follows:

$$\pm Z * \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}$$

Where Z , at 95% confidence level is 1.96; p is the sample proportion estimate and n is the sample size. The overall sample size of 1,200 voting-age adults gives a maximum error margin of $\pm 2.83\%$ at the 95% confidence level, assuming a simple random sampling design. The sampling error is at its highest when the true proportion being estimated is close to 50%.

The following approximate 95%-confidence margins for sampling error should be made when aggregating data at various levels:

	Sample Size	Error margin
Philippines	1200	±3%
National Capital Region	300	±6%
Balance Luzon	300	±6%
Visayas	300	±6%
Mindanao	300	±6%

However, somewhat higher error margins should be expected since multi-stage cluster sampling was used; this design-effect is not readily measurable through established statistical software.

Sampling scheme. The Philippines was divided into four study areas: National Capital Region (NCR), Balance Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao. The sample size for each of the four study areas is 300 voting-age adults.

Multi-stage probability sampling was used in the selection of sample spots. The allocation of sample units in each stage was as follows:

	Sample Prov.	Sample Mun.	Spots	Probability Respondents
National Capital Region	--	17	60	300
Balance Luzon	10	15	60	300
Visayas	5	15	60	300
Mindanao	6	15	60	300
	---	-----	-----	-----
	21	62	240	1200

For the National Capital Region

Stage 1. Selection of Sample Spots (Barangays)

For NCR's first stage, 60 barangays are distributed among the 17 NCR cities and municipalities in such a way that each city/municipality was assigned a number of barangays that was roughly proportional to its population size. An additional provision was that each municipality must receive at least one barangay. Barangays were then selected from within each municipality with probability proportional to size (PPS).

Stage 2. Selection of Sample Households

In each sample barangay, five households were established by systematic sampling. Designated starting points were randomly assigned - it was either: 1) a

municipal/barangay hall, 2) a school, 3) the barangay captain's house, or 4) a church/chapel/mosque. A random start from 1-6 was also randomly generated for each spot. Thus, if a particular spot has a random start of 4, the first sample household should be the 4th household from the designated starting point. Subsequent sample households were chosen using a fixed interval of 5 households in between the sampled ones; i.e. every 6th household was sampled.

Stage 3. Selection of Sample Adult

For the third stage, in each selected household, a respondent is randomly chosen among the household members who were 18 years of age and older, using a probability selection table. In selecting the probability respondent of a household, only male family members were pre-listed in the probability selection table of odd-numbered questionnaires; only female family members were pre-listed for even-numbered questionnaires. A respondent not contacted during the first attempt was visited for a second time. If the respondent remained unavailable, or in cases where there was no qualified probability respondent of a given gender, the interval sampling of households would continue until five sample respondents were identified.

For the rest of the Philippines

Stage 1. Allocation and Selection of Sample Provinces

Balance Luzon was further divided into 5 regions: Region I, CAR + Region II, Region III, Region IV and Region V; Visayas into 3 regions: Region VI, Region VII and Region VIII; and Mindanao into 6 regions; Region IX, Region X, CARAGA, Region XI, Region XII and ARMM.

Using probability proportional to population size (PPS) of the region, the allocation of 10 provinces in Luzon, 5 in Visayas and 6 in Mindanao were as follows:

LUZON		VISAYAS		MINDANAO	
Region I	1	Region VI	2	Region IX	1
CAR/REG II	1	Region VII	1	Reg X	1
Region III	2	Region VIII	1	CARAGA	1
Region IV	3	Non-quota	1	Region XI	1
Region V	1			Region XII	1
Non-quota	2			ARMM	1
	----		----		----
TOTAL	10		5		6

The non-quota provinces were selected without replacement using probability proportional to their remainders. The remainders are fractions derived when the proportion of the regions (based on their respective study area) are multiplied by 10

for Luzon, and 5 for Visayas and 6 for Mindanao. For instance, if 1.45 is obtained for Region I, then 1 province is assigned to this region and remaining fraction of 0.45 is included for the allocation of the non-quota province.

Given the target number of provinces for each region, sample provinces were then selected by PPS, without replacement. An additional provision is that each region must receive at least one province.

Stage 2. Allocation and selection of sample municipalities

Within each study area, 15 municipalities were allocated among the sample provinces. 15 was multiplied by the proportion of the provinces. The resulting integers became the number of municipalities in that province. If there were remaining municipalities to be allocated, they were distributed using probability proportional to the remainders.

Sample municipalities were then selected from within each sample province with probability proportional to population size, without replacement. An additional provision was that each province must receive at least one municipality.

Stage 3. Allocation and Selection of Sample Spots

Once the sample provinces have been selected, 60 spots for each of the major areas were allocated among the sample provinces. Using the target number set for each spot in each region, the spots were distributed in such a way the each province was assigned a number of spots roughly proportional to its population size.

LUZON		VISAYAS		MINDANAO	
Region I	8	Region VI	24	Region IX	9
CAR+REG II	8	Region VII	22	Reg X	9
Region III	14	Region VIII	14	CARAGA	7
Region IV	21			Region XI	17
Region V	9			Region XII	9
				ARMM	9
	----		----		----
TOTAL	60		60		60

Sample barangays within each sample municipality were selected with probability proportional to size.

Sample barangays were then classified as urban or rural based on the latest National Statistics Office classification (2000).

Stage 4. Selection of Sample Households

For the fourth stage, within each sample spot, five households were established by systematic sampling. In urban barangays as well as in rural barangays, designated starting points were randomly assigned - it was either: 1) a municipal/barangay hall, 2) a school, 3) the barangay captain's house, or 4) a church/chapel/mosque. A random start from 1-6 was also randomly generated for each spot. Thus, if a particular spot has a random start of 4, the first sample household should be the 4th household from the designated starting point. The sampling interval for urban barangays was six, while for rural barangays it was two.

Stage 5. Selection of Sample Respondents

For the fifth and final stage, as discussed earlier, a respondent was randomly chosen from among the voting-age adults in each selected household using a probability respondent selection table. A respondent not contacted during the first attempt was visited for a second time. If the respondent remained unavailable, or in cases where there was no qualified probability respondent of a given gender, the interval sampling of households would continue until five sample respondents were identified.

5. Research Methodology

a. Preparation

(1) Questionnaire

The definitive language version of the questionnaire, Tagalog, was translated into English, Cebuano, Ilonggo, Ilocano, Bicolano and Waray by language experts. Then the language translation underwent cognitive pretests to make sure that the messages were conveyed accurately.

(2) Pre-Testing and Finalizing the Questionnaire

SWS pre-tested the questionnaire on 14 voting-age adults from different socio-economic classes in order to:

- Determine the time length of the interview
- Improve the wording of the questions, if necessary
- Eliminate unnecessary questions or add new items, as the case may be
- Test question sequence and identify bases
- Correct and improve translation
- Change open-ended questions into multiple-choice questions
- Find out which items are conceptually vague
- Check accuracy and adequacy of the questionnaire instructions
- Determine whether the focus of the question is clear
- Identify interviewer's recording difficulties

(3) Training

- (a) Training was conducted in 11 central locations: the SWS Office in Quezon City, Dagupan, Quezon, Sorsogon, Bacolod City, Cebu, Samar, Dipolog City, Cotabato, Davao City and Surigao del Norte. The interviewers needed to cover NCR, Nueva Ecija, Pampanga, Tarlac and Rizal were trained in Quezon City, those trained in Dagupan covered Ilocos Sur, Pangasinan and Benguet, those trained in Quezon covered Quezon and Marinduque, while those trained in Sorsogon covered Sorsogon. Those trained in Bacolod City covered Iloilo and Negros Occidental, those trained in Cebu covered Cebu and Negros Oriental, while those trained in Samar covered Northern Samar. Those trained in Dipolog City covered Zamboanga del Norte and Misamis Occidental, those trained in Cotabato covered North Cotabato and Maguindanao, those trained in Davao City covered Davao del Sur, while those trained in Surigao del Norte covered Surigao del Norte.
- (b) Training time - The minimum training time for group supervisors and interviewers was 2 days prior to field implementation. The third day was the start-off, where the field supervisor observed the field interviewers on their first interviews.
- (c) Training Activities - These mainly consisted of:
 One or two days office training to learn the basics of the project. Mock interviews among participants, i.e. field interviewers interviewing field anchors as respondents are done to get accustomed to the flow of interviewing and questionnaire format.
 Interviews were practiced with a supervisor around until the interviewer could be left on her own.
- (d) Evaluation of interviewer's work - All first interviews of each field interviewer were observed by her field supervisor, and then evaluated. Only after meeting a certain evaluation criteria was an interviewer left to interview on her own, although her field supervisor always stayed within the vicinity of the sample spot to conduct checks.

b. Field Work

(1) Workers on Hand

For this project, a total of 72 field staff were deployed:

	Field Manager = 1
NCR	Field Anchors = 1 Field Interviewers = 10
Balance Luzon	Field Anchors = 3 Field Auditors = 2

Field Interviewers = 18

Visayas Field Anchors = 1
 Field Auditors = 2
 Field Interviewers = 14

Mindanao Field Anchors = 1
 Field Auditors = 3
 Field Interviewers = 16

(2) Supervision

Supervisors reporting to the field manager monitored the study full-time. They observed interviewers, (at least 10% of total interviewers were observed by supervisors), followed-up and did surprise checks on the field interviewers. They also ensured that field logistics were received promptly and administered properly.

(3) Spot-checking

Part of quality control was to make sure at least 30% of each interviewer's output was spot-checked and back-checked. Once an incomplete or inconsistent answer was spotted in the questionnaire, the field interviewer went back to the respondent's house to re-ask the question for verification.

c. Field Editing

- (a) After each interview, the interviewer was asked to go over her own work and check for consistency.
- (b) All accomplished interview schedules were submitted to the assigned group supervisor who, in turn, edited every interview.
- (c) Data Processing
 - (1) Office editors conducted final consistency checks on all interviews prior to coding.
 - (2) A data entry computer program verified and checked the consistency of the encoded data before data tables were generated.

6. Weighting Procedure

To yield representative figures at the national level, census-based population weights are applied to the survey data. The weight projection is computed by dividing the projected population in the area by the sample size of the same area. Appropriate projected factors were applied so that original population proportions were reflected in the data tables using this formula.

$$\text{Projection factors (Weight)} = \frac{\text{Population}}{\text{No. of Interviews}}$$

For questions answered by the sample voting-age adults, the following projection

factors were used:

	2005 NSO Projected Population Age 18 and above	Total Sample Size (PR)	Projection factor for 1 probability Respondent (000)
NCR	7,404,523	300	24.6817428933
Balance Luzon	21,377,926	300	71.2597548368
Visayas	10,024,695	300	33.4156487457
Mindanao	11,639,379	300	38.7979308684
	-----	-----	
TOTAL	50,446,523	1,200	

For questions pertaining to household (HH), the following projection factors were used:

	2005 NSO Projected HH Population	Total Sample Size	Projection factors (000)
NCR	2,371,117	300	7.9037237164
Balance Luzon	7,026,957	300	23.4231886194
Visayas	3,344,896	300	11.1496532434
Mindanao	3,886,294	300	12.9543123497
	-----	-----	
TOTAL	16,629,263	1,200	

The SPSS version of the datafile is already weighted according to the above projection factors. As the data are weighted, the total number of cases that appear is 50,447. The figure is in thousands, i.e., 50,446,523 persons representing NSO's projected number of adults (18 years old and above) for year 2005 based on the 1995 Census.

Researchers who are defining data using the ASCII files should apply these projection factors.

7. Sample Spots

8. Statistical Report

A statistical report showing the “representativeness” of the sample for the Philippine component of the 2005 Asian Barometer Survey is accomplished using χ^2 -test for goodness of fit and t -test for the difference in sample and population means. Please note that those figures under the SWS column are the weighted frequency percentages of the variables from the Philippine component dataset. The projected weights that are

census-based population weights were used to yield representative figures at the national level. Furthermore, those figures under the NSO columns are the percentages from the Philippine National Statistics Office (NSO). These figures were computed from the 2000 Census of Population and Housing public use file (PUF) data of the NSO. Since the SWS sample is composed of voting age adults (18 years old & above), tabulations of the same age group were done from the PUFs to obtain official national figures (NSO) for appropriate comparison of the two datasets.

a. Highest Educational Attainment

	SWS %	NSO %	
	(o_i)	(e_i)	$((o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i)$
No Formal Education	1.647036	3.200777	0.754226
Pre-School	0	0.118788	0.118788
Some Elementary	11.9919	15.54805	0.813363
Completed Elementary	17.51796	18.7817	0.085032
Some High School	14.49928	11.35666	0.869628
Completed High School	22.07283	20.89413	0.066494
Some Vocational	1.428527	2.000327	0.163451
Completed Vocational	4.243116	3.894621	0.031184
Some College	12.8877	14.64556	0.210992
Completed College	12.66273	6.66093	5.407901
Post College	1.048927	0.619801	0.29711
Not Reported	0	2.278659	2.278659

Null Hypothesis: Distributions of SWS and NSO Highest Educational Attainment data agree.

The χ^2 -test for goodness of fit is used on the Highest Educational Attainment data since we are investigating the significance of the differences between the distribution of observed data (SWS) arranged in K (=12) classes, and the expected frequencies (NSO) in the K (=12) classes.

The test statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i} = \sum_{i=1}^{12} \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$$

$$\chi^2 = \mathbf{11.0968}$$

K=12 in variable Education since there are 12 categories, the degrees of freedom is computed as follows:

$$v = K - 1 = 12 - 1 = 11$$

Critical value $\chi_{11}^2(0.05) = 19.68$

The calculated χ^2 value is less than the critical value. Hence there are no indications that the distributions of SWS and NSO Highest Educational Attainment data do not agree at 5% level of significance.

b. Marital Status

Note: The SWS coding scheme for Marital Status is different from that of NSO, so the SWS codes were recoded to match the NSO codes.

Recoding of Marital Status Codes:

SWS Codes	→ NSO Codes
11. Never married	1. Single
21. First marriage, 22. Married (formerly widow/widower), 23. Married (formerly separated/divorced)	2. Legally married
12. Widowed	3. Widowed
13. Separated/Divorced	4. Divorced/Separated
31. First live-in partner, 32. With partner (formerly widow/widower), 33. With partner (formerly separated/divorced)	5. Common-law/live-in
-not used-	9. Unknown

Percentage Table of Marital Status:

	SWS %	NSO %	
	(o_i)	(e_i)	$((o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i)$
Single	15.66401	27.37761	5.011707
Legally married	71.58093	59.72548	2.353295
Widowed	5.556254	5.409252	0.003995
Divorced/separated	0.949951	1.268591	0.080035
Common-law/live-in	6.248858	5.422457	0.125946
Unknown	0	0.796605	0.796605

Null Hypothesis: Distributions of SWS and NSO Marital Status data agree.

The χ^2 -test for goodness of fit is used on the Marital Status data since we are investigating the significance of the differences between the observed data (SWS) arranged in K (=6) classes, and the theoretically expected frequencies (NSO) in the K (=6) classes.

The test statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i} = \sum_{i=1}^6 \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$$

$\chi^2 = \mathbf{8.371583}$

K=6 in variable Marital Status since there are 6 categories, the degrees of freedom is

computed as follows:

$$v = K-1 = 6 - 1 = 5$$

Critical value $\chi^2_5(0.05) = 11.07$

The calculated χ^2 value is less than the critical value. Hence there are no indications that the distributions of SWS and NSO Marital Status data do not agree at 5% level of significance.

c. Age Group

	SWS %	NSO %	
	(o_i)	(e_i)	$((o_i - e_i)^2)/e_i$
18 - 19	4.429841	7.283174	1.117852
20 - 24	7.201248	16.29394	5.074096
25 - 29	10.24437	14.00153	1.008192
30 - 34	13.05407	12.79236	0.005354
35 - 39	12.52732	11.31295	0.130355
40 - 44	11.73126	9.611484	0.467508
45 - 49	10.12084	7.692024	0.766917
50 - 54	7.185016	6.058732	0.20937
55 - 59	6.532821	4.400289	1.033499
60 - 64	4.932264	3.775632	0.354324
65 - 69	5.093303	2.633077	2.298721
70 - 74	3.279857	1.84478	1.116364
75 - 79	1.637188	1.168197	0.188283
80 and Over	1.889343	1.131841	0.506969
Refused	0.141258	0	0.141258

Null Hypothesis: Distributions of SWS and NSO Age Group data agree.

The χ^2 -test for goodness of fit is used on the Age Group data since we are investigating the significance of the differences between the distribution of observed data (SWS) arranged in K (=15) classes, and the expected frequencies (NSO) in the K (=15) classes. The test statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i} = \sum_{i=1}^{15} \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$$

$$\chi^2 = \mathbf{14.41906}$$

K=15 in variable Age Group since there are 15 categories, the degrees of freedom is

computed as follows:

$$v = K-1 = 15 - 1 = 14$$

$$\text{Critical value } \chi^2_{14}(0.05) = 23.68$$

The calculated χ^2 value is less than the critical value. Hence there are no indications that the distributions of SWS and NSO Age Group data do not agree at 5% level of significance.

d. Household Size (including servants, transients, or boarders)

	SWS	NSO
Mean household size	4.84	5

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the mean Household Size of SWS sample and the mean Household Size of the NSO population.

The t -test for a population mean (variance unknown) is used on the Household Size data. Since we are investigating the significance of the differences between the population mean μ_o (NSO) and a sample mean \bar{x} (SWS).

The test statistic is

$$t = \frac{(\bar{x} - \mu_o)}{s / \sqrt{n}}$$

wherein,

$$\bar{x} = 4.84n = 1200$$

$$\mu_o = 5$$

$$s = \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n-1} \right\}^{1/2} = \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{1200} (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{1200-1} \right\}^{1/2} = \left\{ \frac{305025.7}{1200-1} \right\}^{1/2}$$

$$s = 15.94992$$

$$t = \frac{(4.84 - 5)}{15.94992 / \sqrt{1200}}$$

$$t = -0.3475$$

Critical Value $t_{1199} (0.025) = \pm 1.96$

The calculated t value is less than the critical value. Hence there are no indications that the SWS and NSO mean Household Size are significantly different at 5% level of significance.

e. Sex

SWS stratifies sample by variable sex to meet the official national (NSO) male and female proportions of voting age adults (18 years old and above). The proportions of male and female in SWS and NSO data are 0.50 each.

Sources:

- 100 Statistical Tests, Kanji 1993
- Census 2000, Philippine Population & Housing Characteristics – Public Use File (PUF), Discs 1 & 2 from the Philippine National Statistics Office (NSO)

附錄三 泰國調查執行報告

Asian Barometer Survey Technical Report (Thailand) 2006

1. Location

The **2006 Asian Barometer Survey** covered the entirety of Thailand and had 44 provincial fields: 7 provinces in the north, 11 provinces in the northeast, 5 provinces in the south, 10 provinces in the central and east, as well as Bangkok.

2. Project Timetable (April – September 2006)

Date/Month	Activities
April-May	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Questionnaire Translation and Sampling Design- Translation Checking- Meeting of project director and research assistants for the preparation of the survey- Conducting a pre-test of the questionnaire- Meeting of project director and survey researchers for introducing questionnaire, sampling process, and collecting data- Signing contractual agreements with field researchers- Beginning field work- Collecting data from 44 provincial fields- Observing the data collection
May-July	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Collecting all answered questionnaires- Raw data keyed in SPSS file- Cleaning up the raw data and analyzing them with SPSS program- Sending collected data to the Asian Barometer, Taiwan
August	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Preparing a country report: Thailand
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Submit a country report to the Asian Barometer, Taiwan

3. Respondents

The respondents for this survey were identified in February-March, 2006, through a probability sampling of eligible Thai voters, which included all Thai citizens 18 years of age and older. The survey included 1,546 respondents from a national

sample of the Thai population. It was conducted in conjunction with the Thai Senate elections in April 2006. In addition, it included an over-sample of roughly 1,500 respondents from the five southernmost provinces, whom were administered an additional 16 questions related to support for the insurgency in that area. These respondents were weighted as a corrected proportion of the Thai sample.

4. Sampling Method

The sampling process for the survey consisted of a two-stage cluster sampling, plus a systematic sampling of the final population. The stages included:

1. A systematic sample of 50 legislative districts drawn from the 400 districts of the Thai Parliament. (See appendix)

0	Region	Numbers of Election Constituencies
	North	9
	Northeast	17
	South	7
	Central and East	12
	Bangkok	5
	Total	50

2. The second stage of clusters consisted of 100 voting units (precincts) obtained by a systematic sample from across the fifty legislative districts.

Region	Voting units
North	19
Northeast	40
South	11
Central and East	22
Bangkok	8
Total	100

3. The third stage consists of systematically sampling roughly 1,500 individuals from across the 100 voting lists.

Region	Number (person)
North	252
Northeast	514
South	193
Central and East	403
Bangkok	184

Total	1,546*
--------------	---------------

* Roughly 1,500 respondents were drawn from a population of 43,261. Because the “skip interval” exceeded 28.84, a more conservative approach using 28 as the interval yielded 1,546 respondents.

If a selected respondent was unavailable, a substitute of the same gender and age was obtained by selecting a name from either side of the chosen respondent on the voting list. This procedure yielded an n-value of 1,546 respondents.

Remark: List of 34 provinces that data were collected.

7 provinces in the North

1. *Chiangrai*
2. *Chiangmai*
3. *Nan*
4. *Nakornsawan*
5. *Prae*
6. *Pichit*
7. *Sukhothai*

5 provinces in the South

1. *Krabi*
2. *Ranong*
3. *Nara Thiwas*
4. *Songkhla*
5. *Nakorn Srithammarat*

10 provinces in the Central and East

1. *Ayuttaya*
2. *Kanchanaburi*
3. *Chachoengsao*
4. *Chanthaburi*
5. *Pathum Thani*
6. *Samut Sakorn*
7. *Supanburi*
8. *Lopburi*
9. *Trad*
10. *Chonburi*

and Bangkok

11 provinces in the Northeast.

1. *Khon Kae*
2. *Nakorn Ratchasima*
3. *Mahasarakam*
4. *Mukdaharn*
5. *Roi Et*
6. *Loei*

7. *Srisaket*
8. *Sakonnakorn*
9. *Yasothon*
10. *Surin*
Ubonratchathani

5. Research Methodology

a. Preparation

(1) Questionnaire Translation

The questionnaire provided by the Asian Barometer was translated into Thai, with additional translation into Malay for the southern sample. Interviewers administered the survey in regional dialects and the use of language of the interview was recorded. It was back-translated by an American scholar who is fluent in Thai.

(2) Pre-Testing and Finalizing the Questionnaire

KPI pre-tested the questionnaire on 20 eligible voters from different socio-economic statuses in order to correct and improve translation, improve the wording of the questions, make the focus of the question clear to interviewers and interviewees, and determine the time length of the interview.

b. Field Work

(1) Field Survey

After translating the questionnaire into Thai, teams of interviewers visited each of the selected respondents who completed the questionnaire provided by the coordinators of the project. Each survey team coordinates with a regional supervisor and other assistants from the particular region. The following table shows the details about a university/institution of a regional supervisor, the data collection areas, and the number of staff in each team.

University/Institute	Data collection areas	Number of staff in team
Naresuan University, Pitsanulok	4 provinces in the North (<i>Chiangrai, Chiangmai, Nan, and Prae</i>)	1 Regional Supervisor 1 Asst. Supervisor 1 team of interviewers 10 interviewers
Rajamangala University of	3 provinces in the North	1 Regional Supervisor

University/Institute	Data collection areas	Number of staff in team
Technology Lanna, Pitsanulok Campus, Pitsanulok	<i>(Pichit, Sukhothai, and Nakornsawan)</i>	1 Asst. Supervisor 1 team of interviewers 10 interviewers
Rajabhat Sakon Nakhon University, Sakon Nakhon	11 provinces in the North east. <i>(Khon Kaen, Chaiyapoom, Nakorn Ratchasima, Mahasarakam, Mukdaharn, Roi Et, Loei, Srisaket, Sakonnakorn, Yasothorn Surin, and Ubonratchathani)</i>	1 Regional Supervisor 2 Asst. Supervisor 2 teams of interviewers 20 interviewers
Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University, Nonthaburi	6 provinces in the Central. <i>(Ayuttaya, Kanchanaburi, Pathum Thani, Samut Sakorn, Supanburi, and Lopburi)</i>	1 Regional Supervisor 1 Asst. Supervisor 1 team of interviewers 10 interviewers
Burapa University, Chonburi	4 provinces in the East. <i>(Chachoengsao, Chanthaburi, Chonburi Trad)</i>	1 Regional Supervisor 1 team of interviewers 10 interviewers
Ramkhamhang University, Bangkok	3 provinces in the South. <i>(Krabi, Ranong Nakorn Srithammarat)</i>	1 Regional Supervisor 1 team of interviewers 10 interviewers
Rajabhat Songkhla University, Songkla	<i>Narathiwat</i>	1 Regional Supervisor 1 team of interviewers 10 interviewers
Thaksin University, Songkla	<i>Songkhla</i>	1 Regional Supervisor 1 Asst. Supervisor 1 team of interviewers 10 interviewers
Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University, Nonthaburi	Bangkok	1 Regional Supervisor 1 Asst. Supervisor 1 team of interviewers 10 interviewers

Every supervisor and most of their teams also had considerable previous experience in conducting such surveys with KPI. To produce completed questionnaires for each of the selected respondents in each region, KPI provided all regional supervisors with the interview instruction manual. Each regional supervisor arranged interviewer training for questionnaire discussion and interview practice. During training and working in the field, every supervisor was in close contact with KPI. According to the schedule plan, the researchers simultaneously began to interview the respondents on April 3, 2006, and data collection was completed on April 18, 2006.

(2) Data Compilation:

The sample data was entered into a SPSS file, which was checked for illegal values, outliers, and wild codes. Whenever these occurred, a staff supervisor rechecked the specific questionnaires and made appropriate corrections. When coding issues could not be resolved, the responses were counted as “missing data.” The researchers then analyzed the data for the draft report.

6. Sample Distribution

No. of voting unit	No. of electoral district	Province	No. of eligible voters	No. of samples	Substituted by/ Extended to	Reason for substitution
72	10	<i>Chiangmai</i>	144	5	-	
182	10	<i>Chiangmai</i>	553	19	-	
109	3	<i>Chiangrai</i>	512	19	-	
219	3	<i>Chiangrai</i>	435	15	-	
96	7	<i>Chiangrai</i>	833	30	-	
3	1	<i>Nan</i>	185	7	-	
113	1	<i>Nan</i>	507	18	-	
223	1	<i>Nan</i>	572	20	-	
75	3	<i>Prae</i>	274	10	-	
185	3	<i>Prae</i>	395	14	-	
72	1	<i>Sukhothai</i>	559	20	-	
182	1	<i>Sukhothai</i>	287	10	-	
65	1	<i>Pichit</i>	133	5	-	
175	1	<i>Pichit</i>	549	20	-	
47	4	<i>Pichit</i>	109	3	-	
157	4	<i>Pichit</i>	175	7	-	
28	1	<i>Nakornsawan</i>	445	16	-	
138	1	<i>Nakornsawan</i>	400	14	-	
57	1	<i>Khon Kaen</i>	403	14	-	
137	1	<i>Khon Kaen</i>	613	22	-	
96	7	<i>Khon Kaen</i>	250	9	-	
206	7	<i>Khon Kaen</i>	250	9	-	
66	3	<i>Loei</i>	350	13	-	

No. of voting unit	No. of electoral district	Province	No. of eligible voters	No. of samples	Substituted by/ Extended to	Reason for substitution
122	3	<i>Loei</i>	375	13	-	
232	3	<i>Loei</i>	360	13	-	
56	3	<i>Maharakam</i>	222	8	-	
166	3	<i>Maharakam</i>	321	11	-	
276	3	<i>Maharakam</i>	398	14	-	
108	6	<i>Nakornratchasima</i>	275	10	-	
218	6	<i>Nakornratchasima</i>	315	11	-	
328	6	<i>Nakornratchasima</i>	274	10	-	
102	7	<i>Nakornratchasima</i>	225	8	-	
212	7	<i>Nakornratchasima</i>	185	7	-	
322	7	<i>Nakornratchasima</i>	180	6	-	
58	1	<i>Mukdaharn</i>	450	16	-	
168	1	<i>Mukdaharn</i>	400	15	-	
27	5	<i>Roi Et</i>	300	11	-	
137	5	<i>Roi Et</i>	292	10	-	
247	5	<i>Roi Et</i>	304	11	-	
19	4	<i>Sakonnakorn</i>	274	9	-	
129	4	<i>Sakonnakorn</i>	288	11	-	
23	2	<i>Yasothon</i>	635	22	-	
133	2	<i>Yasothon</i>	645	23	-	
45	4	<i>Yasothon</i>	377	14	-	
155	4	<i>Yasothon</i>	513	18	-	
47	2	<i>Srisaket</i>	135	5	-	
157	2	<i>Srisaket</i>	262	9	-	
267	2	<i>Srisaket</i>	390	14	-	
101	9	<i>Srisaket</i>	267	10	-	
211	9	<i>Srisaket</i>	205	7	-	
321	9	<i>Srisaket</i>	100	4	-	
53	9	<i>Surin</i>	306	11	-	
163	9	<i>Surin</i>	759	27	-	
58	6	<i>Surin</i>	459	16	-	
168	6	<i>Surin</i>	540	20	-	
82	3	<i>Ubonratchathani</i>	345	12	-	
192	3	<i>Ubonratchathani</i>	553	20	-	
47	8	<i>Ubonratchathani</i>	310	11	-	
157	8	<i>Ubonratchathani</i>	290	10	-	
6	2	<i>Ayuttaya</i>	590	21	-	
116	2	<i>Ayuttaya</i>	378	14	-	
29	5	<i>Kanchanaburi</i>	390	14	-	
139	5	<i>Kanchanaburi</i>	400	14	-	

No. of voting unit	No. of electoral district	Province	No. of eligible voters	No. of samples	Substituted by/ Extended to	Reason for substitution
43	1	Lopburi	590	21	-	
153	1	Lopburi	837	30	-	
71	3	Lopburi	493	17	-	
181	3	Lopburi	572	21	-	
92	2	Pathum Thani	841	30	-	
11	3	Samut Sakorn	350	12	-	
121	3	Samut Sakorn	350	13	-	
53	2	Supanburi	300	11	-	
163	2	Supanburi	300	10	-	
25	2	Chachoengsao	295	11	-	
135	2	Chachoengsao	185	6	-	
21	3	Chanthaburi	1,147	41	-	
131	3	Chanthaburi	269	10	-	
15	2	Chonburi	582	21	-	
125	2	Chonburi	664	23	-	
79	5	Chonburi	440	16	-	
25	1	Trad	580	21	-	
135	1	Trad	357	13	-	
245	1	Trad	304	11	-	
78	1	Krabi	780	27	-	
51	2	Nakornsrihammarat	350	13	-	
161	2	Nakornsrihammarat	534	19	-	
75	3	Nakornsrihammarat	325	12	-	
185	3	Nakornsrihammarat	126	4	-	
109	1	Ranong	375	13	-	
26	2	Narathiwat	432	16	-	
136	2	Narathiwat	425	15	-	
64	3	Songkla	585	21	-	
174	3	Songkla	659	23	-	
96	5	Songkla	821	30	-	
20	1	Bangkok	849	30	-	
130	1	Bangkok	426	15	-	
58	12	Bangkok	842	30	-	
50	16	Bangkok	605	22	-	
37	30	Bangkok	718	26	-	
147	30	Bangkok	644	23	-	
67	33	Bangkok	603	21	-	
177	33	Bangkok	486	19	-	

No. of voting unit	No. of electoral district	Province	No. of eligible voters	No. of samples	Substituted by/ Extended to	Reason for substitution
		1 <u>Total</u>	43,261	1,546	-	

7. Statistical Report: The Background Characteristics of Respondents

To show that the results from the sampling method and research methodology as mentioned in the previous section provided a true probability sample of the Thai eligible electorate, we present below the characteristics of the data-set of selected respondents by region, gender, age, education, marital status, and religion compared with the 2000 Population and Housing Census data.

Region

In line with Thailand's electoral demography, the largest portion of respondents resides in the Northeast (33.3%), while 25.9% live in the Central and Eastern parts of the country. The remainder is comprised of residents in the North (16.3%), Bangkok (12.5%) and the South (12.0%) respectively (Table 8-1). In comparison with Population and Housing Census Data, the %age of residents in the Northeast is 33.0%, 23.9% for the Central and Eastern region, 12.7% for the South, 19.0% for the North and 11.34% for Bangkok.

Table 8-1: of Respondents

N = 1,546

Region	Portion of respondents	Population and Housing Census Data*	χ -square significance
North	16.3	19.0	.220
Northeast	33.3	33.0	
Central and East	25.9	23.9	
South	12.0	12.7	
Bangkok	12.5	11.3	
Total	100.0	100.0	

* Census data conducted by National Statistical Office Thailand is for those aged 15 and above in 2000.

Gender

Table 8-2 shows that more than half of the respondents (52%) are female and the rest (48%) are male. By comparison with the Census, 51.4% of the population was female and 48.6% was male. Thus, the sample provides slightly more representation to women.

Table 8-2: Gender Portions of Respondents*N* = 1,546

Gender	Portion of respondents	Population and Housing Census Data*	χ-square significance
Male	48.0	48.6	.157
Female	52.0	51.4	
Total	100.0	100.0	

* Census data conducted by National Statistical Office Thailand is for those aged 15 and above in 2000.

Age

For analytical purposes, respondents' ages were divided into four aggregated categories: 18–24 years old, 25–39 years old, 40–59 years old, and 60 years old and over. Table 8-3 illustrates that 40.3% of respondents are 40–59 years old, while 32.8% are 25–39 years old, 14.7% are 60 years old and over, and 12.2% of respondents are 18–24 years old. In comparison with the Census, 16.7% of the population were 18–24 years old, 38% were 25–39 years old, 31.8% were 40–59 years old and 13.4% were 60 years old and over. The sample therefore over-represents seniors (aged 60 and over) by approximately 1%, and under-represents the young (aged under 25) by about 5%.

Table 8-3: Age Groups of Respondents*N* = 1,546

Ages	Portion of respondents	Population and Housing Census Data*	χ-square significance
18 – 24 years old	12.2	16.7	.213
25 – 39 years old	32.8	38.0	
40 – 59 years old	40.3	31.8	
60 years old and over	14.7	13.4	
Total	100.0	100.0	

* Census data conducted by National Statistical Office Thailand is for those aged 15 and above in 2000.

Marital Status

Table 8-5 illustrates the marital status of respondents as follows: 71.1% of respondents are married/live-in, 20% are single, and 9% are widowed or separated. Based on an extrapolation of Census data, the sample over-represents married individuals by 12.7% and under-represents single individuals by about 6%.

Table 8-5: Marital Status*N* = 1,546

Marital Status	Portion of respondents	Population and Housing Census Data	χ-square significance
Single	20.0	26.4	.213

Married/live-in	71.1	58.4
Widowed/Separated	9.0	15.2
Total	100.0	100.0

* Census data conducted by National Statistical Office Thailand is for those aged 13 and above in 2000.

Education Level

While the questionnaire recorded respondents' level of education according to a ten-category scale, for analytic purposes the sample was divided into four aggregated levels of education. As illustrated in Table 8-4, 55% of respondents completed primary school, while 24.2% completed upper secondary or vocational school. Only 16.1% of respondents held a bachelor's degree or higher, and 4.7% of respondents had received no formal education. The Census data indicates that while 59.0% of the population completed primary school, 23.6% completed elementary school, and 7.9% completed a bachelor's degree or higher, the sample under-represents no formal education individuals. However, for the census data, the non-formal education population and people currently attending some primary schools are included.

Table 8-4: Education Levels

N = 1,546

Education Levels	Portion of respondents	Population and Housing Census Data*	χ -square significance
No formal education	4.7	8.6	.199
Primary	55.0	59.6	
Elementary	24.2	23.8	
University/College degree	16.1	8.0	
Total	100.0	100.0	

Census data conducted by National Statistical Office Thailand is for those aged 6 and above in 2000, and the %age used for comparison as shown in the table above excluded religious education, other education and unknown level of education.

Religion

Table 8-6 demonstrates that nearly 94% of respondents are Buddhists. However, respondents also include 0.3% Christians and 6.0% Muslims. The Census data indicates that while 94.6% of Thais are Buddhist, the sample under-represents Christians, who constitute 0.7% of the population, and over-represents Muslims, who constitute only 4.6%.

Table 8-6: Religion

N = 1,546

Religion	Portion of respondents	Population and Housing Census Data	χ-square significance
Buddhist	93.7	94.6	.199
Islam	6.0	4.6	
Christian	0.3	0.7	
Total	100.0	100.0	

* Census data conducted by National Statistical Office Thailand is for the entire population of the whole kingdom in 2000

附錄四 蒙古調查執行報告

Asian Barometer 2006 Survey TECHNICAL REPORT (Mongolia) May 25-June 9, 2006

1. Location

The Asian Barometer 2006 Survey covered the entire Mongolia and had eight major study areas based on 76 electoral districts: Ulaanbaatar capital city, Western, Northern, Central I, Central II, Central III, Eastern and Southern regions.

2. Timetable

Fieldwork:

Regions	Date
Ulaanbaatar and vicinity	May 25-June 9, 2006
Western region	May 25-June 6, 2006
Northern region	May 27-June 9, 2006
Central I	May 25-June 5, 2006
Central II	May 25-June 4, 2006
Central III	May 31-June 7, 2006
Eastern region	May 27-June 9, 2006
Southern region	May 31-June 6, 2006

3. Respondents

Data was gathered through face-to-face interviews of voting-age Mongol men and women (18 years old and above) as respondents. It asked a host of questions about political, social and economic issues, some undertaken as regular indicators monitored over time and others reflective of current concerns as well as specific personal information. It also obtained information and background characteristics about the household and family members.

4. Sampling Method

Sample Sizes and Error Margins. An indicator of data quality is the standard error of the estimate, on which the margin for sampling error is based. As survey statistics are mostly proportions, the key measure of data precision is the standard error of a proportion taken from a sample. It is computed as follows:

$$\pm Z * \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}$$

Where Z , at 95% confidence level is 1.96; p is the sample proportion estimate and n is the sample size. The overall sample size of 1,211 voting-age adults gives a maximum error margin of $\pm 3\%$ at the 95% confidence level, assuming a simple random sampling design. The sampling error is at its highest when the true

proportion being estimated is close to 50%. The total sample size was 1206 voting-age adults. Totally **1211** interviews were collected.

Sampling scheme. The survey had a four stage random sampling design. This design uses as its sampling frame the list of the administrative units Aimaks (provinces) and cities of Mongolia, divided into 76 electoral districts. The lower administrative level the Soums (counties) and Districts in the cities, is our Secondary Sampling Unit. Different number of Soums and Districts per PSU, which shown in the Appendix 1, has been chosen. The data used in the appendix based on the data of the last presidential election 2005.

Regions	Number of eligible voters	Sample%=x*1206	
Ulaanbaatar and vicinity	432660	34,8%	410
Western region	165031	13,3%	168
Northern region	136930	11%	132
Central I	113378	9,1%	120
Central II	82915	6,7%	80
Central III	123316	9,9%	120
Eastern region	102313	8,3%	96
Southern region	85148	6,9%	80
Total	1241691	100%	1206

First stage – selection of PSU:

From regional lists divided into election districts PSUs has been selected using a Probability Proportionate to Size interval from a randomly generated starting point.

Second stage – selection of SSU:

Per PSU number of Soums (in Aimaks) and Districts (in Cities) has been also selected using a random selection procedure. (See appendix 2)

Third stage – selection of Households:

A random starting point has been chosen in each Soums and then at concrete interval households has been selected. Each team has cards with numbers from 5 to 15 used for this stage. All selection procedures in each Soums noted in a special protocol and signed by supervisor. Households in rural divided into two groups, the Soum centre and nomadic, in order to represent both groups of population living in the rural. The teams has produced simple maps before starting the interview process to ensure the use of the interval procedure does not exclude particular areas of the Soums and to facilitate post-hoc spot checks. The Academy now has the maps of all Soums in countryside where the survey conducted. Selection of nomads living between Soum centres was made using dice.

Fourth stage – selection of Respondent:

To select respondents in a selected household a Kish Grid table is used. Each interviewer has the table in own manual and to select randomly the respondent a dice is used in each household.

Number of Calls and Substitution

If the randomly selected household is unavailable or refused to be interviewed, interviewer had to go to the left sided household (if the household is unavailable too, to the right sided one) to get a substitute respondent. The substitute respondent does not affect selected intervals in the sample region.

5. Research Methodology

a. Preparation

(1) Questionnaire

The English version of the questionnaire was translated into Mongolian by the staff of the Academy and some amendments and changes were made based on the country specifics (Attachment 1). Then the language translation underwent cognitive pretests to make sure that the messages were conveyed accurately.

(2) Pre-Testing and Finalizing the Questionnaire

Pre-testing of the questionnaire was made on 20 voting-age adults from different socio-economic classes from urban and rural area. The goal of the pre-test was to:

- Determine the time length of the interview
- Improve the wording of the questions
- Eliminate unnecessary questions or add new items, as the case may be
- Test question sequence and identify bases
- Correct and improve translation
- Change open-ended questions into multiple-choice questions
- Find out which items are conceptually vague
- Check accuracy and adequacy of the questionnaire instructions
- Determine whether the focus of the question is clear
- Identify interviewer's recording difficulties
- Finalizing interviewer and supervisor's manuals and show card

(3) Training

(b) Training has been conducted in Ulaanbaatar city and branch offices of the Academy in Darkhan-Uul, Dornod, Dundgovi, Uvurhangai, Khovd and Khuvsgul provinces.

(b) Training time - The minimum training time for group supervisors and interviewers was 2 days prior to field implementation. During the days the field supervisor observed the field interviewers on their first interviews.

(c) Training Activities:

One day to learn the basic of the project for new interviewers, training

of sampling area, household, sample method including Kish Grid. One day to practice on questionnaire by interviewing each other as respondents. Interviews were practiced with a supervisor around until the interviewer could be left on her own.

- (e) Evaluation of interviewer's work - All first interviews of each field interviewer were observed by her field supervisor, and then evaluated. Only after meeting a certain evaluation criteria was an interviewer left to interview on her own, although her field supervisor always stayed within the vicinity of the sample spot to conduct checks.

b. Field Work

(1) Workers on Hand

For this project, a total of 48 field staffs (21 from the Academy) have been deployed:

Region	Field supervisor	Field interviewer	Field manager
Ulaanbaatar and vicinity	4	17	1
Western	1	3	-
Northern	1	3	-
Central I	1	3	-
Central II	1	3 (Darchan), 4 (Orchon)	-
Central III	1	3	-
Eastern	1	3	-
Southern	1	3	-

Note: *Except Ulaanbaatar, in all regions supervisors conducted about 10 % of all interviews*

(2) Supervision

(a) Evaluation of interviewer's work

All first interviews of each field interviewer are observed by field supervisor, and then evaluated. Each supervisor had to note the results and remarks of the observation in protocol. Only after meeting a certain evaluation criteria is an interviewer left to interview on his/her own, although his/her field supervisor always stays within the vicinity of the sample spot to conduct checks.

(b) Field supervisors (Academy's central office staff) reporting to central office monitor the study full time. Supervisors observed about 28% of all interviews, followed up and did surprise checks on 24% of all respondents during field survey. This number is noted in the protocol of supervisors. Field supervisors ensured that field logistics are received promptly and administered properly.

(c) Spot checking

Part of quality control is to make sure at least 30% of each interviewer's

output is spot-checked. To do it, supervisors had to check all interview records every day and note all remarks in the protocol. Once an incomplete or inconsistent answer is spotted in the questionnaire, the field interviewer goes back to the respondent's house to re-ask the question for verification. Reasking percentage is less than 10%.

(d) Back checking

After finishing the field surveys and collecting data, back checking was made from central office of the Academy. Where it was possible telephone number of respondents was noted in the last page of interview form. Back checking has been conducted using the phone numbers of randomly selected respondents. Because in rural only in province centers respondents have home phone or mobile phone, it is not possible to include Soum level respondents in the back checking. About 20% of all interviews were back checked.

c. Field Editing

(a) After each interview, the interviewer was asked to go over her own work and check for consistency.

(b) All accomplished interview schedules were submitted to the assigned group supervisor who, in turn, edited every interview.

(c) Data Processing

(1) Office editors conduct final consistency checks on all interviews prior to coding. All supervisors have submitted report on field survey along with maps of sampled area, supervisor's protocol and receipts of expenditure, including respondents cash payment signature's list.

(2) Interview spot checking

Randomly selected interviews were spot checked by a person from outside. Some minor inaccuracy was detected. For instance, interviewers 02 and 03 conducted 11-14 interviews in one day, which are not possible at all. Because these interviews conducted in remote Soum area, there was no possibility to check back the interviews.

(3) Translating and preparation of coding of open-ended questions.

(a) Memo on Code Q.91 and Q. 100-102 were translated into Mongolian language.

(b) SE12 was changed according to country specifics.

(c) To prepare guiding for data entering of the open-ended questions, 300 interviews were analyzed to find most frequent responds and differences from the Coding Scheme. After this procedure the guide for data entering was finalized.

4) Data entering and cleaning.

(a) 5 persons were responsible for data entering under supervision of project leader. Each person had a special designed sheet for noting strange cases to be resolved by supervisor.

(b) For checking and data cleaning SPSS was used to obtain a frequency distribution of the variables. After it a cross table was produced to see if the responses make sense for some variables which are part of the same question. (38/39,39A; 51/51A; 157-160/161-164)

6. Weighting Procedure

(a) To yield representative figures at the national level, census-based population weights are applied to the survey data. The weight projection is computed by dividing the projected population in the area by the sample size of the same area. Appropriate projected factors were applied so that original population proportions were reflected in the data tables using this formula.

$$\text{Projection factors (Weight)} = \frac{\text{Population No. of Interviews}}{\text{No. of Interviews}}$$

For questions answered by the sample voting-age adults, the following projection factors were used:

Regions	2005 Election data. Number of eligible voters	Total sample size	Projection factor for 1 probability Respondent (000)
Ulaanbaatar and vicinity	432 660	410	1,03507177033492
Western region	165 031	168	1,03144375
Northern region	136 930	132	1,03734848484848
Central I	113 378	120	1,04016513761467
Central II	82 915	80	1,0364375
Central III	123 316	120	1,0362689075630
Eastern region	102 313	96	1,04401020408163
Southern region	85 148	80	1,06435
Total	1 241 691	1206	

(b) The data was weighted by gender and age, which statistics are more accurate in Mongolia. Regarding statistics on educational groups, we are not sure to use it. Gender and age statistics are used from Population and Housing Census, 2000 and Mongolian Statistical Yearbook, 2004.

(1) Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
AGROUP1 * GENDER Gender	1207	99.7%	4	.3%	1211	100.0%

*AGROUP1 * GENDER Gender Crosstabulation (before weighting)*

			GENDER Gender		Total	
			1 male	2 female		
AGROUP1	1	18 - 24	Count	75	123	198
			% of Total	6.2%	10.2%	16.4%
	2	25 - 29	Count	41	88	129
			% of Total	3.4%	7.3%	10.7%
	3	30 - 39	Count	129	197	326
			% of Total	10.7%	16.3%	27.0%
	4	40 - 49	Count	143	138	281
			% of Total	11.8%	11.4%	23.3%
	5	50 - 59	Count	67	76	143
			% of Total	5.6%	6.3%	11.8%
	6	60 +	Count	67	63	130
			% of Total	5.6%	5.2%	10.8%
Total			Count	522	685	1207
			% of Total	43.2%	56.8%	100.0%

*AGROUP1 * GENDER Gender Crosstabulation (after weighting)*

			GENDER Gender		Total	
			1 male	2 female		
AGROUP1	1	18 - 24	Count	155	151	306
			% of Total	12.8%	12.5%	25.4%
	2	25 - 29	Count	92	93	185
			% of Total	7.6%	7.7%	15.3%
	3	30 - 39	Count	151	153	304
			% of Total	12.5%	12.7%	25.2%
	4	40 - 49	Count	99	102	201
			% of Total	8.2%	8.5%	16.7%
	5	50 - 59	Count	49	52	101
			% of Total	4.1%	4.3%	8.4%
	6	60 +	Count	48	62	110

		% of Total	4.0%	5.1%	9.1%
Total		Count	594	613	1207
		% of Total	49.2%	50.8%	100.0%

(2) Syntax: age/gender weighting

```
compute agroup1 =106-se3.
recode agroup1 (18 thru 24 = 1) (25 thru 29 =2) (30 thru 39 = 3)
(40 thru 49 = 4) (50 thru 59= 5) ( 60 thru highest = 6) .
value labels agroup1 1'18 - 24' 2'25 - 29' 3'30 - 39' 4'40 - 49' 5'50 - 59'
6'60 +' .
fre / var agroup1.
```

```
compute sweight=1.
if (agroup1 eq 1 and gender eq 1) sweight =2.06452.
if (agroup1 eq 1 and gender eq 2) sweight =1.22549.
if (agroup1 eq 2 and gender eq 1) sweight =2.23529.
if (agroup1 eq 2 and gender eq 2) sweight =1.05479.
if (agroup1 eq 3 and gender eq 1) sweight =1.16822.
if (agroup1 eq 3 and gender eq 2) sweight =0.77914.
if (agroup1 eq 4 and gender eq 1) sweight =0.69491.
if (agroup1 eq 4 and gender eq 2) sweight =0.73684.
if (agroup1 eq 5 and gender eq 1) sweight =0.73214.
if (agroup1 eq 5 and gender eq 2) sweight =0.68253.
if (agroup1 eq 6 and gender eq 1) sweight =0.71428.
if (agroup1 eq 6 and gender eq 2) sweight =0.98076.
```

7. Sample Spots

Geographic region	District number	Substituted by/ Extended to	Sample	PSU*SSU* Household
1. Ulaanbaatar city	Ten districts		410	10x4x10
	58, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68, 70, 72, 74, 76th districts	-----	41 in each	
2. Western region	Two districts		164	2x4x21
Bayan-Ulgii province /Sagsai, Tsengel, Ulaanhus, Nогоон-нуур soums/	6	-----	84	
Uvs province /Ulaangom 1-4 units/	39	-----	84	
3. Nothern region	Two districts		132	2x3x22
Arhangai province /Tariat, Tsahir, Ikh-tamir soums/	1	-----	66	
Khuvsgul province /Tsagaan-uul,	46	-----	66	

Burentogtokh, Murun soums/				
4. Central I	Two districts		120	2x4x15
Bayanhongor province /Bayanlig, Bayangovi, Bogd, Jinst soums/	8	-----	60	
Uvurhangai province /Arvaikher, Taragt, Guchin-us soums/	24	-----	60	
5. Central II	Two districts		80	2x10x4
Darkhan-Uul city /1-11 subdistricts /	53	-----	40	
Orkhon city /Rashaant, Shand, Naran, Tsagaanchuluut, Bulag, Buren-bust, Denj, Sogoot, Uurkhaichin subdistricts/	55	-----	40	
6. Central III	Two districts		120	2x3x20
Bulgan province /Rashaant, Dashinchilen, Bayan-nuur soums/	11	-----	60	
Tuv province /Altanbulag, Bayan-onjuul, Undurshireet soums/	36	-----	60	
7. Eastern region	Two districts		96	2x4x12
Dornod province /Bayantumen, Choibalsan, Sergelen, Bayandun soums/	17	-----	48	
Khentii /Norovlin, Dadal, Berkh, Batnorov soums/	49	-----	48	
8. Southern region	Two districts		80	2x4x10
Govisumber, Dornogovi provinces /Sumber, Shivegovi, Airag, Dalanjargalan soums/	14	-----	40	
Dundgovi province /Saintsagaan, Bayanjargal, Undurshil, Gurvansaikhan soums/	20	-----	40	

附錄五 印尼調查執行報告

Asian Barometer 2006 Survey TECHNICAL REPORT (Indonesia) November 15-29 November, 2006

1. Location

The **Asian Barometer 2006 Survey** covered the entire Indonesian archipelago and had three major study zones: Western Indonesia, Central Indonesia, and Eastern Indonesia.

2. Timetable

Fieldwork:

Western Indonesia	-	15-29 November, 2006
Central Indonesia	-	15-29 November, 2006
Eastern Indonesia	-	15-29 November, 2006

3. Respondents

Data was gathered through face-to-face interviews of voting-age adults (17 years old and above). The survey asked a host of questions about political, social, and economic issues, some undertaken as regular indicators monitored over time and others reflective of current concerns, as well as specific personal information. It also obtained information and background characteristics about the household, the household head, and family members.

4. Sampling Method

Sample Sizes and Error Margins. An indicator of data quality is the standard error of the estimate, on which the margin for sampling error is based. As survey statistics are mostly proportions, the key measure of data precision is the standard error of a proportion taken from a sample. It is computed as follows:

$$\pm Z * \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}$$

Where Z , at a 95% confidence level is 1.96, p is the sample proportion estimate, and n is the sample size.

The overall sample size of 1,558 voting-age adults gives a maximum error margin of $\pm 2.5\%$ at the 95% confidence level, assuming a simple random sampling design. The sampling error is at its highest when the true proportion being estimated is close to 50%.

The following approximate 95%-confidence margins for sampling error should be made when aggregating data at various levels:

	<u>Sample Size</u>	<u>Error Margin</u>
The original	1,600	±2.5%
Actual with substitution	1,598	±2.5%
Actual without substitution	1,440	±2.7%

However, somewhat higher error margins should be expected since multi-stage cluster sampling was used; this design-effect is not readily measurable through established statistical software.

Response Rate. The original sample size was 1,600 respondents. There were 1,440 successful interviews without substitution, and therefore the response rate is 90%. The number of substitutions is 158, and there were two unsuccessful interviews because of incomplete results.

Sampling scheme.

Stage 1. Study Areas. Indonesia was divided into three study areas: Western Indonesia, Central Indonesia, and Eastern Indonesia. Based on population proportion, 80 regencies/districts were selected as primary sampling units in the three regions. In each selected regency, two villages were randomly selected to be sampling units.

The allocation of villages in the three regions were as follows:

Western Indonesia	128
Central Indonesia	28
Eastern Indonesia	4

Using probability proportional to population size (PPS) of the regions, the locations of villages and regencies/cities in provinces were as follows:

<i>Province/regency/village</i>	<i>CENTRAL INDONESIA</i>	<i>EASTERN INDONESIA</i>
WESTERN INDONESIA		
ACEH NAGGROE DARUSSALAM (4 PSU)	BALI (2 PSU)	MALUKU (2 PSU)
Bireun	Karang Asem	Maluku Tenggara Barat
Kota Bireun	Sinduwati	Ilwaki
Dayah Mesjid	Bunutan	Saumlaki
Aceh Tamiang	WEST NUSA TENGGARA	PAPUA (2 PSU)

	(4 PSU)	
Selamat	Lombok Timur	Kota Jayapura
Seunebok Dalam Upah	Pemongkong	Koya Barat
	Sekarteja	Hamadi
NORTH SUMATERA	Kota Bima	
Tapanuli Selatan	Nae	
Parmonangan	Melayu	
Batang Onang Lama		
Langkat	EAST NUSA TENGGARA (2 PSU)	
Parit Bindu	Ende	
Paluh Manis	Mautapaga	
	Niopanda	
Kota Pematang Siantar		
Sipinggol-pinggol		
Siopat Suhu	WEST KALIMANTAN (2 PSU)	
	Sambas	
Kota Medan	Selakau Tua	
Sari Rejo	Sabaran	
Kota Bangun		
	Kota Pontianak (2 PSU)	
	Sungai Bangkong	
WEST SUMATERA (4 PSU)	Siantan Hilir	
Pasaman		
Nagari Katiagan		
Nagari Tarung-Tarung	CENTRAL KALIMANTAN (2 PSU)	
	Kapuas	
Kota Padang	Terusan Makmur	
Olo	Binakarya/C-1	
Lubuk Buaya		
	SOUTH KALIMANTAN (2 PSU)	
RIAU (2 PSU)	Hulu Sungai Tengah	
Rokan Hilir	Lunjuk	
Gelora	Jaranih	
Bagan Timur		

	EAST KALIMANTAN (2 PSU)	
RIAU ARCHIPELAGO (2 PSU)	Pasir	
Kota Batam	Tanah Grogot	
Muka Kuning	Muara Telake	
Harapan Baru		
	NORTH SULAWESI (2 PSU)	
SOUTH SUMATERA (4 PSU)	Bolaang Mongondow	
Musi Banyu Asin	Kotabunan	
Terusan	Lolak	
Teluk Kijing 1		
Banyu Asin	CENTRAL SULAWESI (4 PSU)	
Lubuk Karet	Banggai	
Teluk Tenggirik	Singkoyo	
	Bungin	
LAMPUNG (6 PSU)	Donggala	
Lampung Barat	Pewunu	
Kota Batu	Tibo	
Pampangan		
Lampung Tengah	SOUTH SULAWESI (4 PSU)	
Surabaya	Gowa	
Rama Dewa	Pangkabinanga	
	Bontomanai	
Tulangbawang		
Tirta Kencana	Maros	
Pasiran Jaya	Baju Bodoa	
	Tukamasea	
DKI JAKARTA (8 PSU)		
Jakarta Selatan	EASTERN INDONESIA	
Petukangan Utara	MALUKU (2 PSU)	
Manggarai	Maluku Tenggara Barat	
	Ilwaki	
Jakarta Timur	Saumlaki	
Gedong		
Pondok Kelapa	PAPUA (2 PSU)	

	Kota Jayapura	
Jakarta Pusat	Koya Barat	
Kebon Sirih	Hamadi	
Kemayoran		
Jakarta Utara		
Kebon Bawang		
Semper Barat		
WEST JAVA (32 PSU)		
Bogor		
Cibunian		
Leuwikaret		
Sukabumi		
Bojongsari		
Nagrak		
Cianjur		
Sukamanah		
Rahong		
Bandung		
Tanggulun		
Girimukti		
Garut		
Paas		
Sucikaler		
Tasikmalaya		
Pangliaran		
Cikunir		
Ciamis		
Karangpawitan		
Mekarjadi		
Cirebon		
Sumber		
Panunggul		

Indramayu		
Situraja		
Majasari		
Subang		
Pakuhaji		
Jatireja		
Purwakarta		
Liunggunung		
Nagrikaler		
Karawang		
Talunjaya		
Pejaten		
Bekasi		
Karangsambung		
Kedungpengawas		
Kota Bogor		
Ciparigi		
Cibadak		
Kota Sukabumi		
Baros		
Benteng		
Kota Bandung		
Cipadung Kulon		
Dago		
CENTRAL JAVA (26 PSU)		
Banyumas		
Gumelar Lor		
Kota Yasa		
Wonosobo		
Surojoyo		

Wonosobo		
Boyolali		
Tanduk		
Donohudan		
Klaten		
Gemblengan		
Gedongjetis		
Karanganyar		
Karanglo		
Banjarharjo		
Blora		
Sumberpitu		
Tlogowungu		
Jejara		
Kerso		
Kecapi		
Batang		
Sendang		
Denasri Kulon		
Pekalongan		
Pekiringan Ageng		
Pegumengan Mas		
Pemalang		
Bojongnangka		
Kertosari		
Tegal		
Globogan Kulon		
Jatibogor		
Kota Surakarta		
Penumping		
Jebres		

Kota Semarang		
Karanganyar Gunung		
Miroto		
EAST JAVA (26 PSU)		
Pacitan		
Donorojo		
Petungsinarang		
Trenggalek		
Masaran		
Krandegan		
Kediri		
Manggis		
Basongan		
Malang		
Purworejo		
Kepanjen		
Lumajang		
Purwosono		
Curahpetung		
Jember		
Curahnangka		
Kamal		
Banyuwangi		
Gentengkulon		
Watukebo		
Jombang		
Mejoyolosari		
Tengaran		
Ngawi		
Keras Wetan		
Katikan		

Bojonegoro		
Megale		
Ngumpak Dalem		
Gresik		
Balongpanggang		
Pangkah Kulon		
Sumenep		
Payudan Daleman		
Duko		
Kota Surabaya		
Mojo		
Sidodadi		
BANTEN (6 PSU)		
Lebak		
Cinginggang		
Cijoro Lebak		
Tangerang		
Pondok Kacang Timur		
Cengklong		
Serang		
Sukaratu		
Pakuncen		

Stage 2. Selection of Sample Village.

In each selected regency/city, village names were listed and then two were selected by systematic random sampling.

Stage 3. Selection of Households.

In each selected village, five Rukun Tetangga (RT, neighborhoods) were established by random numbers. In each selected RT, households were listed and two of them were selected by using random numbers.

Stage 4. Respondent Selection.

In every selected household, voting age members were listed (male or female only). One person was then selected to be a survey respondent based on the Kish Grid system.

Stage 5. Substitution.

In case the selected respondent could not be interviewed (e.g., unavailable after two visits to the household during interview time set for a particular village, interview refusal, etc.), the respondent was substituted with a voting-age person from the household to the left side of the originally selected household. Selection of that respondent followed Stage 4. In case the newly selected respondent could not be interviewed, the interviewer moved to the right side of the originally selected household. The same procedure for selecting a respondent from that household was applied.

5. Research Methodology

a. Preparation

(1) Questionnaire

The definitive language version of the questionnaire is Bahasa Indonesia, which is a translated version from the original questionnaire in English. Then the language translation underwent cognitive pretests to make sure that the messages were conveyed accurately.

(2) Pre-Testing and Finalizing the Questionnaire

LSI pre-tested the questionnaire on 17 voting-age adults from different socio-economic classes in order to:

- Determine the time length of the interview,
- Improve the wording of the questions, if necessary,
- Eliminate unnecessary questions or add new items, as the case may be,
- Test question sequence and identify bases,
- Correct and improve translation,
- Change open-ended questions into multiple-choice questions,
- Find out which items are conceptually vague,
- Check accuracy and adequacy of the questionnaire instructions,

- Determine whether the focus of the question is clear, and
- Identify interviewer's recording difficulties.

(3) Training

- (c) LSI had two levels of trainings. LSI conducted the first level of training in Jakarta by inviting all areas coordinators of LSI to special sessions. The aim of this training was to give the coordinators a general picture of the survey, as well as read and review the questionnaire. The second level of training took place in various provinces of Indonesia. The area coordinators who received knowledge disseminated information to surveyors in their respective areas. Particular attention was given to areas with large primary sampling units such as West Java, Central Java, and East Java and where researchers from LSI's head office were most involved in the training.
- (b) Training time - The minimum training time for group supervisors and interviewers was two days prior to field implementation. The third day was the start-off, where the field supervisor observed the field interviewers during their first round of interviews.
- (c) Training Activities - These mainly consisted of one or two days of office training to learn the basics of the project and mock interviews among participants. The latter activity meant that field interviewers interviewed field anchors as if they were respondents in order to get accustomed to the flow of interviewing and the questionnaire format. Interviewers practiced with a supervisor until they could sufficiently conduct interviews on their own.
- (f) Evaluation of interviewer's work - A field supervisor observed and evaluated all of the first interviews of each field interviewer. Only after meeting certain evaluation criteria was an interviewer left to interview on her own. The field supervisor always stayed within the vicinity of the sample spot to conduct checks, however.

b. Fieldwork

(1) Workers on Hand

For this project, LSI deployed a total of 174 field staff:

Overall Field Manager = 1

Western Indonesia Field Anchors = 12 Field Interviewers = 135

Central Indonesia Field Anchors = 10 Field Interviewers = 35

Eastern Indonesia Field Anchors = 2 Field Interviewers = 4

(2) Supervision

Supervisors reported to the field manager and monitored the study full-time. They observed interviewers, where at least 10% of the total interviews were observed by supervisors, conducted follow-ups, and did surprise checks on the field interviewers. They also ensured that field logistics were received promptly and administered properly.

(3) Spot-checking

Part of quality control was to make sure at least 30% of each interviewer's output was spot-checked and back-checked. Once an incomplete or inconsistent answer was spotted in the questionnaire, the field interviewer went back to the respondent's house to re-ask the question for verification.

c. Field Editing

(a) After each interview, the interviewer was asked to go over his or her own work and check for consistency.

(b) All accomplished interview schedules were submitted to the assigned group supervisor who, in turn, edited every interview.

(c) Data Processing

(1) Office editors conducted final consistency checks on all interviews prior to coding.

(2) A data entry computer program verified and checked the consistency of the encoded data before data tables were generated.

6. Sample Spots

Zone Province Regency/District (PSU) Village	The Number of Substitution	Reason for Substitution/Extension
---	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

WESTERN INDONESIA		
ACEH NAGGROE DARUSSALAM		
Bireun		
Kota Bireun	1	Unavailable
Dayah Mesjid	1	“
Aceh Tamiang		
Selamat		
Seunebok Dalam Upah	1	“
NORTH SUMATERA		
Tapanuli Selatan		
Parmonangan	3	1 Sick, 2 unavailable
Batang Onang Lama	5	3 Unavailable, 2 reject
Langkat		
Parit Bindu	4	2 reject, 2 unavailable
Paluh Manis	1	Unavailable
Kota Pematang Siantar		
Sipinggol-pinggol	6	2 reject, 4 unavailable
Siopat Suhu	1	Unavailable
Kota Medan		
Sari Rejo	9	6 unavailable, 3 reject
Kota Bangun	8	5 reject, 3 unavailable
WEST SUMATERA		
Pasaman		
Nagari Katiagan	1	Unavailable
Nagari Tarung-Tarung		
Kota Padang		
Olo		
Lubuk Buaya		
RIAU		
Rokan Hilir		
Gelora	1	Unavailable

Bagan Timur	1	Unavailable
RIAU ARCHIPELAGO		
Kota Batam		
Muka Kuning	1	Unavailable
Harapan Baru	2	Unavailable
SOUTH SUMATERA		
Musi Banyu Asin		
Terusan		
Teluk Kijing 1		
Banyu Asin		
Lubuk Karet		
Teluk Tenggara		
LAMPUNG		
Lampung Barat		
Kota Batu	2	One reject, one unavailable
Pampangan	2	Reject
Lampung Tengah		
Surabaya	3	1 unavailable, two reject
Rama Dewa		
Tulangbawang		
Tirta Kencana		
Pasiran Jaya		
DKI JAKARTA		
Jakarta Selatan		
Petukangan Utara		
Manggarai		
Jakarta Timur		
Gedong	3	Two reject, one unavailable
Pondok Kelapa		
Jakarta Pusat		

Kebon Sirih	1	Unavailable
Kemayoran	2	One sick, one unavailable
Jakarta Utara		
Kebon Bawang	1	Sick
Semper Barat		
WEST JAVA		
Bogor		
Cibunian		
Leuwikaret	1	Unavailable
Sukabumi		
Bojongsari	2	Unavailable
Nagrak	1	Reject
Cianjur		
Sukamanah	1	Unavailable
Rahong		
Bandung		
Tanggulun	3	Unavailable
Girimukti	2	Unavailable
Garut		
Paas		
Sucikaler	2	Unavailable
Tasikmalaya		
Pangliaran	2	Unavailable
Cikunir		
Ciamis		
Karangpawitan	2	Unavailable
Mekarjadi	3	Unavailable
Cirebon		
Sumber	2	Unavailable
Panunggul	2	Unavailable
Indramayu		

Situraja		
Majasari		
Subang		
Pakuhaji		
Jatireja		
Purwakarta		
Liunggunung	2	Unavailable
Nagrikaler		
Karawang		
Talunjaya	1	Unavailable
Pejaten	2	Unavailable
Bekasi		
Karangsambung	1	Unavailable
Kedungpengawas	1	Unavailable
Kota Bogor		
Ciparigi	2	Unavailable
Cibadak		
Kota Sukabumi		
Baros	4	One reject, 3 unavailable
Benteng	3	Unavailable
Kota Bandung		
Cipadung Kulon		
Dago	3	One sick, 2 unavailable
CENTRAL JAVA		
Banyumas		
Gumelar Lor		
Kota Yasa		
Wonosobo		
Surojoyo		
Wonosobo		

Boyolali		
Tanduk	2	Unavailable
Donohudan	7	3 reject, 4 unavailable
Klaten		
Gemblengan	1	Unavailable
Gedongjetis		
Karanganyar		
Karanglo		
Banjarharjo		
Blora		
Sumberpitu		
Tlogowungu		
Jejara		
Kerso		
Kecapi		
Batang		
Sendang		
Denasri Kulon	2	Unavailable
Pekalongan		
Pekiringan Ageng		
Pegumengan Mas	1	Unavailable
Pemalang		
Bojongnangka		
Kertosari		
Tegal		
Globogan Kulon		
Jatibogor		
Kota Surakarta		
Penumping	1	Unavailable
Jebres	2	Unavailable
Kota Semarang		
Karanganyar Gunung		

Miroto	3	Unavailable, 1 reject
EAST JAVA		
Pacitan		
Donorojo		
Petungsinarang		
Trenggalek		
Masaran		
Krandegan		
Kediri		
Manggis		
Bangsongan	1	Unavailable
Malang		
Purworejo	1	Unavailable
Kepanjen	1	Unavailable
Lumajang		
Purwosono	1	Unavailable
Curahpetung		
Jember		
Curahnangka		
Kamal		
Banyuwangi		
Gentengkulon	1	Unavailable
Watukebo		
Jombang		
Mejoyolosari	1	Unavailable
Tengaran		
Ngawi		
Keras Wetan		
Katikan		
Bojonegoro		
Megale		
Ngumpak Dalem		

Gresik		
Balompanggung		
Pangkajene		
Sumenep		
Payudan Daleman		
Duko	1	Unavailable
Kota Surabaya		
Mojo		
Sidodadi	4	Unavailable, 1 reject
BANTEN		
Lebak		
Cinginggang		
Cijoro Lebak		
Tangerang		
Pondok Kacang Timur		
Cengkong	1	Unavailable
Serang		
Sukaratu	1	Unavailable
Pakuncen		
CENTRAL INDONESIA		
BALI		
Karang Asem		
Sinduwati		
Bunutan		
WEST NUSA TENGGARA		
Lombok Timur		
Pemongkong		
Sekarteja		
Kota Bima		
Nae		
Melayu		

EAST NUSA TENGGARA		
Ende		
Mautapaga	3	Unavailable, 1 reject
Niopanda		
WEST KALIMANTAN		
Sambas		
Selakau Tua		
Sabaran		
Kota Pontianak		
Sungai Bangkong	4	Unavailable
Siantan Hilir	2	Unavailable
CENTRAL KALIMANTAN		
Kapuas		
Terusan Makmur	1	Unavailable
Binakarya/C-1	1	Unavailable
SOUTH KALIMANTAN		
Hulu Sungai Tengah		
Lunjuk	3	Unavailable
Jararih		
EAST KALIMANTAN		
Pasir		
Tanah Grogot		
Muara Telake		
NORTH SULAWESI		
Bolaang Mongondow		
Kotabunan	1	Unavailable
Lolak		

CENTRAL SULAWESI		
Banggai		
Singkoyo	1	Unavailable
Bungin		
Donggala		
Pewunu		
Tibo		
SOUTH SULAWESI		
Gowa		
Pangkabinanga	1	Unavailable
Bontomanai	2	Unavailable
Maros		
Baju Bodoa	3	Unavailable and 1 sick
Tukamasea	1	Unavailable
EASTERN INDONESIA		
MALUKU		
Maluku Tenggara Barat		
Ilwaki		
Saumlaki	1	Unavailable
PAPUA		
Kota Jayapura		
Koya Barat		
Hamadi		

7. Statistical Report

A statistical report showing the “representativeness” of the sample for the Indonesia component of the 2006 Asian Barometer Survey is accomplished using χ^2 -test for goodness of fit and t -test for the difference in sample and population means. Please note that those figures under the LSI column are based on the survey. Furthermore, those figures under the BPS columns are the percentages from the Indonesian National Statistics Office (BPS). These figures were computed from the 2000 Census of Population. The LSI sample is composed of voting-age adults (17 years old and above). Tabulations of the same age group from the BPS are also listed to make an appropriate comparison of the two datasets.

a. Highest Educational Attainment

	LSI	BPS	
	(o_i)	(e_i)	$((o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i)$
<=Primary School	50.1	60.6	1.819306931
Junior High School	18.1	16.8	0.100595238
Senior High School	24.1	18.7	1.559358289
University	7.7	3.8	4.002631579

Null Hypothesis: The distributions of LSI and BPS Highest Educational Attainment data agree.

The χ^2 -test for goodness of fit is used on the Highest Educational Attainment data since we are investigating the significance of the differences between the distribution of observed data (LSI) arranged in K (=4) classes, and the expected frequencies (BPS) in the K (=4) classes.

The test statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i} = \sum_{i=1}^4 \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$$

$$\chi^2 = 7.481892037$$

K=4 in the variable Education since there are 4 categories. The degrees of freedom is computed as follows:

$$v = K - 1 = 4 - 1 = 3$$

Critical value $\chi^2_3(0.05) = 7.8147$

The calculated χ^2 value is less than the critical value. Hence there are no indications that the distributions of LSI and BPS Highest Educational Attainment data do not agree at a .05 level of significance.

b. Ethnicity

	LSI	BPS	
	(o_i)	(e_i)	$((o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i)$
Javanese	41.0	44.0	0.2183
Sundanese	18.9	15.6	0.6978
Madurese	2.6	3.6	0.2809
Bugis	2.8	2.5	0.0362
Betawi	2.1	2.6	0.0980
Minang	2.8	2.7	0.0037
Banten	0.6	1.9	0.7705
Others	29.1	27.2	0.1326

Null Hypothesis: The distributions of LSI and BPS Ethnicity data agree.

The χ^2 -test for goodness of fit is used on the ethnicity data since we are investigating the significance of the differences between the observed data (LSI) arranged in K (=8) classes and the theoretically expected frequencies (BPS) in the K (=8) classes.

The test statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i} = \sum_{i=1}^8 \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$$

$$\chi^2 = 2.2381$$

K=8 in the variable Ethnicity since there are 8 categories, and the degrees of freedom is computed as follows:

$$v = K-1 = 8 - 1 = 7$$

Critical value $\chi^2_7(0.05) = 14.0671$

The calculated χ^2 value is less than the critical value. Therefore, there are no indications that the distributions of LSI and BPS Ethnicity data do not agree at a .05 level of significance.

c. Age Group

	LSI	BPS	
	(o_i)	(e_i)	$((o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i)$
17-19	3.9	9.7	3.4602
20-24	8.5	14.6	2.5433
25-29	12.0	14.2	0.3418
30-34	14.6	12.5	0.3540
35-39	15.0	11.3	1.2090
40-44	12.9	9.5	1.2204
45-49	9.6	7.3	0.7211
50-54	9.2	5.6	2.3100
55-59	5.7	4.3	0.4543
60-64	4.6	4.0	0.0891
65-69	1.9	2.7	0.2363
70-74	1.3	2.2	0.3758
>75	0.9	2.1	0.6976

Null Hypothesis: The distributions of LSI and BPS Age Group data agree.

The χ^2 -test for goodness of fit is used on the Age Group data since we are investigating the significance of the differences between the distribution of observed data (LSI) arranged in K (=13) classes and the expected frequencies (BPS) in the K (=13) classes.

The test statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i} = \sum_{i=1}^{13} \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$$

$$\chi^2 = 14.0128$$

K=13 in the variable Age Group since there are 15 categories, and the degrees of freedom is computed as follows:

$$v = K-1 = 13 - 1 = 12$$

Critical value $\chi_{12}^2(0.05) = 21.0261$

The calculated χ^2 value is less than the critical value. Thus, there are no indications that the distributions of LSI and BPS Age Group data do not agree at a 95% level of significance.

d. Religion

	LSI	BPS	
	(o_i)	(e_i)	$((o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i)$
Islam	89.3	88.3	0.0113
Catholic	2.8	3.0	0.0135
Protestant	5.0	5.7	0.0634
Hindu	2.1	1.9	0.0209
Buddha	0.4	0.9	0.2775
Other	0.4	0.2	0.2012

Null Hypothesis: The distributions of LSI and BPS Religion data agree.

The χ^2 -test for goodness of fit is used on the Religion data since we are investigating the significance of the differences between the distribution of observed data (LSI) arranged in K (=6) classes and the expected frequencies (BPS) in the K (=6) classes.

The test statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i} = \sum_{i=1}^6 \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$$

$$\chi^2 = 0.5878$$

K=6 in variable Religion since there are 6 categories, the degrees of freedom is computed as follows:
 $\nu = K-1 = 6 - 1 = 5$

Critical value $\chi^2_{5}(0.05) = 2.0150$

The calculated χ^2 value is less than the critical value. Hence, there are no indications that the distributions of LSI and BPS Religion data do not agree at a .05 level of significance.

e. Household Size (including servants, transients, or boarders)

	LSI	BPS
Mean household size	5.03	3.9

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the mean Household Size of the LSI sample and the mean Household Size of the BPS population.

The *t*-test for a population mean (variance unknown) is used on the Household Size data. Since we are investigating the significance of the differences between the population mean μ_o (BPS) and a sample mean \bar{x} (LSI), the test statistic is

$$t = \frac{(\bar{x} - \mu_o)}{s / \sqrt{n}}$$

wherein,

$$\bar{x} = 5.03 \quad n = 1558$$

$$\mu_o = 3.9$$

$$s = \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n-1} \right\}^{1/2} = \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{1558} (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{1558-1} \right\}^{1/2}$$

$$s = 2.159$$

$$t = \frac{(5.03 - 3.9)}{2.159 / \sqrt{1558}}$$

$$t = 0.061808$$

Critical Value $t_{1558} (0.025) = \pm 1.96$

The calculated t value is less than the critical value. Therefore, there are no indications that the LSI and BPS mean Household Size are significantly different at a .05 level of significance.

e. Sex

LSI stratified the sample by variable Sex to meet the official national (BPS) male and female proportions of voting-age adults (17 years old and above). The proportion of males and females is as follows:

Gender	LSI (%)	BPS (%)
Male	50	50.2
Female	50	49.8

Sources:

- 100 Statistical Tests, Kanji 1993
- Census 2000, Indonesian Statistics Agency

附錄六 新加坡調查執行報告

Asian Barometer 2006 Survey TECHNICAL REPORT (Singapore) July 15-December 22, 2006

1. Location

The **Asian Barometer 2006 Survey** covered the entire island of Singapore.

2. Timetable

Pilot study: July 15-21, 2006

Actual Fieldwork: August 18-December 22, 2006

3. Respondents

Data was gathered through face-to-face interviews of voting-age adults (21 years old and above). Respondents were asked a host of questions about political, social and economic issues, some undertaken as regular indicators monitored over time and others reflective of current concerns as well as specific personal information. Information and background characteristics about the household, the household head and family members were also obtained.

4. Sampling Method

2,000 addresses were randomly selected, of which 1,000 is used for the actual fieldwork and the other 1,000 functioned as a reserve list. The reserve list was used for replacement whenever any of the actual addresses became invalid, such as “flat demolished” or “exhausted”. A separate set of 1,000 addresses were selected for condominiums. The addresses were all selected from the 2005/2006 Residential Telephone Directory.

5. Respondent Selection

a) We applied to ‘next birthday rule’ to select the appropriate respondent

from a household. In order to qualify for the study, the respondent had to be a Singaporean citizen and aged 21 or above.

- b)* In the event that they failed to achieve a successful interview, the interviewer would replace the address using the ‘2 up & 2 down method’ or the ‘2 left & 2 right method’. If they had visited all 5 households in the cluster and still could not achieve a successful interview, the interviewers will come back for a 2nd, and if necessary, a 3rd visit.
- c)* Given that both the household and respondent selection methods are largely random in nature, no quota controls were imposed.

6. Research Methodology

a) Preparation

(1) Questionnaire

The original language of the questionnaire was English and it was translated into Chinese and Malay by qualified translators. Back-translation was done to ensure accuracy.

(2) Pre-Testing and Finalizing the Questionnaire

Five interviewers were tasked with pre-testing the pilot questionnaire on 20 respondents, with a good spread of respondents in terms of gender, race and age. The pilot test served to achieve the following:

- Determine the time length of the interview
- Improve the wording of the questions, if necessary
- Eliminate unnecessary questions or add new items, as the case may be
- Test question sequence and identify bases
- Correct and improve translation
- Change open-ended questions into multiple-choice questions
- Find out which items are conceptually vague

- Check accuracy and adequacy of the questionnaire instructions
- Determine whether the focus of the question is clear
- Identify interviewer's recording difficulties

(3) Training

Training was conducted for each and every interviewer involved in this project. They were made familiar with the questionnaire and mock interviews were conducted to test their understanding of the questions. All interviewers were required to present the 1st three pieces of their work for a '1st Check'. Only if these three pieces were totally error-free would they be allowed to proceed with the study. If there are errors in the questionnaires, they would be required to go back to the respondent and rectify the error and do another three pieces for a '2nd Check'. This process continues until the interviewer's work is free of errors.

b) Fieldwork

Sixty interviewers in total were used for this survey and they are deployed to locations all over the island. Fieldwork supervision was conducted to observe the interviewers at work so as to maintain quality of fieldwork.

c) Editing

- (1) After each interview, the interviewer was asked to go over his own work and check for consistency.
- (2) Office editors conducted final consistency checks on all questionnaires prior to coding.
- (3) Logic checks were also put in place during data processing.

d) Validation

At least 30% of each interviewer's output was validated. Once an incomplete or inconsistent answer was spotted in the questionnaire, the interviewer was required to call the respondent or go back to the house to verify the correct answers.

7. Weighting Procedure

To yield representative figures at the national level, census-based population weights are applied to the survey data. The weight projection is computed by dividing the projected population in the area by the sample size of the same area. Appropriate projected factors were applied so that original population proportions were reflected in the data tables using this formula.

$$\text{Projection factors (Weight)} = \frac{\text{Population}}{\text{No. of Interviews}}$$

For questions answered by the sample voting-age adults, the following projection factors were used:

Age	Projected Population	Total Sample Size	Projection Factor for 1 Probability Respondent (000)
20-24	222,422	91	2.444
25-29	253,710	48	5.286
30-34	303,587	88	3.450
35-39	310,093	127	2.442
40-44	331,244	145	2.284
45-49	314,470	138	2.279
50-54	260,456	121	2.153
55-59	202,772	87	2.331
60-64	120,799	63	1.917
65-69	104,281	41	2.543
70-74	79,660	40	1.992
75-79	56,244	16	3.515
80-84	30,921	7	4.417
85 over	25,798	0	0

The SPSS version of the datafile is already weighted according to the above projection factors. As the data are weighted, the total number of cases that appear is 1,026.

Researchers who are defining data using the ASCII files should apply these projection factors.

8. Statistical Report

A statistical report showing the “representative-ness” of the sample for the Singaporean component of the 2005 Asian Barometer Survey is accomplished using χ^2 -test for goodness of fit and t -test for the difference in sample and population means. Please note that those figures under the SWS column are the weighted frequency percentages of the variables from the Singapore component dataset. The projected weights that are census-based population weights were used to yield representative figures at the national level. Furthermore, those figures under the SINGSTAT columns are the percentages from the Singaporean Department of Statistics (SINGSTAT). These figures were computed from the 2005 General Household Survey data of the SINGSTAT.

a. Highest Educational Attainment

➔ SWS Codes	➔ SINGSTAT Codes
No formal education	Pre-Primary
Incomplete primary	Primary
Complete primary	Secondary
Incomplete secondary	Upper secondary
Complete secondary \ Incomplete post-secondary (vocational)	Polytechnic
Incomplete post-secondary (JC \ Polytechnic)	University
Complete post-secondary (Vocational \ Technical)	
Complete post-secondary (JC)	
Complete polytechnic	
Some university education	
University education completed	
Post-graduate degree	
Professional qualifications (e.g. ACCA)	

	SWS %	SINGSTAT %	
	(o_i)	(e_i)	$((o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i)$
Pre-Primary	11.06719	8.439725	0.817988

Primary	19.86166	40.54097	10.54819
Secondary	37.54941	30.16936	1.80531
Upper secondary	7.509881	7.160197	0.017078
Polytechnic	7.806324	7.835924	0.000112
University	16.20553	5.853824	18.30562

Null Hypothesis: Distributions of SWS and SINGSTAT Highest Educational Attainment data agree.

The χ^2 -test for goodness of fit is used on the Highest Educational Attainment data since we are investigating the significance of the differences between the distribution of observed data (SWS) arranged in K (=6) classes, and the expected frequencies (SINGSTAT) in the K (=6) classes.

The test statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i} = \sum_{i=1}^6 \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$$

$$\chi^2 = \mathbf{31.4943}$$

K=6 in variable Education since there are 6 categories, the degrees of freedom is computed as follows:

$$v = K-1 = 6 - 1 = 5$$

$$\text{Critical value } \chi_5^2(0.05) = 11.07$$

The calculated χ^2 value is bigger than the critical value. **Hence there are indications that the distributions of SWS and SINGSTAT Highest Educational Attainment data do not agree at 5% level of significance.**

b. Marital Status

Note: The SWS coding scheme for Marital Status is different from that of SINGSTAT, so the SWS codes were recoded to match the SINGSTAT codes.

Recoding of Marital Status Codes:

➔ SWS Codes	➔ SINGSTAT Codes
Single . never married	Single
Married	Married
Living-in as married	Widowed
Widowed	Divorced/Separated
Separated \ Married but separated \ Not living with legal spouse	

Percentage Table of Marital Status:

	SWS %	SINGSTAT%	
	(o_i)	(e_i)	$((o_i - e_i)^2)/e_i$
Single	18.87352	30.97629	4.728683
Married	75.09881	61.38209	3.065201
Widowed	3.656126	4.885734	0.309459
Divorced/Separated	2.371542	2.755885	0.053602

Null Hypothesis: Distributions of SWS and SINGSTAT Marital Status data agree.

The χ^2 -test for goodness of fit is used on the Marital Status data since we are investigating the significance of the differences between the observed data (SWS) arranged in K (=4) classes, and the theoretically expected frequencies (SINGSTAT) in the K (=4) classes.

The test statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i} = \sum_{i=1}^4 \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$$

$$\chi^2 = \mathbf{8.156944}$$

K=4 in variable Marital Status since there are 6 categories, the degrees of freedom is computed as follows:

$$v = K-1 = 4 - 1 = 3$$

$$\text{Critical value } \chi_3^2(0.05) = 7.81$$

The calculated χ^2 value is bigger than the critical value. **Hence there are indications that the distributions of SWS and SINGSTAT Marital Status data do not agree at 5% level of significance.**

c. Age Group

	SWS %	SINGSTAT%	
	(o_i)	(e_i)	$((o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i)$
20-24	8.992095	8.500885	0.028384
25-29	4.743083	9.696701	2.530585
30-34	8.695652	11.60298	0.728482
35-39	12.54941	11.85164	0.041081
40-44	14.32806	12.66002	0.219776
45-49	13.63636	12.01892	0.217666
50-54	11.95652	9.95453	0.402628
55-59	8.596838	7.749869	0.092564
60-64	6.225296	4.616892	0.560326
65-69	4.051383	3.985581	0.001086
70-74	3.952569	3.044575	0.270794
75-79	1.581028	2.149624	0.150399
80-84	0.6917	1.181789	0.203241
85 over	0	0.98599	0.98599

Null Hypothesis: Distributions of SWS and SINGSTAT Age Group data agree.

The χ^2 -test for goodness of fit is used on the Age Group data since we are investigating the significance of the differences between the distribution of observed data (SWS) arranged in K (=14) classes, and the expected frequencies (SINGSTAT) in the K (=14) classes.

The test statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i} = \sum_{i=1}^{14} \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$$

$$\chi^2 = 6.433001$$

K=14 in variable Age Group since there are 14 categories, the degrees of freedom is computed as follows:

$$v = K-1 = 14 - 1 = 13$$

Critical value $\chi_{13}^2(0.05) = 22.36$

The calculated χ^2 value is less than the critical value. Hence **there are no indications that the distributions of SWS and SINGSTAT Age Group data do not agree at 5% level of significance.**

d. Household Size (including servants, transients, or boarders)

➔ SWS Codes (number of persons live in a household)	➔ SINGSTAT Codes (number of persons live in a household)
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6 or more
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	

	SWS %	SINGSTAT %	
	(o_i)	(e_i)	$((o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i)$
1	3.557312	10.01069	4.160158
2	12.25296	18.69146	2.217818
3	20.94862	20.12919	0.033358
4	26.87747	24.20137	0.295913
5	19.56522	15.91449	0.837465
6 or more	16.79842	11.0528	2.986763

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the Household Size of SWS sample and the Household Size of the SINGSTAT population.

The χ^2 -test for goodness of fit is used on the Household Size data since we are investigating the significance of the differences between the distribution of observed data (SWS) arranged in K (=6) classes, and the expected frequencies (SINGSTAT) in the K (=6) classes.

The test statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i} = \sum_{i=1}^6 \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$$

$$\chi^2 = \mathbf{10.53148}$$

K=6 in variable Household Size since there are 6 categories, the degrees of freedom is computed as follows:

$$v = K-1 = 6 - 1 = 5$$

Critical value $\chi_5^2(0.05) = 11.07$

The calculated χ^2 value is less than the critical value. Hence **there are no indications that the distributions of SWS and SINGSTAT Household Size data do not agree at 5% level of significance.**

e. Sex

SWS stratifies sample by variable sex to meet the official national (SINGSTAT) male and female proportions of voting age adults (21 years old and above).

	SWS %	SINGSTAT %	
	(o_i)	(e_i)	$((o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i)$
Male	51.58103	49.66211	0.074146
Female	48.41897	50.33789	0.073151

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the Gender of SWS sample and that of the SINGSTAT population.

The χ^2 -test for goodness of fit is used on the Gender data since we are investigating the significance of the differences between the distribution of observed data (SWS) arranged in K (=2) classes, and the expected frequencies (SINGSTAT) in the K (=2) classes.

The test statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i} = \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$$

$$\chi^2 = \mathbf{0.147297}$$

K=2 in variable Gender since there are 2 categories, the degrees of freedom is computed as follows:

$$v = K - 1 = 2 - 1 = 1$$

Critical value $\chi_1^2(0.05) = 3.84$

The calculated χ^2 value is less than the critical value. Hence **there are no indications that the distributions of SWS and SINGSTAT Gender data do not agree at 5% level of significance.**

Sources:

- 100 Statistical Tests, Kanji 1993
- General Household Survey Singapore 2005

Answers to Qs 1 & 2 of the information needed by the 2005 Asian Barometer Survey:

2) As to the weighting procedure, could you please provide the formula?

Formula and weighting procedure can be found in page 4, section 7.

赴國外研究心得報告

計畫編號	95-2420-H-002-003-
計畫名稱	「全球民主動態調查」計畫-「亞洲民主動態調查」：民主、治理與發展計畫(2/3)

工作記要：

2003年12月東亞民主動態調查與南亞研究團隊完成整合，共同組織涵蓋全球超過二十億人口的亞洲民主動態調查。¹本計畫至今已邁入第七年，目前正在進行第二波的跨國比較調查階段，除了負責支援東亞(中國大陸、台灣、南韓、日本、香港、蒙古)與東南亞(泰國、柬埔寨、越南、菲律賓、新加坡、印尼、馬來西亞)共十三個國家的調查工作外，也將規劃各種國際學術研究成果的發表。

本計畫的總部設於台北，直接督導十二個東亞國家的調查計畫，另設南亞分部計畫辦公室，地點在印度新德里的「發展中社會研究中心」(Centre for the Study of Developing Societies)，負責整合南亞五國研究團隊。同時，本計畫已經與 Afrobarometer、Latinobarometro，New Europe Barometer 等三個大型區域調查計畫，組成全球民主動態調查(Global Barometer Surveys)，成為一個涵蓋六十多個新興民主國家與轉型社會的全球性民主化調查研究組織，並開展與「國際民主與選舉支援機構」(International IDEA)、聯合國開發總署(UNDP)、世界銀行，以及其他重要國際組織的長期合作關係，定期收集與建構全球範圍的民主發展與治理品質指標，並合作發表權威性的調查研究報告。

差旅內容：

亞洲民主動態調查第二波調查費用，除台灣外，包括泰國、蒙古、柬埔寨、越南、新加坡、馬來西亞與印尼等國家的調查經費，都由台灣補助。同時，台灣也負責支援中國大陸與菲律賓調查的部份費用。基於提昇研究品質與水準，在調查時期台灣團隊不定期提供各國當地團隊技術建議及支援，其主要的合作性參訪如下：

¹ 更詳細的計畫介紹，請參考本計畫兩個工作網站：

亞洲民主動態調查：<http://www.asianbarometer.org/>。

東亞民主動態調查：<http://eacsurvey.law.ntu.edu.tw/>。

日期	出國人員姓名	內容
2006年1月7~9日	朱雲漢、洪永泰、張佑宗(國立台灣大學政治系)	至曼谷(Bangkok)與泰國調查主持人 Robert Albritton 及 KPI 團隊研討調查訪問之抽樣設計、問卷內容，以及相關行政事務。
2006年1月17~20日	朱雲漢、張佑宗(國立台灣大學政治系)	至新加坡(Singapore)與 Tan Ern Ser、Chengxu Wang、David Yang 等學者討論調查訪問之抽樣設計、問卷內容，以及相關行政事務。
2006年5月5~7日	朱雲漢、洪永泰、黃旻華(國立台灣大學政治系)	至雅加達(Jakarta)與 Saiful Mujani 及其團隊(LSI)討論調查訪問之抽樣設計、問卷內容(印尼特殊題組)，以及相關行政事務。
2006年10月30~31日	朱雲漢(國立台灣大學政治系)	至吉隆坡(Kuala Lumpur)和 Ibrahim Suffian 及其團隊商研馬來西亞納入亞洲民主動態調查的可行性。
2006年12月20~23日	朱雲漢、洪永泰、黃旻華(國立台灣大學政治系)	至河內(Hanoi)與 Pham Minh Hac 討論未來越南調查計畫的相關步驟及程序。

研究報告：

民主化的研究在過去二十多年蓬勃發展，成為國際學術界研究開發中國家政治最核心的議題，新的研究議題與理論觀點不斷湧向，民主化研究並與許多重要的社會與經濟發展議題緊密相連，不少重要的國際發展組織，包括世界銀行、亞洲開發銀行，聯合國開發計畫(UNDP)也不約而同將民主發展、民主治理、民主參與列為健全社會發展的先決條件之一，同時民主化研究也帶動對於西方國家早期政治發展經驗的重新檢視(Held, 1996)。不過到目前為止，國際學術界在民主化領域所累積的實證研究大量集中在南歐、拉丁美洲與東歐地區，所開展的研究議題與理論觀點，也絕大部分是以前述三個地區的民主化經驗為範疇。東亞民主化經驗在民主化研究領域內能見度相對比較低，在經驗分析與理論觀點的呈現上也屬於最薄弱的一環，在許多全球民主化比較研究的代表性著作中(Huntington 1993; Linz and Stepan 1996; Diamond 1999; Diamond and Plattner 2001)，東亞經驗的引述往往聊備一格，這個地區政體轉型經驗潛在的理論價值尚未得到充分的提煉與闡揚，也並尚未得到國際學術界應有的重視。對於東亞國家民主化的研究，

目前累積比較多的是對個案進行深入的、動態的過程與變遷機制分析(Diamond, Plattner, Chu and Tien 1997; Diamond and Kim 2000)，或是個別國家的民主鞏固近程(Shin, 1999; Diamond and Shin 1999);系統性的比較研究仍十分有限，無論是以跨國社會調查研究的系統性經驗性資料切入；或是以跨國性的總體層次制度與結構比較分析切入的研究仍在起步階段。以常設性的研究建制與跨國合作的方式推動民主化比較研究在東亞地區更是罕見。因此台灣學者在此一議題領域將有很大的發揮空間。

環顧全球，真正能以全球視野進行民主化比較研究的常設性研究建制並不多見，隸屬於美國民主基金會(NED)的「民主研究國際論壇」(International Forum for Democratic Studies)算是其中的翹楚，但顧名思義，該論壇的性質仍是於一個整合全球民主研究代表性學者的學術對話與交流網絡，而非推動經常性研究計畫的研究組織建制。此外，比較重要的常設性民主研究機構，則多半各有其研究範圍或主題上的偏重，例如美國加州大學系統設於 Irvine 分校的 The Center for the Study of Democracy 主要研究西方民主先進國家政治過程在二十一世紀面臨的各種挑戰，以及東歐與前蘇聯地區的民主轉型；美國史坦福大學新成立的 The Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law 著重法治、民主治理與永續發展的相互關連性；美國聖母大學的 Kellogg Institute for International Studies 是以研究拉丁美洲民主化為其研究重點之一，該計畫並特別重視民主化與經濟發展的相互關係；德國柏林社會科學研究計畫(WZB)的「市民社會、衝突與民主」研究片(Civil Society, Conflict and Democracy Research Area)是以南歐與東歐國家民主化為重點，並突出市民社會與民主發展的關連性問題；南非的 IDASA 則以研究非洲民主化問題著稱，也同時具有民主教育的功能。

嚴格說來，目前全世界還沒有一個以研究東亞或亞太地區威權政體轉型與民主化為重點的常設性研究建制或整合性研究計畫，目前以亞太地區民主發展為焦點的只有兩個政策導向的民主研究機構：一個是澳洲「國際開發援助總署」資助成立的 The Centre for Democratic Institutions (CDI)，其次是由美國民主基金會與印度工業總會共同資助成立的 The Asian Center for Democratic Governance (ACDG)，但這兩個機構的主要宗旨在民主推廣與民主支援，研究活動是以配合政策任務為導向。另外還勉強可以算在內的，是由「民主研究國際論壇」與南韓世宗研究院(Sejong Institute)共同成立的 Democracy Forum for East Asia，但這此一合作計畫只是論壇，而非常設性研究建制。此外，國際知名的東亞研究機構，例如哥倫比亞大學的 Weatherhead East Asian Institute，加州柏克萊大學的 Institute of East Asian Studies，哈佛大學的費正清研究計畫，雖然都偶而有研究東亞民主發展的項目，但基本上都是個別研究計畫，沒有長期性的整合型研究。

而在東亞地區內，還沒有一個以研究東亞地區威權政體轉型與民主化經驗為

焦點的長期性且大型的整合計畫，台灣大學若能在此方興未艾而台灣學者又具有明顯國際競爭優勢的研究領域，即時進行策略性的學術投資，整合本校堅實的研究團隊，挹注穩固而充分的研究資源，來支持國內學者出面整合東亞其他國家的學者，並與國際一流學術機構全面開展合作，將可確立台灣學者對東亞民主發展經驗的學術詮釋地位，並可讓台灣學者在全球民主研究領域內逐漸扮演引導尖端研究議題的角色，對於提高台灣大學社會科學的國際學術地位，將可收立竿見影之效。

本計畫由「東亞民主動態調查」升格而來，在原先東亞八個國家的比較研究基礎上，擴大為一個覆蓋全亞洲的國際學術合作組織，以「民主、治理、與發展」為研究主題，定期在亞洲各國針對公民對民主、治理與發展的價值取向、評估與態度，進行同步的調查研究。這個大型的國際合作計畫，涵蓋了亞洲地區最重要的穩定民主國家（例如日本與印度），所有新興民主國家，以及最重要的社會主義轉型國家（中國大陸與越南），同時跨越儒家文化、基督教、回教、印度教以及佛教文明等五大文化體系，更覆蓋了全球百分之四十八的人口。「亞洲民主動態調查」下設東亞計畫與南亞計畫。設置於台大的區域營運總部將同時扮演東亞計畫辦公室的功能，直接督導日本、韓國、台灣、蒙古、中國大陸、香港、菲律賓、泰國、印尼、越南、新加坡、馬來西亞等十二國的調查計畫。南亞計畫辦公室設於印度新德里的「發展中社會研究計畫」(Centre for the Study of Developing Societies)，負責整合印度、巴基斯坦、孟加拉、斯里蘭卡與尼泊爾等五國的研究隊伍。「亞洲民主動態調查」並與美國卡特中心「中國村選舉計畫」進行合作，委託美國杜克大學史天健教授設置中國大陸基層民主實施評鑑機制，正在建立覆蓋全中國大陸的一個長期性、制度化運作的調查網，抽樣點分佈於全中國大陸的兩百個農村與兩百個居委會。此外，「亞洲民主動態調查」已經與 Afrobarometer、Latinobarometro，New Europe Barometer 等三個區域大型調查計畫，組成 Global Barometer Surveys，成為一個涵蓋六十多個新興民主國家與轉型社會的全球性民主化調查研究組織，並開展與「國際民主與選舉支援計畫」(IDEA)，聯合國開發總署(UNDP)，世界銀行，以及其他重要國際組織的長期合作關係，將定期收集與建構全球範圍的民主發展與治理品質指標，並合作發表權威性的調查研究報告。