ANNEXES

Annex 1: Methodology

METHODOLOGY

This was a countrywide survey by Integrity Watch Afghanistan on Afghans’ perceptions and experiences of corruption, and an assessment of how corruption impacts their lives and communities. Since 2007, this is the fifth biennial survey of its kind by Integrity Watch. The survey offers insights to the high level government authorities, political leaders, CSOs, think tanks and public officials about Afghans’ perception of corruption and their expectations from the state and political leaders of the country.

The target population for this survey was Afghans age 18 years and older. According to population data from the Central Statistics Organization (CSO) of Afghanistan (Settled Population by Sex and Age Groups -2014-15), around 48 percent of the provincial population is 18 and over. This means that the total of the target population was 13,021401 (total population of Afghanistan is = 27101365).

In this study, the sampling frame was a list of villages or nahias, using various village databases in each of the selected districts as research location. The representative sample villages were drawn at random from the list in each district.

SAMPLE SIZE CALCULATION

Integrity Watch Afghanistan administered a country level public opinion survey in one hundred Thirty-Seven (137) sample districts including Nahias in all thirty-four (34) provinces of Afghanistan. The sample size for the whole country was calculated to obtain a 1.1% margin of error at 95% confidence level with an estimate of 50 percent response distribution (among male and female). The total number of respondents was 7810. To increase demographic variation and taking into account the budget considerations, the research team distributed 10 surveys per sampling point, which accounts for a total of 781 sampling points in all one hundred and thirty-seven districts of thirty-four provinces.

PROVINCE AND DISTRICT SELECTION

Integrity Watch conducted a security assessment of all 34 provinces, together with the security committee and research team, and developed a four-part, color-based security ranking system. The system/classifications outline the level of access survey teams could achieve and the relevant survey methodology, including clustering and possible bias, at each level. Security classifications were determined through consultation with field coordinators and provincial networks.

▪ **Green**: Green districts were completely open to survey teams. All villages were included in sampling lists.

▪ **Amber**: In amber districts, all villages within approximately two hours of the district center were surveyed. Travel times beyond two hours from the district center meant that survey teams had to make multiple trips to each remote village. In semi-permissive districts, making repeated visits to the same area increases the risk that survey teams could be intercepted by anti-government elements. Therefore, sampling points in these districts were clustered within two hours of the district center.

▪ **Red**: Red districts were highly insecure, meaning surveys could only conduct survey in the district centers. This can consist of household surveys of residents of the district center and villages surrounding the district center. The higher degree of clustering in red districts introduces a correspondingly higher degree of selection bias than was the case with amber districts.

▪ **Black**: Black districts were those where the absence of GI RoA control made even district centers too dangerous for survey teams. Moreover, extensive Anti-Government Elements checkpoints in these districts made it impossible to transport survey materials to the district centers, even when the survey teams traveled in separate vehicles. In this survey, the districts colored black were not covered at all; no one from our team traveled for survey purposes to this class of the districts.
URBAN-RURAL STRATIFICATION

According to the municipality administration, populations living within municipal boundaries are classified as urban, and those living outside municipal boundaries are classified as rural. In some provinces, municipal boundaries are not clearly defined. According to the CSO population yearbook for 2014-15, urban populations are mostly oriented in provincial centers and very rarely in a few major districts. However, not necessarily all parts of the provincial centers and districts are within the municipal boundaries. Even in the provincial capital/city, some villages lie outside of the municipal boundary. Urban areas are divided into nahias by the municipality administration, and in this study urban participants were representative of nahias and were drawn from nahias within the municipal boundaries. The sample is distributed proportionally to urban-rural population size of each district using population data from the CSO 2014-15.

SETTLEMENT-VILLAGE/SAMPLING POINT SELECTION

In this survey a village in a rural area and a nahia in an urban area are called a sampling point. At this stage, within districts the sampling frame was the list of all villages in the rural area and list of all nahias in urban area. Sampling point selection for urban areas: As described earlier, urban areas are divided into nahias within municipal boundaries. Because there was no population data available about nahia sizes within the municipal boundaries, the survey was distributed equally among nahias.

Sampling point selection for rural areas: Within districts, villages were assigned a number on a serial number list. Using a simple random-sampling generator (Random.org), the village numbers are chosen at random until the desired sample size reached. Because the CSO lacks accurate population counts for rural villages, villages/sampling points cannot be drawn proportionally.